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>> 1992 General Introduction

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1992:
[PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEYS ENHANCED]
WITH DATA FROM 1990 AND 1991

(ICPSR 6067)

During the summer and early fall of 1993 the National Election Studies staff and ICPSR prepared a comprehensive version of the 1992 American National Election Study to take full advantage of both its cross-sectional and panel components. The number of cases in this file, 2,485, includes all respondents from the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election surveys. More than half of these respondents or 1,359 individuals also participated in the 1990 Post-Election survey (ICPSR 9548) or in the 1991 Political Consequences of War survey (ICPSR 9673), or both. This collection may therefore be used in the traditional fashion to support cross-sectional analysis of the 1992 electorate or to support panel analysis to trace political developments over the turbulent period from the fall of 1990 through the 1992 presidential election and its aftermath. Another way to describe this collection is to say that it contains
"lagged" measures for 1,359 of the 2,485 cases. The codebook contains complete documentation for 2,105 variables beginning with three identification variables which provide the ICPSR study number, edition number, and part number (V1-V3). It continues with all questions from the 1990 Post-Election survey (V4-V711, consecutive numbering), the 1991 Political Consequences of War survey (V2002-V2580, not consecutively numbered), and concludes with the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election surveys (V3004-V7001, also not consecutively numbered). This file does not contain any variables from the 1991 Pilot Study, originally embedded within ICPSR Study Number 9673. On occasion the introduction to the codebook refers indirectly to this Pilot Study. Users who wish to analyze the 1991 Pilot Study variables should consult Study Number 9673. USERS SHOULD NOTE THAT NO VARIABLE NUMBERS HAVE CHANGED SINCE THESE FILES WERE RELEASED AS SEPARATE COLLECTIONS. Those respondents who are members of the cross-section sample have padded missing data values for all 1990 and 1991 variables.

A complete and detailed description of each element in the collection follows. Please note that UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES AND MARGINALS ONLY appear in the codebook.

>> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE 1990 POST-ELECTION SURVEY

(Variables v4 through v711)

The NES/CPS American National Election Study 1990 was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of principal investigators Warren E. Miller, Donald R. Kinder and Steven J. Rosenstone. Santa Traugott is the Project Manager for the National Election Studies. Giovanna Morchio was the 1990 Election Study manager for NES, overseeing the study from very early planning stages through data release.

This is the twenty-first in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the Political Behavior Program of the Survey Research Center and the Center for Political Studies, and it is the seventh such study to be conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants providing long-term support for the national election studies. Both the 1990 National Election Study and the Vote Validation Study were funded under grant number SES-8808361. Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed by a National Board of Overseers, 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 1990 National Election Study included: Morris P. Fiorina, Harvard University, Chair; Richard A. Brody, Stanford University; Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky; Edie N. Goldenberg,
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 1990 Study Planning Committee included Kinder and Miller, several Board members (Mann, Co-chair; Brody; Feldman; Jackman; Miller, ex officio; and Rosenstone, ex officio and Co-chair), and four other scholars (Jon Krosnick, Ohio State University; Gregory Markus and Vincent Price, University of Michigan; and David Leege, Notre Dame University).

A two-wave pilot study was carried out in July and September of 1989 for the purpose of developing new instrumentation for the 1990 Election Study. New items were tested in the area of religious attitudes and denominational affiliation, media exposure and the type of information recalled, and individualism. A significant portion of the study was devoted to experiments contrasting different instrumentation for issue questions: seven-point scales versus branching response alternatives; "framed" versus "stripped" questions; unipolar versus bipolar scales; and filtered versus unfiltered questions. Data from the 1989 Pilot Study are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR 9295). Results from the pilot study (as summarized in Pilot Study Reports, page xix) were used by the Planning Committee in formulating recommendations to the Board about study content for the 1990 Election Study.

The 1991 membership of the NES Board of Overseers is: Stanley Feldman, State University of New York, Stony Brook; Morris J. Fiorina, Harvard University; Mary Jackman, University of California, Davis; Gary Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; David Leege, Notre Dame University; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, Stanford University; John Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles.

>> 1992 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SURVEY CONTENT

The Board of Overseers balanced a number of considerations in selecting content for the Post-Election Survey. There was, as always, the necessity of maintaining continuity with past surveys. All congressional time-series items were evaluated by the Board, and input was solicited from the user community about whether each should be used for the 1990 Study.
The items that fall into the time-series, or "core" category, are: campaign attention; likes and dislikes of political parties; likes and dislikes of congressional candidates; contact with Congressperson or candidate; vote for Representative, Senator and Governor; most important problem; campaign activities; system support and efficacy items; feeling thermometer ratings of congressional candidates and groups; retrospective economic evaluations (national and individual); liberal-conservative scale (with proximities); party identification, seven-point issue scales with placements; federal budget preferences; views on abortion; and the standard and extensive battery of demographic questions.

A number of questions are new or relatively new to the Study. Some came from the piloting work described above--e.g., the new measures of denominational affiliation; individualism; and attitudes toward abortion and discrimination against women. Others were designed to reflect topical concerns of the campaign. Items in this category include some foreign policy issue items relating to changes in Eastern Europe and to events in the Persian Gulf; and knowledge of and attitudes about the failures of the savings and loans financial institutions and about the federal budget deficit.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

Two forms were used in order to incorporate the maximum amount of content. (Even so, the average length of the survey interview was 78 minutes.) Half of the study sample was randomly assigned to Form A, and the other half to Form B. More than 75 percent of the questionnaire content was the same in both forms; Form A had additional questions relating to values and individualism; Form B had additional content relating to foreign relations. In addition, there was a question form experiment (branching alternatives vs. a seven-point scale).

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 Code) 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. B13, 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 Appendix (Note 4) of this documentation.
NOTES ON CONFIDENTIAL VARIABLES

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, occupation code variables have been released in somewhat less detail than in years past. The dataset includes a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who have need of the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access to these data may be provided.

Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Permission to use the more detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about this is available from NES project staff.

Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable (Variable 541). This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the congressional candidates likes and dislikes). These questions are put into Master Codes by the SRC coding section. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for the questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR #8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways that respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.

Table 1: Field Administration Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Rate:</th>
<th>71.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Interview:</td>
<td>78.0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Respondents:</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number and Cumulative Percent of Interviews in Two-Week Intervals from Election Day, 1990

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 07-Nov. 17</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18-Dec. 01</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1990 NES is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1990 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units, other than on military reservations, in the 48 coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and 18 years of age on or before the 6th of November 1990.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1990 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1990 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four-stage sampling process--a primary stage sampling of U.S. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) 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 titled 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, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units. The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two times the size of the 1990 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSU's. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 84 PSU design.
The sample for the 1990 NES is selected from the "one-half" partition of the 1980 SRC National Sample. The "one-half sample" includes 11 of the 16 self-representing SMSA PSU's and a stratified subsampling of 34 (of the 68) nonself-representing PSU's of the SRC National Sample. Table 3 identifies the PSU's for the 1990 National Election Study by SMSA status and Region.

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1980 National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1980 Census summary tape file series (STF1-B). The designated second-stage sampling units (SSU's), termed "area 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 was selected from each of the a=39 nonself-representing (NSR) PSU's (except Houston that 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.

Table 3: PSU'S in the 1990 NES Post-Election Survey by SMSA Status and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>SMSA STATUS</th>
<th>SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA's</th>
<th>NON-SMSA'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-east</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>Boston, MA*</td>
<td>Schuyler, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia,</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 1990 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The overall probability of selection for 1990 NES households was \( f = \frac{0.0003761}{10,000} \) or 0.3761 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] (1949), 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

The targeted minimum completed interview sample size for the 1990 NES Post-Election Survey was n=1,750 cases. In the original sample size computation, the following assumptions were made: response rate = .68, combined occupancy/eligibility rate = .83. These assumptions were derived from survey experience in the 1986 NES Post Election Survey. Table 4 provides a full description of the original sample design specifications.

Table 4: 1990 National Post-Election Survey
Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications and Assumptions</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews</td>
<td>2,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible sample households</td>
<td>2,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate*</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final sample HU listings</td>
<td>3,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample growth from update**</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample listings from frame</td>
<td>3,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Expected eligibility (.97) x occupancy (.90)

** Since the updating process produces about a 5% increase in sample lines over the count selected from the National Sample system, the update inflation factor was set at 1.05.

SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

In comparing the design stage expectations in the first column of Table 4 with the actual survey outcomes in the second column, it can be seen that the sample growth from the update procedure was slightly higher than expected. Also, the original sample design specifications overestimated the occupancy/eligibility rates and underestimated the response rate for the actual survey.
Design stage assumptions for the study response rate and occupancy/eligibility rate were based on the rates obtained in the 1986 Post-Election Survey.

The actual occupancy/eligibility rate for the 1990 NES Post-Election Survey (.802) was somewhat lower than the rate obtained in the 1986 NES Post-Election Survey (.835). The response rate for 1990 (.714) was higher than the 1986 NES Post-Election Survey response rate of .677 or the 1988 NES Pre-election response rate of .705.

The original area probability sample for the 1990 NES was selected as a basic sample replicate of 3280 sample HU listings. In the Post-Election surveys the elapsed time between Election Day and the date of interview is a critical design consideration. Since timing is so critical, the option of using a replicated sample approach to control final study sample size has little utility. In order to ensure that no fewer than a minimum of 1750 completed interviews would be obtained within the study time frame, the initial size of the basic sample replicate was increased from the expected 3100 to 3280 listings (approximately a 5% increase). In addition, 6.8% sample growth from SRC's standard sample update procedure increased the size of the final sample to n=3503 housing units listings. Due to the deliberate increase in sample size and higher than expected response rate, the final number of completed interviews (n=2004) was approximately 14.5% higher than the minimum interview target specified for the survey.

WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1990 NES DATA

The area probability sample design for the 1990 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 Error Calculation Programs**

The probability sample design for the 1990 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 REPERR 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 1990 NES are included as a variable in the ICPSR Public Use 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 5 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 that is comprised of cases assigned sampling code values 36 and 55 and the second SECU in stratum 29 that is comprised of cases with SECU's 61 and 63.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>
Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1990 NES

To assist NES data analysts, the OSIRIS PSALMS program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging set of means and proportions estimated from NES survey data sets. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for fifteen demographic and political affiliation subclasses of NES samples. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 6.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 6 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1990 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value that best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest.[4] Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g. z=1.96 for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages, not to
the difference between two percentage estimates.

The generalized variance results presented in Table 6 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.

Table 6: 1990 NES Post-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</th>
<th>30% or</th>
<th>20% or</th>
<th>10% or</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<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>2.260</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>

>> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE 1990-1991 PANEL STUDY
OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

(Variables V2002 through V2580)

The documentation for variables 2002 through 2580 is a subset of the documentation for ICPSR 9673, AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY: 1990-1991 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR/1991 PILOT STUDY. There are, however, several references in this documentation to Pilot Study variables that are not contained in the data for this collection.
This study was initially thought about as the 1991 Pilot Study, the next in sequence in a series of NES Pilot Studies which have been conducted in the biennial "off-years" since 1979, and which have become the standard mode by which new areas of interest are explored and new instrumentation developed. Pilot Studies typically involve re-interviews with a subset of respondents from the most recently completed Post-Election study.

When the Board of Overseers met in early February of 1991, to consider responses to this stimulus letter, a consensus rapidly developed that with the 1990 National Election Studies Post-Election study completed before the outbreak of hostilities in the Persian Gulf, NES was particularly well positioned to carry out a panel study of the consequences of war. Accordingly, the NES Board of Overseers reconceptualized the 1991 study as the second wave of a panel study focusing on the political consequences of the war, with the first wave of the study being the 1990 Post-Election Study. By interviewing respondents before the war broke out, a few months after hostilities ended, and hopefully again in the weeks after the 1992 elections (Additional funding will be sought for a third wave of the panel) we have a powerful opportunity to assess the short term and the longer term impact of war on national politics and public opinion. As NES Board Chair, Thomas Mann, stated in his stimulus letter of February 25, 1991:

"...understanding the public's assessment of the war is a way station on the road to the more important objective of understanding how war shapes the future course of national politics. The implications are many. The war might affect isolationist sentiment; the military's claim on the federal budget; views on dissent and protest; patriotism; the level of internal discord; the relative appeal of various Democratic challengers in 1992; confidence in government; alterations in national priorities; racial and ethnic conflict; and more."

A panel study committee was convened in early April to lay out thirty minutes of content for the Consequences of War study. This committee, chaired by David Leege, University of Notre Dame, decided upon a subset of questions from the 1990 study which needed to be repeated in the 1991 Study. These questions are listed below:

* Approval ratings of Bush/Senators/Rep./Congress
* Thermometers
* Party ID
* Most important problems facing the country
* Differences between the parties
* Whether or not the Cold War is ending
* Assistance to E. Europe
* Was it the right thing to send military to Gulf
* Bush handling of Gulf Crisis
* Party differences on taxes, the economy, and foreign affairs
* Liberal/conservative placements
* Personal and National economic well-being
* Defense spending placements
* Has the U.S. position in the world grown weaker or stronger
* Trust in government
* Worry about conventional and nuclear war

The Panel Study Committee crafted for the 1991 Study a number of additional items especially relevant to the Gulf War conflict:

* Foreign policy goals
* Congressional term limitations
* Did one party support use of force more than the other
* Recall of respondent's own position on the war resolution
* Respondent's personal feelings during the war
* Morality of bombing near civilians
* Attention paid to the war
* Attention to religious broadcasts
* Open-ended questions on good/bad outcomes of the war
* Was war worth the costs
* Friends or relatives in the Persian Gulf Crisis
* Aid to the Kurds
* Correct to stop while Saddam still in power
* Did Senators and Representative vote for or against war resolution

>> ATTENDEES AT THE APRIL 1991 PLANNING MEETING FOR THE 1991 NES PANEL STUDY

David Leege (Chair)
Notre Dame University

Stanley Feldman
SUNY, Stony Brook

Morris J. Fiorina
Harvard University

Thomas W. Graham
University of California, San Diego

Thomas M. Ivacko
NES Staff, Center for Political Studies,
University of Michigan

Gary Jacobson
University of California, San Diego

Donald Kinder
University of Michigan

Warren Miller
Arizona State University
John Mueller  
Rochester University

Doug Rivers  
Stanford University

Steven J. Rosenstone  
University of Michigan

Santa Traugott  
NES Staff, Center for Political Studies,  
University of Michigan

John Zaller  
University of California, Los Angeles

While placing special emphasis on the panel study of the political consequences of war, the Board of Overseers explicitly did not wish to forego the pilot aspects of the off-year study, so a full-fledged pilot study is also embedded within the 1990-1991 Panel study.

Variables related to the 1991 Pilot Study are not included in the ICPSR edition of this collection. Users wishing to examine data from the pilot study should consult ICPSR 9673, AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1991: 1990-91 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR/1991 PILOT STUDY.

>> 1992 STUDY CHARACTERISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION

The 1990-1991 Panel/1991 Pilot Study was a telephone reinterview of respondents to the NES 1990 Post-Election Study. Interviewing for the study was carried out by the Telephone Facility of the Survey Research Center, the Institute for Social Research.

* Field period was June 4, 1991 -- July 31, 1991
* Average interview length was 42 minutes
* 1385 interviews were taken
* Survey cooperation (response rate) was 78%
  (See below)
* An experiment in response incentives was done
  (See below, Response Incentives)
* Three Forms were used (see below, Form Assignment)
* The study was CATI -- there is no paper version of the Questionnaire

RESPONSE RATE CALCULATIONS

This is a Panel Study, and response rate calculations are somewhat different than those for an initial contact study. In one sense, there is no "non-sample" since every one of the 2000 persons we originally interviewed in 1990 is, by definition, eligible for a reinterview. We reinterviewed
1385 of these 2000 respondents to the 1990 study, for a strictly construed reinterview rate of 69.3%. Some of the 615 respondents who were not reinterviewed are accounted for by "panel mortality" -- respondents who move and cannot be located, or die. Some are effectively non-sample for the purposes of a telephone reinterview: they are extremely hard of hearing, or we cannot reach them by telephone (unlisted and refused telephone numbers; no telephone in the home and no recontact person with a telephone, et al.) Those who needed to be interviewed in a language other than English were also treated as non-sample. Of the 615 respondents we did NOT reinterview, 223 are "non-sample."

392 respondents from the 1990 Study either refused to be reinterviewed, or could not cooperate because they were ill or for some other reason physically unable to complete a telephone interview. It should be noted that included among these 392 respondents are some who did not have a telephone and who we attempted to reach by passing messages through a recontact person for whom we did have a telephone number. (Respondents to NES interviews are routinely asked to give us the name of someone who will know how to reach them.)

Cases such as these are normally not included in the Pilot Study samples, but were included for this study in the interests of maximizing the number of cases interviewed now and available for reinterview in 1992. A cooperation rate, which excludes the 223 unlocatable cases, is calculated at 78% (1385/1777).

This cooperation, or response rate, compares very favorably with those of past pilot studies, in which respondents deemed hard to interview over the telephone and/or without telephones in their homes were eliminated in advance from the sample. While we don't know what accounts for "good" response rates, we did do some careful advance contacting of respondents, to ensure that a) they could be located in June and July and b) they would be predisposed to give us a reinterview. A "Thank-You" letter for their participation in the 1990 Study was mailed in early March. A respondent report (a brief description of some 1990 study results) reached them in early May. Finally, a response incentives experiment was performed, which involved still a third contact with about 1200 of the 2000 respondents to the 1990 study. This experiment is described below.

RESPONSE INCENTIVES EXPERIMENT

At the suggestion of the Survey Operations Group in the Survey Research Center, the Board of Overseers agreed to implement a small response incentives experiment in the Pilot Study. We eliminated from the experiment those who did not have good mailing addresses, or who we would normally have eliminated from an RDD sample -- i.e., they had no phones.

The remaining respondents were divided into four roughly equal groups: those who received no advance communication from NES; those who received a letter saying that we would
be calling for an interview shortly; those who received a letter and a pen with a University of Michigan logo and 4) those who received an advance letter and $1.

An analysis of the results will be forthcoming from the Survey Operations Group and will be part of the NES 1991 Pilot Study Reports. The Pilot Study variables used for this experiment are not included in this collection. Users wishing to examine data from the pilot study should consult ICPSR 9673, AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1991: 1990-91 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR/1991 PILOT STUDY.

FORM ASSIGNMENT

When the Board began planning for this study, we were budgeted for about 40 minutes of interview time. Since we needed 30 minutes for the Panel component of the study, and had about 30 minutes of suggested new instrumentation, we had to divide the pilot study instrumentation into 3 forms of 10 minutes apiece. This form assignment was based on the assignment to forms in the 1990 election study, which itself had a Form A and a Form B. Form A, in the 1990 study, incorporated batteries of items on "values" --individualism, equalitarianism, attitudes toward racial matters, etc. Form B included items relating to partisan differences, and some foreign policy questions. Also, it contained the standard "women's role" seven-point scale.

