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>> 1988 STUDY DESCRIPTION INTRODUCTION

ELECTIONS PRODUCED BY THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR PROGRAM OF THE
SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER AND THE CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES,
AND IT IS THE SIXTH SUCH STUDY TO BE CONDUCTED UNDER THE
AUSPICES OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANTS (SOC77-08885
AND SES-8341310) PROVIDING LONG-TERM SUPPORT FOR THE
NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. SINCE 1978 THE NES ELECTION
STUDIES HAVE BEEN DESIGNED BY A NATIONAL BOARD OF OVERSEEERS,
THE MEMBERS OF WHICH MEET SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR TO PLAN
CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE MAJOR STUDY COMPONENTS.

BOARD MEMBERS DURING THE PLANNING OF THE 1988 NATIONAL
ELECTION STUDY INCLUDED: MORRIS P. FIORINA, HARVARD
UNIVERSITY, CHAIR; RICHARD A. BRODY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY;
STANLEY FELDMAN, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY; EDIE N. GOLDENBERG,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN; GARY C. JACOBSON, UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO; STANLEY KELLEY, JR., PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY; DONALD R. KINDER, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN;
THOMAS MANN, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION; DOUGLAS RIVERS, THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES; RAY WOLFINGER, THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY; WARREN E. MILLER,
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, EX OFFICIO; AND STEVEN J.
ROSENSTONE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, EX OFFICIO.

AS PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS, A SPECIAL PLANNING
COMMITTEE WAS APPOINTED, A PILOT STUDY CONDUCTED, AND
STIMULUS LETTERS SENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SCHOLARLY
COMMUNITY SOLICITING INPUT ON STUDY PLANS. THE 1988 STUDY
PLANNING COMMITTEE INCLUDED SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS (KINDER,
CO-CHAIR; KELLEY; MILLER, EX OFFICIO; AND ROSENSTONE,
EX-OFFICIO AND CO-CHAIR) AND TWO OTHER SCHOLARS (KATHLEEN
KNIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, AND JOHN ZALLER, UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE BEGAN MEETING IN FEBRUARY OF 1987. A
TWO-WAVE PILOT STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT IN MAY AND JUNE OF 1987
FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEVELOPING NEW INSTRUMENTATION FOR THE
1988 ELECTION STUDY. THE PILOT STUDY RESPONDENTS WERE A
SUBSAMPLE OF 1986 ELECTION STUDY RESPONDENTS, AND THE 1986
DATA FOR THESE RESPONDENTS IS PART OF THE RELEASED DATASET.
NEW ITEMS WERE TESTED IN THE AREA OF MORALITY, FOREIGN
POLICY ATTITUDES, SYSTEM SUPPORT AND POLITICAL EFFICACY.

A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE STUDY WAS DEVOTED TO
EXPERIMENTS DESIGNED TO FURTHER UNDERSTANDING OF THE SURVEY
RESPONSE. DATA FROM THE PILOT STUDY ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH
THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL
RESEARCH (ICPSR 8713). RESULTS FROM THE PILOT STUDY WERE
USED BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN FORMULATING
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD ABOUT STUDY CONTENT FOR THE
1988 ELECTION STUDY.

THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY HAD TWO OTHER MAJOR
COMPONENTS. THIS DOCUMENT DESCRIBES THE TRADITIONAL PRE-
AND POST-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION SURVEY PANEL. THE OTHER
MAJOR COMPONENTS WERE: A STUDY OF THE PRESIDENTIAL
NOMINATING PROCESS, FOCUSED ON THE MARCH 8 (SUPER-TUESDAY)
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION; AND A STUDY OF SENATE
ELECTIONS, CONDUCTED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE POST-ELECTION
SURVEY. THE SENATE ELECTIONS STUDY WAS CONDUCTED BY
TELEPHONE. THE SUPER-TUESDAY STUDY IS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE
THROUGH THE ICPSR (9093); THE SENATE STUDY IS AVAILABLE AS
ICPSR 9219.
SURVEY CONTENT.

THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS BALANCED A NUMBER OF CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTING CONTENT FOR THE PRE- AND POST-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION SURVEY PANEL. THERE WAS, AS ALWAYS, THE NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING CONTINUITY WITH PAST SURVEYS, SO THAT MEASURES THAT HAVE REACHED THE TIME-SERIES OR "CORE" STATUS COULD BE MAINTAINED. ALL "CORE" ITEMS WERE EVALUATED BY THE BOARD, AND INPUT WAS SOLICITED FROM THE USER COMMUNITY ABOUT WHETHER EACH SHOULD BE RETAINED.

THE CORE ITEMS FOR THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY INCLUDE: CAMPAIGN ATTENTION; LIKES AND DISLIKES OF THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES; MEDIA ATTENTIVENESS; REAGAN APPROVAL; FEELING THERMOMETER RATINGS OF CANDIDATES AND PARTIES; RETROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS (NATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL); TRAITS AND AFFECTS FOR BUSH, DUKAKIS AND JACKSON; LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCALE (WITH PROXIMITIES); PARTY IDENTIFICATION, 7-POINT ISSUE SCALES WITH PLACEMENTS; FEDERAL BUDGET PREFERENCES; VIEWS ON ABORTION; VOTE INTENTION; AND THE STANDARD AND EXTENSIVE BATTERY OF DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS.

POST-ELECTION STUDY CORE ITEMS ARE: CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE LIKES AND DISLIKES; THERMOMETER RATINGS OF CANDIDATES AND GROUPS; RECALL; CONTACT WITH CONGRESSPERSON OR CANDIDATE; VOTE; MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM; CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES; SYSTEM SUPPORT AND EFFICACY ITEMS; QUESTIONS ABOUT RACIAL ATTITUDES; BATTERIES OF LIKERT TYPE (AGREE-DISAGREE) MEASURES OF VALUES AND PREDISPOSITIONS; AND A GROUP CLOSENESS QUESTION.

A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ARE NEW OR RELATIVELY NEW TO THE PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEYS. SOME CAME FROM THE PILOTING WORK DESCRIBED ABOVE, OTHERS WERE REINSTATED AT THE URGING OF THE NES SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY, AND OTHERS WERE DESIGNED TO REFLECT TOPICAL CONCERNS OF THE CAMPAIGN. ITEMS IN THIS NEW CONTENT CATEGORY IN THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY ARE: EVALUATIONS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY CANDIDATES; THE RESPONDENT'S PRIMARY VOTE; HOW SERIOUSLY THE RESPONDENT EVALUATES THE BUDGET DEFICIT AND WHETHER H/SHE WOULD PAY MORE IN TAXES; A SEVEN-POINT SCALE ON HEALTH INSURANCE; FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDE ITEMS; A REINSTATED ITEM ON EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN; A QUESTION ON SERIOUSNESS OF THE DRUG PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES; AND A SECTION DEALING WITH EVALUATIONS OF THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY.

THE POST-ELECTION "NEW CONTENT" INCLUDES: EVALUATIONS OF THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY (SEE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION); RECALL OF THE 1984 PRESIDENTIAL VOTE; PARENTAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION; EVALUATION OF BUSH AND DUKAKIS ON THE ISSUES
OF ENVIRONMENT AND CRIME; A QUESTION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY; AND NEW SYSTEM SUPPORT AND POLITICAL EFFICACY ITEMS.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION.

TWO BASIC DESIGN PARAMETERS WERE SET BY THE BOARD THAT RELATE TO SURVEY ADMINISTRATION: 1) IN THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE, THE SURVEY WAS TO BE ADMINISTERED IN TWO-WEEK "QUARTERS." 2) BOTH SURVEYS WERE TO BE ADMINISTERED IN TWO FORMS, SO THAT A MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CONTENT COULD BE INCLUDED. BOTH OF THESE PARAMETERS ARE EXPLAINED BELOW.

INTERVIEW TARGET PERIODS.

IF ONE THINKS THAT THERE IS SOME AMOUNT OF VOTE DECISION-MAKING THAT IS RELATIVELY LATE, THEN ONE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A MEASURE THAT IS NOT CONTAMINATED BY DIFFICULTY OF OBTAINING INTERVIEW, FOR VOTE-DECISION BY TIME-OF-INTERVIEW. THAT IS, IF THE ENTIRE SAMPLE IS RELEASED IMMEDIATELY AND THE MOST RELUCTANT AND HARD-TO-REACH RESPONDENTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY INTERVIEWED LATER IN THE INTERVIEW PERIOD THAN ARE MORE AMENABLE RESPONDENTS, AND IF THE HARDER-TO-REACH RESPONDENTS ALSO DECIDE LATER (OR DIFFERENTLY) THAN OTHER RESPONDENTS, THEN THE VOTE-DECISION BY TIME-OF-INTERVIEW RELATIONSHIP IS CONFOUNDED.

THIS LOGIC LED THE BOARD TO DECIDE THAT THE SAMPLE SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED IN FOUR TWO-WEEK QUARTERS. THE FIELD PERIOD BEGAN ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6. THE FIRST QUARTER ENDED MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19TH. THE SECOND QUARTER WAS SEPTEMBER 20TH-OCTOBER 3RD; THE 3RD QUARTER WAS OCTOBER 4TH-OCTOBER 17TH; AND THE LAST QUARTER WAS OCTOBER 17TH-OCTOBER 31. NOVEMBER 1-NOVEMBER 7 WAS LEFT FOR "CATCH-UP" INTERVIEWS. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED RESPONDENTS THAT COULD NOT BE TAKEN IN THE SAMPLE QUARTER ASSIGNED TO THEM WERE NONETHELESS TAKEN, USUALLY LATER IN THE STUDY PERIOD. 80% OF ALL INTERVIEWS WERE TAKEN WITHIN THE TARGET PERIOD. VARIABLE V880039 RECORDS INFORMATION ABOUT TARGET PERIOD ASSIGNMENT AND SUCCESS. ONE QUARTER OF EACH SEGMENT (SEE SAMPLING INFORMATION) AS ASSIGNED TO EACH TWO-WEEK TARGET PERIOD.

FORMS.


IT IS CRITICAL TO NOTE THE INTERACTION OF THE REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATION ITEMS WITH THE FORM ASSIGNMENT. THIS SECTION WAS PARTICULARLY LENGTHY. IN ORDER NOT TO MAKE EITHER THE PRE- OR THE POST-ELECTION INSTRUMENT UNACCEPTABLY LONG, AND ALSO TO STUDY THE EFFECTS OF POST-ELECTION MEDIA

NOTE THAT PART 1 ITEMS WERE ADMINISTERED TO HALF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE PRE-ELECTION SURVEY AND TO THE OTHER HALF OF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY, AND SIMILARLY FOR PART 2 ITEMS. THE STUDY STAFF HAS BUILT, AND ICPSR HAS RETAINED, MEASURES COMBINING PRE- AND POST-ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OF EACH REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE VARIABLE. THESE COMBINED VARIABLES APPEAR IN THE POST-ELECTION SECTION OF THE DATASET, VARIABLES V880898-V880923 AND 881002-881043. (PLEASE SEE TABLE 1A BELOW FOR CLARIFICATION.) THE CODEBOOK DOCUMENTS THESE SITUATIONS WITH AN A OR B AND PRE- OR POST- NOTATION IN THE VARIABLE NAME. THE ORIGINAL PRE-ELECTION VARIABLES HAVE BEEN DELETED FOR THE ICPSR RELEASE DATASET.

THE OTHER MAJOR USAGE OF THE TWO FORMS WAS TO CONDUCT AN EXPERIMENT IN SURVEY RESPONSE. STANDARD LIKERT BATTERIES ON VALUES (I.E., EGALITARIANISM, RACISM) WERE ADMINISTERED AS USUAL, TOGETHER AS ONE BATTERY, IN FORM A OF THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY. IN FORM B, THESE ITEMS WERE SPLIT UP AND SCRAMBLED. THE PURPOSE OF THE EXPERIMENT IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER SCALE OR INDEX RELIABILITIES RESULT FROM INHERENT ITEM CONSISTENCIES, OR BECAUSE OF RESPONSE SET DEVELOPED BY RESPONDENTS, AS THEY GO THROUGH A SIMILAR SET OF ITEMS. THE VERSION OF THESE ITEMS THAT APPEARS IN THE ICPSR RELEASE OF THE DATA ARE COMBINED FROM BOTH FORMS; USERS SHOULD BE AWARE, HOWEVER, OF THE DIFFERENCES IN ADMINISTRATION BETWEEN FORMS FOR THESE ITEMS. BOTH THE DATA MAP AND CODEBOOK FLAG THESE VARIABLES WITH (A & B) NOTATION.

SEVERAL OTHER POINTS ABOUT THE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION NEED FURTHER ELABORATION:

1) AS USUAL, THERE WERE A FEW ERRONEOUSLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS. IN THE TWO OF THE THREE INSTANCES LISTED BELOW, THE REASON FOR THE INCORRECT SELECTION WAS IMPROPER NUMBERING OF THE KISH SELECTION TABLE (SEE SAMPLING INFORMATION) BY THE INTERVIEWER. THE WRONGLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WERE NOT SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF WHO WAS MOST AVAILABLE. NEVERTHELESS, FOR THOSE ANALYSTS WHO WISH TO DELETE THESE CASES, THEIR PRE-ELECTION CASE ID#S ARE: 00253, 00316, 00362.

2) IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY, RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED LENGTHY SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR PARTICULAR CONGRESSPERSONS AND SENATORS. INTERVIEWERS MUST PRE-EDIT QUESTIONNAIRES TO FILL IN THE NAMES APPROPRIATE FOR THE STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE RESPONDENT IS LIVING (OR WAS LIVING DURING THE PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW). INTERVIEWERS ARE SENT "CANDIDATE LISTS" FOR EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN THE SAMPLE SEGMENTS IN WHICH THEY
ARE INTERVIEWING. EACH CANDIDATE AND SENATOR ON THAT LIST IS ASSIGNED A PARTICULAR NUMBER THAT REFLECTS HIS OR HER INCUMBENCY STATUS AND PARTY. (SEE CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODES) PARTICULAR QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY REQUIRE THE INSERTION BY THE INTERVIEWER DURING PRE-EDITING OF THE NAMES OF CANDIDATES WITH SPECIFIC NUMBERS. SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, Q. B1, THE FEELING THERMOMETER. THE CANDIDATE LISTS USED BY THE INTERVIEWERS, WHICH SHOW WHICH CANDIDATES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH WHICH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AND WITH WHICH NUMBERS THEY ARE TAGGED, CAN BE FOUND IN THE APPENDICES, NOTE 3 OF THIS DOCUMENTATION.

OCCUPATION CODING.


OTHER CONFIDENTIALITY RECODING.

FOR SOME YEARS, THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES HAVE NOT RELEASED INFORMATION FOR CENSUS TRACTS OR MINOR CIVIL DIVISIONS. THIS YEAR, INFORMATION ABOUT NEWSPAPERS READ BY FEWER THAN 10 PERSONS, AND/OR PUBLISHED IN RELATIVELY SMALL GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, HAS BEEN SUPPRESSED. PERMISSION TO USE THE MORE DETAILED GEOGRAPHIC OR NEWSPAPER INFORMATION FOR SCHOLARLY RESEARCH MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE BOARD OF OVERSEEERS. MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THIS IS AVAILABLE FROM NES PROJECT STAFF.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS.