It was decided by the Pilot Study Committee that analysis of Form One items (those relating to attitudes toward immigration) on the Pilot required respondents from Form A of the 1990 Post Election Study, and that analysis of Form Two (gender-related) instrumentation should be done on respondents to Form B of the Post-Election Study. Accordingly, the form assignment was done such that two/thirds of the Form A respondents were assigned to Form One in the Pilot Study; two/thirds of the Form B respondents were assigned to Form Two; and the remaining one/third in each of 1990 Study's Form A and Form B were assigned to the Pilot Study Form Three. The partitioning of the Forms A and B into thirds was done randomly, and the initial assignment to Form A and Form B in the 1990 study was random.

>> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1992

(Variables V3004 through V7001)

The 1992 American National Election Study 1992 was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of Warren E. Miller, Donald R. Kinder and Steven J. Rosenstone. Santa Traugott was the Director of Studies for the National Election Studies. Giovanna Morchio was the Study Manager, overseeing the study from very early planning stages through release of the 1992 data collection.
This is the twenty-second in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the Political Behavior Program of the Survey Research Center and the Center for Political Studies, and it is the eighth traditional time-series study to be conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants (SOC77-08885, SES-8341310, and SES-8808361) providing long-term support for the National Election Studies. Since 1978, the National Election Studies have been designed by a national Board of Overseers, 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 1992 National Election Study included: Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution (Chair); Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky; Morris Fiorina, Harvard University; Mary Jackman, University of California at Davis; Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; David Leeege, Notre Dame University; Douglas Rivers, Stanford University; Virginia Sapiro, University of Wisconsin; John Zaller, the University of California at Los Angeles; Warren E. Miller, Arizona State University, ex officio; Donald R. Kinder and Steven J. Rosenstone, University of Michigan, ex officio.

As part of the study planning process, a special planning committee was appointed, a pilot study conducted, and stimulus letters sent to members of the scholarly community soliciting input on study plans. David Leege chaired the 1992 Study Planning Committee which included from the board Stanley Feldman, Mary Jackman, Douglas Rivers, Virginia Sapiro, and three other scholars: Paul Beck, Ohio State University; Jack Citrin, University of California at Berkeley; and Leonie Huddy, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

A pilot study was carried out in June-July of 1991 for the purpose of developing new instrumentation for the 1992 Election Study. New items were tested in the area of ethnic politics, gender consciousness and social altruism. It should be noted that the 1991 Pilot Study was simultaneously the 1990-1991 Panel Study on the Political Consequences of War. Data from the 1991 Pilot Study are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR 9673). Results from the pilot study (summarized in "List of 1991 Pilot Study Reports," ) were used by the Planning Committee in formulating recommendations to the Board about study content for the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Surveys. Copies of the Pilot Study reports may be obtained by contacting the NES project staff, at the addresses given below.

NES Project Staff  
Center for Political Studies  
Room 4026 Institute for Social Research  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor MI  48104
STUDY DESIGN

The 1992 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. Approximately half of the 1992 cases are comprised of empaneled respondents who were first interviewed in the 1990 National Election Study and later in the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study. The other half of the cases are a freshly drawn cross-section sample. (Details of the sample design are given in "Sample Design of the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Study", below.)

The panel component of the study design provides an opportunity to trace how the changing fortunes of the Bush presidency, from the high levels of approval at the start of the Gulf War, through the decline after the onset of a recession, affected voting in the November 1992 presidential election. It also permits analysts to investigate the origins of the Clinton and Perot coalitions as well as changes in the public's political preferences over the two years preceding the 1992 election.

Altogether, 2485 citizens were interviewed in the 9 weeks prior to the November 3, 1992 election. [Note: The original study Staff release of the 1992 National Election Study in April, 1993 contained 2,487 cases. See the note on "A Note on Deletion of Cases", below, for further information about the two cases deleted from this edition of the collection.] To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign, a random half of the sample was released to the field on September 1 and the other half on October 1st. 1359 of the pre-election interviews were conducted with panel respondents; 1126 with cross-section respondents. In the weeks following the election, 2255 pre-election respondents were reinterviewed; 1250 panel, 1005 cross-section. Further details of the administration of the surveys are given in "Study Administration", below.

The two components of the study -- the panel and the new cross-section -- were designed to be easily used together to create a combined nationally representative sample of the American electorate. Several case weights are provided with this data set.

V3008 (which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when analyzing the combined sample (the panel and the new cross-section respondents).

V3009 (which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when analyzing the panel respondents alone.

V7000 (which corrects for panel attrition and the aging of the panel respondents, but does not...
incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when comparing either the panel respondents or the combined panel and new cross-section respondents to previous (unweighted) National Election Studies data collections.


The frequencies that appear in this codebook are unweighted.

STUDY CONTENT; SUBSTANTIVE THEMES

The content for the 1992 Election Study reflects its double duty, both as the traditional presidential election year time-series data collection and as a panel study. The substantive themes represented in the 1992 questionnaires include:

* interest in the political campaigns; concern about the outcome; and attentiveness to the media's coverage of the campaign

* information about politics

* evaluation of the presidential candidates and placement of presidential candidates on various issue dimensions

* partisanship and evaluations of the political parties

* knowledge of, contact with, and evaluation of House candidates (including questions on how their Representative voted on the Persian Gulf War resolution and whether he/she was implicated in the House banking scandal); opinions on term limitations

* political participation: turnout in the Presidential primaries and in the November general election; other forms of electoral campaign activity

* vote choice for President, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, including second choice for President

* personal and national economic well-being, with particular attention to the impact of the recession

* positions on social welfare issues including: social security; government health insurance; federal budget priorities, and the role of the government in the provision of jobs and good standard of living

* positions on social issues including: abortion, the death penalty; prayer in the schools; the rights of homosexuals; sexual harassment and women's rights

* racial and ethnic stereotypes; opinions on school
integration and affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants (particularly Hispanics and Asians); opinions on immigration policy and bilingual education

* opinions about the nation's most important problem and the most important issues discussed during the local congressional campaign

* political predispositions: moral traditionalism; patriotism; political efficacy; egalitarianism; individualism; trust in government; racial prejudice; and feminist consciousness

* social altruism and social connectedness

* assessments of U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf War and of U.S. foreign policy goals

* feeling thermometers on a wide range of political figures and political groups; affinity with various social groups

* detailed demographic information and measures of religious affiliation and religiosity

>> 1992 Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers

In the usual NES Post-Election survey, and for 1992, in the Pre-Election survey as well, respondents are asked several questions about their particular Congresspersons and Senators. Interviewers pre-edited questionnaires to fill in the names appropriate for the state and congressional district in which the respondent was living (or was living during the pre-election interview). Each candidate and Senator is assigned a unique number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. (See Candidate Number Codes and Lists.) Particular questions in the survey require the insertion by the interviewer during pre-editing of the names of candidates. See, for example, post-election question B1, which includes feeling thermometers for the various candidates. 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 Appendix 5.

Asking questions about incumbent candidates is somewhat more problematic in a year when redistricting occurred, and for the Pre-Election survey there is the additional complication that a number of states held their Congressional primaries after the Pre-Election field work had started. Further details can be found at the documentation for Pre-Election questions J10-J11.

Handling of Congressional Incumbency Where Redistricting has Occurred

Throughout, whenever the word "incumbent" is used, its referent is a representative who was a member of the 102nd Congress; i.e., the Congress in session prior to the November 1992 General Election. Due to redistricting as a result of the 1990 U.S. Census, any given incumbent's district for the 103rd Congress may consist of a fairly different geographical area from the area covered by the district prior to the boundary changes. Therefore, prior to 1992, the "incumbent" may or may not have been the representative for the particular piece of geography (the sample segment or census tract) in which the respondent lives. For each sample segment, we have included in the dataset its 1992 congressional district number, v3019, and its congressional district number in 1990, v3020. By comparing the two, it can be determined whether the "incumbent" in question was actually the respondent's incumbent prior to the 1992 general election.

"Lagged" Measures Obtained from 1990 and 1991 Interviews

Slightly more than half of the respondents in the 1992 study were also interviewed in 1990 and 1991. Therefore, all of the variables associated with the 1990 Post-Election Study (ICPSR 9548) and the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study (ICPSR 9673) are available for use as "lagged" measures in the current release of this collection.

STUDY ADMINISTRATION

Pre-election Study Release of Sample

To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign and to minimize the relationship between interviews taken late in the campaign period and the difficulty of obtaining an interview, NES divided the Pre-Election study sample into two random parts. Administration of the first random half occurred between September 1 and September 30; the second half between October 1 and October 31st, with the first two days of November as "cleanup." The two part division applied to both panel and cross-section samples.

Note that the study period began before Labor Day, the traditional start of the Election Studies (and Presidential campaigns). The combination of a late date for Labor Day (Sept. 7) and an early date for Election Day (Nov. 3rd) would have shortened our standard field period by about a week, which would have reduced the overall response rate.

Sample "Replicates"

To more closely tailor the field effort to the actual sample performance during this study, both parts of the sample (panel and cross-section) were randomly subdivided into five replicates, each of which is a proper, random subsample of the NES sample. Replicates 1 and 2 were considered the "base sample," certain to be released, with three replicates
Survey Modes: Design and Implementation

One of the administrative problems in fielding a panel study is that respondents have had an intervening period of time in which to relocate, perhaps at some remove from areas where field staff is maintained. Additionally, some of the SRC sample primary areas were replaced between 1990 and 1992, and therefore potentially some of the 1990 Election Study respondents lived in areas where SRC interviewers were no longer on staff. We estimated that between 50 and 125 respondents might have moved to areas in which SRC did not have interviewers, or might be living in their 1990 residence, in a place where SRC no longer maintained interviewing capability. (As it turned out, the total number of panel respondents that we interviewed who were "out of range" for either of these two reasons was 43.) It was our intention to interview as many panel respondents as possible, but we did not want to incur the additional costs associated with interviewer travel. Therefore, we prepared a truncated version of both Pre- and Post-Election Survey questionnaires, (the "Short-Form") to be administered over the telephone to those panel respondents who had moved out of range.

Interviews, both in the Pre- and in the Post Election surveys, were also administered over the telephone to many respondents, both panel and cross-section, who did not meet the "panel out-of-range" criteria for telephone interviewing. The mis-implementation of the design also entailed the inappropriate use of the full-length questionnaire. Table 7, below, sums up the situation. In total, 86 percent of the interviews (91 percent before the election and 81 percent of those conducted after the election) were administered as mandated by the study design: face-to-face with the full length questionnaires or by phone for those panel respondents who moved out of range.

A NOTE ON DELETION OF CASES

In putting together the panel file, study staff examined with particular attention the work of one interviewer and decided that his entire production for 1990 was suspect. Two panel reinterviews in 1992 were thus based on 1990 interviews which were very likely faked in whole or very large part. The decision was made to eliminate these interviews from the 1992 dataset (and also from the panel file). Consequently, the total N for the ICPSR release of these data is 2485 as compared with a N of 2487 in the Study Staff release of the 1992 Cross-Section data. The tables found in this introduction were produced using the original Study Staff release of the data and reflect the original N of 2487.
Table 7: Mode and Form Administration in the 1992 Pre-/Post Election Studies

Panel Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (A)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (B)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Section Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (C)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (D)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The 1155 Pre-election respondents in this category include 16 Panel interviews taken F-T-F using the Spanish version of the questionnaire.

B. The Pre-election respondents in this category include 1 Spanish language panel interview, taken by phone.

C. The pre-election total includes 4 Spanish version questionnaires taken F-T-F.

D. The 5 cases in the Pre-election category consist of 1 F-T-F and 3 Phone short-form, plus 1 Spanish language cross-section case.

>> 1992 SURVEY FORMS: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

There were two[5] forms of both the Pre- and the Post-Election Study questionnaire: a short form, to be
administered over the phone to panel respondents who were "out of range," as described above, and a standard, or full-length questionnaire to be administered to everyone else. The questions on the short-form were a subset of those on the full length questionnaires whose 70 minutes in length was thought to be unacceptably long for a telephone interview.

50 minutes worth of content was selected for the short form, both Pre- and Post-Election Surveys. The criteria for inclusion were that the questions were "core," i.e., questions part of the NES time-series, as opposed to recently piloted or topical items, or that they related to the focus of the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study. We decided not to repeat most of the demographics items for the approximately 100 panel respondents we expected would be interviewed with the short form, relying instead on their responses in the 1990 survey. Additionally, some congressional content was deleted, because of the difficulty in assigning respondents over the phone to the newly drawn congressional districts.

Because we estimated the number of cases affected to be few and randomly scattered across the country, we did not design the instrument for the telephone. Except for the income question, we made no adjustments to the questionnaire for the difference in mode. In general, interviewers were expected to read response options to the respondent and to repeat them as necessary until they were clear to the respondent.

All interviews with a short form questionnaire, except for Spanish language, and including "legitimate" or "out-of-range" panel respondent interviews, have been designated as partial interviews, in the result code variables for the Pre- and Post-Election Studies (v3033 and v5012).

EVALUATION OF PROBLEMS IN STUDY IMPLEMENTATION

The problems mentioned above did not become fully evident until coding was virtually completed, in the last week of February. At its March 1 meeting, the NES Board of Overseers, to whom these problems were reported, instructed the Principal Investigators to assess the significance of these problems with respect to data quality. This work was carried out by the Principal Investigators and members of the Study Staff in consultation with Board members, SRC methodologists and Center for Political Studies personnel as appropriate. The findings are available in NES Technical Report No. 43, available from NES Project Staff.

As the Technical Report documents in detail, the inappropriate use of the telephone and the short-form questionnaire thankfully had only a negligible impact on the quality of the 1992 data. When the short-form questionnaire was used, it of course generated missing data on those items that appeared on the full-length questionnaire but not on the short-form. But this resulted in a very slight increase
(less than .05 percentage points) in the standard errors of the affected variables. The pattern of missing data (from use of the short-form questionnaire) is unrelated to the demographic or political characteristics of respondents. Instead, interviewers turned to the short form when it appeared they would have difficulty securing an interview for other reasons having to do with the field administration of the study. The same holds for use of phone instead of face-to-face interviewing. Respondents interviewed over the phone are politically indistinguishable from those interviewed face-to-face. Attributes of the study administration, not attributes of the individual respondents, are associated with the propensity of interviewers to conduct some of their interviews over the phone. Finally, although some survey questions perform differently across the two modes of interviewing, the distribution of responses and the relationship among variables are substantively the same among phone and face-to-face respondents.

RESPONSE RATES

The Pre-Election study response rate for the cross section sample was 74.0%. Recalculating the response rate to eliminate 4 short-form, cross-section interviews (partials) results in a response rate of 73.7%[6]. For the panel sample, the response (or reinterview) rate is 77.7% when partials, or short form interviews, are included, but drops to 69.2% when they are excluded. Post-Election reinterview rates are 91.8% for the panel, including partials, and 85.0% excluding the partial or short-form interviews. The cross-section Post-Election reinterview rate was 89.3% including 4 partials; 88.9% excluding them. These calculations do not differentiate between face-to-face and telephone modes of interviewing.

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE

Table 8 lays out the number of interviews taken for each week elapsing after the Nov. 3 General Election. In 1992, 25.8% of the interviews were completed in the first two weeks after the election; 53.1% in the first four weeks. For comparison, in 1988, 55% of the interviews were taken in the first two weeks after the election, and 82% in the first four weeks.

Table 8: Number of and Cumulative Percent of Interviews Taken in the Post-Election Study by Week of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4-Nov.10</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.11-Nov.17</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.18-Nov.24</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.25-Dec. 1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code 1</td>
<td>Code 2</td>
<td>Code 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2- Dec. 8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 9-Dec.15</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.16-Dec.22</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.23-Dec.29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.30-Jan. 5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6-Jan.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES SUPPRESSED FOR REASONS OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, NES has released occupation code variables in somewhat less detail than in years past. This dataset includes a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who need the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access may be provided.

Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Permission to use the more detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about this is available from NES project staff.

Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable. This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the National Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the candidate likes and dislikes). These questions are put into Master Codes by the SRC coding section. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for the questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR 8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways which respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.


STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1992 National Pre/Post Election Study (NES) is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1992 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 the 3rd of November 1992.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1992 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1992 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process—a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) 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 titled, 1980 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs), which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, 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 MSA/Non-MSA 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, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units.

The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two to three times the size of the 1992 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 84 PSU design.

Since the 1992 NES desired comparison of data over time from 1990 NES respondents, as well as an expanded representative sample of eligible 1992 respondents, a combined panel/cross-section sample was designed for the 1992 Pre/Post-Election Study.

The Panel portion of the 1992 sample was selected from the original 1990 NES sample which, at the Primary stage had been selected from the "one-half" partition of the 1980 SRC National Sample. The "A" one-half sample of the 1980 National Sample design includes 11 of the 16 self-representing MSA PSUs and a stratified subsampling of
34 (of the 68) nonself-representing PSUs of the SRC National Sample. The Panel portion of the 1992 NES is designed to allow longitudinal analysis of individual change since the panel cases follow the original proportionate distribution to the 1990 "A" one-half sample areas.

The 1992 NES Cross-Section encompasses both the panel cases and a new selection of cases from the two-thirds partition of the 1980 National Sample (that is the "A" plus the "B1" PSUs). The two-thirds 1980 National Sample design includes all 16 self-representing PSUs and 11 additional nonself-representing PSUs for a total of 45 (of 68) nonself-representing PSUs. The additional cases were added to the 1992 NES to supplement the Panel selections such that when the Panel and new Cross-section selections are combined for analysis a representative cross-section of the study population has been maintained.

Table 9 identifies the PSUs for the 1992 National Election Study by MSA status and Region. The PSUs in the Panel portion of the sample design are shown in standard print on this table while those PSUs added for the two-thirds Cross-section are shown in italics.

Table 9: PSUs in the 1992 NES Pre- and Post-Election Survey
By: MSA Status and Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Self-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, MA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis, MO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston, TX*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Nonself-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haven, CT
Atlantic City, NJ
Manchester, NH

North Central
Milwaukee, WI
Dayton, OH
Kansas City, MO-KS
Des Moines, IA
Grand Rapids, MI
Fort Wayne, IN
Steubenville, OH
Saginaw, MI

South
Birmingham, AL
Columbus, GA-AL
Miami, FL

Jacksonville, FL
Lakeland, FL
McAllen, TX
Waco, TX
Wheeling, WV
Knoxville, TN
Richmond, VA

West
Seattle, WA
Denver, CO
Anaheim, CA
Riverside, CA
Fresno, CA
Eugene, OR
Phoenix, AZ

REGION
Non-MSAs

Northeast
Schuyler, NY
Gardner, MA

North Central
Sanilac, MI
Decatur, IN
Phillips, KS/Saline, NE
Mower, MN

South
Bulloch, GA
Sabine, LA
Hale, TX
Monroe, AR/Ashley, AR
Bedford, TN
Montgomery, VA
Robeson, NC

West
ElDorado-Alpine, CA
Carbon, WY

NOTE: The PSU's marked with an asterisk are
Self-Representing for sample designs which use the
two-thirds or larger portion of the sample (i.e., in this case, the combined cross-section and panel design). For the half-sample design (i.e., in this case, the panel portion alone) 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.