TABLE 1A

QUESTION LAYOUT BY FORM
### Pre-Election Wave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Content</th>
<th>Form A</th>
<th>Form B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q#</td>
<td>VAR#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV. HELP BLACKS/OTHR MINORITIES 7-PT SCALE</td>
<td>880332-</td>
<td>880340-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 1</td>
<td>881002-</td>
<td>881043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 2</td>
<td>NOT ASKED</td>
<td>880898-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-Election Wave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Content</th>
<th>Form A</th>
<th>Form B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q#</td>
<td>VAR#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 1</td>
<td>NOT ASKED</td>
<td>881002-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 2</td>
<td>K1-K5X</td>
<td>880898-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUALITARIANISM</td>
<td>L1A-F</td>
<td>880924-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL EFFICACY</td>
<td>M1A-H</td>
<td>880936-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL MORALITY</td>
<td>M4A-D</td>
<td>880951-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACISM</td>
<td>M11A-E</td>
<td>880961-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONALISM</td>
<td>M15A-C</td>
<td>880972-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1B

**Study Totals for Pre and Post Election Surveys**

**Pre-Election Response Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUARTER 2  .730
QUARTER 3  .701
QUARTER 4  .641
---
OVERALL  .705

LENGTH OF INTERVIEW  68.0 MIN
NO. OF RESPONDENTS  2040

POST-ELECTION: NUMBER AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS
BY TIME AFTER NOV. 8TH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of Interviews</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8-21</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 22-25</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 6-19</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 20-2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 3-16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 16-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS  1775
RESPONSE RATE: .870
LENGTH OF INTERVIEW  60.2 MINUTES

>> 1988 SAMPLING INFORMATION

STUDY POPULATION

THE STUDY POPULATION FOR THE 1988 NES IS DEFINED TO INCLUDE ALL UNITED STATES CITIZENS OF VOTING AGE ON OR BEFORE THE 1988 ELECTION DAY. ELIGIBLE CITIZENS MUST HAVE RESIDED IN HOUSING UNITS, OTHER THAN ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS, IN THE FORTY-EIGHT COTERMINOUS STATES. THIS DEFINITION EXCLUDES PERSONS LIVING IN ALASKA OR HAWAII AND REQUIRES ELIGIBLE PERSONS TO HAVE BEEN BOTH A UNITED STATES CITIZEN AND EIGHTEEN YEARS OF AGE ON OR BEFORE 8 NOVEMBER 1988.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

PROCESS--A PRIMARY STAGE SAMPLING OF U.S. STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (SMSA'S) (SEE CENSUS DEFINITIONS IN APPENDIX) AND COUNTIES, FOLLOWED BY A SECOND STAGE SAMPLING OF AREA SEGMENTS, A THIRD STAGE SAMPLING OF HOUSING UNITS WITHIN SAMPLED AREA SEGMENTS AND CONCLUDING WITH THE RANDOM SELECTION OF A SINGLE RESPONDENT FROM SELECTED HOUSING UNITS. A DETAILED DOCUMENTATION OF THE SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE IS PROVIDED IN THE SRC PUBLICATION ENTITLED 1980 SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.

PRIMARY STAGE SELECTION

THE SELECTION OF PRIMARY STAGE SAMPLING UNITS (PSU'S) (2), WHICH DEPENDING ON THE SAMPLE STRATUM ARE EITHER SMSA'S, SINGLE COUNTIES OR GROUPINGS OF SMALL COUNTIES, IS BASED ON THE COUNTY-LEVEL 1980 CENSUS REPORTS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING.

PRIMARY STAGE UNITS WERE ASSIGNED TO 84 EXPLICIT STRATA BASED ON SMSA/NON-SMSA STATUS, PSU SIZE, AND GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION. SIXTEEN OF THE 84 STRATA CONTAIN ONLY A SINGLE SELF-REPRESENTING PSU, EACH OF WHICH IS INCLUDED WITH CERTAINTY IN THE PRIMARY STAGE OF SAMPLE SELECTION. THE REMAINING 68 NONSELF-REPRESENTING STRATA CONTAIN MORE THAN ONE PSU. FROM EACH OF THESE NONSELF-REPRESENTING STRATA,

------------------------

(1) PREPARED BY THE SAMPLING SECTION OF THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER.
(2) IN SRC PUBLICATIONS AND SURVEY MATERIALS, THE TERM "PRIMARY AREA" IS USED INTERCHANGEABLY WITH THE MORE COMMON "PRIMARY STAGE UNIT" TERMINOLOGY.


SECOND STAGE SELECTION OF AREA SEGMENTS

SEGMENTS", ARE COMPRISED OF CENSUS BLOCKS IN THE
METROPOLITAN PRIMARY AREAS AND ENUMERATION DISTRICTS (ED'S)
IN THE RURAL NON-SMSA'S AND RURAL AREAS OF SMSA PRIMARY
AREAS. EACH SSU BLOCK, BLOCK COMBINATION OR ENUMERATION
DISTRICT WAS ASSIGNED A MEASURE OF SIZE EQUAL TO THE TOTAL
1980 OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT COUNT FOR THE AREA (MINIMUM =
50). SECOND STAGE SAMPLING OF AREA SEGMENTS WAS PERFORMED
WITH PROBABILITIES PROPORTIONATE TO THE ASSIGNED MEASURES OF
SIZE.

A THREE-STEP PROCESS OF ORDERING THE SSU'S WITHIN THE
PRIMARY AREAS PRODUCED AN IMPLICIT STRATIFICATION OF THE
AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SECOND STAGE SAMPLING FRAME, STRATIFIED
AT THE COUNTY LEVEL BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION AND POPULATION.
AREA SEGMENTS WERE STRATIFIED WITHIN COUNTY AT THE MINOR
CIVIL DIVISION (MCD) LEVEL BY SIZE AND INCOME, AND AT THE
BLOCK AND ED LEVEL BY LOCATION WITHIN THE MCD OR COUNTY.
(FOR DETAILS, REFER TO THE SRC PUBLICATION, 1980 NATIONAL
SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.)

SYSTEMATIC PPS SAMPLING WAS USED TO SELECT THE AREA SEGMENTS
FROM THE SECOND STAGE SAMPLING FRAME FOR EACH COUNTY. IN
THE SELF-REPRESENTING (SR) PSU'S THE NUMBER OF SAMPLE AREA
SEGMENTS VARIED IN PROPORTION TO THE SIZE OF THE PRIMARY
STAGE UNIT, FROM A HIGH OF B=18 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SR NEW
YORK SMSA TO A LOW OF B=7 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SMALLER SR
PSU'S SUCH AS SAN FRANCISCO. A TOTAL OF B=6 AREA SEGMENTS

| TABLE 2 |
| PSU'S IN THE 1988 NES PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY |
| BY: SMSA STATUS AND REGION |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S</th>
<th>NON SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH-EAST</td>
<td>NEW YORK, NY-NJ</td>
<td>BOSTON, MA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHILADELPHIA, PA-NJ</td>
<td>PITTSBURGH, PA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUFFALO, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEW HAVEN, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATLANTIC CITY, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MANCHESTER, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH-CENTRAL</td>
<td>CHICAGO, IL</td>
<td>ST. LOUIS, MO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DETROIT, MI</td>
<td>MILWAUKEE, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAYTON, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DES MOINES, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND RAPIDS, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORT WAYNE, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STEUBENVILLE, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>HOUSTON, TX*</td>
<td>BULLOCH, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BALTIMORE, MD*</td>
<td>HALE, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COLUMBUS, GA-AL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10/28/2009
NOTE: THE PSU’S MARKED WITH AN ASTERISK (*) ARE
SELF-REPRESENTING FOR SAMPLE DESIGNS THAT USE THE TWO-THIRDS
OR LARGER PORTION OF THE SAMPLE. FOR THE HALF-SAMPLE
DESIGN, ONLY 6 OF THE 16 SELF-REPRESENTING AREAS REMAIN
SELF-REPRESENTING. THE OTHER TEN SELF-REPRESENTING PSU’S
ARE PAIRED AND ONLY FIVE ARE USED IN THE HALF-SAMPLE DESIGN,
EACH REPRESENTING BOTH ITSELF AND THE PSU IT IS PAIRED WITH.

WAS SELECTED FROM EACH OF THE A=39 NONSELF-REPRESENTING
(NSR) PSU’S (EXCEPT HOUSTON WHICH HAD 7 SEGMENTS SELECTED).
A TOTAL OF 303 SEGMENTS WERE SELECTED, 68 IN THE SIX
SELF-REPRESENTING PSU’S AND 235 IN THE NONSELF-REPRESENTING
PSU’S.

THIRD STAGE SELECTION OF HOUSING UNITS

FOR EACH AREA SEGMENT SELECTED IN THE SECOND SAMPLING STAGE,
A LISTING WAS MADE OF ALL HOUSING UNITS LOCATED WITHIN THE
PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES OF THE SEGMENT. FOR SEGMENTS WITH A VERY
LARGE NUMBER OF EXPECTED HOUSING UNITS, ALL HOUSING UNITS IN
A SUBSELECTED PART OF THE SEGMENT WERE LISTED. THE FINAL
EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF HOUSING UNITS FOR THE 1988 NES
WAS SYSTEMATICALLY SELECTED FROM THE HOUSING UNIT LISTINGS
FOR THE SAMPLED AREA SEGMENTS.

IN ORDER TO DISTRIBUTE THE INTERVIEWS EVENLY ACROSS THE
PRE-ELECTION PERIOD, THE SAMPLE WAS DIVIDED INTO QUARTERS:
(1) SEPTEMBER 6-19; (2) SEPTEMBER 20-OCTOBER 3; (3)
OCTOBER 4-17; (4) OCTOBER 18-31. (NOVEMBER 1-NOVEMBER 7 WAS
"CLEAN-UP" WEEK). ONCE AN INTERVIEW WAS RELEASED FOR A GIVEN
QUARTER, IT COULD BE TAKEN DURING ANY SUBSEQUENT QUARTER,
ALTHOUGH 80% WERE ACTUALLY ADMINISTERED DURING THE ASSIGNED
QUARTER. THE SAMPLE FROM EACH QUARTER INCLUDED ALL SAMPLE
SEGMENTS. EACH QUARTER SAMPLE COULD STAND ALONE AS A
PROBABILITY SAMPLE.

THE OVERALL PROBABILITY OF SELECTION FOR 1988 NES HOUSEHOLDS
WAS F=.00003800 OR .38 IN 10,000. THE EQUAL PROBABILITY
SAMPLE OF HOUSEHOLDS WAS ACHIEVED BY USING THE STANDARD
MULTI-STAGE SAMPLING TECHNIQUE OF SETTING THE SAMPLING RATE
FOR SELECTING HOUSING UNITS WITHIN AREA SEGMENTS TO BE
INVERSELY PROPORTIONAL TO THE PPS PROBABILITIES (SEE ABOVE)
USED TO SELECT THE PSU AND AREA SEGMENT.

FOURTH STAGE RESPONDENT SELECTION
WITHIN EACH SAMPLED HOUSING UNIT, THE SRC INTERVIEWER PREPARED A COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS. USING AN OBJECTIVE PROCEDURE DESCRIBED BY KISH (3) A SINGLE RESPONDENT WAS THEN SELECTED AT RANDOM TO BE INTERVIEWED. REGARDLESS OF CIRCUMSTANCES, NO SUBSTITUTIONS WERE PERMITTED FOR THE DESIGNATED RESPONDENT.

------------------


SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS


TABLE 3

ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS AND ACTUAL SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE RATE</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBLE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>2893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL SAMPLE HU LISTINGS</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>3503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE GROWTH FROM UPDATE**</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE LISTINGS FROM FRAME</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>3349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------------------

* ELIGIBILITY (.97) X OCCUPANCY (.90)

**SINCE THE UPDATING PROCESS PRODUCES ABOUT A 3% INCREASE IN SAMPLE LINES OVER THE COUNT SELECTED FROM THE NATIONAL SAMPLE SYSTEM, THE UPDATE INFLATION FACTOR WAS SET AT 1.03

SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

IN COMPARING THE FIRST COLUMN OF TABLE 3 WITH THE SECOND COLUMN, IT CAN BE SEEN THAT THE SAMPLE GROWTH FROM THE UPDATE PROCEDURE WAS SLIGHTLY HIGHER THAN EXPECTED. HOWEVER, THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS OVERESTIMATED THE ACTUAL RESPONSE AND OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATES. THE ASSUMPTIONS FOR RESPONSE RATE AND
OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE WERE BASED ON THE RATES OBTAINED
IN THE 1984 PRE-ELECTION SURVEY. THE ACTUAL
OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE FOR THE 1988 PRE-ELECTION SURVEY
(.826) WAS CLOSER TO THE RATE OBTAINED IN THE 1986
POST-ELECTION SURVEY (.835) THAN THE 1984 RATE OF .87. THE
RESPONSE RATE FOR 1988
(.705) WAS BETWEEN THE 1984 RATE OF .72 AND THE 1986 RATE OF
.677. THE RELEASE OF THREE RESERVE REPPLICATES OF 83 SAMPLE
LISTINGS EACH ALLOWED THE NUMBER OF SAMPLE LISTINGS TO BE
ADJUSTED DURING THE INTERVIEW PERIOD TO REFLECT THE ACTUAL
RESPONSE AND OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATES. THEREFORE, THE
NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS OBTAINED, 2040, WAS CLOSE TO THE TARGET
OF 2000 INTERVIEWS.

WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1988 NES DATA

THE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1988 NES RESULTS
IN AN EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF U.S. HOUSEHOLDS. HOWEVER,
WITHIN SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS A SINGLE ADULT RESPONDENT IS CHOSEN
AT RANDOM TO BE INTERVIEWED. SINCE THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE
ADULTS MAY VARY FROM ONE HOUSEHOLD TO ANOTHER, THE RANDOM
SELECTION OF A SINGLE ADULT INTRODUCES INEQUALITY INTO
RESPONDENTS' SELECTION PROBABILITIES. IN ANALYSIS, A
RESPONDENT SELECTION WEIGHT SHOULD BE USED TO COMPENSATE FOR
THESE UNEQUAL SELECTION PROBABILITIES. THE VALUE OF THE
RESPONDENT SELECTION WEIGHT IS EXACTLY EQUAL TO THE NUMBER
OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD FROM WHICH THE RANDOM
RESPONDENT WAS SELECTED. THE USE OF THE RESPONDENT
SELECTION WEIGHT IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED, DESPITE PAST
EVALUATIONS THAT HAVE SHOWN THESE WEIGHTS TO HAVE LITTLE
SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE VALUES OF NES ESTIMATES OF
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.

THE CURRENT POLICY OF THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES IS NOT
TO INCLUDE IN PUBLIC USE DATA SETS SPECIAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS
DESIGNED TO COMPENSATE FOR NONRESPONSE OR TO POST-STRATIFY
THE SAMPLE TO KNOWN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLS.
ANALYSTS INTERESTED IN DEVELOPING THEIR OWN NONRESPONSE OR
POST-STRATIFICATION ADJUSTMENT FACTORS MUST REQUEST ACCESS
TO THE NECESSARY SAMPLE CONTROL DATA FROM THE NES BOARD.

SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1988 NES ESTIMATES
SAMPLING ERROR CALCULATION PROGRAMS

THE PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION
STUDY PERMITS THE CALCULATION OF ESTIMATES OF SAMPLING ERROR
FOR SURVEY STATISTICS. FOR CALCULATING SAMPLING ERRORS OF
STATISTICS FROM COMPLEX SAMPLE SURVEYS, THE OSIRIS
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DATA MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEM
OFFERS THE PSALMS AND REPERR PROGRAMS. PSALMS IS A GENERAL
PURPOSE SAMPLING ERROR PROGRAM THAT INCORPORATES THE TAYLOR
SERIES APPROXIMATION APPROACH TO THE ESTIMATION OF VARIANCES
OF RATIOS (INCLUDING MEANS, SCALE VARIABLES, INDICES,
PROPORTIONS) AND THEIR DIFFERENCES. REPERR IS AN OSIRIS
PROGRAM THAT INCORPORATES ALGORITHMS FOR REPLICATED
APPROACHES TO VARIANCE ESTIMATION. BOTH BALANCED REPEATED
REPLICATION (BRR) AND JACKKNIFE REPEATED REPLICATION (JRR)
ARE AVAILABLE AS PROGRAM OPTIONS. THE CURRENT VERSION OF
REPPERR is best suited for estimating sampling errors and design effects for regression and correlation statistics.

**Sampling Error Codes and Calculation Model**

Estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires a computation model. Individual data records must be assigned sampling error codes that reflect the complex structure of the sample and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. The sampling error codes for the 1988 NES are included as variable 24 in the ICPSR data set. The assigned sampling error codes are designed to facilitate sampling error computation according to a paired selection model for both Taylor series approximation and replication method programs.

Table 4 provides a description of how individual sampling error code values are to be paired for sampling error computations. Thirty (30) pairs or strata of sampling error computation units (SECU's) are defined. Each SECU in a stratum pair includes cases assigned to a single sampling error code value. The exceptions are the second SECU in stratum 27, which is comprised of cases assigned sampling code values 36 and 55, and the second SECU in stratum 29, which is comprised of cases with SECU's 61 and 63.

**Table 4**

1988 Pre- and Post-Election Survey Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR (STRATUM)</th>
<th>(SECU) 1 OF 2 CODES</th>
<th>(SECU) 2 OF 2 CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERALIZED SAMPLING ERROR RESULTS FOR THE 1988 NES


THE GENERALIZED VARIANCE RESULTS PRESENTED IN TABLE 5 ARE A USEFUL TOOL FOR INITIAL, CURSORY EXAMINATION OF THE NES SURVEY RESULTS. FOR MORE IN DEPTH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING OF CRITICAL ESTIMATES, ANALYSTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO COMPUTE EXACT ESTIMATES OF STANDARD ERRORS USING THE APPROPRIATE CHOICE OF A SAMPLING ERROR PROGRAM AND COMPUTATION MODEL.

------------------

(4) THE STANDARD ERROR OF A PERCENTAGE IS A SYMMETRIC FUNCTION WITH ITS MAXIMUM CENTERED AT P=50%; I.E., THE STANDARD ERROR OF P=40% AND P=60% ESTIMATES ARE EQUAL.
1988 NES PRE-ELECTION SURVEY GENERALIZED VARIANCE TABLE
APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

FOR PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES NEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE N</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40% OR 60%</th>
<th>30% OR 70%</th>
<th>20% OR 80%</th>
<th>10% OR 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>2.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td>1.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>1.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>2.294</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>2.094</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>1.685</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>> 1988 VOTE VALIDATION STUDY


THE MOTIVATION FOR THESE STUDIES CONTINUES TO BE FOUND IN THE DIFFERENCE IN ESTIMATES OF NATIONAL TURNOUT AS DERIVED FROM: 1) AGGREGATING OFFICIAL VOTE TOTALS FROM ELECTION OFFICES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND DIVIDING BY THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AGE-ELIGIBLE U. S. CITIZENS; AND 2) DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED THAT THEY VOTED BY THE TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN THE SURVEY. THE LATTER ESTIMATE IS ALMOST ALWAYS 10-12% LOWER.

WHILE SOME PORTION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO ESTIMATES IS DUE TO THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO DENOMINATORS-- I.E., THE POPULATION OF THOSE AGREEING TO BE INTERVIEWED IN A SURVEY IS DEMONSTRABLY DIFFERENT FROM THE POPULATION OF ALL CITIZENS OVER 18-- ANOTHER LARGE PORTION OF THIS DIFFERENCE IS THOUGHT TO BE EXPLAINED BY THE MISREPORTING OF VOTING BEHAVIOR TO INTERVIEWERS BY RESPONDENTS. SOME RESPONDENTS REPORT THAT THEY VOTED WHEN IN FACT THEY HAVE NOT DONE SO. BECAUSE THE INTERVIEW IS A SOCIAL SITUATION AND VOTING IS A NORM, IN ORDER NOT TO
REPORT THE VIOLATION OF A NORM, SOME RESPONDENTS PREFER TO TELL INTERVIEWERS THAT THEY VOTED. (SOME MAY BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A MORE REPRESENTATIVE STATEMENT OF THEIR USUAL CIVIC INVOLVEMENT THAN THE HAPPENSTANCE OF THEIR NOT VOTING IN THE MOST RECENT ELECTION.)

THE MOTIVATION FOR THE RECORDS CHECK IS NOT SO MUCH TO STUDY THE INTERESTING SOCIAL PHENOMENON OF MISREPORTING AS IT IS TO CLARIFY TO THE ANALYST WHO ACTUALLY DID VOTE AND WHO PROBABLY DID NOT. OVER-REPORT IS AN OBVIOUS PROBLEM FOR ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPATION AND IT MAY ALSO BE A PROBLEM IN THE ANALYSIS OF VOTE CHOICE.

THE ONLY WAY TO TELL IF SOMEONE ACTUALLY VOTED IS TO LOOK AT THE VOTING AND REGISTRATION RECORDS IN THE LOCAL ELECTION OFFICE CORRESPONDING TO WHERE THE RESPONDENT LIVES (OR TELLS THE INTERVIEWER THAT HE IS REGISTERED). FOR THE NES ELECTION STUDIES, THIS PROCEDURE WAS USED BY SENDING SRC INTERVIEWERS (IN 1984, 1986 AND 1988, THESE WERE OFTEN FIELD SUPERVISORS) TO PERFORM THE RECORD SEARCH AND INSPECTION. EACH TIME VALIDATION HAS BEEN ATTEMPTED IN THIS MANNER, STAFF HAVE FOUND THAT A SMALL PROPORTION (3-5%) OF RESPONDENTS: A) REPORTED THAT THEY VOTED; AND B) HAVE A REGISTRATION RECORD IN THE ELECTION OFFICE; BUT C) ARE NOT INDICATED IN THE VOTING RECORD AS HAVING VOTED IN THE ELECTION. LEAVING ASIDE THE QUESTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERRORS, THE PRESUMPTION IS THAT THESE R'S ACTUALLY DID NOT VOTE.

THERE IS ANOTHER SET OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT THEY VOTED BUT FOR WHOM INTERVIEWERS ARE UNABLE TO FIND A REGISTRATION RECORD AT ALL. THE NES STUDY STAFF IS CONVINCED OF THE DILIGENCE AND TENACIOUS PERSISTENCE OF THE SRC REPRESENTATIVES SEARCHING FOR THESE RECORDS, AND BELIEVES THAT FOR THE VERY GREAT MAJORITY OF THIS SET OF RESPONDENTS, THERE IS INDEED NO ONE REGISTERED AT THAT OFFICE, WITH THAT NAME. THE NES STAFF IS NOT NECESSARILY CONVINCED OF HAVING THE RIGHT ADDRESS FOR THIS PERSON, OR THE RIGHT NAME, OR THE RIGHT NAME SPELLED CLOSE ENOUGH TO THE VERSION ON THE REGISTRATION RECORDS, TO ENABLE SUCCESS IN FINDING THE RESPONDENT'S RECORD.

THE NES STAFF DOES NOT VALIDATE THE REPORTED REGISTRATION AND/OR VOTE OF EVERY RESPONDENT IN THE STUDY. IT IS ACCEPTED WITHOUT FURTHER CHECK THE REPORT OF THOSE WHO SAID THEY ARE NOT REGISTERED. AND THE RECORDS CANNOT BE CHECKED OF THOSE WHO DIDN'T GIVE THEIR NAME. IN RARE INSTANCES, AN ELECTION OFFICE WILL REFUSE ACCESS TO RECORDS AND RESPONDENTS SERVED BY THESE OFFICES ALSO CANNOT BE VALIDATED.

THE VOTE VALIDATION PORTION OF THE DATAFILE CONTAINS A NUMBER OF SUMMARY VARIABLES REPORTING THE RESULTS OF THE RECORD CHECK. THE SUMMARY VARIABLE V881147 ASSIGNS A VALUE OF VOTING OR NOT VOTING TO EVERY RESPONDENT IN THE STUDY. WHERE STAFF WAS UNABLE OR DID NOT CHECK THE RECORDS, RESPONDENT'S SELF-REPORT WAS ASSIGNED. IT IS THIS VARIABLE THAT REPRESENTS, IN THE STUDY STAFF'S VIEW, THE MAXIMUM CLARIFICATION POSSIBLE OF WHETHER OR NOT THE RESPONDENT
ACTUALLY VOTED IN THE 1988 ELECTION


OF THE 2040 TOTAL RESPONDENTS, 375 WERE NOT VALIDATED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

19 - NO NAME*
3 - OFFICE REFUSED**
11 - R DK IF REGISTERED; NOT REQUIRED TO REGISTER
342 - NOT REGISTERED***

* 11 OF THESE HAD NO POST INTERVIEW
** 2 OF THESE HAD NO POST INTERVIEW
*** OF 344 IN THIS CATEGORY, 2 ALSO HAD NO NAME AND ARE INCLUDED IN THE 19 WITH NO NAMES

IN ADDITION, 35 CASES EARMARKED FOR VALIDATION COULD NOT BE VERIFIED BECAUSE THE R WAS NOT REGISTERED AT HIS/HER SAMPLE LOCATION AND THE IWR CHECKED RECORDS AT THE ELECTION OFFICE SERVING THE SAMPLE LOCATION INSTEAD OF THE ELECTION OFFICE OF R'S ASSERTED REGISTRATION. THESE CASES ARE DESIGNATED CODE 9 IN V1118.

>> 1988 ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY

THE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION DATASET IS PART OF THE 1988 VOTE VALIDATION STUDY. IN ORDER TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL VOTER RECORD SEARCH CONDUCTED FOR RESPONDENTS TO THE 1988 PRE-POST ELECTION SURVEYS, AN INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED WITH THE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL IN CHARGE OF THE ELECTION OFFICE PERTAINING TO THE SAMPLE SEGMENT IN WHICH RESPONDENTS LIVED.

INTERVIEWS WERE OBTAINED WITH OFFICIALS IN 120 OFFICES. THIS INTERVIEW USED A STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE THAT WAS DESIGNED TO GATHER INFORMATION IN THREE AREAS: 1) HOW REGISTRATION AND VOTING RECORDS ARE KEPT AND UPDATED; 2) CONVENIENCE OF REGISTRATION IN THE JURISDICTION AND 3) INTERVIEWER EVALUATION OF OFFICE ORGANIZATION, EFFICIENCY AND COOPERATION.

A NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY WERE NOT VALIDATED FOR ANY OF SEVERAL REASONS; FOR EXAMPLE, THEY REPORTED THAT THEY WERE NOT REGISTERED AND DID NOT VOTE; AND/OR THEY DID NOT PROVIDE THEIR NAME; AND/OR THEY WERE REGISTERED AT SOME PLACE OUTSIDE OF THE ANES SAMPLE AREAS. IN THESE CASES, OFFICE DATA WAS ATTACHED TO RESPONDENTS
BASED ON THEIR SAMPLE ADDRESS.

>> 1988 NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS


BREHM, JOHN. (1985C) "QUESTION ORDERING EFFECTS ON REPORTED VOTE CHOICE." UNPUBLISHED MEMO, JULY 1985.


MORCHIO, GIOVANNA. (1987) "TRENDS IN NES RESPONSE RATES." MEMO TO NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS.


NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "YEARS OF SCHOOLING." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.

NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "NEWSPAPER CODE." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.


TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (UNDATED) "THE POLITICAL INTEREST VARIABLE
ON THE 1984 ELECTION STUDY." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO NES PLANNING COMMITTEE.

TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "SOME ANALYSIS OF HARD-TO-REACH ROLLING THUNDER RESPONDENTS." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO NES BOARD OF OVERSEEERS, FEBRUARY 1985.

>> 1987 PILOT STUDY REPORTS

CONOVER, PAMELA JOHNSTON AND STANLEY FELDMAN. MEASURING PATRIOTISM AND NATIONALISM.

CONOVER, PAMELA JOHNSTON AND DAVID LOWERY. PILOT STUDY QUESTIONS ON WELFARE/POVERTY.


PEFFLEY, MARK AND JON HURWITZ. REPORT ON FOREIGN POLICY ITEMS, 1987 PILOT STUDY.

SHINGLES, RICHARD. REPORT ON MEASURES OF EFFICACY AND TRUST. SEPTEMBER 28, 1987. MEMORANDUM.

REPORT. NEW MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE POLITICAL EFFICACY AND POLITICAL TRUST. SEPTEMBER 28, 1987. ADDENDUM TABLE 4. SUPPLEMENTS 1, 2, 3.


This dataset consists of the results of a revalidation of voting and registration as reported by respondents to the 1988 Election Study. The re-looking up of these records was carried out in conjunction with the 1990 Vote Validation Study. It was done in order to measure the error in the vote validation process itself. The vote validation study carried out in July-August of 1991 was the eighth time that NES has done a voter validation study. Previous validations were done for the 1964, 1976, 1978, 1980, 1984, 1986, and 1988 Post Election Studies.

The voter validation study is carried out by sending name and address information for respondents who say they are registered to vote, to a Survey Research Center field interviewer, who is instructed to check with the local office at which respondents report being registered for the purpose of locating the registration records of these respondents and to ascertain whether or not the records show that the respondents voted in the most recent general election.

It is important to note that the search is conducted by people who are trained in survey methods but not in records management, and who may themselves vary in terms of their understanding of the records, their pertinacity, the thoroughness by which every avenue in the records is explored, and so on. It was recommended to the NES Board of Overseers that revalidation of the 1988 Election Study would be an appropriate and modest first step in determining the extent to which vote validation findings are related to the process itself. (1) Accordingly, the Board decided that 1988 respondents should be validated at the same time as the 1990 respondents, to the extent that offices scheduled to be visited for the 1990 respondents also encompassed the 1988 respondents.

The procedures and forms used for the 1988 respondents were identical to those used for the 1990 respondents. The 1990 forms and procedures are similar to, but distinct from, those used in 1988. In most cases, the SRC field personnel who did the lookups in 1990 were not the same people who did the 1988 lookups. If there are interviewer effects, these would show up as different interviewers conduct record checks on the same people in the same offices.

A. The "Office" Variables

In order to conduct elections honestly, lists of eligible voters are generated by each election office, with each voter assigned to one and only one precinct. Therefore, for the purpose of registration and voting, an individual must be associated with one and only one address, belonging in one and only one electoral jurisdiction.

Since NES respondents come from a national area probability sample, a large number of different election offices are included in the validation study, usually over 100.


The jurisdiction of these election offices is usually the county but in New
England and a few other states, registration and voting records are maintained at a local level, including townships.

Because of the diversity in record keeping and access across these many offices, the vote validation dataset has two conceptual parts. The most obvious part is the results of the record check for individual respondents. The other part, the office variables, may perhaps be labeled "contextual" data, for these variables describe the search procedure and the records themselves.

We include the variables describing the records and the search procedure because the relationship between the respondent's report and what is found or not found in official records is not necessarily a straightforward one. One view of the matching process is that the official records are always correct, and that in the event of discrepancy, the respondent must have "misreported" his or her behavior. Another view is that the records themselves are but another form of measurement of a particular behavior, and as such, are subject to measurement error. So, for example, the computerized transcription of poll records, which are the records which have been checked in most offices, could be inaccurate. The situation is made more complex by the fact that there appears to be an irreducible minimum proportion of respondents for whom a record of registration cannot be located at all, and logically, it is difficult if not impossible to say that this negative finding demonstrates beyond doubt that respondents are not registered. It is always possible that with a "better" search, a more accurate spelling of the person's name, a correct understanding of where the person is actually registered, the record would have been located.