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1980 National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1980[8] Census summary tape file series (STF1-B). The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in the metropolitan primary areas and enumeration districts (EDs) in the rural areas of both non-MSA and MSA 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 SSUs 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) PSUs the number of sample area segments varied in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 Cross-section and 12 Panel area segments in the SR New York MSA, 6 Cross-section segments and 5 Panel segments in the San Francisco MSA, to a low of 4 Cross-section and no Panel area segments in the smaller SR PSUs such as Minneapolis and Atlanta MSAs. Most Nonself-representing (NSR) half-sample (A) PSUs were represented by 2 Cross-section and 6 Panel area segments; most of the eleven other (B1) NSR PSUs had 6 Cross-section area segments (and, of course, no Panel segments). A total of 487 area segments were selected, 206 Cross-section and 281 Panel segments, 151 in the sixteen self-representing PSUs and 336 in the nonself-representing PSUs as shown in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Number of Cross-Section and Panel Area Segments in the 1992 NES Sample Showing PSU Name, National-Sample Stratum and Partition, and MSA Status
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU#</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Panel Sample</th>
<th>Sample Segs.</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-Va</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>St Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Manchester, NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Steubenville, OH-WV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Saginaw, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU#</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Panel Sample</th>
<th>Sample Segs.</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jacksonvile, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wheeling, WV-OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1980 National Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU#</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Panel Sample</th>
<th>Sample Segs.</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Manchester, NH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Saginaw, MI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: North Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU#</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Panel Sample</th>
<th>Sample Segs.</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jacksonvile, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wheeling, WV-OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU#</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Panel Sample</th>
<th>Sample Segs.</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jacksonvile, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wheeling, WV-OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonself-representing MSAs: West

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Riverside-San</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardino, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Schuyler, NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Gardner, MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: North Central

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sanilac, MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Decatur, IN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Phillips, KS/Saline, NE</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mower, MN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: South

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bulloch, GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sabine, LA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hale, TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Monroe, AR/Ashley, AR</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bedford, TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Montgomery, VA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Robeson, NC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: West

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Eldorado-Alpine, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Carbon, WY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 206 281

** In two Non-SMSA National Sample strata (68 and 77) the 1980 materials from which the Panel area segments had been selected was exhausted (i.e., there were insufficient remaining SSUs from which to select new Cross-section area segments), so a new Primary selection had to be made from those two strata. Therefore, the Panel area segments for stratum 68 are from PSU Phillips County, KS, and the Cross-section area segments are from Saline County, NE; the Panel area segments for stratum 77 are from PSU Monroe County, AR, and the Cross-section area segments are from Ashley County, AR.

Although 281 segments were used in the 1990 NES, only 272
Panel segments appear in the 1992 NES Panel. The difference is due to some segments used in 1990 not having any interviews completed in 1990 and, therefore, not becoming part of the 1992 Panel.

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 1992 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The overall probability of selection for 1992 NES Cross-Section households was $f = 0.00003988$ or $0.3988$ in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the combined Cross-Section/Panel design 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.

Five 1992 Panel replicates were designated for the entire "frame" of households in which a complete interview was obtained in the 1990 NES study (2000 - 11 partial interviews = 1989 1990 interview HUs). The original 1990 sample lines had been selected from the National Sample ("A" or "half-sample" PSUs) to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the area segments as described in the previous paragraph.

The new Cross-Section component of the 1992 NES sample design was disproportionately allocated to the "B1" PSUs to supplement the Panel cases such that when cross-sectional analysis was undertaken, combining new cross-section cases with panel cases would yield an equal probability sample of households. The distribution of the combined sample would be that required by the two-thirds design.

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection

Within each sampled new cross-section housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949)[9] a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent. This technique had also been used in 1990 to select the original Panel respondents. In 1992 the same Panel respondent (R) was sought for interview as had been interviewed in 1990.

SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS
The targeted completed interview sample size for the 1992 NES Pre/Post-Election Survey was \( n = 2,057 \) total cases. In the original sample size computation, the following assumptions were made for the cross-section component of the sample: response rate for the pre-election interview = .72 and of these 95% were assumed to be available and cooperative for the post-election interview, combined occupancy/eligibility rate = .83. These assumptions were derived from survey experience in the 1986 NES Post Election Survey[10]. The assumptions made for the panel component were: .913 recontact rate and .75 response rate for the pre-election interview. The same .95 response rate for the post-election interview was assumed for both the panel and the cross-section component.

To most closely tailor the field effort to the sample field experience during this study, both parts of the selected sample had five replicates designated. Replicates 1 and 2 were considered the "base sample", certain to be released. 55% of this base was designated as Replicate 1 to be released September 1, 1992 and 45% designated as Replicate 2 to be released October 1, 1992. The other three replicates were designated "Reserve" replicates, one or more to be released for field work October 1, 1992 at the discretion of NES study staff. Replicate 3 (Reserve replicate 1) was never, in fact, released. Replicates 4 and 5 (Reserve replicates 2 and 3) were released with Base sample replicate 2 on October 1, 1992. Each replicate is a proper subsample of the NES sample.

A subsampling of one-third of selected addresses was made in certain cases when selected lines were determined to be within locked buildings, in gated subdivisions or in areas which posed a danger to interviewing staff. This allowed concentration of greater field effort in these circumstances to obtain at least some interviews. In cases where this was done, appropriate weighting of the results will be used to compensate. (This is not reflected in the following tables however).

Table 11 provides a full description of the original sample design specifications applied to the Base Sample and also indicates the number of HU listings assigned to each replicate. As stated above, Replicates 1 and 2 constitute the Base Sample; Replicates 3, 4 and 5 are reserve replicates. Replicate 3 was, in fact, never released for field work.

Table 11: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

Cross-Section Component
(Supplemental)

Original Specifications
and Assumptions

Completed Post/ interview 1,000
Contact/Response Rate .95
Completed Pre/ interview 1,052
Response Rate .72
Eligible sample households 1,462
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[11] .83
Panel Recontact Rate

Sample HU listings
Replicates 1 and 2 1,760
Replicate 1 (incl above)[12] 961
Replicate 2 (incl above)[13] 799
Replicate 3 (Reserve)[14] 200
Replicate 4 (Reserve) 75
Replicate 5 (Reserve) 51

Total Sample lines 2,086

Panel Component Total

Original Specifications and Assumptions

Completed Post/ interview 1,057 2,057
Contact/Response Rate .95
Completed Pre/ interview 1,112 2,164
Response Rate[15] .75
Eligible sample households 1,483 2,945
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[11] Panel Recontact Rate .913
Sample HU listings
Replicates 1 and 2 1,625 3,385
Replicate 1 (incl above)[12] 900
Replicate 2 (incl above)[13] 725

Replicate 3 (Reserve)[14] 208
Replicate 4 (Reserve) 104
Replicate 5 (Reserve) 52

Total Sample lines 1,989[16]

SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

Table 12 compares the original sample design specifications and assumptions for the new Cross-Section Component of the 1992 NES as applied to the Base Sample (as in Table 11) and as applied to the actually released sample (Replicates 1, 2, 4 and 5) to the actual outcome for that component. Table 13 makes a similar comparison for the Panel Component of the 1992 NES Sample and Table 14 presents a summary of the

figures for the combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample. The response rates which appear in these tables are calculated using both complete and partial (short-form) interviews. An alternative response rate which excludes short-form interviews is described in "Response Rates", above.

Table 12: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Cross-Section Component of the 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Original S &amp; A Applied to &amp; Assumptions</th>
<th>Actual Release (Reps. 1 &amp; 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/Interviews</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Response Rate</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/Interviews</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[17]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample growth from update[18]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Sample lines</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Outcome

| Completed Post/Interviews | 1,005 |
| Contact/Response Rate | .89 |
| Released for Recontact | 1,126 |
| Completed Pre/Interviews | 1,126 |
| Response Rate | .74 |
| Eligible Sample Households | 1,522 |
| Occupancy/Eligibility Rate | .80 |
| subsampling for dangerous/locked areas | .99[19] |
| Sample HU listings | 1,923 |
| Sample growth from update | 1.02 |
| Selected Sample lines | 1,886 |

Table 13: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Panel Component of the 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Original S &amp; A Applied to &amp; Assumptions</th>
<th>Actual Release (Reps 1 &amp; 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/Interviews</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Response Rate</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/Interviews</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[17]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample growth from update[18]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Sample lines</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Outcome

| Completed Post/Interviews | 1,005 |
| Contact/Response Rate | .89 |
| Released for Recontact | 1,126 |
| Completed Pre/Interviews | 1,126 |
| Response Rate | .74 |
| Eligible Sample Households | 1,522 |
| Occupancy/Eligibility Rate | .80 |
| subsampling for dangerous/locked areas | .99[19] |
| Sample HU listings | 1,923 |
| Sample growth from update | 1.02 |
| Selected Sample lines | 1,886 |
### Table 14: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample. 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Specifications &amp; Assumptions (Reps. 1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Original S &amp; A Applied to Actual Release (Reps. 1, 2, 4 &amp; 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/ Interviews</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/ Interviews</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>3,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample HU listings</td>
<td>3,385[21]</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from update of Cross-Section component</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Sample lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/ Interviews</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/ Interviews</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Completed Post/ Interviews: The number of completed post/interviews for the original and actual samples.
- Contact/Response Rate: The proportion of contacts that result in a completed interview.
- Released for Recontact: The number of households released for recontact.
- Completed Pre/ Interviews: The number of completed pre/interviews.
- Eligible Sample Households: The number of eligible sample households.
- Total Panel cases: The total number of panel cases released.

---

Actual Outcome

- Completed Post/ Interviews: The number of completed post/interviews in the actual sample.
- Contact/Response Rate: The proportion of contacts that result in a completed interview.
- Released for Recontact: The number of households released for recontact.
- Completed Pre/ Interviews: The number of completed pre/interviews.
- Eligible Sample Households: The number of eligible sample households.
- Total Panel cases: The total number of panel cases released.

---

Table 14 extends the comparison to include the growth from the update of the cross-section component and the selected sample lines.
Eligible Sample Households    3,274
Total Sample HU listings      3,712

In comparing the second column of Table 12 with the third column, it can be seen that, for the 1992 Cross-Section component, the sample growth from the update procedure was slightly less than expected; this was perhaps due to the fact that many of the new cross-section segments had been listed within the year previous to field dates for the 1992 NES study. The original sample design specifications also overestimated the actual occupancy/eligibility rates resulting in 91 fewer eligible HUs than estimated. However, since the actual response rate was higher than estimated, completed pre-election interviews fell only 35 short of the number estimated. The assumptions for response rate and occupancy/eligibility rate were based on the 1986 NES field experience for a probability sample based on the entire two-thirds design of the National Sample.

The actual response rate for the 1992 cross-section component (.74), as well as the occupancy/eligibility rate very likely reflects the disproportionate allocation of the new cross-section segments in the B1 areas of the National Sample which may well have different occupancy/eligibility and response rates than any overall past NES rates on which the original assumptions were based.

The number of Post-election interviews obtained, 1,005, was closer to the target of 1000 interviews projected for the Base Sample alone than the 1,103 projected for the actual 1,886 sample lines released.

For the Panel Component (see Table 13), both the Panel recontact rate and the response rate exceeded assumptions resulting in 142 more pre-election interviews than expected. A lower than assumed response rate for the post-election interview reduced the excess to 92 more post-election interviews than projected for the release of the Panel base sample plus replicates 4 and 5 (reserve replicates 2 and 3).

The figures for the combined cross-section sample shown in Table 14 show completed pre-election interviews of 107 over expected. Due to lower than assumed response rate for the post-election interview, combined with lower cross-section and higher panel overall response and occupancy/eligibility rates, the final total number of post election interviews was 6 fewer than the projected outcome for the sample lines released.

>> WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1992 NES DATA

The area probability sample design for the 1992 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 which have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

The Sampling Section has provided two final person level analysis weights which will incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. One weight variable (#3009) is for use with Panel cases only; the other weight variable (#3008) is for the 1992 NES Cross-section (which includes both panel and new cross-section cases.) 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.

**CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS**

Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level separately for Panel and new Cross-Section component cases. Nonresponse adjustment cells were formed by crossing PSU type (Self-representing, Nonself-representing MSA or non-MSA) by the nine Census divisions (New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific). A nonresponse factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. In order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each nonresponse adjustment cell, some cells were collapsed across Census divisions in the same Census region.

An intermediate weight was constructed by multiplying the probability of selection of the household by the nonresponse adjustment factor by the number of eligible persons in the household[22]. This intermediate weight was used to produce a weighted sex by age category by Census Region table. The age categories used were: 18-44, 45-64, and 65+. Post-stratification factors were constructed to match the sample proportions in the 24 sex by age by Region cells to the July 1991 Census population totals (United States Department of Commerce News Public Information Office Press Release - CB92-93).

The two final analysis weights were each centered to a mean of 1.0 so that the sum of the weights equals the number of respondents (1,359 for the 1990-92 Panel and 2,485 for the 1992 Cross-section).
Comparing the 1992 NES to Previous National Election Studies

Earlier National Election Studies data collections did not include weights to adjust for nonresponse and the unequal probability of selection at the household level. Thus, weighting the 1992 NES data by V3009 (for analysis of the Panel cases) or by V3008 (for combined analysis of the panel and new cross-section cases) produces estimates that are not strictly comparable to those obtained from previous National Election Studies that were not weighted to incorporate sampling, nonresponses and post-stratification factors.

Analysis comparing data from the 1992 NES data to previous NES data collections should employ V7000.

Because approximately half of the respondents to the 1992 NES were part of a panel first interviewed in 1990, to be comparable with previous NES cross-section data collections, the combined 1992 panel and new cross-section data must be weighted to correct for panel attrition and the aging of the panel respondents. Panel attrition is not uniform across demographic groups. Some respondents (the mobile and those with the least amount of formal education) are more susceptible to panel attrition. By definition, panel respondents are two years older than the cross-section respondents. And by definition, there are almost no 18 or 19 year-olds among the panel respondents interviewed in 1992 (because an 18 year-old in 1992 would have been 16 years-old in 1990 and ineligible for the 1990 study). Weighting of the panel respondents is necessary to ensure comparability with past NES data collections.

V7000 corrects the combined panel and cross-section cases for the panel attrition and aging that occurred among the panel respondents. This weight should be used when comparing estimates made on the 1992 NES data to estimates made on previous (unweighted) NES data collections. V7000 does not appear in the April 1993 CPS Early Release Version of the 1992 National Election Study.

Construction of V7000

To construct this weight, panel respondents were classified by age (17-24, 25-39, 40-64, 65-74, 75 and over), education (less than high school, high school diploma, and more than high school education), and mobility (whether or not the respondent had moved between 1990 and 1992).

Cross-classification of these three variables produced a 30-celled table (5 x 3 x 2) for each of the following: (1) 1990 panel respondents who comprised the panel portion of the sample "universe" for the 1992 study (N=1769); and (2) panel respondents interviewed in 1992 (N=1359). The weight was constructed by dividing the value of each cell in the 1990 table (1) by the value of the corresponding cell in the 1992 table (2). (For example, 10.9 percent of the 1,769 1990 panel respondents were age 40-64/had more than high school education/ had not moved. In 1992, respondents in the...
cell defined by these same categories comprised 11.8 percent of the 1359 panel respondents interviewed. The case weight for this group of respondents is $10.9/11.8 = .9237$.) In order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each cell, some cells were collapsed.

This procedure centers the weight variable V7000 so that it has a mean of 1.0 and the sum of the weights (2488) is approximately equal to the actual number of combined panel and cross-section respondents (2,485). Respondents who are part of the new cross-section have the value "1.0000" on V7000.

**SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1992 NES ESTIMATES**

**SAMPLING ERROR CALCULATION PROGRAMS**

The probability sample design for the 1992 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 which 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 which 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 REPERR 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 which reflect the complex structure of the sample and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. The sampling error codes for the 1992 NES are included as variables #3068 and #3069 in the ICPSR Public Use 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.

For the Panel Component segments, two sampling error (SE) codes have been included for analysis of 1992 data. For longitudinal analysis of Panel data alone, the original 1990 SE code should be used since this reflects the half-sample design of the 1990 NES sample. For any cross-sectional analysis, where Panel data is combined with new cross-section data, the 1992 SE code must be used. Table 15 provides a description of how individual sampling error code values for Panel only data are to be paired for sampling error computations. Thirty (30) pairs or strata of sampling error computation units (SECUs) 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 SECUs 61 AND 63.

Table 15: 1992 Pre/Post-Election Survey: Panel-Only Analysis Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations (1990 Sampling Error Codes - Variable #3069)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>(SECU)</th>
<th>(SECU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Stratum)</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36 + 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61 + 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows the Strata and SECU codes to be used for the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 1992 cross-sectional analyses using the combined cross-section/panel data. The 42 strata reflect the expanded 2/3rds National Sample design used in 1992.

It can be seen from this table that the three-digit 1992 SE code is comprised of: first the two-digit SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code.

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1992 NES

To assist NES analysts, the OSIRIS PSALMS program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of means and proportions estimated from the 1988 NES Pre-election Survey data set[24]. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for fifteen demographic and political affiliation subclasses of...
the 1988 NES Pre-Election Survey sample. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 17.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 17 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1988 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest[25]. Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g. \( z=1.96 \) for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages not to the difference between two percentage estimates.

The generalized variance results presented in Table 17 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.

Table 17: Generalized Variance Table.
1992 NES Pre-Election Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For percentage estimates near.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>750</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>2.294</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>1.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>1.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>2.094</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>1.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2000   1.722   1.691   1.568   1.368   1.030
2500   1.637   1.604   1.506   1.310   0.982

>> 1992 TECHNICAL REPORTS AND OTHER OCCASIONAL PAPERS

1. Sanchez, Maria. (July 1982) "7-Point Scales."
2. Shanks, J. Merrill, Maria Sanchez, and Betsy Morton. (March 1983). "Alternative Approaches to Survey Data Collection for the National Election Studies."
4. Lake, Celinda. (November 1983) "Comparison of 3-point, 5-point, and 7-point Scales from the CATI Experiment 1982 Election Study."
5. NES Staff. (December 1983) "1980 Precinct Data Returns Project."
8. Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (March 1984) "Comparison of the Michigan Method of District Assignment on the Telephone with the Personal Interview Simulated Data: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
9. Traugott, Santa. (June 1984) "Two Versions of the Abortion Question."
10. Sanchez, Maria. (July 1984) "Branching versus 7-point scale measurements."
12. NES Staff. (August 1984) "Questions and Versions in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

13. NES Staff. (n.d) "Years of Schooling."

14. NES Staff. (n.d) "Newspaper Code."


16. Sanchez, Maria and Giovanna Morchio. (n.d.) Probing Don't Know Answers -- Do We Always Want to Do This?"

17. NES Staff. (February 1985) "Progress of the Rolling Cross Section."

18. Traugott, Santa. (February 1985) "Production for the Pre-Post"


22. Brehm, John. (June 1985) "Report on Coding of Economic Conditions Series in the 1984 Pre-Post Election Study"


24. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in RXS."

25. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in Pre-Post"


28. Morchio, Giovanna and Santa Traugott. (February 1986) "Congressional District Assignment in an RDD Sample: Results of 1982 CATI Experiment."

29. Brehm, John and Santa Traugott. (March 1986)
"Similarity and Representativeness of the 1985 Pilot Half-samples."


31. Brehm, John. (March 1987) "How Representative is the 1986 Post-Election Survey?"


35. NES Staff. (February 1990) "Possible Bias Due to Attrition and Sample Selection in the 1989 Pilot."

36. Traugott, Santa and Giovanna Morchio. (March 1990) "Assessment of Bias Due to Attrition and Sample Selection in the NES 1989 Pilot Study."


42. Traugott, Michael W., Santa Traugott and Stanley Presser. (May 1992) "Revalidation of Self-Reported Vote."

43. Rosenstone, Steven J., Margaret Petrella and Donald R. Kinder. (June 1993) "The Consequences of Substituting Telephone for Face-to-Face Interviewing in the 1992 National Election Study."

>> NES 1989 PILOT STUDY REPORTS
Abelson, Robert. Message on Vote Validation Experiment.

Calvo, Maria Antonia and Steven J. Rosenstone. The Re-Framing of the Abortion Debate.


Knight, Kathleen. Comparisons of Liberal-Conservative Items in the ANES 1989 Pilot Study.

Krosnick, Jon and Matthew K. Berent. Impact of Verbal Labeling on Response Alternatives and Branching on Attitude Measurement Reliability.


Markus, Gregory. Measuring Popular Individualism.

   Appendix 1: [Price & Zaller] Measuring individual differences...
   Appendix 2: [Zaller & Price] In One Ear and Out the Other...


Traugott, Michael. Memo to Pilot Study Committee, including as an Appendix: Understanding Campaign Effects on Candidate Recall and Recognition.


>> 1991 PILOT STUDY REPORTS

Beebe, Tim. The Effects of Pre-Notification and Incentive on Panel Attrition. Undated.


Citrin, Jack, Donald P. Green, Beth Reingold and David O.


>> 1992 FILE STRUCTURE

The AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1992 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY [ENHANCED WITH DATA FROM 1990 AND 1991] are available from ICPSR in logical record length (LRECL) format. The data are sorted in ascending order by respondent number, and contains 2,105 variables for 2,485 respondents.

A machine-readable codebook, which provides complete formatting and other information for all variables accompanies the data. In addition, a set of SAS and SPSS control statements has been prepared for this collection. The control statements contain formatting information as well as variable labels, value labels and missing data specifications for all variables in the collection.

An OSIRIS dictionary and dictionary-codebook are also available. The OSIRIS dictionary provides formatting and other information for each variable in the logical record data file. Either the dictionary or dictionary-codebook file can be used in conjunction with the OSIRIS package of
computer programs, or to interface with other software packages such as SPSS or SAS.

The data can also be accessed directly through software packages that do not use SAS or SPSS control statements by specifying the record locations of the desired variables. The record locations for all variables are provided in the codebook.

>> 1992 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The example below is a reproduction of information appearing in the machine-readable codebook for a typical variable. The numbers in brackets do not appear but are references to the descriptions that follow this example.

............................................................
    REF 0020     [4] LOC   76 WIDTH  2
    [5]
    AREA CODES
    -----------------------------------------------------
[7] The six largest SCSA’s are marked with **.
[8]
[9] [10] [11]
31 07.  Boston-Lawrence-Lowell, MA-NH
44 14.  Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI**
34 32.  Dayton-Springfield, OH
18 35.  Detroit-Ann Arbor, MI**
27 42.  Houston-Galveston, TX
47 49.  Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA**
10 56.  Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL
45 63.  Milwaukee-Racine, WI
37 70.  New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-CT**
24 77.  Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-DE-NJ-MD**
14 84.  San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA**
14 91.  Seattle-Tacoma, WA
2120 00.  INAP; location not in SCSA

............................................................

[1] Indicates the variable and reference numbers. A variable number and a reference number are assigned to each variable in the data collection. In the present codebook, which documents the archived data collection, these numbers are identical.
[2] Indicates the abbreviated variable name (maximum of 24 characters) used to identify the variable for the user. An expanded version of the variable name can be found in the variable description list.

[3] Indicates the code values of missing data. In this example, code values equal to 0 are missing data (MD=0). Alternative statements for other variables are "MD=0 or GE 8," or "NO MISSING DATA CODES." Most analysis software packages require that certain types of data that the user desires to be excluded from analysis be designated as "MISSING DATA," e.g., inappropriate, unascertained, unascertainable, or ambiguous data categories. Although these codes are defined as missing data categories, this does not mean that the user should not or cannot use them in a substantive role if so desired.

[4] Indicates the starting location and width of this variable when the data are stored on a magnetic tape in LRECL format. If the variable is of a multiple-response type, the width referenced is that of a single response. In this example the variable named "FIPS SCSA CODE" is 2 columns wide and is located in the 76th and 77th columns within the record.

[5] A variable containing data with implied decimals is denoted by the message "IMP DEC= 0", where 0 is the number of decimal places implied in the variable.

[6] This is the full text (question) supplied by the investigator to describe the variable. The question text, and the numbers and letters that may precede it, reflect the original wording of the questionnaire item.

[7] Indicates an additional comment or explanation appended to the variable description.

[8] Various processor comments may appear in this position, such as: "Actual number is coded", "FORM A ONLY" or "BUILT from 633".

[9] Indicates the frequency of occurrence of each code value for this variable. Frequencies inserted in this codebook are not weighted.

[10] Indicates the code values occurring in the data for this variable.

[11] Indicates the textual definitions of the codes. Abbreviations commonly used in the code definitions are "DK" (Do Not Know), "NA" (Not Ascertained), and "INAP" (Inappropriate). In this example, responses to FIPS SCSA Code were coded "INAP" for those respondents whose location of interview was not in an SCSA.
ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION, 1992

The data collection was processed according to standard ICPSR processing procedures. The data were checked for illegal or inconsistent code values which, when found, were corrected or recoded to missing data values. Consistency checks were performed. Statements bracketed in "<" and ">") signs in the body of the codebook were added by the processors for explanatory purposes.

ICPSR has added frequencies to the codebook text for most variables in which the entire coding scheme is listed in the codebook, and a frequency addendum is provided for those variables with an extensive coding scheme.

1992 NOTES


[2] In SRC publications and survey materials, the term "primary area" is used interchangeably with the more common "primary stage unit" terminology.


[4] The standard error of a percentage is a symmetric function with its maximum centered at p=50%; i.e., the standards errors of p=40% and p=60% estimates are equal.

[5] There were actually three forms of both questionnaires, since they were translated in Spanish. The Spanish language questionnaires are also "short-form" since only core items were translated. They are not, however, treated as "short-form" for "partials" for the purpose of this discussion.

[6] The denominator for the calculations in this paragraph are as given in Tables 14 and 15 this Introduction. Information about the numerators appears in Table 7.


[8] While the Panel segments were selected from the 1980 STF1B file, most of the Cross-section segments were selected from the nearly equivalent 1990 Census file (PL94-171 file on CD ROM) which contains the block-level 1990 Census housing unit (HU) data. At the time of selection the 1990 STF1B file was not available. Therefore, the PL94-171 file
was used, which had "total HU's" (rather than "occupied HU's") per block; for these Cross-section segments, linkage was designed to achieve a minimum measure of 72 TOTAL HU's per SSU. Also, since in 1990 all areas had been divided into Census Tracts and blocks, no Enumeration Districts were involved as SSU's. In other respects the second stage selection was the same for both sets of area segments.


[10] The 1986 NES was the most recent NES sample using the two-thirds National Sample. Response rate in 1986 was .701 and occupancy eligibility rate was .835.


[12] About 55% of the base sample was assigned to the first release, September 1, 1992.


[14] All "reserve" replicates were to have coversheets sent to the field October 1, 1992, in sealed envelopes which were not to be opened by the interviewers until notified of their "release". As it happened, it was decided to release Replicates 4 and 5 on October 1, 1992. Replicate 3 was never released. (However, a few cases from Replicate 3 were released by mistake; these cases can be identified by using variables 3023 and 3024.)

[15] An overall Panel response rate of 75% was assumed. Based on recontact response to the 1991 Persian Gulf Study: 1385 cases at 87% response rate = 1205 cases, and 615 cases at 50% response rate = 308 cases. Therefore, Overall: 1513/2000 = .756

[16] See Note 12.

[17] Based on 1986 NES field experience using the two-thirds National Sample (.835).

[18] No provision of update growth was applied in early estimates. Since the updating process was applied to the cross-section component of the 1992 NES Sample, and since it typically produces about 3% increase in sample lines over the count selected from the National Sample system, the update inflation factor was set at 1.03 for the cross-section component.

[19] One percent of the sample was lost due to subsampling in three locked and two dangerous areas.

[20] An overall Panel response rate of 75% was assumed, based on previous recontact experience (response to the 1991 Persian Gulf Study): 1385 cases at 87% response rate = 1205 cases, and 615 cases at 50% response rate = 308 cases. Overall: 1513/2000 = .756

[21] This figure was left without applying the usual growth factor for updating to the cross-section component of the
sample, since this was the table presented (see Table 11) in the original planning for the study. The equivalent figure for the actually released Replicates 1, 2, 4 and 5) was taken with the growth factor of 1.03 applied to the cross-section component only.

[22] In constructing the analysis weight, a maximum of three eligible adults was allowed.

[23] For cross-sectional analysis of the 1992 NES data the combined cross-section and panel data must be used. Cross-section component data cannot be used alone.

[24] The design effects from the 1988 NES are expected to be similar to those for the 1992 NES. Sampling errors for the 1992 NES have not yet been run.

[25] 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.

>> 1990-1991 CROSS-REFERENCE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var#</th>
<th>Q #</th>
<th>QUESTION DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Approve/Disapprove of Bush on: Presidency; Economy; Foreign Relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Approve or disapprove of Bush's presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>B5a/b</td>
<td>Summary Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119</td>
<td>B6a/b</td>
<td>Summary Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of foreign countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2123</td>
<td>B7a/b</td>
<td>Summary Variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Thermometers and Probes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2203</td>
<td>B13b</td>
<td>Mario Cuomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>B13a</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211</td>
<td>B13f</td>
<td>Jesse Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>B13d</td>
<td>Dan Quayle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2217</td>
<td>B13o/p</td>
<td>R's Congressperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2218</td>
<td>B13g-n</td>
<td>R's Senator #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2219</td>
<td>B13g-n</td>
<td>R's Senator #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220</td>
<td>B14f</td>
<td>Thermometer rating of Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2222</td>
<td>B14a</td>
<td>The Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>B14m</td>
<td>Liberals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2228</td>
<td>B14b</td>
<td>The Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232</td>
<td>B14e</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women's movement

People working to protect the environment
* See wording change ('working' vs. 'seeking')

Approve/Disapprove of the Way Congress is handling its job

Approve or disapprove of way U.S. Congress is handling job

Summary Variable

Differences Between the Parties

Important differences in what Republicans and Democrats stand for

Differences from v2304 2316

Approve/Disapprove of Representative and Senators

Approve or disapprove of the way Representative has been handling his/her job

Summary Variable

Party ID

R thinks of self as Republican, Democrat, Independent or other

Strong Republican or not very strong Republican

Strong Democrat or not very strong Democrat

R closer to Republican Party or the Democratic Party

Party ID Summary

Most Important Problems Facing the Country

What R thinks are most important problems facing this country

Single most important problem the country faces

Foreign Policy

Is Cold War between U.S. and Soviet Union coming to an end

U.S. to give economic assistance to countries in Eastern Europe somewhat, not very, never)

Does R think right thing to send U.S. military forces to Persian Gulf or should we have stayed out
Approve/Disapprove of Bush Handling of Persian Gulf Crisis

2410   F23* Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of Persian Gulf crisis
          *See wording change ('is' vs. 'has')

2413   F23a/b Summary Variable

Differences Between the Parties

2414   H3 Democrats or Republicans more likely to raise taxes, if any difference

2415   H4a Democrats or Republicans better at handling nation's economy, if any difference

2416   H4d Democrats or Republicans better at handling foreign affairs, if any difference

Liberal/Conservative Scales

2450   H9a Seven-point scale from extremely liberal to extremely conservative; how does R place themself on scale

2451   H9aa R considers self liberal or conservative

2452   H9b Using scale, how does R rate President Bush

2453   H9g Democratic Party

2454   H9h Republican Party

Economic Well-being

2455   J1 R and family better off, worse off or same financially than year ago

2458   J1a/b Summary Variable

2459   J4 Economy as a whole gotten better, stayed same or gotten worse

2462   J4a/b Summary Variable

Defense Spending Scale

2475   L1a Scale indicating reaction to increase in defense spending (between 1-7) R's feeling

2476   L1b On scale, R's rating of George Bush on defense spending

2477   L1e Democratic Party

2478   L1f Republican Party

Which Party Will Keep Us Out of Future Wars Better

2481   N1 Keeping out of future wars handled better by Republicans, Democrats or about the same

U.S. Position in the World

2482   N2 During past year, U.S. position in world grown weaker, same, or grown stronger
Need of Strong U.S. Military

2483 N4 How important for U.S. to have strong military force to deal with enemies

Worried about Conventional War

2484 N5 R how worried about country getting into conventional war without use of nuclear weapons

Isolationist Sentiment

2485 N6 Agree or disagree: "This country would be better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world.

Worried About Nuclear War

2486 N7 R how worried about country getting into nuclear war at this time

Trust in Government

2487 P2 R's ideas about government in Washington in general; how much of the time does R trust government to do what is right
2488 P4 Government run for benefit of few big interests or for the benefit of all the people
2489 P6b R's agreement/disagreement to: "People like me don't have any say about what the government does."

R For/Against Preferential Hiring/Promotion of Blacks

2558 L8 Is R for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks
2561 L8a/b Summary Variable

>> VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST 1990 POST-ELECTION SURVEY VARIABLES

ICPSR VARIABLES

900001 ICPSR Study Number
900002 ICPSR Edition Number
900003 ICPSR Part Number
900004 Respondent Post-Election Case ID

SAMPLING INFORMATION
900005 Primary Area Code
900006 Primary Area Name
900007 Segment Number
900008 Census Region
900009 Postal State Abbreviation and Congressional District Number
900010 FIPS State Code
900011 FIPS State and County Code
900012 ICPSR State Code
900013 Congressional District
900014 ICPSR State and Congressional District Code
900015 Tract/Enumerated District Indicator
900016 1980 Census Tract
900017 1980 Census Enumeration District
900018 1980 Census Place Code
900019 FIPS 1980 SMSA Code
900020 FIPS 1980 SCSA Code
900021 Size of Place of Interview
900022 Actual Population of Place of Interview
900023 1980 Belt Code
900024 1980 Minor Civil Division
900025 Sampling Error Code
900026 Selection Table
900027 Selected R Person Number

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

900028 Number of persons in household
900029 Number of eligible adults
900030 Number of children under six years old
900031 Number of children six to nine years old
900032 Number of children ten to thirteen years old
900033 Number of children fourteen to seventeen years old
900034 Household composition

INTERVIEW/ER INFORMATION

900035 Refusal conversion indicator
900036 Persuasion letter requested
900037 Final call number
900038 Final result code
900039 Was respondent's name obtained
900040 If R is female, has R legally changed her name
900041 Phone number obtained
900042 Should not interview by telephone?
900043 Interviewer's ID number
900044 Interviewer's race
900045 Interviewer's languages
900046 Interviewer's ethnicity
900047 Interviewer's age, bracketed
900048 Interviewer's years of work, bracketed
900049 Interviewer's gender
900050 Interviewer's education, bracketed
900051 Interviewer's interview number
900052 Date of interview - month
900053 Date of interview - day

900054 Total length of interview
900055 Total time to pre-edit
900056 Total time to post-interview edit
900057 Beginning time - local

900058 Type of Congressional race (House of Representatives)
900059 Type of Senate race
900060 Type of Governor race
900061 Form type

R'S INTEREST/ATTENTION TO CAMPAIGN/MEDIA

900062 R's interest in the campaign
900063 Did R read about the campaign in any newspapers
900064 How much attention did R give to the campaign in the newspaper
900065 Did R watch any programs about the campaign on TV
900066 How many programs about the campaign did R watch
900067 How much attention did R give to the campaign news on TV
900068 Does R ever discuss politics
900069 How often does R discuss politics
900070 How often did R discuss politics in the past week
900071 How often did R read a daily newspaper in the past week
900072 How many days did R watch TV news in the past week
900073 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form Type

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

900074 Whether R likes anything about the democratic party
900075 What R likes about the Democratic party - first mention
900076 What R likes about the Democratic party - second mention
900077 What R likes about the Democratic party - third mention
900078 What R likes about the Democratic party - fourth mention
900079 What R likes about the Democratic party - fifth mention
900080 Whether R dislikes anything about the Democratic party
900081 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - first mention
900082 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - second mention
900083 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - third mention
900084 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - fourth mention
900085 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - fifth mention

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY

900086 Whether R likes anything about the Republican party
900087 What R likes about the Republican party - first mention
900088 What R likes about the Republican party - second mention
900089 What R likes about the Republican party - third mention
900090 What R likes about the Republican party - fourth mention
900091 What R likes about the Republican party - fifth mention
900092 Whether R dislikes anything about the Republican party
900093 What R dislikes about the Republican party - first
R'S ASSESSMENT OF BUSH PRESIDENCY

900098 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of presidency
900099 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling of presidency
900100 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of economy
900101 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling of economy
900102 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of relations with foreign countries
900103 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling of relations with foreign countries
900104 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of pollution and other environmental problems
900105 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling of pollution and other environmental problems

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN

900106 How much did R personally care about the outcome of the U.S. congressional election
900107 Does R remember the congressional candidates
900108 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 1
900109 From which party was the candidate - candidate 1
900110 Collapsed code for congressional candidate - candidate 1
900111 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party - candidate 1
900112 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 2
900113 From which party was the candidate - candidate 2
900114 Collapsed code for congressional candidate - candidate 2
900115 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party - candidate 2
900116 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 3
900117 From which party was the candidate - candidate 3
900118 Collapsed code for congressional candidate - candidate 3
900119 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party - candidate 3
900120 Interviewer Checkpoint: U.S. Senate race in state?

SENATE CAMPAIGN

900121 Does R remember the Senate candidates
900122 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 1
900123 From which party was the candidate - candidate 1
900124 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 1
900125 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
FEELING THERMOMETER: POLITICAL FIGURES

900134 Feeling thermometer - George Bush
900135 Feeling thermometer - Mario Cuomo
900136 Feeling thermometer - Mikhail Gorbachev
900137 Feeling thermometer - Dan Quayle
900138 Feeling thermometer - Ronald Reagan
900139 Feeling thermometer - Jesse Jackson
900140 Feeling thermometer - Democratic U.S. Senate candidate
900141 Feeling thermometer - Republican U.S. Senate candidate
900142 Feeling thermometer - U.S. Senate incumbent whose term is not up - race in state
900143 Feeling thermometer - U.S. Senate incumbent - no race in state
900144 Feeling thermometer - second U.S. Senate incumbent - no race in state
900145 Feeling thermometer - Democratic U.S. House candidate
900146 Feeling thermometer - Republican U.S. House candidate
900147 Feeling thermometer - Democratic gubernatorial candidate
900148 Feeling thermometer - Republican gubernatorial candidate
900149 Feeling thermometer - Governor or retiring Governor - no race in state
900150 Feeling thermometer - third party gubernatorial candidate (Connecticut only)
900151 Feeling thermometer - Democratic party
900152 Feeling thermometer - Republican party
900153 Feeling thermometer - political parties in general

FEELING THERMOMETER: GROUPS IN SOCIETY

900154 Feeling thermometer - supporters of abortion
900155 Feeling thermometer - Blacks
900156 Feeling thermometer - conservatives
900157 Feeling thermometer - labor unions
900158 Feeling thermometer - the women's movement
900159 Feeling thermometer - people on welfare
900160 Feeling thermometer - people seeking to protect the environment
900161 Feeling thermometer - liberals
900162 Feeling thermometer - poor people
900163 Feeling thermometer - opponents of abortion

R'S ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

900164 Does R approve/disapprove of the way Congress has been handling its job
900165 How strongly does R approve/disapprove of Congress' handling of its job

R'S VOTE: 1988

900166 Did R vote in 1988 election
900167 Who did R vote for in 1988 presidential election

PROBE INDICATORS

900168 Was question B13a probed by interviewer
900169 Was question B13b probed by interviewer
900170 Was question B13c probed by interviewer
900171 Was question B13d probed by interviewer
900172 Was question B13e probed by interviewer
900173 Was question B13f probed by interviewer
900174 Was question B13g probed by interviewer
900175 Was question B13h probed by interviewer
900176 Was question B13k probed by interviewer
900177 Was question B13m probed by interviewer
900178 Was question B13n probed by interviewer
900179 Was question B13o probed by interviewer
900180 Was question B13p probed by interviewer
900181 Was question B13q probed by interviewer
900182 Was question B13r probed by interviewer
900183 Was question B13t probed by interviewer
900184 Was question B13u probed by interviewer
900185 Was question B14a probed by interviewer
900186 Was question B14b probed by interviewer
900187 Was question B14c probed by interviewer
900188 Was question B14d probed by interviewer
900189 Was question B14e probed by interviewer
900190 Was question B14f probed by interviewer
900191 Was question B14g probed by interviewer
900192 Was question B14h probed by interviewer
900193 Was question B14j probed by interviewer
900194 Was question B14k probed by interviewer
900195 Was question B14m probed by interviewer
900196 Was question B14n probed by interviewer
900197 Was question B14o probed by interviewer

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES HOUSE CANDIDATE: DEMOCRATIC

900198 Is there anything R likes about Democratic candidate for House of Representatives
900199 What R likes about House Democratic candidate - first mention
900200 What R likes about House Democratic candidate - second mention
900201 What R likes about House Democratic candidate - third mention
900202 What R likes about House Democratic candidate - fourth mention
900203 What R likes about House Democratic candidate - fifth mention
900204 Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic candidate for House of Representatives
What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
first mention
What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
second mention
What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
third mention
What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
fourth mention
What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
fifth mention

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES 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
Is there anything R dislikes about Republican
candidate for House of Representatives
What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
first mention
What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
second mention
What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
third mention
What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
fourth mention
What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
fifth mention
Interviewer Checkpoint: Type of race - one or two
candidates

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

Interviewer Checkpoint: Has R mentioned issues

Issue most important to R in campaign
Did R prefer one of the candidates because of this issue
Candidate R preferred
Party of candidate named

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF HOUSE INCUMBENT
Two House candidates running: was either candidate already in House of Representatives
Two House candidates running: which candidate was already in House of Representatives
Two House candidates running: party of candidate already in House of Representatives
One House candidate running: was candidate already in House of Representatives
One House candidate running: candidate number code
One House candidate running: party of candidate

Interviewer Checkpoint: Districts in which House incumbent ran

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT

Did R have any contact with incumbent
Did R meet incumbent personally
Did R attend meeting/gathering where incumbent spoke
Did R talk with incumbent's staff/office
Did R receive something in mail from incumbent
Did R read about incumbent in newspaper/magazine
Did R hear incumbent on radio
Did R see incumbent on television
R had contact with incumbent in other ways
Does R know anyone who had contact with incumbent

Interviewer Checkpoint: District in which House incumbent had opposition

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE CHALLENGER

Did R have any contact with candidate
Did R meet candidate personally
Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
Did R receive something in mail from candidate
Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
Did R hear candidate on radio
Did R see candidate on television
R had contact with candidate in other ways
Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

R'S CONTACT WITH DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE, NO INCUMBENT

Did R have any contact with candidate
Did R meet candidate personally
Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
Did R receive something in mail from candidate
Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
Did R hear candidate on radio
Did R see candidate on television
R had contact with candidate in other ways
Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate
R'S CONTACT WITH REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE, NO INCUMBENT

900269 Did R have any contact with candidate
900270 Did R meet candidate personally
900271 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
900272 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
900273 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
900274 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
900275 Did R hear candidate on radio
900276 Did R see candidate on television
900277 R had contact with candidate in other ways
900278 Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

VOTING SECTION: VOTERS

900279 Did R vote in 1990 election
900280 Was R registered to vote in this election
900281 Is R registered to vote at current address
900282 In what county and state is R registered

900283 Interviewer Checkpoint: Did R vote in 1990 election
900284 Did R vote in person or by absentee ballot
900285 Where R has voted

900286 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R registered to vote in county/state of interview

900287 Did R vote for House of Representatives candidate
900288 For which House of Representatives candidate did R vote

900289 R's vote for House candidate - party
900290 Was R's preference strong for House candidate

900291 Interviewer Checkpoint: Was there a Senate race in R's state

900292 Did R vote for a Senate candidate
900293 For which Senate candidate did R vote
900294 R's vote for Senate candidate - party
900295 Was R's preference strong for Senate candidate

900296 Interviewer Checkpoint: Was there a gubernatorial race in R's state

900297 Did R vote for gubernatorial candidate
900298 For which gubernatorial candidate did R vote
900299 R's vote for gubernatorial candidate - party

VOTING SECTION: NON-VOTERS

900300 Did R prefer one candidate for U.S. House
900301 Whom did D R prefer for U.S. House
900302 R's preference for House candidate - party
NON-CAMPAIGN CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT

900303 Did R or family member ever contact U.S. House incumbent/office
900304 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to express opinion
900305 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to seek information
900306 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to seek help with problem
900307 Did R get response from House incumbent
900308 How satisfied was R with response from incumbent
900309 Does R know anyone else who had contact with U.S. House incumbent
900310 Did person/group get response from House incumbent
900311 How satisfied was person/group with response from incumbent
900312 How helpful would House incumbent be with another problem

R'S ASSESSMENT OF HOUSE INCUMBENT

900313 How well does U.S. representative keep in touch with district
900314 Does R remember a bill representative voted on
900315 Does R agree/disagree with way representative voted
900316 Anything special done by House incumbent for district/people

R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION

900317 R's party identification
900318 Strength of R's party identification
900319 R closer to Republican/Democratic party
900320 Summary: R's party identification

IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

900321 How often does R follow government/public affairs
900322 What is most important national problem - 1st mention
900323 What is most important national problem - 2nd mention
900324 What is most important national problem - 3rd mention
900325 Interviewer Checkpoint: Has R mentioned any problems
900326 What is the single most important national problem
900327 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

INDIVIDUALISM

900328 Fitting in with people vs. acting according to your own standards
900329 Taking care of yourself vs. caring more about society
900330 Raising children to be independent-minded vs. obedient
900331 Strong government vs. free market in handling economic problems
900332 Being poor due to not working hard enough vs. circumstances beyond control
900333 Less government vs. more government
900334 Cooperation vs. self-reliance
900335 The main reason government has become bigger

PARTY DIFFERENCES

900336 Does R see important differences between parties
900337 Important party differences: party preference - first mention
900338 Party difference content - first mention
900339 Important party differences: party preference - second mention
900340 Party difference content - second mention
900341 Important party differences: party preference - third mention
900342 Party difference content - third mention
900343 Important party differences: party preference - fourth mention
900344 Party difference content - fourth mention
900345 Important party differences: party preference - fifth mention
900346 Party difference content - fifth mention
900347 Important party differences: party preference - sixth mention
900348 Party difference content - sixth mention
900349 Does R think one party more conservative at national level
900350 Which party does R think is more conservative

EASTERN EUROPE

900351 How much has R heard about changes in Soviet Union/eastern Europe
900352 Does R think the cold war is coming to an end
900353 Should U.S. give economic assistance to east European countries that have turned toward democracy

NATIONAL SECURITY

900354 Is Soviet Union or Japan bigger threat to national security of U.S.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

900355 Does R approve/disapprove of efforts to reduce federal deficit
900356 Did democrats/Republicans work hardest to reduce deficit

PERSIAN GULF

900357 Was sending U.S. troops to Persian Gulf right
900358 What should U.S. do now in Persian Gulf
900359 Does R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of Persian
Gulf crisis
900360 How strongly does R approve/disapprove of Bush's
handling of Persian Gulf crisis

PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

900361 Did a political party worker contact R during
campaign
900362 Which party(s) contacted R during campaign
900363 Did anyone else contact R during campaign
900364 Which candidate did the contact ask R to support -
1st mention
900365 Which candidate did the contact ask R to support -
2nd mention

R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

900366 Did R try to influence other's vote choice
900367 Did R wear a button, put a sticker on the car, or
put up a sign
900368 Did R attend any political meetings or rallies
900369 Did R work for party or candidate
900370 Did R use $1 political contribution option on
federal income tax return
900371 Did R contribute money to an individual candidate
900372 R gave money to candidate from which party
900373 Did R give money to specific political party
900374 Which party did R give money to
900375 Did R give money to any other group supporting/opposing
candidates
900376 Was R contacted about registering or voting

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS

900377 Increase/decrease spending on protection of the
environment
900378 Increase/decrease spending on foreign aid
900379 Increase/decrease spending on fighting the disease
AIDS
900380 Increase/decrease spending on social security
900381 Increase/decrease spending for the war on drugs
900382 Increase/decrease spending on food stamps
900383 Increase/decrease spending on public schools
900384 Increase/decrease spending on the homeless
900385 Increase/decrease spending on childcare
900386 Increase/decrease spending on programs that assist
Blacks
900387 Increase/decrease spending on the space program

WHICH PARTY WOULD DO A BETTER JOB HANDLING VARIOUS PROBLEMS

900388 Which party is more likely to cut social security
900389 Which party is more likely to raise taxes
900390 Which party would do better job of handling the economy
900391 Which party would do better job of handling the environment
900392 Which party would do better job of dealing with crime
900393 Which party would do better job of handling foreign affairs
900394 Which party would do better job of cleaning up savings and loan business

R'S RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL FIGURES

900395 Does R know what job/office Dan Quayle holds
900396 Does R know what job/office George Mitchell holds
900397 Does R know what job/office William Rehnquist holds
900398 Does R know what job/office Mikhail Gorbachev holds
900399 Does R know what job/office Margaret Thatcher holds
900400 Does R know what job/office Nelson Mandela holds
900401 Does R know what job/office Tom Foley holds

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF PARTY REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

900402 Does R know which party had the most members in the House of Representatives before the election
900403 Does R know which party had the most members in the Senate before the election

R'S ASSESSMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE'S PERFORMANCE

900404 R's approval/disapproval of representative's handling of job
900405 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of representative's handling of job

POSITIONS ON LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE

900406 Liberal/conservative scale-R
900407 If R had to choose, would R consider self a liberal/conservative
900408 Liberal/conservative scale-Bush
900409 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic House candidate
900410 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican House candidate
900411 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic Senate candidate
900412 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican Senate candidate
900413 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic party
900414 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican party
900415 liberal/conservative scale-the federal government

R'S PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

900416 Does R feel better/worse off financially than a year ago
900417 How much better/worse off does R feel financially
900418 Has federal economic policy made a difference on R's financial position
900419 How much better/worse has it made R financially
900420 Will R be better/worse off financially a year from now
900421 Will R be much or somewhat better/worse off financially a year from now

R'S OPINION OF NATIONAL ECONOMY

900422 Does R think the nation's economy has gotten better/worse/stayed the same in the past year
900423 How much better/worse is the nation's economy
900424 Does R see the economy getting better/worse/staying about the same in the next year

900425 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES/RIGHTS

900426 Society should ensure equal opportunity to succeed
900427 We have gone too far in pushing equal rights
900428 A problem in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance
900429 We should worry less about equality
900430 It is not a problem if people have unequal chances
900431 We would have fewer problems if people were treated more equally

LIMITS ON IMPORTS/SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

900432 Increase/decrease limits on foreign imports scale-R (Form A)
900433 Increase/decrease sanctions against South Africa scale-R (Form A)
900434 Does R favor increasing/decreasing limits on foreign imports (Form B)
900435 How much does R favor increasing/decreasing limits on foreign imports (Form B)
900436 Does R favor increasing/decreasing sanctions against South Africa (Form B)
900437 How much does R favor increasing/decreasing sanctions against South Africa (Form B)

WOMEN RIGHTS SCALE

900438 Women's rights scale-R

DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE

900439 Defense spending scale-R
900440 Defense spending scale-Bush
900441 Defense spending scale-Democratic House candidate
900442 Defense spending scale-Republican House candidate
900443 Defense spending scale-Democratic party
900444 Defense spending scale-Republican party
900445 Defense spending scale-federal government
GUARANTEED STANDARD OF LIVING SCALE
900446 Guaranteed standard of living/job scale-R

SOCIO/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE
900447 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-R
900448 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Bush
900449 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Democratic party
900450 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Republican party
900451 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-federal government

GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE
900452 Government services/spending scale-R
900453 Government services/spending scale-Bush
900454 Government services/spending scale-Democratic House candidate
900455 Government services/spending scale-Republican House candidate
900456 Government services/spending scale-Democratic party
900457 Government services/spending scale-Republican party
900458 Government services/spending scale-the federal government

JOB DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
900459 Does R favor/oppose laws to protect women against job discrimination
900460 How strongly does R favor/oppose laws protecting women against job discrimination
900461 How much job discrimination do women face
900462 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

PREFERENTIAL HIRING/STUDENT QUOTAS FOR BLACKS
900463 R is for/against preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks
900464 How strongly does R favor/oppose preferential hiring and promotion of Blacks
900465 R is for/against quotas to admit Black students
900466 How strongly does R favor/oppose quotas

SCHOOL PRAYER
900467 R's opinion on school prayer
900468 How strongly does R favor their opinion on school prayer

DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
900469 Does R have opinion on government's involvement in desegregation of public schools
900470 R's opinion on government's involvement in desegregation of public schools

**BURNING/DESTROYING THE AMERICAN FLAG**

900471 Should burning/destroying the American flag as political protest be legal/illegal
900472 Favor/oppose constitutional amendment outlawing destruction of flag for political reasons

**PROBLEMS IN THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY**

900473 Has R heard/read about problems in savings and loan business
900474 Who is more to blame for problems of savings and loan business
900475 Is Reagan/Bush/Congress more to blame for savings and loan problems
900476 Is Democratic/Republican party more to blame for savings and loan problems

**DEATH PENALTY**

900477 Does R favor/oppose the death penalty
900478 How strongly does R favor/oppose the death penalty

**ABORTION**

900479 R's position on abortion
900480 Does R favor/oppose parental consent law
900481 How strongly does R favor/oppose parental consent law
900482 Does R favor/oppose government-funded abortion
900483 How strongly does R favor/oppose government-funded abortion

**TAX INCREASE**

900484 Would R support/oppose tax increase to reduce federal budget deficit
900485 How strongly does R support/oppose tax increase to reduce federal budget deficit
900486 Would R support/oppose tax increase to clean up nation's air and water
900487 How strongly does R support/oppose tax increase to clean up nation's air and water

**GOVERNMENT CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE**

900488 Should government provide child care assistance to low and middle income working parents
900489 Would R favor/oppose law requiring national service of all young adults
PEACE DIVIDEND
900490 How peace dividend should be used

STRICT POLLUTION STANDARDS
900491 Should government force compliance with strict pollution standards

JAPANESE COMPETITION
900492 Do Japanese companies compete unfairly or is U.S. blaming Japan for its own economic problems

WHICH PARTY KEEP U.S. OUT OF WAR
900493 Which party could better handle keeping the U.S. out of war

STRENGTH OF U.S. POSITION
900494 Has the United States’ position grown stronger/weaker/stayed the same in the past year
900495 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

IMPORTANCE OF STRONG MILITARY/CONCERNS ABOUT WAR
900496 How important is a strong military force for dealing with our enemies
900497 How worried is R about the U.S. getting into a conventional war
900498 Does R agree/disagree U.S. should stay out of problems in other parts of the world
900499 How worried is R about the U.S. getting into a nuclear war

MORAL VALUES
900500 Newer lifestyles are contributing to societal breakdown
900501 We should adjust moral behavior to changes in the world
900502 There would be fewer problems if more emphasis was placed on traditional family ties
900503 We should be more tolerant of people with different moral standards

R’S FEELINGS ABOUT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL
900504 How much of the time does R think he/she can trust government
900505 How much does the government waste our tax dollars
900506 Is government run by a few big interests or for the benefit of all
900507 How many people in government does R think are crooked
900508 How much attention does R feel government pays to what people think
900509 People like me don't have any say about government
900510 Politics are so complicated a person like me can't understand what's going on

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO R

900511 Is religion an important part of R's life
900512 How much guidance does religion provide in R's life
900513 How often does R pray
900514 How often does R read the bible
900515 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B
900516 R's view of the bible
900517 R's feelings about the bible