We think the user needs information not only about what we have found, but what the records themselves are like, and what the search was like, so that the user can make some evaluation of whether record-respondent discrepancies cluster in-particular patterns of record keeping or search. (2)

Information about the records, and the search process, was coded from several sources. First, the SRC interviewer who did the records check administered a brief (10-15 minute) questionnaire to an official in the records office asking specifically about how the records were organized. The purpose of this interaction was for the interviewer to gain information to enable her to conduct the records search efficiently.

Second, as the interviewer went on to fill out the forms recording the results of individual record checks, that is, to actually use the records that had been described, her understanding of the records often changed, sometimes by the discovery of additional sources not originally described to her. These discoveries were annotated on the forms themselves, rather than on the office interview. The NES staff reviewed all of the individual record check forms from a particular office in conjunction with the election official's questionnaire.

A third source of information, used somewhat tentatively because of the possibility of change in the intervening time, was the previous interviews.
conducted in the same office. (NES has been in the same sample frame since 1984, and many of these offices have been visited three previous times.) These interviews were used to elucidate points that were not clear. Finally, for between 20-30% of the offices, various points remained unclear and the offices and/or the SRC interviewers were called by the NES staff for further information.

All of these sources were used in the coding of the office variables (V882103-V882149). The chief focus of the office variables is in what sources were actually used by the interviewer, and how they were used. We do not describe in detail all of the records that the office keeps. These office variables differ in focus from previous codings of office variables, where the interest was in describing the office records themselves, rather than those used. The reason for this is that as we read through the materials, we were struck by how frequently sources which were theoretically available were not used because they were not readily accessible. For example, the office might have a computerized system for keeping track of registrants. But, it is in another building, and we don't have access to it on anything but printouts. Or, the computer is "down." Often, poll books are stored off-site, and offices are reluctant to retrieve them for our inspection, claiming that "everything on them is on the computer." Hence, while we attach the office interview schedule itself as part of the documentation, the user should be aware that the office variables are not a direct transcription from this questionnaire, but rather address the somewhat different question of what sources were actually used.

B. The Lookup Process

If election offices share a common central mission, that of conducting elections without fraud, they also display a bewildering variety of terms for similar procedures, to say nothing of widely different procedures to achieve the same ends. There are places with numerous versions of sophisticated computer tracking, and places with one set of poll ledgers. The supervisors of these offices can be highly professional, or, in one or two cases, obvious political appointees. Some offices boast the latest in computer technology, including digitized signatures and bar codes over which a wand can be passed to register that a person has voted; while others make do with signatures and initials on the original registration card. We have validated in jurisdictions having voters numbering in the millions and thousands of precincts and in places where there is one precinct with several hundred registrants.

Each year we face the difficulty of trying to train survey interviewers in how to diagnose the intricacies of records management in the offices they are likely to encounter, so that they can use ALL the sources potentially available to them efficiently in the actual lookup process. In 1984, we hit upon the strategy of conducting an interview with an election official, prior to actually looking up the records, so that the look-up person would have a detailed idea of what records were available to her. Each time we do this, we struggle to improve this office questionnaire so that it will better lead the naive interviewer through the maze of different office procedures.

Although NES staff is somewhat removed from the complexities of each individual office, we try to write some general instructions to guide the interviewers in the lookup process. For this study, the task of the interviewer was described to them as first finding a record that they were reasonably sure was the respondent's; then, ascertaining what the record showed about whether the respondent voted or did not vote in the general elections of 1990 and 1988. It was explained that all offices maintain a list of who is registered in their jurisdiction. From this master list, all offices send to each polling place a list in some form of who is eligible to vote at
that voting place. When people vote, some mark is made to indicate that they
done so (to reduce the possibility of fraud, following the time honored rule
of one person, one vote.) Information about whether a person did or did not
vote may or may not be posted back to the master office list of who is
registered. There are many variations on this scheme: for example, some
offices divide the master list (which is on cards) into precinct binders and
send these out to the polls where they are marked.) Thus, the master list is
also the poll book. However, the general outline is simple.

Based on this general outline, and assuming that most offices post vote
information back to the registration record, interviewers were to look first
at the master registration record for evidence that R had voted. If the record
did not show that R voted, they were to look at the original poll books, to
the extent they were available, for some further indication of vote.
(Historiographers will recognize the distinction between primary and secondary
sources, one that has been slow to dawn on us as survey researchers.) One
example will illustrate the importance of primary sources. An interviewer
happened to be a registered voter in a county where she was looking up
records. She noted that many more respondents appeared to have voted in 1990
than in 1988. She thought this was strange. Accordingly, she looked up her own
record for 1988, and found that the computer did not show her as voting,
although she had. It didn't show her son or husband as voting either, although
they voted with her. The original poll records, however, showed she and her
family as voting. It turned out that there had been a sizeable transcription
error in 1988, in this office.

As the NES staff evaluated what we received back from interviewers, both
record check forms and election official interviews, it was clear that in many
offices, original sources were not used, either because they were not made
available to the interviewer (sometimes they are destroyed after information
has been posted to the computer) or because the interviewer did not press for
access to these sources. Also, some interviewers went about their task in a
way exactly contrary to instructions, i.e., they looked first at the poll
records, and then searched the registration records for people they couldn't
locate. The trouble with this strategy is that some nontrivial proportion of
people are not registered to vote in the precinct in which they were
interviewed; rather they vote somewhere else in the same jurisdiction.
Starting with the poll books means considerably more going back and forth
between registration records and poll records; in this process, it is much
more difficult for the interviewer with a sizeable number of cases in an
office to keep track of exactly which sources she has or has not used in a
particular case. (3)

C. Contents of the Dataset

The present dataset is very similar in structure to the 1990 vote
validation dataset; containing variables about the results of the individual
respondent lookup as well as about the lookup procedure itself. A few
variables from the 1988 vote validation are included; these are the results of
the lookup, i.e., whether or not a registration record was found and whether
or not the respondent appears to have voted in 1988.

There are 2040 records in the 1988 Revalidation dataset, one record for
each respondent in the 1988 Pre-Election Study. We have "padded" the vote
validation dataset by adding records with missing data codes for 1988
respondents who were not validated.

The dataset which we are releasing now has variables from several
sources. These are:
1. Variables about the individual respondents from the 1988 Election Study, including self-reported vote and registration. All variables which were generated for the coversheet, with the exception of name, address and geographic information, are included.

2. Variables from the individual record check form filled out by the interviewer in the election office. These are variables 882003-882046.

4. Variables describing the sources used and the search procedure in the election records office in which the respondent's record was looked up. (Variables 882103-882149). There will be no further release of the office level information.

While this is a "stand-alone" dataset, most users will find it most useful merged back into the 1988 Election Study. Merging should be relatively simple because there is one record for the vote validation dataset for each record in the 1988 Pre-Election Study.

(3) In fairness to the interviewers, we should say that our interviewers are entirely dependent on the good will of the people assisting them in any given office. Often, these people had an understandable interest in minimizing the time devoted to helping our interviewer and the interviewers were reluctant to press them with timeconsuming requests for original sources. In retrospect, the NES staff needed to do much more to prepare the offices and the interviewers about resources would be needed to complete the lookup task.
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>> 1988 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The following example from the 1948 NES study provides the standard format for codebook variable documentation.
Note that NES studies which are not part of the Time-Series usually omit marginals and the descriptive content in lines 2-5 (except for variable name).

Line 1: 

VAR 480026  NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
COLUMNS 61 - 61
NUMERIC
MD=0 OR GE 8

Q. 17. (IF R DID NOT VOTE) WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE) TO VOTE.

Q. 17. (IF R DID NOT VOTE) WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE) TO VOTE.

82 1. YES
149 2. NO
0 8. DK
9 9. NA
422 0. INAP., R VOTED

Line 2 - VARIABLE NAME. Note that in the codebook the variable name (usually a 'number') does not include the "V" prefix which is used in the release SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files) for all variables including those which do not have 'number' names. For example the variable "VERSION" in the codebook is "VVERSION" in the data definition files.

Line 2 - "NAME". This is the variable label used in the SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files). Some codebooks exclude this.

Line 3 - COLUMNS. Columns in the ASCII data file (.dat file).

Line 4 - CHARACTER OR NUMERIC. If numeric and the variable is a decimal rather than integer variable, the number of decimal places is also indicated (e.g. "NUMERIC DEC 4")

Line 5 - Values which are assigned to missing by default in the Study's SAS and and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files).

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of non-survey variables (for example, congressional district). Survey items usually include the question number (for example "Bla.") from the Study questionnaire; beginning in 1996 non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example "CSheet.1").

Line 9 - A dashed or dotted line usually separates question text from any other documentation which follows.

Line 10 - When present, annotation provided by Study staff is presented below the question text/description and preceding code values.
Code values are listed with descriptive labels. Valid codes (those not having 'missing' status in line 5) are presented first, followed by the values described in line 5. For continuous variables, one line may appear providing the range of possible values. A blank line usually separates the 'valid' and 'missing' values.

Marginals are usually provided for discrete variables. The counts may be unweighted or weighted; check the Study codebook introductory text to determine weight usage.

THE DATA COLLECTION WAS PROCESSED ACCORDING TO THE STANDARD ICPSR PROCESSING PROCEDURES FOR CLASS I DATA COLLECTIONS. THE DATA WERE CHECKED FOR ILLEGAL OR INCONSISTENT CODE VALUES WHICH, WHEN FOUND, WERE EITHER CORRECTED OR RECODED TO MISSING DATA VALUES. EXTENSIVE CONSISTENCY CHECKS WERE PERFORMED. STATEMENTS BRACKETED IN "<" AND ">" SIGNS IN THE BODY OF THE CODEBOOK WERE ADDED BY THE PROCESSORS FOR EXPLANATORY PURPOSES.

ICPSR VARIABLES

VERSION NES VERISON NUMBER
DSETNO NES DATASET NUMBER
880001 ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER- 9196
880004 RESPONDENT PRE-ELECTION CASE ID

SAMPLING INFORMATION

880005 PRIMARY AREA CODE
880006 PRIMARY AREA NAME
880007 SEGMENT NUMBER
880008 CENSUS REGION
880009 POSTAL STATE ABBREVIATION AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NUMBER
880010 FIPS STATE CODE
880011 FIPS STATE AND COUNTY CODE
880012 ICPSR STATE CODE
880013 ICPSR STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CODE
880014 TRACT/ENUMERATION DISTRICT INDICATOR
880015 1980 CENSUS TRACT
880016 1980 CENSUS ENUMERATION DISTRICT
880017 1980 CENSUS PLACE CODE
880018 FIPS 1980 SMSA CODE
880019  FIPS 1980 SCSA CODE
880020  SIZE OF PLACE OF INTERVIEW
880021  ACTUAL POPULATION OF PLACE OF INTERVIEW
880022  1980 BELT CODE
880023  1980 MINOR CIVIL DIVISION
880024  SAMPLING ERROR CODE
880025  SELECTION TABLE

PRE-ELECTION INFORMATION

880026  INTERVIEWER'S ID NUMBER
880027  REFUSAL CONVERSION INDICATOR
880028  PERSUASION LETTER REQUESTED
880029  FINAL CALL NUMBER
880030  FINAL RESULT CODE
880031  IF R IS FEMALE, HAS R LEGALLY CHANGED HER NAME
880032  PHONE NUMBER OBTAINED
880033  INTERVIEWER'S RACE
880034  INTERVIEWER'S ETHNICITY
880035  INTERVIEWER'S AGE, BRACKETED
880036  INTERVIEWER'S YEARS OF WORK, BRACKETED

880037  INTERVIEWER'S SEX
880038  INTERVIEWER'S EDUCATION, BRACKETED
880039  INTERVIEW QUARTER CODE
880040  FORM TYPE
880041  INTERVIEW PRIMARY AREA
880042  INTERVIEWER'S INTERVIEW NUMBER
880043  DATE COMPLETED - MONTH
880044  DATE COMPLETED - DAY
880045  LENGTH OF INTERVIEW
880046  LENGTH OF POST-EDITING
880047  BEGINNING TIME - LOCAL

POST-ELECTION INFORMATION

880048  RESPONDENT POST-ELECTION CASE ID
880049  INTERVIEWER'S ID NUMBER
880050  TYPE OF CONGRESSIONAL RACE
880051  TYPE OF SENATE RACE
880052  FORM TYPE
880053  REFUSAL CONVERSION INDICATOR
880054  PERSUASION LETTER REQUESTED
880055  FINAL CALL NUMBER
880056  FINAL RESULT CODE
880057  CHECKPOINT: R'S PHONE NUMBER/PHONE STATUS DIFFERENT
880058  PHONE NUMBER OBTAINED
880059  IS R'S NUMBER LISTED IN THE PHONE DIRECTORY
880060  IS PHONE LISTED IN R'S NAME
880061  IS THERE A REASON THAT WE SHOULD NOT INTERVIEW R BY TELEPHONE
880062  INTERVIEWER'S INTERVIEW NUMBER
880063  DATE COMPLETED - MONTH
880064  DATE COMPLETED - DAY
880065  LENGTH OF INTERVIEW
880066  LENGTH OF PRE-EDITING
880067  LENGTH OF POST-EDITING
880068  BEGINNING TIME - LOCAL
880069 DID R REFUSE INTERVIEW INITIALLY
880070 DID R BREAK ANY APPOINTMENTS

R'S RESISTANCE TO INTERVIEW

880071 WAS THERE RESISTANCE TO THE INTERVIEW FROM R
880072 NOT INTERESTED, DOESN'T VOTE
880073 SURVEYS WASTE OF TIME, PREVIOUS BAD EXPERIENCE
880074 VERY ILL
880075 "TOO BUSY"
880076 STRESSFUL FAMILY SITUATION
880077 CONFIDENTIALITY
880078 FIRST INTERVIEW TOO LONG
880079 DIDN'T LIKE FIRST INTERVIEW
880080 DIDN'T LIKE FIRST INTERVIEWER
880081 NO REASON GIVEN
880082 OTHER REASON GIVEN FOR R'S RESISTANCE
880083 WAS R SUSPICIOUS
880084 WAS R HOSTILE

880085 WAS R RUDE
880086 WAS R THREATENING
880087 IF NON-INTERVIEW, WAS R POLITE BUT FIRM
880088 OTHER RESISTANCE REASON
880089 WAS THANK YOU LETTER SENT TO R

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

880090 NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD
880091 NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS
880092 NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX YEARS OLD
880093 NUMBER OF CHILDREN SIX TO NINE YEARS OLD
880094 NUMBER OF CHILDREN TEN TO THIRTEEN YEARS OLD
880095 NUMBER OF CHILDREN FOURTEEN TO SEVENTEEN YEARS OLD
880096 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

R'S INTEREST IN AND PREDICTIONS FOR CAMPAIGN

880097 R'S INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN
880098 R'S PREDICTION OF WINNER IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
880099 DOES R THINK PRESIDENTIAL RACE WILL BE CLOSE
880100 WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE DOES R THINK WILL CARRY R'S STATE
880101 DOES R THINK THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE WILL BE CLOSE IN R'S STATE
880102 DOES R CARE WHICH PARTY WINS THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

BUSH AS CANDIDATE

880103 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT BUSH THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE FOR HIM
880104 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FIRST MENTION
880105 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - SECOND MENTION
880106 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - THIRD MENTION
880107 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FOURTH MENTION
880108 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FIFTH MENTION
880109 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT BUSH THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE
AGAINST HIM
880110 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FIRST MENTION
880111 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - SECOND MENTION
880112 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - THIRD MENTION
880113 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FOURTH MENTION
880114 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FIFTH MENTION

DUKAKIS AS CANDIDATE
880115 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT DUKAKIS THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE FOR HIM
880116 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FIRST MENTION
880117 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - SECOND MENTION
880118 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - THIRD MENTION
880119 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FOURTH MENTION
880120 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FIFTH MENTION
880121 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT DUKAKIS THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE AGAINST HIM
880122 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FIRST MENTION
880123 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - SECOND MENTION
880124 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - THIRD MENTION
880125 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FOURTH MENTION
880126 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FIFTH MENTION

R'S ATTENTION TO CAMPAIGN/MEDIA
880127 HOW OFTEN DID R DISCUSS POLITICS IN THE PAST WEEK
880128 HOW OFTEN DID R WATCH NEWS ON TV IN THE PAST WEEK
880129 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN NEWS ON TV
880130 HOW OFTEN DID R READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER IN THE PAST WEEK
880131 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - FIRST MENTION
880132 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - SECOND MENTION
880133 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - THIRD MENTION
880134 DID R READ ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN IN ANY NEWSPAPER
880135 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN NEWS IN THE NEWSPAPER
880136 DID R READ ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN IN ANY MAGAZINES
880137 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN NEWS IN MAGAZINES
880138 DID R LISTEN TO CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OR DISCUSSIONS ON THE RADIO
880139 HOW MANY CAMPAIGN SPEECHES/DISCUSSIONS ON THE RADIO DID R LISTEN TO

R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN AS PRESIDENT (PRE-ELECTION)
880140 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF HIS JOB AS PRESIDENT
880141 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF HIS JOB

REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES
WHICH REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE DOES R THINK WOULD MAKE THE BEST PRESIDENT

DOES R THINK BUSH WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN ANY OTHER REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE

DOES R THINK REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE NAMED IN Q. D1 WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN BUSH

WHICH DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE DOES R THINK WOULD MAKE THEBEST PRESIDENT

DOES R THINK DUKAKIS WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN ANY OTHER DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE

DOES R THINK THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE NAMED IN Q. D2 WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN DUKAKIS

R'S PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY/CAUCUS

DID R VOTE IN CAUCUS/PRIMARY ELECTION

DID R VOTE IN REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY/CAUCUS

WHICH REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE DID R VOTE FOR IN STATE CAUCUS/PRIMARY

WHICH DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE DID R VOTE FOR IN STATE PRIMARY/CAUCUS

FEELING THERMOMETERS - POLITICAL FIGURES

FEELING THERMOMETER - ROBERT DOLE

FEELING THERMOMETER - MARIO CUOMO

FEELING THERMOMETER - GEORGE BUSH

FEELING THERMOMETER - MICHAEL DUKAKIS

FEELING THERMOMETER - PAT ROBERTSON

FEELING THERMOMETER - TED KENNEDY

FEELING THERMOMETER - RONALD REAGAN

FEELING THERMOMETER - LLOYD BENTSEN

FEELING THERMOMETER - DAN QUAYLE

FEELING THERMOMETER - MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

FEELING THERMOMETER - JESSE JACKSON

FEELING THERMOMETER - OLIVER NORTH

FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC PARTY

FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN PARTY

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION D

WAS QUESTION D1 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WAS QUESTION D4N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880180 WAS QUESTION D5A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880181 WAS QUESTION D5B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

880182 WHETHER R LIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880183 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIRST MENTION
880184 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-SECOND MENTION
880185 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-THIRD MENTION
880186 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FOURTH MENTION
880187 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIFTH MENTION
880188 WHETHER R DISLIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880189 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIRST MENTION
880190 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-SECOND MENTION
880191 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-THIRD MENTION
880192 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FOURTH MENTION
880193 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIFTH MENTION

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY

880194 WHETHER R LIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY
880195 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIRST MENTION
880196 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-SECOND MENTION
880197 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-THIRD MENTION
880198 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FOURTH MENTION
880199 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIFTH MENTION
880200 WHETHER R DISLIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY
880201 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIRST MENTION
880202 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-SECOND MENTION
880203 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-THIRD MENTION
880204 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FOURTH MENTION
880205 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIFTH MENTION

R'S PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

880206 DOES R FEEL BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY THAN A YEAR AGO
880207 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE OFF DOES R FEEL
880208 WILL R BE BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY A YEAR FROM NOW
880209 WILL R BE MUCH OR SOMEWHAT BETTER/WORSE OFF A YEAR FROM NOW
880210 HAS R'S INCOME STAYED AT/ABOVE/Below THE COST OF LIVING
880211 HOW MUCH HAS R'S INCOME RISEN ABOVE/FALLEN BEHIND
THE COST OF LIVING
880212 HAS FEDERAL ECONOMIC POLICY MADE A DIFFERENCE ON R'S
FINANCIAL POSITION
880213 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAS IT MADE R

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: BUSH
880214 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R ANGRY
880215 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R HOPEFUL
880216 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM
880217 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R PROUD

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: DUKAKIS
880218 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R ANGRY
880219 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R HOPEFUL
880220 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM
880221 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R PROUD

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: JACKSON
880222 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R ANGRY
880223 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R HOPEFUL
880224 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM
880225 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R PROUD

R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF ECONOMY
(PRE-ELECTION)
880226 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF
THE ECONOMY
880227 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S
HANDLING OF THE ECONOMY

POSITIONS ON LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE
880228 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-R
880229 IF R HAD TO CHOOSE, WOULD R CONSIDER SELF A LIBERAL/
CONSERVATIVE
880230 SUMMARY: R'S LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE PLACEMENT
880231 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-DUKAKIS
880232 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-BUSH
880233 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-JACKSON
880234 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880235 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880236 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-REAGAN
880237 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

R'S OPINION ON NATIONAL/STATE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS
IN THE PAST YEAR
880238 HOW DOES R FEEL THE COUNTRY IS DOING
880239 DOES R THINK UNEMPLOYMENT HAS GOTTEN BETTER/
WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR
880240 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS UNEMPLOYMENT
880241 DOES R THINK THAT INFLATION HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR
880242 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS INFLATION
880243 DOES R THINK THE NATION'S ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR
880244 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS THE NATION'S ECONOMY
880245 DOES R THINK FEDERAL ECONOMIC POLICY HAS MADE THE ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE/NOT MADE MUCH DIFFERENCE
880246 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAS FEDERAL POLICY MADE THE ECONOMY
880247 DOES R SEE THE ECONOMY GETTING BETTER/WORSE/STAYING ABOUT THE SAME IN THE NEXT YEAR
880248 DOES R FEEL THE BUDGET DEFICIT IS A VERY/SOMEWAY/NOT SERIOUS PROBLEM
880249 WOULD R PAY MORE TAXES TO REDUCE THE BUDGET DEFICIT
880250 DOES R THINK THE STATE'S ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR
880251 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS THE STATE ECONOMY

R'S OPINIONS ON FOREIGN RELATIONS - PAST YEAR
880252 DOES R THINK THE UNITED STATES' POSITION HAS GROWN STRONGER/WEAKER/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR
880253 DOES R THINK THE REPUBLICANS/DEMOCRATS COULD BETTER KEEP THE U.S. OUT OF WAR IN THE NEXT FOUR YEARS
880254 DOES R AGREE/DISAGREE U.S. SHOULD STAY OUT OF PROBLEMS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD

880R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS (PRE-ELECTION)
880255 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS
880256 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTIONS G AND H
880257 WAS QUESTION G1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880258 WAS QUESTION G1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880259 WAS QUESTION G1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880260 WAS QUESTION G1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880261 WAS QUESTION G2A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880262 WAS QUESTION G2B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880263 WAS QUESTION G2C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880264 WAS QUESTION G2D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880265 WAS QUESTION G3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880266 WAS QUESTION G3B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880267 WAS QUESTION G3C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880268 WAS QUESTION G3D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880269 WAS QUESTION H7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880270 WAS QUESTION H8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION
880271 R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION
880272 STRENGTH OF R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION
QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: BUSH

880275 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE BUSH
880276 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE BUSH
880277 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE BUSH
880278 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE BUSH
880279 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE BUSH
880280 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE BUSH
880281 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU" DESCRIBE BUSH
880282 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE BUSH
880283 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE BUSH

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: DUKAKIS

880284 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880285 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880286 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880287 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880288 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880289 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880290 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880291 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS
880292 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: JACKSON

880293 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880294 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880295 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880296 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880297 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880298 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880299 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880300 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE JACKSON
880301 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE JACKSON

POSITION ON MORE/LESS GOVT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE

880302 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-R
880303 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-DUKAKIS
880304 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-BUSH
880305 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-JACKSON
880306 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880307 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880308 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-DEMOCRATIC
PARTY
880309 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-REAGAN

POSITION ON MORE/LESS DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE
880310 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-R
880311 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-DUKAKIS
880312 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-BUSH
880313 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-JACKSON
880314 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880315 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880316 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880317 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-REAGAN

POSITION ON GOVT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE
880318 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-R
880319 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-DUKAKIS
880320 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-BUSH
880321 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880322 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY

POSITION ON GOVT GUARANTEED LIVING/JOB SCALE
880323 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-R
880324 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-DUKAKIS
880325 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-BUSH
880326 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-JACKSON
880327 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880328 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880329 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880330 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-REAGAN

880331 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

POSITION ON IMPROVING SOC/ECON STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE
880332 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-R
880333 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-DUKAKIS
880334 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-BUSH
880335 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-JACKSON
880336 SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880337 SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880338 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880339 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-REAGAN

POSITION ON IMPROVING SOC/ECON STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE
880340 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-R
880341 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-DUKAKIS
880342 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-BUSH
880343 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-JACKSON
880344 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880345 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880346 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880347 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-REAGAN

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS
(SEE ALSO VARIABLES 377-386)

880348 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON SOCIAL SECURITY
880349 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FOOD STAMPS
880350 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON AID TO CONTRAS
880351 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON STAR WARS
880352 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FIGHTING THE DISEASE AIDS

DEMOCRATS/REPUBLICANS CUT SOC SECURITY/RAISE TAXES

880353 WHICH PARTY IS MORE LIKELY TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY
880354 WHICH PARTY IS MORE LIKELY TO RAISE TAXES

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION L

880355 WAS QUESTION L8A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880356 WAS QUESTION L8B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880357 WAS QUESTION L8C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880358 WAS QUESTION L8D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880359 WAS QUESTION L8E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880360 WAS QUESTION L9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880361 WAS QUESTION L10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

R'S OPINION ON CHANCES OF GETTING IN WAR

880362 DOES R THINK CHANCES OF GETTING INTO A WAR HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/HAVEN'T CHANGED
880363 HOW MUCH HAVE CHANCES INCREASED/DECREASED

R'S OPINION ON U.S.-SOVIET ARMS AGREEMENTS

880364 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF U.S.-SOVIET ARMS AGREEMENTS
880365 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

R'S OPINION ON U.S. MILITARY IN MIDDLE EAST

880366 R FAVORS/OPOSES AMERICAN MILITARY FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO PROTECT OIL SHIPMENTS
880367 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE
POSITION ON COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE

880368 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-R
880369 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-DUKAKIS
880370 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-BUSH
880371 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-JACKSON
880372 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880373 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880374 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880375 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-REAGAN

R'S OPINION ON LIMITS ON IMPORTS

880376 R FAVORS/OPPOSES LIMITS ON FOREIGN IMPORTS

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS
(SEE ALSO VARIABLES 348-352)

880377 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT
880378 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FINANCIAL AID FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS
880379 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED
880380 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON SPACE AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
880381 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PROGRAMS THAT ASSIST BLACKS
880382 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON CHILDCARE
880383 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
880384 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON CARE FOR THE ELDERLY
880385 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON THE HOMELESS
880386 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING FOR THE WAR ON DRUGS

POSITION ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE

880387 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-R
880388 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-DUKAKIS
880389 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-BUSH
880390 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY
880391 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY
880392 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-REAGAN

R'S OPINIONS ON DRUG PROBLEM

880393 HOW IMPORTANT IS THE DRUG PROBLEM IN THE U.S.
880394 WILL BUSH/DUKAKIS DO BETTER JOB OF SOLVING THIS PROBLEM

R'S OPINION ON ABORTION

880395 R'S POSITION ON ABORTION
R'S OPINION ON PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION (PRE-ELECTION)

880396 DOES R EXPECT TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER
880397 WHO WILL R VOTE FOR IN THE ELECTION FOR PRESIDENT
880398 HOW STRONG IS R'S PREFERENCE FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

880399 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION N

880400 WAS QUESTION N1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880401 WAS QUESTION N1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880402 WAS QUESTION N1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880403 WAS QUESTION N1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880404 WAS QUESTION N1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880405 WAS QUESTION N1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880406 WAS QUESTION N1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880407 WAS QUESTION N1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880408 WAS QUESTION N1J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880409 WAS QUESTION N1K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880410 WAS QUESTION N3 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880411 WAS QUESTION N3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT R

880412 R'S RACE
880413 R'S SEX
880414 R'S AGE
880415 R'S DATE OF BIRTH - MONTH
880416 R'S DATE OF BIRTH - YEAR
880417 R'S RECODED AGE
880418 R'S MARITAL STATUS

R'S EDUCATION

880419 HIGHEST GRADE OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY R
880420 DOES R HAVE A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
880421 R'S HIGHEST-College Degree
880422 SUMMARY: R'S EDUCATION

880423 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R IS MARRIED OR LIVING WITH PARTNER

EDUCATION OF R'S SPOUSE

880424 HIGHEST GRADE OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY SPOUSE
880425 DOES SPOUSE HAVE HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
880426 SPOUSE'S HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE
880427 SUMMARY: SPOUSE'S EDUCATION

R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

880428 R'S PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
880429 SUMMARY: R'S WORKING STATUS
880430 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED) EVER WORKED FOR PAY
880431 WHEN DID R RETIRE
880432 HAS R (DISABLED) EVER WORKED FOR PAY
880433 IS R (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKING NOW
880434 HAS R (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKED IN LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - R WORKING OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF

880435 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880436 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880437 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880438 IS R SELF-EMPLOYED
880439 IS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880440 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKS
880441 IS R SATISFIED WITH NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED
880442 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT JOB SECURITY

880443 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R WORKING NOW

880444 WAS R OUT OF WORK WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
880445 HAS R HAD TO TAKE A PAY CUT/REDUCE HOURS WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - R UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED

880446 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880447 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880448 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880449 ON R'S LAST REGULAR JOB, WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED
880450 WAS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880451 DID R WORK WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
880452 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED

880453 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R UNEMPLOYED

880454 IS R DOING ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE PRESENT TIME
880455 IS R LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME
880456 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND A JOB

OCCUPATION - R HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT

880457 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880458 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880459 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880460 WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED ON LAST JOB
880461 WAS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880462 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED ON LAST JOB
880463 IS R LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME
880464 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND A JOB

R'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

880465 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880466 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED 1980 CODE
880467 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880468 R SELF-EMPLOYED
880469 EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880470 NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK
880471 IS R WORRIED ABOUT JOB SECURITY
880472 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) HAD A JOB IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS
880473 IS R (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) LOOKING FOR WORK AT PRESENT TIME
880474 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED/DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK FOR PAY

880475 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R IS MALE AND MARRIED/PARTNERED

WIFE/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATION

880476 IS R'S WIFE/PARTNER WORKING NOW
880477 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R MARRIED AND FEMALE

HUSBAND/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATION SECTION

880478 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
880479 SUMMARY: HUSBAND/PARTNER'S WORKING STATUS
880480 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (UNEMPLOYED) EVER DONE ANY WORK FOR PAY
880481 WHEN DID HUSBAND/PARTNER RETIRE
880482 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK FOR PAY
880483 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) DOING ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE PRESENT TIME
880484 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKED FOR PAY IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - HUSBAND WORKING OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF

880485 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880486 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880487 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880488 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER SELF-EMPLOYED
880489 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880490 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKS
880491 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER SATISFIED WITH NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED
880492 HOW WORRIED IS HUSBAND/PARTNER ABOUT JOB SECURITY

880493 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKING NOW

880494 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER OUT OF WORK WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
880495 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER HAD TO TAKE A PAY CUT/REDUCE HOURS WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
OCCUPATION - HUSBAND UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED

880496 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880497 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880498 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880499 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER SELF-EMPLOYED ON LAST JOB
880500 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT ON LAST JOB
880501 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
880502 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKED

880503 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS HUSBAND/PARTNER UNEMPLOYED
880504 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER DOING ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE PRESENT TIME
880505 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME
880506 HOW WORRIED IS HUSBAND/PARTNER ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND A JOB

HUSBAND/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

880507 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880508 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED 1980 CODE
880509 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
880510 IS/WAS HUSBAND SELF-EMPLOYED
880511 IS/WAS HUSBAND EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT
880512 HUSBAND - NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK
880513 HUSBAND - WORRIED ABOUT JOB SECURITY
880514 HAS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) HAD A JOB IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS
880515 IS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME
880516 HAS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK FOR PAY

LABOR UNION POSITION

880517 DOES ANYONE IN R'S HOUSEHOLD BELONG TO A LABOR UNION
880518 WHO BELONGS TO A LABOR UNION

880519 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R ONLY FAMILY MEMBER AGE 14 OR OLDER

R'S FAMILY POSITION AND SOCIAL CLASS

880520 FAMILY/HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES
880521 R'S INCOME BEFORE TAXES
880522 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS
880523 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS MIDDLE OR WORKING CLASS
880524 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS AVERAGE OR UPPER MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS
880525 SUMMARY: R'S SOCIAL CLASS
880526 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS

R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND PRACTICE

880527 R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND DENOMINATION
880528 IS RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES MENTIONED BY R CHRISTIAN
880529 DOES R CONSIDER SELF A BORN-AGAIN CHRISTIAN
880530 HOW OFTEN DOES R ATTEND CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE
880531 DOES R ATTEND CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE ONCE A WEEK OR MORE OFTEN
880532 DID R WATCH/LISTEN TO RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS ON TV/RADIO DURING THE PAST WEEK
880533 HOW OFTEN DID R WATCH/LISTEN TO RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS

R'S ETHNIC IDENTITY

880534 WHAT DOES R CONSIDER HIS/HER MAIN ETHNIC GROUP (OTHER THAN AMERICAN) - FIRST MENTION
880535 WHAT DOES R CONSIDER THEIR MAIN ETHNIC GROUP (OTHER THAN AMERICAN) - SECOND MENTION
880536 NUMBER OF ETHNIC GROUPS R MENTIONED
880537 WITH WHICH GROUP DOES R MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFY
880538 WERE R'S PARENTS BORN IN THIS COUNTRY
880539 CHECKPOINT: DID R MENTION SOME HISPANIC GROUP
880540 IS R OF SPANISH OR HISPANIC ORIGIN/DESCENT
880541 CATEGORY THAT BEST DESCRIBES R'S HISPANIC ORIGIN

PERSONAL INFORMATION: R'S PARENTS

880542 R'S FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
880543 DID R'S MOTHER HAVE A JOB
880544 R'S MOTHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE

PERSONAL INFORMATION: R'S COMMUNITY

880545 R'S BIRTHPLACE
880546 WHERE DID R GROW UP
880547 COMMUNITY TYPE R GREW UP IN
880548 HOW LONG HAS R LIVED IN PRESENT CITY/TOWN/TOWNSHIP/COUNTY
880549 WHERE DID R LIVE BEFORE - CITY
880550 WHERE DID R LIVE BEFORE - STATE OR COUNTRY
880551 HOW LONG HAS R LIVED IN THIS HOUSE/APARTMENT
880552 DOES R/R'S FAMILY OWN OR RENT R'S HOME

CONDITIONS OF PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW
POST-ELECTION SURVEY

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN

880564 R'S INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN
880565 DOES R REMEMBER THE CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES
880566 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1
880567 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1
880568 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 1
880569 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 1
880570 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2
880571 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2
880572 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 2
880573 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 2
880574 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3
880575 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3
880576 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 3
880577 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 3

880578 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: U.S. SENATE RACE IN STATE?

SENATE CAMPAIGN

880579 DOES R REMEMBER THE SENATE CANDIDATES
880580 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1
880581 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1
880582 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 1
880583 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 1
880584 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2
880585 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2
880586 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 2
880587 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 2
880588 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3
880589 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3
880590 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 3
880591 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY - CANDIDATE 3
FEELING THERMOMETER: POLITICAL FIGURES

880592 FEELING THERMOMETER - GEORGE BUSH
880593 FEELING THERMOMETER - MICHAEL DUKAKIS
880594 FEELING THERMOMETER - JESSE JACKSON
880595 FEELING THERMOMETER - JIMMY CARTER
880596 FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE
880597 FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE
880598 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT - CANDIDATE 1 (TERM IS NOT UP)
880599 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT - CANDIDATE 2
880600 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT - CANDIDATE 3
880601 FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
880602 FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
880603 FEELING THERMOMETER - INDEPENDENT/THIRD PARTY HOUSE CANDIDATE

FEELING THERMOMETER: GROUPS IN SOCIETY

880604 FEELING THERMOMETER - LABOR UNIONS
880605 FEELING THERMOMETER - FEMINISTS
880606 FEELING THERMOMETER - CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS
880607 FEELING THERMOMETER - PEOPLE ON WELFARE
880608 FEELING THERMOMETER - WOMEN
880609 FEELING THERMOMETER - CONSERVATIVES
880610 FEELING THERMOMETER - POOR PEOPLE
880611 FEELING THERMOMETER - CATHOLICS
880612 FEELING THERMOMETER - BIG BUSINESS
880613 FEELING THERMOMETER - BLACKS
880614 FEELING THERMOMETER - EVANGELICAL GROUPS ACTIVE IN POLITICS
880615 FEELING THERMOMETER - FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880616 FEELING THERMOMETER - LIBERALS
880617 FEELING THERMOMETER - HISPANICS
880618 FEELING THERMOMETER - THE MILITARY
880619 FEELING THERMOMETER - THE ELDERLY
880620 FEELING THERMOMETER - ENVIRONMENTALISTS
880621 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SUPREME COURT
880622 FEELING THERMOMETER - ILLEGAL ALIENS
880623 FEELING THERMOMETER - PALESTINIANS
880624 FEELING THERMOMETER - OPPONENTS OF ABORTION
880625 FEELING THERMOMETER - WHITES
880626 FEELING THERMOMETER - JEWS
880627 FEELING THERMOMETER - HOMOSEXUALS
880628 FEELING THERMOMETER - CONGRESS
880629 FEELING THERMOMETER - CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS

R'S VOTE - 1984

880630 DID R VOTE IN 1984 ELECTION
880631 WHO DID R VOTE FOR IN 1984 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATES: BUSH/DUKAKIS

880632 HOW WELL DOES "TOUGH ON CRIME AND CRIMINALS" DESCRIBE GEORGE BUSH
880633 HOW WELL DOES "CARES ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT" DESCRIBE GEORGE BUSH
880634 HOW WELL DOES "TOUGH ON CRIME AND CRIMINALS" DESCRIBE MICHAEL DUKAKIS
880635 HOW WELL DOES "CARES ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT" DESCRIBE MICHAEL DUKAKIS

PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTION B

880636 WAS QUESTION B1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880637 WAS QUESTION B1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880638 WAS QUESTION B1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880639 WAS QUESTION B1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880640 WAS QUESTION B1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880641 WAS QUESTION B1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880642 WAS QUESTION B1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880643 WAS QUESTION B1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880644 WAS QUESTION B1I PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880645 WAS QUESTION B1K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880646 WAS QUESTION B1M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880647 WAS QUESTION B1N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880648 WAS QUESTION B2A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880649 WAS QUESTION B2B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880650 WAS QUESTION B2C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880651 WAS QUESTION B2D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880652 WAS QUESTION B2E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880653 WAS QUESTION B2F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880654 WAS QUESTION B2G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880655 WAS QUESTION B2H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880656 WAS QUESTION B2J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880657 WAS QUESTION B2K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880658 WAS QUESTION B2M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880659 WAS QUESTION B2N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880660 WAS QUESTION B2P PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880661 WAS QUESTION B2Q PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880662 WAS QUESTION B2R PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880663 WAS QUESTION B2S PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880664 WAS QUESTION B2T PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880665 WAS QUESTION B2U PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880666 WAS QUESTION B2V PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880667 WAS QUESTION B2W PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880668 WAS QUESTION B2X PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880669 WAS QUESTION B2Y PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880670 WAS QUESTION B2Z PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880671 WAS QUESTION B2AA PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880672 WAS QUESTION B2BB PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880673 WAS QUESTION B2CC PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE CANDIDATE: DEMOCRATIC

880674 IS THERE ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
R's likes/dislikes about House candidate: Republican

Is there anything R likes about Republican candidate for House of Representatives?

What R likes about House Republican candidate - first mention

What R likes about House Republican candidate - second mention

What R likes about House Republican candidate - third mention

What R likes about House Republican candidate - fourth mention

What R likes about House Republican candidate - fifth mention

Important issues - House campaign

Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - first mention

Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - second mention

Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - third mention
880701 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: HAS R MENTIONED ISSUES

880702 ISSUE MOST IMPORTANT TO R IN CAMPAIGN

880703 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: TYPE OF RACE, ONE OR TWO CANDIDATES

880704 DID R PREFER ONE OF THE CANDIDATES BECAUSE OF THIS ISSUE

880705 CANDIDATE R PREFERRED

880706 PARTY OF CANDIDATE NAMED

880707 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: TYPE OF RACE, ONE OR TWO CANDIDATES

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF INCUMBENTS - HOUSE CAMPAIGN

880708 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: WAS EITHER CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880709 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: WHICH CANDIDATE WAS ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880710 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: PARTY OF CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880711 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: WAS CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880712 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: CANDIDATE NUMBER CODE

880713 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: PARTY OF CANDIDATE

880714 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: DISTRICTS IN WHICH HOUSE INCUMBENT RAN

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880715 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT

880716 DID R MEET INCUMBENT PERSONALLY

880717 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE INCUMBENT SPOKE

880718 DID R TALK WITH INCUMBENT'S STAFF/OFFICE

880719 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM INCUMBENT

880720 DID R READ ABOUT INCUMBENT IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE

880721 DID R HEAR INCUMBENT ON RADIO

880722 DID R SEE INCUMBENT ON TELEVISION

880723 R HAD CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT IN OTHER WAYS

880724 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT

880725 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: DISTRICT IN WHICH HOUSE INCUMBENT HAD OPPOSITION

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE CANDIDATE - DISTRICTS WITH RUNNING INCUMBENT

880726 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

880727 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY

880728 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE

880729 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE'S STAFF/OFFICE

880730 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE

880731 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE
880732 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO
880733 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION
880734 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS
880735 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT - DISTRICTS WITH NO INCUMBENT RUNNING

880736 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE
880737 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY
880738 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE
880739 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE’S STAFF/OFFICE
880740 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE
880741 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE
880742 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO
880743 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION
880744 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS
880745 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE
880746 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE
880747 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY
880748 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE
880749 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE’S STAFF/OFFICE
880750 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE
880751 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE
880752 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO
880753 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION
880754 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS
880755 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

VOTING SECTION: VOTERS

880756 DID R VOTE IN 1988 ELECTION
880757 WAS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN THIS ELECTION
880758 IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE AT CURRENT ADDRESS
880759 IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN THIS STATE
880760 IN WHAT STATE IS R REGISTERED

880761 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN STATE OF INTERVIEW

880762 DID R VOTE FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IN 1988 ELECTION
880763 WHO DID R VOTE FOR IN 1988 ELECTION
880764 WAS R'S PREFERENCE STRONG FOR THIS PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
880765 WHEN DID R REACH VOTE DECISION
880766 DID R VOTE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE
880767 FOR WHICH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE DID R VOTE
880768 R'S VOTE FOR HOUSE CANDIDATE - PARTY
880769 WAS R'S PREFERENCE STRONG FOR HOUSE CANDIDATE

880770 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: WAS THERE A SENATE RACE IN R'S STATE

880771 DID R VOTE FOR A SENATE CANDIDATE
880772 FOR WHICH SENATE CANDIDATE DID R VOTE
880773 R'S VOTE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE - PARTY
VOTING SECTION: NON-VOTERS

880774 DID R PREFER ONE CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT
880775 WHOM DID R PREFER FOR PRESIDENT
880776 HOW STRONG WAS R'S PREFERENCE FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
880777 DID R PREFER A CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
880778 WHICH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE DID R PREFER
880779 PARTY OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE PREFERRED BY R

NON-CAMPAIGN CONTACTS WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880780 DID R OR FAMILY MEMBER EVER CONTACT U. S. HOUSE INCUMBENT/OFFICE
880781 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO EXPRESS OPINION
880782 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO SEEK INFORMATION
880783 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO SEEK HELP WITH PROBLEM
880784 DID R GET RESPONSE FROM HOUSE INCUMBENT/OFFICE
880785 HOW SATISFIED WAS R WITH RESPONSE FROM INCUMBENT
880786 DOES R KNOW ANYONE ELSE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT
880787 DID PERSON/GROUP GET RESPONSE FROM HOUSE INCUMBENT/OFFICE
880788 HOW SATISFIED WAS PERSON/GROUP WITH RESPONSE FROM INCUMBENT

R'S ASSESSMENT OF U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880789 R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF INCUMBENT'S HANDLING OF JOB
880790 STRENGTH OF R'S APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL OF INCUMBENT'S HANDLING OF JOB
880791 HOW HELPFUL WOULD HOUSE INCUMBENT BE WITH ANOTHER PROBLEM
880792 ANYTHING SPECIAL DONE BY HOUSE INCUMBENT FOR DISTRICT/PEOPLE
880793 HOW WELL DOES U.S. REPRESENTATIVE KEEP IN TOUCH WITH DISTRICT
880794 DOES R AGREE/DISAGREE WITH WAY REPRESENTATIVE VOTED
880795 DOES R REMEMBER A BILL REPRESENTATIVE VOTED ON
880796 DID R AGREE/DISAGREE WITH WAY REPRESENTATIVE VOTED
880797 DOES R SEE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTIES

PARTY DIFFERENCES

880798 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - FIRST MENTION
880799 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FIRST MENTION
880800 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - SECOND MENTION
880801 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - SECOND MENTION
880802 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - THIRD MENTION
880803 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - THIRD MENTION
880804 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - FOURTH MENTION
880805 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FOURTH MENTION
880806 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - FIFTH MENTION
880807 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FIFTH MENTION
880808 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE - SIXTH MENTION
880809 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - SIXTH MENTION
880810 DOES R THINK ONE PARTY MORE CONSERVATIVE AT NATIONAL LEVEL
880811 WHICH PARTY DOES R THINK IS MORE CONSERVATIVE

IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

880812 HOW OFTEN DOES R FOLLOW GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC AFFAIRS
880813 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM - 1ST MENTION
880814 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM - 2ND MENTION
880815 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM - 3RD MENTION