CIVIL RIGHTS/POSITION OF BLACKS

900518 Does R think civil rights leaders are pushing too fast/slow
900519 How much change does R think there has been in the position of Blacks
900520 Blacks have gotten less than they deserve over the past few years
900521 Blacks should overcome prejudice without any special favors
900522 If Blacks would try harder they could be just as well off as whites
900523 Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for Blacks to move up

R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND PRACTICE

900524 Does R ever attend religious services
900525 Does R consider self as part of a particular church or denomination
900526 How often does R attend religious services
900527 Does R go to religious services once a week or more often
900528 R's religious preference
900529 R's religious denomination
900530 R's religious group association - Baptist
900531 R's religious group association - larger Baptist or local
900532 R's religious group association - Lutheran
900533 R's religious group association - Methodist
900534 R's religious group association - Presbyterian
900535 R's religious group association - Reformed
900536 R's religious group association - Brethren
900537 R's religious group association - "Christian"
900538 R's religious group association - Church of Christ
900539 R's religious group association - Church of God
900540 R's religious group association - "other" responses
900541 R's religious group association - miscellaneous
denomination
900542 Is R's "other" religious denomination Christian?
900543 Does R attend/consider self Orthodox, Conservative, 
Reform or other Jew
900544 What best describes R's Christianity
900545 Does R consider self a born-again Christian
900546 Religious affiliation summary

PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT R

900547 R's gender
900548 R's age from household listing
900549 R's race
900550 R's date of birth - month
900551 R's date of birth - year
900552 R's recoded age
900553 R's marital status
900554 Highest grade of school completed by R
900555 Does R have a high school diploma
900556 R's highest college degree
900557 Summary: R's education
900558 Interviewer Checkpoint: R is married or living with
partner

EDUCATION LEVEL OF R'S SPOUSE

900559 Highest grade of school completed by spouse/partner
900560 Does spouse/partner have high school diploma
900561 Spouse/partner's highest college degree
900562 Summary: spouse/partner's education
900563 Interviewer Checkpoint: R is male and married/partnered

R'S WIFE/PARTNER WORK STATUS

900564 Is R's wife/partner working now

R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

900565 R's present employment status
900566 Summary: R's working status
900567 Has R (unemployed) ever worked for pay
900568 When did R retire
900569 Has R (disabled) ever worked for pay
900570 Is R (homemaker/student) working now
900571 Has R (homemaker/student) worked in last six months

R Working or Temporarily Laid Off

900572 R's present occupation - census occupation code
900573 R's present occupation - collapsed census occupation
code
900574 R's present occupation - census industry code
900575 Is R self-employed
900576 Is R employed by federal/state/local government
900577 Number of hours per week R works
900578 Is R satisfied with number of hours worked
900579 How worried is R about job security

900580 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R working now

900581 Was R out of work within the last six months
900582 Has R had to take a pay cut/reduce hours within the last six months

R Unemployed, Retired, or Disabled

900583 R's last occupation - census occupation code
900584 R's last occupation - collapsed census occupation
900585 R's last occupation - census industry code
900586 Was R self-employed on last regular job
900587 Was R employed by federal/state/local government
900588 Did R work within the last six months
900589 Number of hours worked per week on last job

900590 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R unemployed

900591 Is R doing any work for pay at the present time
900592 Is R looking for work at the present time
900593 How worried is R about not being able to find a job

R Homemaker or Student

900594 R's last occupation - census occupation code
900595 R's last occupation - collapsed census occupation code
900596 R's last occupation - census industry code
900597 Was R self-employed on last regular job
900598 Was R employed by federal/state/local government
900599 Number of hours worked per week on last job
900600 Is R looking for work at the present time
900601 How worried is R about not being able to find a job

R'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

900602 R's present/last occupation - census occupation code
900603 R's present/last occupation - collapsed census occupation code
900604 R's present/last occupation - census industry code
900605 Is/was R self-employed on current/last regular job
900606 Is/was R employed by federal/state/local government
900607 Number of House work/ed per week on current/last job
900608 Is R worried about job security
900609 Did R (unemployed/retired/disabled) work within the last six months
900610 Is R (unemployed/retired/disabled) looking for work at the present time
900611 Has R (unemployed/disabled) ever worked for pay

900612 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R married and female

R'S HUSBAND/PARTNER OCCUPATIONAL DATA

900613 Husband/partner's present employment status
Summary: husband/partner's working status

Has husband/partner (unemployed) ever done any work for pay

When did husband/partner retire

Has husband/partner (disabled) ever done any work for pay

Is husband/partner (homemaker/student) doing any work for pay at the present time

Has husband/partner (homemaker/student) worked for pay in the last six months

Husband/Partner Working or Temporarily Laid Off

Husband/partner's present occupation - census occupation code

Husband/partner's present occupation - collapsed census occupation code

Husband/partner's present occupation - census industry code

Is husband/partner self-employed

Is husband/partner employed by federal/state/local government

Number of hours per week husband/partner works

Is husband/partner satisfied with number of hours worked

How worried is husband/partner about job security

Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner working now

Was husband/partner out of work within the last six months

Has husband/partner had to take a pay cut/reduce hours within the last six months

Husband/Partner Unemployed, Retired, or Disabled

Husband/partner's last occupation - census occupation code

Husband/partner's last occupation - collapsed census occupation code

Husband/partner's last occupation - census industry code

Was husband/partner self-employed on last job

Was husband/partner employed by federal/state/local government on last job

Was husband/partner employed in the last six months

Number of hours per week husband/partner worked on last job

Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner unemployed

Is husband/partner doing any work for pay at the present time

Is husband/partner looking for work at the present time

How worried is husband/partner about not being able to find a job

Husband/Partner Homemaker or Student

Husband/partner's last regular occupation - census occupation code

Husband/partner's last regular occupation - collapsed census occupation code
900644 Husband/partner's last regular occupation - census industry code
900645 Was husband/partner self-employed on last regular job
900646 Was husband/partner employed by federal/state/local government on last regular job
900647 Number of hours per week husband/partner worked on last regular job
900648 Is husband/partner looking for work at the present time
900649 How worried is husband/partner about not being able to find a job

HUSBAND/PARTNER'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

900650 H/p's present/last occupation - census occupation code
900651 H/p's present/last occupation - collapsed census occupation code
900652 H/p's present/last occupation - census industry code
900653 Is/was h/p self-employed on current/last regular job
900654 Is/was h/p employed by federal/state/local government
900655 Number of House work/ed per week on current/last job
900656 Is h/p worried about job security
900657 Did h/p (unemployed/retired/disabled) work within the last six months
900658 Is h/p (unemployed/retired/disabled) looking for work at the present time
900659 Has h/p (unemployed/disabled) ever worked for pay

LABOR UNION POSITION

900660 Does anyone in R's Household belong to a labor union
900661 Who belongs to a labor union
900662 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R only family member age 14 or older

R'S INCOME AND SOCIAL CLASS

900663 Family/household income before taxes
900664 R's income before taxes
900665 Does R think of self as belonging to a social class
900666 Does R think of self as middle or working class
900667 Does R think of self as average or upper middle/working
900668 Summary: R's social class
900669 Does R feel close to middle/working class

R'S ETHNIC IDENTITY

900670 What does R consider his/her main ethnic group (other than American) - first mention
900671 What does R consider his/her main ethnic group (other than American) - second mention
900672 Interviewer Checkpoint: R mentioned more than one group
900673 With which group does R most closely identify
900674 Were R's parents born in this country
900675 Interviewer Checkpoint: Did R mention some hispanic
group

900676 Is R of Spanish or hispanic origin/descent
900677 Category that best describes R's hispanic origin

R'S COMMUNITY/RESIDENCE

900678 R's birthplace
900679 Where did R grow up
900680 Community type R grew up in
900681 How long has R lived in present city/town/township/county
900682 Where did R live before - city
900683 Where did R live before - state or country
900684 How long has R lived in this house/condo/apartment
900685 Does R/R's family own or rent R's home

CONDITIONS OF THE INTERVIEW

900686 Others present at interview
900687 R's cooperation
900688 R's level of information about politics/public affairs
900689 R's apparent intelligence
900690 Was R suspicious before interview
900691 R's interest in the interview
900692 R's sincerity
900693 Did R report income correctly
900694 Interviewer's estimate of R's family income
900695 Was interview conducted in English
900696 Language in which interview was conducted (if other than English)

R'S REACTION TO THE INTERVIEW

900697 R's reaction to interview: negative - general
900698 Negative - too long
900699 Negative - too complicated
900700 Negative - boring/tedious/repetitious
900701 R wanted to stop before completion
900702 R was ill/deaf/tired, interview was hard for R
900703 R was confused by questions, interview was hard for R
900704 Doubts over lack of knowledge/suitability for interview
900705 Doubts over lack of political knowledge
900706 R was agitated or stressed by interview process
900707 R angry at interview content
900708 R concerned about sampling purposes or bias
900709 R could not read respondent booklet
900710 R appeared to enjoy interview
900711 Neutral or no
Good And Bad Point About Bush That Would Make Respondent Vote For/Against Him

912100 Anything that would make you vote for Bush in 1992
912101 What would make you vote for Bush <1st mention>
912102 What would make you vote for Bush <2nd mention>
912103 What would make you vote for Bush <3rd mention>
912104 What would make you vote for Bush <4th mention>
912105 What would make you vote for Bush <5th mention>

912106 Anything to make you vote against Bush in 1992
912107 What would make you vote against Bush <1st mention>
912108 What would make you vote against Bush <2nd mention>
912109 What would make you vote against Bush <3rd mention>
912110 What would make you vote against Bush <4th mention>
912111 What would make you vote against Bush <5th mention>

Approve/Disapprove of Bush on: Presidency; Economy; Foreign Relations
912112  Approve or disapprove of Bush's presidency
912113  Approve strongly or not strongly
912114  Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912115  Summary Variable
912116  Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of economy
912117  Approve strongly or not strongly
912118  Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912119  Summary Variable
912120  Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of foreign countries
912121  Approve strongly or not strongly
912122  Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912123  Summary Variable

Thermometers and Probes

Feeling Thermometers:

912200  Norman Schwartzkopf
912201  Richard Cheney
912202  Lloyd Bentsen
912203  Mario Cuomo
912204  Bill Clinton
912205  George Bush
912206  James Baker
912207  Al Gore
912208  Richard Gephardt
912209  L. Douglas Wilder
912210  Saddam Hussein
912211  Jesse Jackson
912212  Dan Quayle
912213  Paul Tsongas
912214  Jay Rockefeller
912215  Bob Kerrey
912216  Colin Powell
912217  Respondent's Congressperson
912218  Respondent's Senator #1
912219  Respondent's Senator #2
912220  Conservatives
912221  Palestinians
912222  The Democratic Party
912223  Japan
912224  Moderates
912225  Israel
912226  Liberals
912227  Anti-war Protesters
912228  The Republican Party
912229  Immigrants from foreign countries
912230  Environmentalists
912231  Whites
912232  Blacks
912233  Hispanics
912234  Illegal Aliens
912235  Asian-Americans
912236  Mexican-Americans
912237  Cuban-Americans
912238  Puerto Ricans
912239  Women's movement
912240  Feminists
Housewives
People working to protect the environment
People who oppose the use of nuclear power
The elderly

Feeling Thermometer Probes:

Probe, Norman Schwartzkopf
Probe, Richard Cheney
Probe, Lloyd Bentsen
Probe, Mario Cuomo
Probe, Bill Clinton
Probe, George Bush
Probe, James Baker
Probe, Al Gore
Probe, Richard Gephardt
Probe, L. Douglas Wilder
Probe, Saddam Hussein
Probe, Jesse Jackson
Probe, Dan Quayle
Probe, Paul Tsongas
Probe, Jay Rockefeller
Probe, Bob Kerrey
Probe, Colin Powell
Probe, Respondent's Congressperson
Probe, Respondent's Senator #1
Probe, Respondent's Senator #2

Approve/Disapprove of the Way Congress is handling its job

Approve or disapprove of way U.S. Congress is handling job
Approve strongly or not strongly
Disapprove strongly or not strongly
Summary Variable

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES

Important differences in what Republicans and Democrats stand for
Republican and Democratic differences <1st mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <2nd mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <3rd mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <4th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <5th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <6th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <7th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <8th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <9th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <10th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <11th mention>
Republican and Democratic differences <12th mention>

Approve/Disapprove of Representative and Senators

Approve or disapprove of the way Representative has
been handling his/her job
912318 Approve strongly or not strongly
912319 Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912320 Summary Variable
912321 Approve or disapprove of way Senator #1 has been
handling his/her job
912322 Approve strongly or not strongly
912323 Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912324 Summary Variable
912325 Approve or disapprove of way Senator #2 has been
handling his/her job
912326 Approve strongly or not strongly
912327 Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912328 Summary Variable

PARTY ID
912329 Respondent thinks of self as Republican, Democrat,
Independent or other
912330 Strong Republican or not very strong Republican
912331 Strong Democrat or not very strong Democrat
912332 Respondent closer to Republican Party or the
Democratic Party
912333 Party ID Summary

Most Important Problems Facing the Country
912334 What Respondent thinks are most important problems
facing this country
912335 Most important problem country faces <1st mention>
912336 Most important problem country faces <2nd mention>
912337 Most important problem country faces <3rd mention>
912338 Single most important problem the country faces

FOREIGN POLICY
912400 Is Cold War between U.S. and Soviet Union coming to
an end
912401 U.S. to give economic assistance to countries in
Eastern Europe
912402 How willing U.S. in future to use military force to
solve international problems
912403 Rating foreign policy goals
912404 Preventing spread of nuclear weapons
912405 Reducing environmental pollution around the world
912406 Protecting weaker nations against foreign aggression
912407 Helping bring democratic form of government to other
nations
912408 Does Respondent think right thing to send U.S.
military forces to Persian Gulf
912409 How important is issue to Respondent personally

Approve/Disapprove of Bush Handling of Persian Gulf Crisis
912410 Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of Persian
Gulf crisis
912411 Approve strongly or not strongly
912412 Disapprove strongly or not strongly
912413 Summary Variable

Differences Between the Parties
912414 Democrats or Republicans more likely to raise taxes
912415 Democrats or Republicans better at handling nation's economy
912416 Democrats or Republicans better at handling foreign affairs

Patriotism
912417 Feelings when respondent sees American flag flying
912418 How strong is respondent's love for country

Liberal/Conservative Scales
912450 Seven-point liberal/conservative scale
912451 Respondent considers self liberal or conservative
912452 How does Respondent rate President Bush on scale
912453 How does Respondent rate Democratic Party on scale
912454 How does Respondent rate Republican Party on scale

Economic Well-being
912455 Respondent and family better off, worse off or same financially than year ago
912456 Much better off or somewhat better
912457 Much worse off or somewhat worse
912458 Summary Variable
912459 Economy as a whole gotten better, stayed same or gotten worse
912460 Much better or somewhat better
912461 Much worse or somewhat worse
912462 Summary Variable

DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE
912475 Scale indicating reaction to increase in defense spending
912476 Rating of George Bush on defense spending
912477 Rating of Democratic Party on defense spending
912478 Rating of Republican Party on spending

Who Would Respondent Vote For in House Race Today
912479 House of Representatives election held today, Respondent would vote for Democratic candidate or Republican candidate
CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITATION

912480  Respondent favors or opposes proposed law limiting members of Congress to no more than 12 years service.

Which Party Will Keep Us Out of Future Wars Better

912481  Keeping out of future wars handled better by Republicans or Democrats.

U.S. POSITION IN THE WORLD

912482  During past year, U.S. position in world grown weaker

Need of Strong U.S. Military

912483  How important for U.S. to have strong military force

Worried about Conventional War

912484  Respondent worried about country getting into conventional war

Isolationist Sentiment

912485  Agree or disagree: "This country would be better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world.

Worried About Nuclear War

912486  Respondent worried about country getting into nuclear war at this time

Trust in Government

912487  How much of the time does Respondent trust government to do what is right.
912488  Government run for benefit of few big interests
912489  Respondent's agreement/disagreement: "People like me don't have any say about what the government does."

Respondent's Position and Recall of Congressperson's and Parties Positions on Use of Force Vote

912500  Prior to war in Persian Gulf, Respondent in favor of continuing to rely on sanctions or in favor of authorizing President to use military force.
912501  Does Respondent remember how representative in U.S. House of Reps voted on use of force in Persian Gulf.
912502  Did he/she vote for or against use of force.
912503  Would Respondent guess whether voted for or against use of force.
912504  Summary Variable

912505  Does Respondent remember how Senator #1 voted on use of force in Gulf
912506  Did he/she vote for or against use of force
912507  Guess he/she vote for or against use of force
912508  Summary Variable

912509  Does Respondent remember how Senator #2 voted on use of force in Gulf
912510  Did he/she vote for or against the use of force
912511  Would Respondent guess whether voted for or against use of force
912512  Summary Variable

912513  Before war actually started, does Respondent think one political party more in favor of military force
912514  Which party supported use of force
912515  Summary Variable

Respondent's Recall of Feelings During the War

912516  During the war, did Respondent feel proud
912517  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912518  During the war, did Respondent ever feel upset
912519  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912520  During the war, did Respondent ever feel sympathy for the Iraqi people
912521  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912522  During the war, was Respondent worried the fighting might spread
912523  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912524  During the war, did Respondent ever feel angry at Saddam Hussein
912525  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912526  During the war, did Respondent ever feel disgusted at the killing
912527  Feel strongly or not so strongly
912528  During the war, did Respondent ever feel afraid for American troops
912529  Feel strongly or not so strongly

Attention Paid To War

912530  How much attention did Respondent pay to news about Gulf war

Did One Party Support War More Than The Other After War Began

912531  After fighting started, did Respondent think one party supported war more or about equal
912532  Which party supported the war more
912533  Summary Variable

Anything Good/Bad For U.S. Come From The War

912534  Does Respondent think anything good came out of Gulf
War for the U.S.

912535 Good that came out of Gulf War <1st mention>
912536 Good that came out of Gulf War <2nd mention>
912537 Good that came out of Gulf War <3rd mention>
912538 Good that came out of Gulf War <4th mention>
912539 Good that came out of Gulf War <5th mention>

912540 Other than losing lives, does Respondent think anything bad came out of war for U.S.

912541 Bad that came out of Gulf War <1st mention>
912542 Bad that came out of Gulf War <2nd mention>
912543 Bad that came out of Gulf War <3rd mention>
912544 Bad that came out of Gulf War <4th mention>
912545 Bad that came out of Gulf War <5th mention>

912546 All things considered, was worth the cost or not

Worried about Another Middle East War

912547 How worried Respondent that another war will break out in the Middle East in the next few years

Morality of Bombing Near Civilians

912548 Should there be no bombing of targets near where civilians live
912549 Feel strongly or not so strongly about this
912550 Summary Variable

Any Friends/Relatives Who Served in the Persian Gulf War

912551 Does Respondent have any relatives or close friends called up to serve in Persian Gulf War
912552 Personnel's relationship to respondent <1st person>
912553 Personnel's relationship to respondent <2nd person>
912554 Personnel's relationship to respondent <3rd person>
912555 Personnel's relationship to respondent <4th person>

Was U.S. Right to Stop While Saddam Still in Power

912556 Does Respondent feel U.S. and allies should have continued fighting until Saddam Hussein was driven from power or right to stop with liberation of Kuwait

Did U.S. Handle the Kurdish Problem Correctly

912557 Did the U.S. do enough/helped quickly enough to help the Kurdish people in Iraq

Respondent For/Against Preferential Hiring/Promotion of Blacks

912558 Is Respondent for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks
912559 Favor preference in hiring and promotion
Oppose preference in hiring and promotion

Democratic party: preferential hiring and promotion of blacks

Republican party: preferential hiring and promotion of blacks

Respondent's Attention to Religious Programming

How many times in last week did Respondent watch religious program on TV or listen on radio other than services of local churches

>> 1992 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION VARIABLES SAMPLING INFORMATION

1992 Pre-Election Study Case ID
1992 Panel or Cross-Section Indicator
1990 Post Election Study Case ID
Panel Status For The 1991 Panel/Pilot Study
Full Sample Weight
Panel Only Weight
Pre-Post Indicator: 1992 Election Study
Pre-Election Form-Sample Indicator
Primary Area Code (3 digits)
PRIMARY AREA NAME
Census Region
State Abbreviation
ICPSR State and 1992 Congressional District
ICPSR State Code
FIPS State Code
1992 Congressional District Number (2 digits)
1990 Congressional District Number
Type of Race: House of Representatives
Type of Race: Senate

PRE-ELECTION INFORMATION

Pre-Election Sample Releases and Replicates
Pre-Election Sample Release -- Summary
A0. Pre-Election: Beginning Time (local)--Exact Time Now
Pre-Election: Date of Interview: MONTH
Pre-Election: Date Interview: Day
Pre-Election: Interviewer's Interview Number
Pre-Election: Interview Length in Minutes
Pre-Election: Post-Edit Length, in Minutes
Pre-Election: Mode of Interview: Telephone or Personal
Pre-Election: Total Number of Calls to Obtain Interview
Pre-Election: Result Code
Reasons for using telephone questionnaire
923035  Was Name Obtained
923036  R's Address
923037  Address Different From Sample Label
923038  Phone Number Obtained
923039  Is Number Listed in the Phone Directory
923040  Is Phone Listed in R's Name
923041  Does R Have Other Residence
923042  Contact Information
923043  Reason for not Interviewing by Phone
923044  Type of Structure in Which R Lives
923045  Is Cooperation Needed to Gain Access to Housing Unit
923046  Instructions for Gaining Access to Housing Unit

**R's Resistance to Interview**

923047  Refusal Conversion Indicator
923048  Persuasion Letter Requested
923049  Type of Incentive Sent to Selected Household
923050  Amount of Payment Offered to R
923051  Amount of Payment Made to R
923052  Did R Refuse Interview Initially
923053  Did R Break Any Appointment
923054  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Waste of Time
923055  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Very Ill
923056  Reason for Resistance to Interview: 'Too Busy'
923057  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Stressful Family Situation
923058  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Confidentiality
923059  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Invasion of Privacy
923060  Reason for Resistance to Interview: Other

**Geographic Variables**

923061  FIPS State and County Codes
923062  Tract/Enumeration District Indicator
923063  FIPS 1980 SMSA Code
923064  FIPS 1990 CMSA Codes
923065  Size of Place of Interview - 1990
923066  Actual Population of Interview Location - 1990
923067  1990 Belt Code

**Sampling Variables**

923068  Sampling Error Code - Combined Panel/Cross-Section
923069  Sampling Error Code - Panel Only
923070  Cross-Section: Number of Household Units
923071  Panel Only: R Found Not Living at Sample Label Address
923072  Cross-Section: Household Listing
923073  Cross-Section: Selection Table
923074  Cross-Section: Person Number Selected As R
923075  Cross-Section: Number of Persons in Household
923076  Cross Section: Number of Politically Eligible Adults in HH
923077  Cross Section: Household Composition Code
923078  Household Description for Panel and Cross-Section
923079  Cross-Section: Number of Children Under 6 Years Old in HH
923080  Cross-Section: Number of Children 6-9 Years Old in HH
Cross-Section: Number of Children 10-13 Years Old in HH

Cross-Section: Number of Children 14-17 Years Old in HH

Interviewer Variables

Interviewer's ID Number
Supervisor ID Number
Interviewer's Race
Interviewer's Ethnicity
Interviewer's Age Bracketed
Interviewer's Years of Experience
Interviewer's Gender
Interviewer's Education
Interest in the Campaign

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Prediction of Winner in Presidential Election
Does R Think Presidential Race Will Be Close
Which Presidential Candidate Does R Think Will Carry State
Does R Think the Presidential Race Will Be Close in State
Does R Care Which Party Wins the Presidential Election
Did R Vote in 1988 Presidential Election
Vote for President in 1988

BUSH AS CANDIDATE

Is There Anything About Bush That Would Make R Vote For Him
Reasons Would Vote For Bush - First Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Second Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Third Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Fourth Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Fifth Mention

Is There Anything About Bush That Would Make R Vote Against Him
Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - First Mention
Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Second Mention
Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Third Mention
Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Fourth Mention
Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Fifth Mention

CLINTON AS CANDIDATE

Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - First Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Second Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Third Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Fourth Mention
Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Fifth Mention
Is There Anything About Clinton That Would Make R Vote For Him
Against Him
923128 Reasons Would Vote Against Clinton - First Mention
923129 Reasons Would Vote Against Clinton - Second Mention
923130 Reasons Would Vote Against Clinton - Third Mention
923131 Reasons Would Vote Against Clinton - Fourth Mention
923132 Reasons Would Vote Against Clinton - Fifth Mention
923133 Is There Anything About Perot That Would Make R Vote For Him

PEROT AS CANDIDATE
923134 Reasons Would Vote For Perot - First Mention
923135 Reasons Would Vote For Perot - Second Mention
923136 Reasons Would Vote For Perot - Third Mention
923137 Reasons Would Vote For Perot - Fourth Mention
923138 Reasons Would Vote For Perot - Fifth Mention
923139 Is There Anything About Perot That Would Make R Vote Against Him
923140 Reasons Would Vote Against Perot - First Mention
923141 Reasons Would Vote Against Perot - Second Mention
923142 Reasons Would Vote Against Perot - Third Mention
923143 Reasons Would Vote Against Perot - Fourth Mention
923144 Reasons Would Vote Against Perot - Fifth Mention

R'S ATTENTION TO CAMPAIGN/MEDIA
923145 Satisfaction With Presidential Candidates
923201 How Often Did R Watch News on TV in the Past Week
923202 How Much Attention Did R Give to the Presidential Campaign News on TV
923203 How Often Did R Read a Daily Newspaper in the Past Week
923204 Did R Read About the Campaign in Any Newspaper
923205 How Much Attention Did R Give to Campaign News in the Newspaper
923206 Did R Read About the Campaign in Any Magazines
923207 How Much Attention Did R Give to the Campaign News in Magazines
923208 Did R Listen to Campaign Speeches or Discussions on the Radio
923209 How Many Campaign Speeches/Discussions Did R Listen to on the Radio
923210 Did R Listen/Watch Call-In Radio/TV Talk Shows
923211 Does R Recall Seeing Any Presidential Campaign Advertisements on TV
923212 Remembered About Campaign Ads on TV - First Mention
923213 Remembered About Campaign Ads on TV - Second Mention
923214 Remembered About Campaign Ads on TV - Third Mention
923215 Remembered About Campaign Ads on TV - Fourth Mention
923216 Remembered About Campaign Ads on TV - Fifth Mention

R'S PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY/CAUCUS
923301 Did R Vote in Caucus/Primary Election
923302 Did R Vote in Republican or Democratic Primary/Caucus
923303 Which Republican Did R Vote For in State Primary/Caucus
923304 Which Democratic Did R Vote For in State
Primary/Caucus

FEELING THERMOMETERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>923305</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923306</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923307</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Ross Perot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923308</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Dan Quayle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923309</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Albert Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923310</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Anita Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923311</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Tom Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923312</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Barbara Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923313</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Hillary Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923314</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Clarence Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923315</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Pat Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923316</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Jesse Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923317</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923318</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer - Republican Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R'S ASSESSMENT OF BUSH AS PRESIDENT (PRE-ELECTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>923319</td>
<td>Approves/Disapproves of Bush's Handling of His Job as President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923320</td>
<td>How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of His Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923321</td>
<td>Approves/Disapproves of Bush's Handling of Foreign Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923322</td>
<td>How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Foreign Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923323</td>
<td>Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of the Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923324</td>
<td>How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923325</td>
<td>Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Persian Gulf Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923326</td>
<td>How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Gulf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R'S OPINION ABOUT CANDIDATES AND PARTIES

Candidate Best Able to Handle...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>923327</td>
<td>...The Nation's Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923328</td>
<td>...Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923329</td>
<td>...Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923330</td>
<td>...Pollution and the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923331</td>
<td>...Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923332</td>
<td>...the Budget Deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>923401</td>
<td>Whether R Likes Anything About the Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923402</td>
<td>Likes About the Democratic Party - First Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923403</td>
<td>Likes About the Democratic Party - Second Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923404</td>
<td>Likes About the Democratic Party - Third Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923405</td>
<td>Likes About the Democratic Party - Fourth Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923406</td>
<td>Likes About the Democratic Party - Fifth Mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether R Dislikes Anything About the Democratic Party
Dislikes About the Democratic Party - First Mention
Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Second Mention
Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Third Mention
Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Fourth Mention
Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Fifth Mention

Whether R Likes Anything About the Republican Party
Likes About the Republican Party - First Mention
Likes About the Republican Party - Second Mention
Likes About the Republican Party - Third Mention
Likes About the Republican Party - Fourth Mention
Likes About the Republican Party - Fifth Mention

Whether R Dislikes Anything About the Republican Party
Dislikes About the Republican Party - First Mention
Dislikes About the Republican Party - Second Mention
Dislikes About the Republican Party - Third Mention
Dislikes About the Republican Party - Fourth Mention
Dislikes About the Republican Party - Fifth Mention

R's Likes/Dislikes About Republican Party

R's Personal Financial Situation
Better/Worse Off Financially Than a Year Ago
How Much Better/Worse Off Financially Than a Year Ago
Better/Worse Off Financially a Year From Now
Much or Somewhat Better/Worse Off a Year From Now
Income Stayed At/Above/Below the Cost of Living
Income Gone Up/Fallen Behind the Cost of Living
Federal Economic Policy Has Affected R Financially
How Much Federal Economic Policy Has Affected R Financially
Been Able to Buy/Had to Put Off Buying Things During Past Year
Put Off Medical/Dental Treatment Due to Lack of Money
Borrow Money to Make Ends Meet
Dip Into Savings to Make Ends Meet
Look for Job, Work 2nd Job/More Hours to Make Ends Meet
Able to Save Any Money Over the Past Year
Fallen Behind in Rent/House Payments This Past Year

R Has Received Payments
Receive Payments From Social Security
Receive Payments From Food Stamps
Receive Payments From Medicare
Receive Payments From Medicaid
Receive Payments From Unemployment Compensation
Receive Payments From AFDC
Receive Payments From Veterans Benefits
Receive Payments From Government Retirement Pensions
Receive Payments From Disability Payments
Receive Payments From Workman's Compensation
Presidential Candidate Most Likely to Raise Taxes
R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: BUSH

923501 Whether Bush Makes R Angry
923502 Whether Bush Makes R Hopeful
923503 Whether Bush Makes R Afraid
923504 Whether Bush Makes R Proud

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: CLINTON

923505 Whether Clinton Makes R Angry
923506 Whether Clinton Makes R Hopeful
923507 Whether Clinton Makes R Afraid
923508 Whether Clinton Makes R Proud

IDEOLOGICAL PLACEMENT

923509 Ideological Placement
923510 Interviewer Checkpoint: Ideological Placement
923511 Ideological Placement if Moderate/Middle of Road
923512 Ideological Placement if DK/Haven't Thought Much
923513 Summary: Ideological Placement
923514 Ideological Placement - Bush
923515 Ideological Placement - Clinton
923516 Ideological Placement - Ross Perot
923517 Ideological Placement - The Republican Party
923518 Ideological Placement - The Democratic Party
923519 Whether Political Candidates Should Display Higher Moral Standards

Qualities of a True American:

923520 Getting Ahead Through Own Effort
923521 Believing in God
923522 Treating People of All Races Equally
923523 Speaking English

R'S OPINION ON NATIONAL ISSUES/PROBLEMS

923524 Racial/Ethnic Groups Should Maintain Distinct Cultures
923525 Those Who Avoided Vietnam Should Have Served Despite Beliefs
923526 Things in This Country Are Going in the Right Direction
923527 Level of Unemployment Has Gotten Better/Worse in Past Year

R'S OPINION ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

923528 How Much Better/Worse is the Level of Unemployment
923529 Inflation Has Gotten Better/Worse in the Past Year
923530 How Much Better/Worse is Inflation
923531 Nation's Economy Has Gotten Better/Worse in Past Year
923532 How Much Better/Worse is the Nation's Economy
923533 Economy Has Gotten Better/Worse in Last Few Months
How Much Better/Worse is Economy in Past Few Months
Economy Has Gotten Better/Worse Compared to Four Years Ago
How much Better/Worse is Economy Compared to Four Years Ago
Economy Will Get Better/Worse in Next 12 Months
America's Ability to Compete in World Economy Gotten Better/Worse
How Much Better/Worse is America's Ability to Compete in World Economy
Standard of Living Will be Better/Worse 20 Years From Now
Federal Economic Policies Have Made Economy Better/Worse
How Much Better/Worse Have Federal Economic Policies Made Economy
Economic Conditions in State Have Gotten Better/Worse
How Much Better/Worse Are Economic Conditions in State

R'S OPINION ON POLITICAL PARTIES
Which Party Would Do a Better Job...
...Handling Economy
...Handling Foreign Affairs
...Solving Problem of Poverty
...Making Health Care More Affordable
...Cut Social Security Benefits
Taxes and the Deficit
Which Party is More Likely to - Raise Taxes
Who is More to Blame for Federal Budget Deficit

R'S OPINION ON MILITARY ISSUES
Unites States' World Position Has Grown Weaker/Stronger
Party Best Able to Keep United States Out of War
Should U.S. Maintain Military Power Through High Defense Spending
U.S. Should Not Concern Itself With Problems in Other Parts of World
How Willing Should U.S. be to Use Force to Solve Intl. Problems
How Worried is R About U.S. Getting into a Nuclear War
How Worried is R About U.S. Getting into Conventional War
Did U.S. Do the Right Thing in Sending Military Forces to Persian Gulf
Was One Party Was More in Favor of Military Force in Persian Gulf
Which Party Supported Use of Force in Persian Gulf More
Incumbent's Support of Persian Gulf War
INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Candidate Named
Remembers How Incumbent Voted on Use of Force in Persian Gulf
Did Incumbent Vote For/Against Use of Force
Would R Have Guessed Incumbent Would Vote For/Against Use of Force
Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of War in Persian Gulf
Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Gulf War
Effects of Persian Gulf War
Did Anything Good Come Out of the Persian Gulf War for the U.S.
Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - First Mention
Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Second Mention
Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Third Mention
Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Fourth Mention
Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Fifth Mention
Did Anything Bad Come Out of the War for the U.S. Besides Losing Lives
Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - First Mention
Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Second Mention
Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Third Mention
Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Fourth Mention
Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Fifth Mention
Was the War Worth the Cost
Should the War Have Continued After Kuwait Was Liberated

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Party Identification
Strength of Party Identification
Is R Closer to Republican/Democratic Party
Summary: Party Identification

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: BUSH

How Well Does "Intelligent" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Compassionate" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Moral" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Inspiring" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Provides Strong Leadership" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Really Cares About People Like You" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Knowledgeable" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Honest" Describe Bush
How Well Does "Gets Things Done" Describe Bush

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: CLINTON

How Well Does "Intelligent" Describe Clinton
How Well Does "Compassionate" Describe Clinton
How Well Does "Moral" Describe Clinton
How Well Does "Inspiring" Describe Clinton
How Well Does "Provides Strong Leadership" Describe Clinton
Clinton

923649 How Well Does "Really Cares About People Like You" Describe Clinton
923650 How Well Does "Knowledgeable" Describe Clinton
923651 How Well Does "Honest" Describe Clinton
923652 How Well Does "Gets Things Done" Describe Clinton

GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALES:

923701 Respondent
923702 George Bush
923703 Bill Clinton
923704 The Republican Party
923705 The Democratic Party
923706 The Federal Government

DEFENSE SPENDING SCALES:

923707 Respondent
923708 George Bush
923709 Bill Clinton
923710 The Republican Party
923711 The Democratic Party
923712 The Federal Government

HEALTH CARE AND HEALTH INSURANCE

923713 Can R Afford Health Care
923714 Does R Have Health Insurance
923715 Satisfaction With Quality of Available Health Care
923717 Should Government Require Parental Leave

JOB ASSURANCE SCALES:

923718 Respondent
923719 George Bush
923720 Bill Clinton
923721 The Republican Party
923722 The Democratic Party
923723 The Federal Government
923724 Governmental Support of Social and Economic Position of Blacks

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS
(See also Variables 3811-3819)

923725 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Food Stamps
923726 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Welfare
923727 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on AIDS Research
923728 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Financial Aid For Students
923729 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Programs That Assist Blacks
923730 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Solving Problem of Homeless
Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Programs That Assist Blacks

VIEWS ON ABORTION

- Respondent's Position on Abortion
- Respondent's View of Bush's Position on Abortion
- Respondent's View of Clinton's Position on Abortion
- Would Respondent Favor/Oppose Parental Consent Law for Teenage Abortions
- How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Parental Consent Law for Abortions
- Would Respondent Favor/Oppose Government Funding for Abortions
- How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Government Funding for Abortions
- Spousal Notification Law for Married Women Seeking Abortion
- How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Spousal Notification Law

VIEWS ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- Respondent's View of Seriousness of Sexual Harassment in the Work Place
- Has Respondent or Anyone Respondent Knows Been Subject to Sexual Harassment in Workplace
- Status of Protection for Women From Sexual Harassment in Workplace
- Is Respondent More Inclined to Believe the Woman/Man in Sexual Harassment

CONGRESSIONAL ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

- Should Gov't Provide Child Care Assistance to Low/Mid Income Parents
- Dealing With Urban Unrest/Rioting Scale - R
- Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Term Limits For Congress
- Has Respondent Heard/Read About Problems in Savings and Loan Business
- Respondent's View of Who is to Blame for Problems of Savings and Loan Business
- Women's Rights Scale - R
- Does Respondent Favor/Oppose New Limits on Foreign Imports