880816 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: HAS R MENTIONED ANY PROBLEMS
880817 WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM
880818 HOW GOOD A JOB IS GOVERNMENT DOING WITH THIS PROBLEM
880819 WHICH PARTY WOULD GET GOVERNMENT TO DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM

PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

880820 DID A POLITICAL PARTY WORKER CONTACT R DURING CAMPAIGN
880821 WHICH PARTY(S) CONTACTED R DURING CAMPAIGN
880822 DID ANYONE ELSE CONTACT R DURING CAMPAIGN
880823 WHICH CANDIDATE DID THE CONTACT ASK R TO SUPPORT - 1ST MENTION
880824 WHICH CANDIDATE DID THE CONTACT ASK R TO SUPPORT - 2ND MENTION

R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

880825 DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHER'S VOTE CHOICES
880826 DID R WEAR A BUTTON, PUT A STICKER ON THE CAR, OR PUT UP A SIGN
880827 DID R ATTEND ANY POLITICAL MEETINGS OR RALLIES
880828 DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE

R'S POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

880829 DID R USE $1 POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION OPTION ON FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURN
880830 DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO AN INDIVIDUAL CANDIDATE
880831 R GAVE MONEY TO CANDIDATE FROM WHICH PARTY
880832 DID R GIVE MONEY TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL PARTY
880833 WHICH PARTY DID R GIVE MONEY TO
880834 DID R GIVE MONEY TO ANY OTHER GROUP SUPPORTING/Opposing CANDIDATES
880835 WAS R CONTACTED ABOUT REGISTERING OR VOTING
880836 DID R RECEIVE REQUESTS THROUGH MAIL FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS
880837 HOW MANY MAIL REQUESTS DID R GET
880838 DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY BECAUSE OF MAIL REQUESTS
880839 DID R RECEIVE PHONE REQUESTS FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS
880840 HOW MANY PHONE REQUESTS DID R RECEIVE
880841 DID R GIVE MONEY BECAUSE OF PHONE REQUESTS
880842 DID R RECEIVE PERSONAL REQUEST FOR POL. CONTRIBUTION
880843 HOW MANY PERSONAL REQUESTS DID R RECEIVE
880844 DID R GIVE MONEY BECAUSE OF PERSONAL REQUESTS

R'S OPINIONS ON VARIOUS SOCIAL/POLITICAL ISSUES

CIVIL RIGHTS/POSITION OF BLACKS

880845 DOES R THINK CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS ARE PUSHING TOO FAST/SLOW
880846 HOW MUCH CHANGE DOES R THINK THERE HAS BEEN IN THE POSITION OF BLACKS

POWER OF GOVERNMENT

880847 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ON THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
880848 DOES R FEEL THE GOVERNMENT IS/IS NOT TOO POWERFUL
880849 DOES R THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD/SHOULD NOT BECOME MORE POWERFUL
880850 SUMMARY: R'S OPINION ON THE POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT
880851 DOES R THINK THE DEMOCRATS/REPUBLICANS FAVOR A POWERFUL GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON

LAWS TO PROTECT HOMOSEXUALS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

880852 DOES R FAVOR/Oppose LAWS TO PROTECT HOMOSEXUALS AGAINST JOB DISCRIMINATION
880853 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/Oppose SUCH LAWS

DEATH PENALTY

880854 DOES R FAVOR/Oppose THE DEATH PENALTY
880855 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/Oppose THE DEATH PENALTY

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR BLACKS

880856 IS R FOR/Against PREFERENTIAL HIRING/PROMOTION OF BLACKS
880857 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/Oppose PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

CONCERN ABOUT CONVENTIONAL/NUCLEAR WAR
880858 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT THE U.S. GETTING INTO A CONVENTIONAL WAR
880859 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT THE U.S. GETTING INTO A
NUCLEAR WAR

SOUTH AFRICA

880860 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ABOUT U.S. POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA
880861 DOES R FAVOR/OPPPOSE U.S. PRESSURE ON SOUTH AFRICA
880862 HOW STRONGLY DOES R HOLD THIS OPINION
880863 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

GOVT ENSURANCE OF FAIR TREATMENT TO BLACKS

880864 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ON THE GOVERNMENT ENSURING THAT BLACKS RECEIVE FAIR TREATMENT IN JOBS
880865 DOES R FEEL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD/SHOULD NOT ENSURE FAIR TREATMENT TO BLACKS

SCHOOL PRAYER

880866 R'S OPINION ON SCHOOL PRAYER
880867 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR THEIR OPINION
880868 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL PRAYER

BLACK STUDENT QUOTAS

880869 R IS FOR/AGAINST QUOTAS TO ADMIT BLACK STUDENTS
880870 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPPPOSE QUOTAS

RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL FIGURES

880871 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE TED KENNEDY HOLDS
880872 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE GEORGE SCHULTZ HOLDS
880873 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE WILLIAM REHNQUIST HOLDS
880874 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE MIKHAIL GORBACHEV HOLDS
880875 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE MARGARET THATCHER HOLDS
880876 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE YASSER ARAFAT HOLDS
880877 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE JIM WRIGHT HOLDS

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF PARTY REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

880878 DOES R KNOW WHICH PARTY HAD THE MOST MEMBERS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE THE ELECTION
880879 DOES R KNOW WHICH PARTY HAD THE MOST MEMBERS IN THE SENATE BEFORE THE ELECTION

R'S ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESS

880880 DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF THE WAY CONGRESS HAS BEEN HANDLING ITS JOB
880881 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTIONS H AND J

880882 WAS QUESTION H1 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880883 WAS QUESTION H2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880884 WAS QUESTION H3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880885 WAS QUESTION H4 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880886 WAS QUESTION H5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880887 WAS QUESTION H6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880888 WAS QUESTION H9A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880889 WAS QUESTION H10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880890 WAS QUESTION J2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880891 WAS QUESTION J3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880892 WAS QUESTION J3B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880893 WAS QUESTION J3C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880894 WAS QUESTION J3D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880895 WAS QUESTION J3E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880896 WAS QUESTION J3F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880897 WAS QUESTION J3G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880898 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

VARIABLES 899-923: REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS
R'S EVALUATION OF THE PAST EIGHT YEARS
(SEE ALSO VARIABLES 881002-881043)

EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT

880899 HAVE EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880900 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASING PROGRAMS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT
880901 DOES R THINK THESE PROGRAMS SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880902 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASING THESE PROGRAMS
880903 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT

LEVEL OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

880904 HAVE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880905 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS
880906 DOES R THINK BENEFITS SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880907 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASE IN BENEFITS
880908 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

LEVEL OF DEFENSE SPENDING

880909 HAS DEFENSE SPENDING INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880910 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASE IN DEFENSE SPENDING
880911 DOES R THINK DEFENSE SPENDING SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880912 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED DEFENSE SPENDING
880913 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF DEFENSE SPENDING

LEVEL OF SPENDING ON POVERTY

880914 HAS SPENDING ON ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR INCREASED/
DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880915 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASED ASSISTANCE FOR THE POOR
880916 DOES R THINK ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880917 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR
880918 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SPENDING ON POVERTY

LEVEL OF SPENDING ON EDUCATION
880919 HAS SPENDING ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880920 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASED SPENDING FOR SCHOOLS
880921 DOES R THINK SPENDING FOR SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
880922 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED SPENDING FOR SCHOOLS
880923 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SPENDING ON EDUCATION

VARS 924–974: QUESTION ORDER EXPERIMENT

EQUAL RIGHTS - R AGREE/DISAGREE
880924 SOCIETY SHOULD ENSURE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO SUCCEED
880925 WE HAVE GONE TOO FAR IN PUSHING EQUAL RIGHTS
880926 WE SHOULD WORRY LESS ABOUT EQUALITY
880927 IT IS NOT A PROBLEM IF PEOPLE HAVE UNEQUAL CHANCES
880928 WE WOULD HAVE FEWER PROBLEMS IF PEOPLE WERE TREATED MORE EQUALLY
880929 A PROBLEM IN THIS COUNTRY IS THAT WE DON'T GIVE EVERYONE AN EQUAL CHANCE

R'S CHOICE OF GOALS FOR THE NATION
880930 R'S CHOICE OF MOST DESIRABLE GOAL FOR THE NATION
880931 R'S CHOICE OF SECOND GOAL FOR OUR NATION

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO R
880932 IS RELIGION AN IMPORTANT PART OF R'S LIFE
880933 HOW MUCH GUIDANCE DOES RELIGION PROVIDE TO R'S LIFE
880934 R'S VIEW ABOUT THE BIBLE
880935 HOW OFTEN DOES R PRAY

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS - R AGREE/DISAGREE
880936 PEOPLE WHO DON'T CARE ABOUT AN ELECTION OUTCOME SHOULDN'T VOTE
880937 PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT GOVERNMENT
880938 PUBLIC OFFICIALS DON'T CARE WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME THINK
880939 POLITICS ARE SO COMPLICATED A PERSON LIKE ME CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON
880940 I HAVE A GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES FACING OUR COUNTRY
I AM WELL-QUALIFIED TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICS
I COULD DO AS GOOD A JOB IN PUBLIC OFFICE AS MOST OTHERS
I AM BETTER INFORMED ABOUT POLITICS THAN MOST
TAXES SHOULD BE CUT EVEN IF IT PUTS OFF IMPORTANT THINGS TO BE DONE

WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - FIRST MENTION
WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - SECOND MENTION
WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - THIRD MENTION
WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - FIRST MENTION
WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - SECOND MENTION
WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - THIRD MENTION

R'S OPINIONS ON MORALITY IN SOCIETY

WE SHOULD ADJUST MORAL BEHAVIOR TO CHANGES IN THE WORLD
WE SHOULD BE MORE TOLERANT OF PEOPLE WITH DIFFERENT MORAL STANDARDS
THERE WOULD BE FEWER PROBLEMS IF MORE EMPHASIS WAS PLACED ON TRADITIONAL FAMILY TIES
NEWER LIFESTYLES ARE CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIETAL BREAKDOWN

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL

HOW MUCH OF THE TIME DOES R THINK HE/SHE CAN TRUST GOVERNMENT
HOW MUCH DOES THE GOVERNMENT WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS
IS GOVERNMENT RUN BY A FEW BIG INTERESTS OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL
HOW MANY PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT DOES R THINK ARE CROOKED
HOW MUCH DOES R FEEL ELECTIONS MAKE GOVERNMENT LISTEN TO PEOPLE
HOW MUCH ATTENTION DOES R FEEL GOVERNMENT PAYS TO WHAT PEOPLE THINK

R'S OPINIONS ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACKS

BLACKS SHOULD OVERCOME PREJUDICE WITHOUT ANY SPECIAL FAVORS
BLACKS HAVE GOTTEN LESS THAN THEY DESERVE OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS
IF BLACKS WOULD TRY HARDER THEY COULD BE JUST AS WELL OFF AS WHITES
GENERATIONS OF SLAVERY AND DISCRIMINATION MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR BLACKS TO MOVE UP
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IS IMPORTANT BUT NOT THE GOVERNMENT'S JOB TO GUARANTEE

R'S OPINION ON A STRONG MILITARY

IS A STRONG MILITARY OR THE BARGAINING TABLE THE BETTER WAY TO KEEP PEACE
HOW IMPORTANT IS A STRONG MILITARY FORCE FOR DEALING WITH OUR ENEMIES
R'S FEELINGS ABOUT BEING AN AMERICAN

880968 HOW GOOD DOES R FEEL SEEING THE AMERICAN FLAG FLY
880969 HOW STRONG IS R'S LOVE FOR HIS/HER COUNTRY
880970 HOW EMOTIONAL DOES R FEEL HEARING THE NATIONAL ANTHEM
880971 HOW PROUD IS R TO BE AN AMERICAN

R'S OPINION ON U.S. WORLD POWER/COMMUNIST THREAT

880972 THE U.S. SHOULD REMAIN THE WORLD'S MOST POWERFUL NATION EVEN IF IT MEANS RISKING WAR
880973 ANY COMMUNIST COUNTRY IS A THREAT TO THE U.S.
880974 THE U.S. SHOULD DO EVERYTHING IT CAN TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

PROBE INDICATORS FOR QUESTION ORDER EXPERIMENT - FORM A

880975 WAS QUESTION M1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880976 WAS QUESTION M1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880977 WAS QUESTION M1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880978 WAS QUESTION M1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880979 WAS QUESTION M1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880980 WAS QUESTION M1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880981 WAS QUESTION M1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880982 WAS QUESTION M1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880983 WAS QUESTION M1I PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880984 WAS QUESTION M1J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880985 WAS QUESTION M1K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880986 WAS QUESTION M1L PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880987 WAS QUESTION M1M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880988 WAS QUESTION M1N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880989 WAS QUESTION M1O PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880990 WAS QUESTION M1P PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880991 WAS QUESTION M1Q PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880992 WAS QUESTION M1R PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880993 WAS QUESTION M1S PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880994 WAS QUESTION M1T PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880995 WAS QUESTION M1U PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880996 WAS QUESTION M1V PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880997 WAS QUESTION M1W PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880998 WAS QUESTION M1X PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
880999 WAS QUESTION M1Y PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881000 WAS QUESTION M1Z PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881001 WAS QUESTION M1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

VARIABLES 1002-1043: REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS
R'S EVALUATION OF THE PAST EIGHT YEARS
(ALSO VARIABLES 88899-88923)

ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS DONE AS PRESIDENT

881002 IS THERE ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS
881002 DONE AS PRESIDENT
881003 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIRST MENTION
881004 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - SECOND MENTION
881005 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - THIRD MENTION
881006 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FOURTH MENTION
881007 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIFTH MENTION

ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS DONE AS PRESIDENT

881008 IS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS DONE AS PRESIDENT
881009 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIRST MENTION
881010 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - SECOND MENTION
881011 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - THIRD REAGAN
881012 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FOURTH MENTION
881013 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIFTH MENTION

QUALITIES DESCRIBING REAGAN

881014 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881015 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881016 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881017 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881018 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881019 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881020 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881021 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE REAGAN
881022 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE REAGAN

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT REAGAN

881023 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL ANGRY
881024 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL HOPEFUL
881025 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL AFRAID OF HIM
881026 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL PROUD

UNEMPLOYMENT BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881027 DOES R THINK UNEMPLOYMENT HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME SINCE 1980
881028 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS UNEMPLOYMENT

INFLATION BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881029 DOES R THINK THAT INFLATION HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/STAYED THE SAME SINCE 1980
881030 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS INFLATION

ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881031 DOES R THINK REAGAN'S ECONOMIC POLICIES HAVE MADE THE ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE/NOT MADE MUCH DIFFERENCE
881032 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAVE REAGAN'S POLICIES MADE THE ECONOMY
881033 HAS R BEEN HELPED OR HURT BY REAGAN'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM

U.S. MORE/LESS SECURE FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES

881034 DOES R THINK REAGAN'S POLICIES HAVE MADE THE U.S.
MORE/LESS SECURE FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES
881035 HOW MUCH MORE/LESS SECURE IS U.S.

BUDGET DEFICIT SMALLER/LARGER SINCE 1980
881036 DOES R THINK THE BUDGET DEFICIT IS SMALLER/LARGER/
STAYED ABOUT THE SAME SINCE 1980
881037 HOW MUCH SMALLER/LARGER IS THE BUDGET DEFICIT

GOVERNMENT MORE/LESS HONEST SINCE 1980
881038 DOES R THINK PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT ARE MORE/LESS
HONEST THAN IN 1980
881039 HOW MUCH MORE/LESS HONEST ARE PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT

EFFORTS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION INCREASED/DECREASED
881040 DOES R THINK EFFORTS TO PROTECT BLACKS FROM
DISCRIMINATION HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED THE
SAME SINCE 1980
881041 DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF THIS INCREASE/DECREASE

OVERALL, R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S PRESIDENCY
881042 OVERALL, DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S
HANDLING OF THE PRESIDENCY
881043 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION P
881044 WAS QUESTION P5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881045 WAS QUESTION P6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881046 WAS QUESTION P7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881047 WAS QUESTION P8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881048 WAS QUESTION P9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881049 WAS QUESTION P10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881050 WAS QUESTION P11 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881051 WAS QUESTION P12 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881052 WAS QUESTION P13 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTIONS N, P & Q
881053 WAS QUESTION N4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881054 WAS QUESTION N4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881055 WAS QUESTION N4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881056 WAS QUESTION N4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881057 WAS QUESTION N5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881058 WAS QUESTION N6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881059 WAS QUESTION N7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881060 WAS QUESTION N8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881061 WAS QUESTION N9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881062 WAS QUESTION N10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881063 WAS QUESTION N11 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881064 WAS QUESTION N12 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881065 WAS QUESTION N13 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881066 WAS QUESTION P1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881067 WAS QUESTION P1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
881068 WAS QUESTION P1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER
R'S IDENTIFICATION WITH GROUPS IN SOCIETY

881097 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO POOR PEOPLE
881098 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO LIBERALS
881099 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO THE ELDERLY
881100 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO BLACKS
881101 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO LABOR UNIONS
881102 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO FEMINISTS
881103 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS
881104 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO BUSINESS PEOPLE
881105 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO YOUNG PEOPLE
881106 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO CONSERVATIVES
881107 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WOMEN
881108 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WORKING PEOPLE
881109 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WHITES
881110 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO EVANGELICAL GROUPS ACTIVE IN POLITICS
881111 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO MIDDLE-CLASS PEOPLE

881112 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R MENTIONED MORE THAN ONE GROUP

881113 TO WHICH GROUP DOES R FEEL CLOSEST
881114 DOES R BELONG TO ORGANIZATIONS OF CLOSEST GROUP

PARTY IDENTIFICATION OF R'S PARENTS

881115 WAS R'S FATHER DEMOCRAT/REPUBLICAN/INDEPENDENT
881116 WAS R'S MOTHER DEMOCRAT/REPUBLICAN/INDEPENDENT
VOTE VALIDATION

881117 ELECTION OFFICE NUMBER
881118 DOES R HAVE A REGISTRATION RECORD IN THIS OFFICE
881119 WAS THE CROSS-REFERENCE FILE CHECKED
881120 WHERE WAS THE REGISTRATION RECORD FOUND
881121 MONTH OF PURGE/APPLICATION
881122 DAY OF PURGE/APPLICATION
881123 YEAR OF PURGE/APPLICATION
881124 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: PURGE/APPLICATION DATE
881125 DOES R'S NAME ON COVERSHEET LABEL MATCH THE NAME ON THE REGISTRATION RECORD
881126 MONTH OF BIRTH ON REGISTRATION RECORD
881127 YEAR OF BIRTH ON REGISTRATION RECORD
881128 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-REPORTED BIRTHDATE AND BIRTHDATE ON REGISTRATION RECORD
881129 DOES R'S ADDRESS ON COVERSHEET LABEL MATCH THE ADDRESS ON THE REGISTRATION RECORD
881130 R'S PRECINCT/ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER/DESIGNATION
881131 KINDS OF REGISTRATION RECORDS KEPT BY ELECTION OFFICE
881132 REGISTRATION RECORDS NOT ACCESSIBLE FOR CHECKING
881133 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: VOTE INFORMATION ON REGISTRATION RECORDS
881134 DOES THE REGISTRATION RECORD INDICATE THAT R VOTED
881135 DO VOTE RECORDS INDICATE R VOTED IN NOVEMBER 1988 GENERAL ELECTION
881136 WHICH VOTE RECORD INDICATED R VOTED
881137 WERE ALL VOTE RECORDS ACCESSIBLE FOR CHECKING
881138 WHICH VOTE RECORDS WERE NOT AVAILABLE FOR CHECKING
881139 MONTH R LAST VOTED
881140 DAY R LAST VOTED
881141 YEAR R LAST VOTED
881142 R'S SELF-REPORTED VOTE
881143 WAS CHECK MADE FOR R'S REGISTRATION VOTING RECORD
881144 SUMMARY: REGISTRATION RECORD FOUND
881145 AVAILABILITY OF VOTING RECORDS
881146 RECORD OF R VOTING - EXCLUDING NO SELF-REPORT
881147 SUMMARY: ASSIGNMENT OF R TO VOTE/NON-VOTE
881148 RECORD OF R VOTING - INCLUDING NO SELF-REPORT

ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY

881149 MONTH OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW
881150 DAY OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW
881151 LENGTH OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW
881152 DISPOSITION OF REGISTRATION RECORDS WHEN OFFICE NOTIFIED PEOPLE MOVED OUT OF JURISDICTION
881153 DISPOSITION OF REGISTRATION RECORDS WHEN OFFICE NOTIFIED OF DEATH OR FELONY CONVICTION
881154 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS DELETED FROM ACTIVE FILES BECAUSE OF NON-VOTING
881155 ARE PEOPLE FIRST NOTIFIED THAT THEY WILL BE DELETED/PURGED
PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - FIRST MENTION
PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - SECOND MENTION
PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - THIRD MENTION
CAN PEOPLE STAY REGISTERED OR ARE THEY REQUIRED TO RE-REGISTER
TIME INTERVAL FOR DELETION OF RECORDS/NOTICES OF INTENT
DISPOSITION OF RECORDS DELETED BECAUSE OF NON-VOTING
FOR HOW LONG ARE DELETED RECORDS FILED
ARE THESE RECORDS CALLED PURGED/INACTIVE/OTHER
ARE THESE RECORDS ACCESSIBLE
ARE THERE STANDARD PROCEDURES TO CONFIRM CURRENT ADDRESS OF REGISTERED VOTERS
IS THIS RESIDENCY CHECK PERFORMED FOR ALL OR JUST NON-VOTERS
NON-VOTERS: HOW LONG MUST IT HAVE BEEN SINCE LAST VOTED
INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: NON-VOTERS/ALL OTHERS
HOW OFTEN IS RESIDENCY CHECK PERFORMED FOR EVERYONE
DISPOSITION OF RECORD WHEN CHECK DETERMINES CHANGE OF ADDRESS
CAN INACTIVE REGISTRANT VOTE BY SHOWING NEW PROOF OF ADDRESS ON ELECTION DAY
DOES INACTIVE REGISTRANT GO TO VOTING PLACE FOR PREVIOUS OR CURRENT ADDRESS IF THEY WANT TO VOTE ON ELECTION DAY
DOES OFFICE HAVE A MASTER FILE FOR ALL REGISTRATION RECORDS
IS MASTER FILE ON A COMPUTER
IS PRECINCT NUMBER ON THE RECORD OF EACH PERSON
IS EXACT ADDRESS OR PRECINCT NECESSARY TO LOCATE A RECORD
WITH MASTER FILE, CAN REGISTRANT BE IDENTIFIED FROM AN ADDRESS
DOES MASTER FILE INDICATE WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A PARTICULAR ELECTION
IS THE ENTRY PROCESS COMPLETE FOR THE 1988 GENERAL ELECTION
IS ANOTHER KIND OF MASTER FILE KEPT
IS OTHER FILE KEPT ON A COMPUTER
IS PRECINCT NUMBER ON THE RECORD OF EACH PERSON
IS EXACT ADDRESS OR PRECINCT NECESSARY TO LOCATE A RECORD
WITH OTHER FILE, CAN REGISTRANT BE IDENTIFIED FROM AN ADDRESS
DOES OTHER FILE INDICATE WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A PARTICULAR ELECTION
IS THE ENTRY PROCESS COMPLETE FOR THE 1988 GENERAL ELECTION
INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: EITHER MASTER OR OTHER FILE INDICATES WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A PARTICULAR ELECTION
ANY OTHER REGISTRATION RECORDS THAT CONTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT VOTING PARTICIPATION
REGISTRATION RECORDS CONTAIN VOTE INFORMATION
881189 ARE LISTS OF PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE PROVIDED TO PRECINCTS ON ELECTION DAY
881190 WHAT ARE THESE LISTS CALLED - FIRST MENTION
881191 WHAT ARE THESE LISTS CALLED - SECOND MENTION
881192 ARE THESE LISTS MARKED BY OFFICIALS TO INDICATE THAT SOMEONE VOTED
881193 ARE THESE LISTS SIGNED BY THE VOTERS THEMSELVES
881194 ARE VOTERS REQUIRED TO SIGN A BALLOT APPLICATION/VOUCHER
881195 ARE FILES OF BALLOT APPLICATIONS KEPT
881196 ARE RECORDS KEPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT
881197 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS MARKED WHEN AN ABSENTEE BALLOT IS RETURNED

REGISTRATION RECORDS DO NOT CONTAIN VOTE INFORMATION

881198 MUST USE VOTING, AND NOT REGISTRATION, RECORDS FOR VOTING INFORMATION
881199 VOTING INFORMATION IS KEPT ON REGISTRATION MASTER FILE/SET OF REGISTRATION RECORDS/OTHER
881200 VOTE RECORDS KEPT IN THIS/OTHER OFFICE
881201 ARE LISTS OF PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE PROVIDED TO PRECINCTS ON ELECTION DAY
881202 ARE THESE LISTS MARKED BY OFFICIALS TO INDICATE THAT SOMEONE VOTED
881203 ARE THESE LISTS SIGNED BY THE VOTERS THEMSELVES
881204 ARE VOTERS REQUIRED TO SIGN A BALLOT APPLICATION/VOUCHER
881205 ARE FILES OF BALLOT APPLICATIONS KEPT
881206 ARE RECORDS KEPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT
881207 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS MARKED WHEN AN ABSENTEE BALLOT IS RETURNED
881208 IS A VOTER’S PRECINCT/ELECTION DISTRICT NEEDED TO FIND A PERSON’S NAME ON THE VOTING RECORDS
881209 IF LACKING A PRECINCT NUMBER, CAN IT BE RETRIEVED FROM THE REGISTRATION RECORD

881210 HOW SOON BEFORE A FEDERAL ELECTION MUST PEOPLE BE REGISTERED TO VOTE
881211 HOW MANY PEOPLE REGISTERED FOR THE FIRST TIME ON ELECTION DAY, NOVEMBER 1988
881212 HOW MANY PEOPLE REGISTERED FOR THE FIRST TIME DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1988
881213 APPROXIMATE NUMBER REGISTERED AT THE END OF 1987
881214 APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF REGISTRATION RECORDS PURGED DURING 1988
881215 APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF REGISTERED VOTERS AS OF TODAY
881216 SUMMARY: NUMBER OF NEW REGISTRATIONS DURING 1988
881217 NUMBER OF ELECTION DISTRICTS/PRECINCTS IN THIS JURISDICTION
881218 NUMBER OF POLLING PLACES FOR A GENERAL ELECTION
881219 TIME LAG BETWEEN REGISTRATION AND COMPLETION OF PROCESSING
881220 REGISTRATION AT THIS LOCATION OR AT ANOTHER LOCALE
881221 REGISTRATION ALL YEAR YEAR ROUND/CERTAIN TIMES
881222 IS THIS OFFICE THE ONLY PLACE WHERE PEOPLE CAN REGISTER
881223 IS THIS ALWAYS THE ONLY OFFICE, OR ARE SOME LOCATIONS OPEN TEMPORARILY BEFORE ELECTIONS
OTHER LOCATIONS FOR REGISTRATION - YEAR ROUND

881224 PUBLIC LIBRARIES
881225 FIRE STATIONS
881226 SHOPPING MALLS/MARKETS
881227 POST OFFICES
881228 DRIVERS' LICENSE RENEWAL (SEC'Y OF STATE OFFICE)
881229 SHERIFF'S OFFICE/POLICE STATIONS
881230 COURTHOUSE
881231 COLLEGE DORMS/UNIONS
881232 APARTMENT COMPLEX CLUBHOUSE/COMMONS
881233 COMMUNITY CENTERS/SENIOR CITIZENS CENTERS
881234 ATHLETIC CLUB/YMCA
881235 ORGANIZATION MEETING PLACE
881236 CHURCHES/PARISH HALL
881237 SOMEONE'S HOUSE
881238 VOLUNTEERS GOING DOOR-TO-DOOR
881239 SPECIAL MOBILE UNITS
881240 OTHER
881241 OTHER - SPECIFIED

OTHER LOCATIONS FOR REGISTRATION - TEMPORARY BEFORE ELECTIONS

881242 CAN PEOPLE REGISTER AT OTHER LOCATIONS OPEN TEMPORARILY BEFORE ELECTIONS

881243 PUBLIC LIBRARIES
881244 FIRE STATIONS
881245 SHOPPING MALLS/MARKETS
881246 POST OFFICES
881247 DRIVERS' LICENSE RENEWAL (SEC'Y OF STATE OFFICE)
881248 SHERIFF'S OFFICE/POLICE STATIONS
881249 COURTHOUSE
881250 COLLEGE DORMS/UNIONS
881251 APARTMENT COMPLEX CLUBHOUSE/COMMONS
881252 COMMUNITY CENTERS/SENIOR CITIZENS CENTERS
881253 ATHLETIC CLUB/YMCA
881254 ORGANIZATION MEETING PLACE
881255 CHURCHES/PARISH HALL
881256 SOMEONE'S HOUSE
881257 VOLUNTEERS GOING DOOR-TO-DOOR
881258 SPECIAL MOBILE UNITS
881259 OTHER
881260 OTHER - SPECIFIED
881261 WHEN ARE THESE OTHER PLACES OPEN

881262 DOES JURISDICTION HAVE DEPUTY REGISTRARS
881263 NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS
881264 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - FIRST MENTION
881265 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - SECOND MENTION
881266 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - THIRD MENTION
881267 ARE THERE LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS
881268 LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS - FIRST MENTION
881269 LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS - SECOND MENTION
881270 ARE THERE LIMITS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS
881271 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - FIRST MENTION
881272 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - SECOND MENTION
881273 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - THIRD MENTION
881274 ARE THERE LIMITS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK
881275 LIMITATIONS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK - FIRST MENTION
881276 LIMITATIONS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK - SECOND MENTION
881277 CAN PEOPLE REGISTER INITIALLY BY MAIL
881278 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - FIRST MENTION
881279 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - SECOND MENTION
881280 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - THIRD MENTION
881281 ARE MAIL APPLICATIONS ON DISPLAY AT THESE PLACES
881282 DAYS OF THE WEEK REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - FIRST MENTION
881283 HOURS OF THE DAY REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - FIRST MENTION
881284 DAYS OF THE WEEK REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - SECOND MENTION
881285 HOURS OF THE DAY REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - SECOND MENTION
881286 ARE HOURS EXTENDED BEFORE AN ELECTION
881287 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - FIRST MENTION
881288 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - FIRST MENTION
881289 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - FIRST MENTION
881290 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - SECOND MENTION
881291 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - SECOND MENTION
881292 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - SECOND MENTION
881293 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - THIRD MENTION
881294 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - THIRD MENTION
881295 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - THIRD MENTION
881296 IS THERE A PUBLICATION THAT EXPLAINS REGISTRATION ELIGIBILITY AND PROCEDURES
881297 MAY INTERVIEWER HAVE A COPY
881298 RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT TO REGISTER - DAYS

INTERVIEWER NOTES

881299 INTERVIEWER ALLOWED TO HANDLE THE RECORDS
881300 INFORMATION RETRIEVAL WAS DONE BY SOMEONE ELSE OPERATING A COMPUTER
881301 INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF OFFICE ORGANIZATION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND ACCURACY OF RECORDS