RESPONDENTS PLANS FOR NOVEMBER ELECTION

- Does Respondent Expect to Vote in November
- Who Will Respondent Vote for in the Presidential Election
- How Strong is Respondent's Preference for Presidential Candidate
- If "No" in v 3804: Who Would Respondent Vote for in
the Presidential Election
923808 If "No" in v 3804: Strength of Respondent's Preference for President
923809 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent Volunteered Ross Perot in V 3807
923810 Was Perot Ever Respondent's First Choice for President

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS
(See also Variables 3725-3731)
923811 Increase/Decrease Spending on Social Security
923812 Increase/Decrease Spending on Science and Technology
923813 Increase/Decrease Spending on Child Care
923814 Increase/Decrease Spending on Dealing with Crime
923815 Increase/Decrease Spending on Improving and Protecting the Environment
923816 Increase/Decrease Spending on Government Assistance to the Unemployed
923817 Increase/Decrease Spending on Poor people
923818 Increase/Decrease Spending on Public schools
923819 Increase/Decrease Spending on Aid to Big Cities

R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND PRACTICE
923820 Is Religion an Important Part of Respondent's Life
923821 Amount of Guidance in Daily Living Provided by Respondent's Religion
923822 How Often Does Respondent Pray
923823 How Often Does Respondent Read the Bible
923824 Respondent's View of the Bible
923825 How Often Does Respondent Watch/Listen to Religious Programs
923826 Does Respondent Attend Religious Services Apart From Weddings/Baptisms/Funerals
923827 Does Respondent Consider Self Part of a Particular Church or Denomination
923828 How Often Does Respondent Attend Religious Services
923829 Does Respondent Attend Religious Services More Than Once a Week

Denomination/Affiliation
923830 Does Respondent Consider Self Protestant/Roman Catholic/Jewish
923831 Respondent's Church/Denomination
923832 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Baptist
923833 Is Respondent's Church Affiliated With Larger Baptist Group/Strictly Local
923834 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Lutheran
923835 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Methodist
923836 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Presbyterian
923837 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Reformed
923838 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
Brethren

Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Christian

Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Church/Churches of Christ

Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Church of God

Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Holiness/Pentecostal

Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation - Other

Is "Other" Group Mentioned in V 3844 Christian

If Jewish: Is Respondent Orthodox/Conservative/Reform

Description of Respondent's Kind of Christianity

Is Respondent a Born-Again Christian

Is Respondent Officially a Member of a Place of Worship

Does Respondent Participate in Religious Group Outside of Place of Worship

Respondent's Religious Affiliation - Summary

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Respondent’s Date of Birth - Month

Respondent’s Date of Birth - Year

Respondent's Recoded Age

Respondent's Marital Status

R'S EDUCATION

Years of Education Completed - R

Did Respondent Get High School Diploma/Pass Equivalency Test

Highest Degree Earned - R

Summary: R's Education

EDUCATION OF SPOUSE/PARTNER

INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent Married/Living with Partner

Years of Education Completed - Respondent's Spouse/Partner

Did Respondent's Spouse/Partner Get High School Diploma/Pass Equivalency Test

Highest Degree Earned - Respondent's Spouse/Partner

Summary: Spouse's Education

R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

Respondent's Working Status

Summary: Respondent's Working Status

If Unemployed: Has Respondent Ever Worked for Pay

If Retired: When Did Respondent Retire

If Disabled: Has Respondent Ever Worked for Pay

If Homemaker/Student: Is Respondent Doing Any Work for Pay at Present
923920 If Unemployed Homemaker/Student: Has Respondent Worked for Pay in Last 6 Months
923921 If Working/Temporarily Laid Off: Respondent's Occupation
923922 Collapsed 1980 Occupation Code
923923 Prestige Score
923924 Respondent's Industry/Business
923925 Is Respondent Self-Employed/Works for Someone Else
923926 Is Respondent Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
923927 Number of Hours Worked Per Week by R
923928 Is Respondent Satisfied with Number of Hours Worked
923929 How Worried is Respondent About Losing Job

**OCCUPATION - R WORKING OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF**

923930 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent is Working/Temporarily Laid Off
923931 Was Respondent Out of Work/Laid Off During Last 6 Months
923932 Has Respondent Had Pay Cut/Reduction in Work Hours in Past 6 Months
923933 Respondent's Last Occupation - Collapsed Census Occupation Code
923934 Collapsed 1980 Occupation Code
923935 Prestige Score
923936 Respondent's Last Occupation - Census Industry Code
923937 Was Respondent Self-Employed/Worked for Someone Else
923938 Was Respondent Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
923939 Has Respondent Had a Job in the Past 6 Months
923940 Number of Hours Per Week Respondent Worked

**OCCUPATION - R UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED**

923941 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Employment Status
923942 Is Respondent Doing Any Work for Pay at the Present Time
923943 Is Respondent Looking for Work at the Present Time
923944 How Worried is Respondent About Not Being Able to Find a Job

**R'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED**

923945 Respondent's Last Occupation - Census Occupation Code
923946 Respondent's Last Occupation - Collapsed 1980 Occupation Code
923947 Respondent's Last Occupation - Prestige Score
923948 Respondent's Last Occupation - Census Industry Code
923949 Was Respondent Self-Employed/Worked for Someone Else
923950 Was Respondent Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
923951 Number of Hours Respondent Worked in Average Week
923952 Is Respondent Looking for Work at the Present Time
923953 How Worried is Respondent About Not Being Able to Find a Job
923954 Respondent's Present/Last Occupation - Census Occupation Code
923955 Respondent's Current/Former Occupation - Collapsed Code
923956 Respondent's Current/Former/Occupation - Census Industry Code
923957 Was Respondent Self-Employed/Worked for Someone Else
923958 Is/Was Respondent Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
923959 Number of Hours Respondent Works/Worked on Job in Average Week
923960 How Worried is Respondent About Losing Job/Not Being able to Find a Job
923961 Has Respondent (If Unemployed/Disabled) Had a Job in the Last 6 Months
923962 Is Respondent (If Unemployed/Retired/Disabled) Looking for Work at Present Time
923963 Has Respondent (If Unemployed/Permanently Disabled) Ever Done Any Work For Pay

OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE/PARTNER

924001 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent's Marital Status
924002 Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Working Now
924003 Summary: Working Status of Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924004 Has Spouse/Partner (If Unemployed) Ever Worked for Pay
924005 When Did Respondent's Spouse/Partner Retire
924006 Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner (If Disabled) Ever Done Any Work for Pay
924007 Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner (If Homemaker/Student) Doing Any Work for Pay
924008 Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner Done Any Work in Last 6 Months for Pay
924009 Present Occupation of Respondent's Spouse/Partner - Census Occupation code
924010 Collapsed 1980 Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924011 Prestige Score - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924012 Census Industry Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924013 Respondent's Spouse/Partner was Self-Employed/Worked for Someone Else
924014 Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
924015 Number of Hours Worked by Respondent's Spouse/Partner in Average Week
924016 Does Respondent's Spouse/Partner Work More/Fewer Hours Than He/She Wants
924017 How Worried is Respondent's Spouse/Partner About Losing His/Her Job

OCCUPATION - SPOUSE/PARTNER WORKING NOW OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF

924018 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Employment Status of Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924019  Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner Been Out of Work/Laid Off in Last 6 Months
924020  Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner Had Reduction in Hours/Pay in Last Six Months
924021  Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924022  Collapsed Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924023  Prestige Score - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924024  Census Industry Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924025  Respondent's Spouse/Partner Worked for Someone Else/Was Self-Employed
924026  Was Respondent's Spouse/Partner Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
924027  Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner had a Job in the Last 6 Months
924028  Number of Works Worked By Respondent's Spouse/Partner in Average Week

OCCUPATION - SPOUSE/PARTNER UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED

924029  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Employment Status of Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924030  Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Doing Any Work for Pay as the Present Time
924031  Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Looking for Work at the Present Time
924032  How Worried is Respondent's Spouse/Partner About Losing His/Her Job
924033  Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924034  Collapsed Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924035  Prestige Score - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924036  Census Industry Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924037  Respondent's Spouse/Partner Worked for Someone Else/Was Unemployed
924038  Was Respondent's Spouse/Partner Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
924039  Number of Hours Worked by Respondent's Spouse/Partner in Average Week
924040  Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Looking for Work at the Present Time
924041  How Worried is Respondent's Spouse/Partner About Not Being Able to find a Job

SPOUSE/PARTNER'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

924042  Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924043  Collapsed Census Occupation Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924044  Census Industry Code - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
924045  Respondent's Spouse/Partner Works/Worked for Someone Else or Is/Was Unemployed
924046  Was Respondent's Spouse/Partner Employed by Federal/State/Local Government
924047 Number of Hours Worked by Respondent's Spouse/Partner in Average Week
924048 How Worried is Respondent's Spouse/Partner About Losing His/Her Job
924049 Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner Had a Job in the Past 6 Months
924050 Is Respondent's Spouse/Partner Looking For Work at the Present Time
924051 Has Respondent's Spouse/Partner Ever Done Any Work For Pay

UNION MEMBERSHIP
924101 Does Anyone in Respondent's Household Belong to a Labor Union
924102 Who in Respondent's Household Belongs to a Labor Union

HOUSEHOLD INCOME
924103 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent Only HH Member Age 14 or Older
924107 Respondent's Family Income Before Taxes
924105 Respondent's Income Before Taxes

Short Form Variables
924106 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent Only HH Member Age 14 or Older
924107 Respondent's Family Income Before Taxes
924108 Family Income Category
924109 Was Respondent's Income Before Taxes Above/Below $24,999
924110 Respondent's Income

R'S CLASS IDENTITY
924111 Does Respondent Think of Self as Belonging to a Social Class
924112 Does Respondent Think of Self as Middle Class or Working Class
924113 If Middle Class: Is Respondent Average/Upper Middle Class
924114 Summary: Respondent's Social Class
924115 Does Respondent Feel Closer to Middle/Working Class

R'S ETHNIC GROUP IDENTITY
924116 Respondent's Main Ethnic/Nationality Group (Other Than American) - 1st Mention
924117 Respondent's Main Ethnic/Nationality Group (Other Than American) - 2nd Mention
924118 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Number of Groups Mentioned
924119 Ethnic/National Group R Identifies Most Closely
924120 Both Parents Born in This Country

924121 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Hispanic Group Mentioned/Not Mentioned
924122 Is R of Spanish/Hispanic Origin/Descent
924123 Category Best Describing Hispanic Origin

R'S BACKGROUND

924124 Birthplace
924125 Where R Grew Up
924126 Occupation of Father - Collapsed Occupation Code
924127 Did Mother Have a Job
924128 Occupation of Mother - Collapsed Occupation Code
924129 Type of Community R Grew Up In
924130 How Long R Has Lived in Present City/Town/Township/County
924131 Where Lived Previously - City
924132 Where Lived Previously - State/Country
924133 Distance to Previous Residence

RESIDENCE AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

924134 How Long R Has Lived at Current Residence
924135 Does R/Family Own/Rent Home
924136 Does R Have Any Children
924137 Number of Children Under Age 6
924138 Number of Children Under Age 6 Living With R
924139 Number of Children Between 6-18 Years Old
924140 Number of Children Between Age 6-18 Living With R
924141 Responsible for Raising Any Other Children
924142 How Many Additional Children Live With R
924143 Ending Time of Interview

CONDITIONS OF PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW

924201 Sex
924202 Race
924203 Other Persons Present at Interview
924204 Cooperation
924205 Level of Information About Politics/Public Affairs
924206 Intelligence
924207 Level of Suspicion About the Study Before Interview
924208 Interest in the Interview
924209 Sincerity of Answers
924210 Did R Report Income Correctly
924211 Estimate of Family Income by Interviewer
924212 Interview in English/Translated into Another Language
924213 What Language Was Interview Translated Into
924214 Reaction to Interview - 1st Mention
924215 Reaction to Interview - 2nd Mention
924216 Reaction to Interview - 3rd Mention
924217 Reaction to Interview - 4th Mention
924218 Reaction to Interview - 5th Mention
924219 Reaction to Interview - 6th Mention
924220 Reaction to Interview - 7th Mention
PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW

924224  George Bush
924225  Bill Clinton
924226  Ross Perot
924227  Dan Quayle
924228  Albert Gore
924229  Anita Hill
924230  Tom Foley
924231  Barbara Bush
924232  Hillary Clinton
924233  Clarence Thomas
924234  Pat Buchanan
924235  Jesse Jackson
924236  The Democratic Party
924237  The Republican Party

POST-ELECTION SURVEY 1992 POST-ELECTION INFORMATION

925001  Case ID Number
925002  Sample-Form Indicator
925003  Mode of Interview - Telephone/Personal
925004  Beginning Time of Interview
925005  Date of Interview - Month
925006  Date of Interview - Day
925007  Interviewer's Interview Number
925008  Interview Length in Minutes
925009  Length of Pre-Edit
925010  Length of Post-Edit in Minutes
925011  Total Number of Calls
925012  Result Code

SAMPLING INFORMATION

925013  Short/Panel-Form Only: Reasons for Using Short-Form
925014  Is R Living at Sample Address
925015  Recontact: Was Name Obtained
925016  Recontact: Interviewer Checkpoint: Address Obtained
925017  Recontact: If Address Different From Sample Label
925018  Recontact: Was Phone Number Obtained
925019  Recontact: Is Phone Listed in Current Directory
925020  Recontact: Is Phone Listed in Name
925021  Recontact: Does R Have Another Residence
925022  Recontact: Name/Phone of Contact Person for R
925023  Refusal Conversion Indicator
925024  Persuasion Letter Requested
925025  R Payment Offered - Amount
925026  R Payment Paid - Amount
925027  Contact Description: Did R Refuse Initially
925028  Contact Description: Did R Break Any Appointments

R's Resistance to Interview

925029  Waste of Time
925030  Very Ill
925031  Too Busy
925032  Stressful Family Situation
925033  Confidentiality
925034  Invasion of Privacy
925035  Other Reason

Interviewer Information

925036  Interviewer's ID Number
925037  Supervisor's ID Number
925038  Interviewer's Race
925039  Interviewer's Ethnicity
925040  Interviewer's Age Bracketed
925041  Interviewer's Yrs of Experience - Up to Sept 1, 1992
925042  Interviewer's Gender
925043  Interviewer's Education

Geographic Variables

925101  ICPSR State/Congressional District - R Voting Outside Sample Address
925102  Interest in Political Campaigns
925103  Did R Watch Programs About Campaign on TV

925104  Number of Campaign Programs R Watched on TV
925105  Does R Ever Discuss Politics With Family/Friends
925106  How Often R Discusses Politics With Family/Friends
925107  Number of Days in Past Week That R Talked Politics With Family/Friends
925108  How Much R Cared About Outcome of U.S. House Elections
925109  Does R Remember Names of Candidates for U.S. House of Representatives

HOUSE CAMPAIGN

925110  Number of House Candidate - 1st Mention
925111  Party of House Candidate - 1st Mention
925112  Collapsed Code: House Candidate - 1st Mention
925113  Knowledge of Names/Parties: House Candidate - 1st Mention

925114  Number of House Candidate - 2nd Mention
925115  Party of House Candidate - 2nd Mention
925116  Collapsed Code: House Candidate - 2nd Mention
925117  Knowledge of Names/Parties: House Candidate - 2nd Mention

925118  Number of House Candidate - 3rd Mention
925119  Party of House Candidate - 3rd Mention
925120  Collapsed Code: House Candidate - 3rd Mention
925121  Knowledge of Names/Parties: House Candidate - 3rd Mention

SENATE CAMPAIGN

925201  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: U.S. Senate Race in State
Does R Remember Names of Candidates for U.S. Senate

Number of Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
Party of Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 1st Mention

Number of Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
Party of Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention

Number of Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
Party of Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention

California Senate Race

Does R Remember Names of Candidates in California Senate Race

Number of Senate Candidate: California - 1st Mention
Party of Senate Candidate: California - 1st Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate: California - 1st Mention, California
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 1st Mention

Number of Senate Candidate: California - 2nd Mention
Party of Senate Candidate: California - 2nd Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate: California - 2nd Mention, California
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 2nd Mention

Number of Senate Candidate: California - 3rd Mention
Party of Senate Candidate: California - 3rd Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate: California - 3rd Mention, California
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 3rd Mention

Number of Senate Candidate: California - 4th Mention
Party of Senate Candidate: California - 4th Mention
Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate: California - 4th Mention, California
Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 4th Mention

FEELING THERMOMETERS: POLITICAL FIGURES AND GROUPS

Feeling Thermometer - George Bush
Feeling Thermometer - Bill Clinton
Feeling Thermometer - Ross Perot
FEELING THERMOMETERS: GROUPS

925316 Feeling Thermometer - Labor Unions
925317 Feeling Thermometer - Feminists
925318 Feeling Thermometer - People On Welfare
925319 Feeling Thermometer - Conservatives
925320 Feeling Thermometer - Poor People
925321 Feeling Thermometer - Catholics
925322 Feeling Thermometer - Big Business
925323 Feeling Thermometer - Blacks
925324 Feeling Thermometer - The Women's Movement
925325 Feeling Thermometer - The Federal Government in Washington
925326 Feeling Thermometer - Liberals
925327 Feeling Thermometer - Hispanic-Americans
925328 Feeling Thermometer - The Military
925329 Feeling Thermometer - Environmentalists
925330 Feeling Thermometer - Lawyers
925331 Feeling Thermometer - Illegal Immigrants
925332 Feeling Thermometer - Southerners
925333 Feeling Thermometer - Whites
925334 Feeling Thermometer - Jews
925335 Feeling Thermometer - Gay Men and Lesbians
925336 Feeling Thermometer - Immigrants
925337 Feeling Thermometer - Congress
925338 Feeling Thermometer - Christian Fundamentalists
925339 Feeling Thermometer - Asian-Americans
925340 Feeling Thermometer - The Police

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES

925401 Whether R Liked Anything About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House
925402 What R Likes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 1st Mention
925403 What R Likes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 2nd Mention
925404 What R Likes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 3rd Mention
925405 What R Likes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 4th Mention
925406 What R Likes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 5th Mention

925407 Whether R Disliked Anything About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House
925408 What R Dislikes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 1st Mention
925409 What R Dislikes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 2nd Mention
925410 What R Dislikes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 3rd Mention
925411 What R Dislikes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 4th Mention
925412 What R Dislikes About Democratic Candidate for U.S. House - 5th Mention

925413 Whether R Liked Anything About Republican Candidate for U.S. House
925414 What R Likes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 1st Mention
925415 What R Likes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 2nd Mention
925416 What R Likes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 3rd Mention
925417 What R Likes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 4th Mention
925418 What R Likes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 5th Mention
925419 Whether R Disliked Republican Candidate for U.S. House
925420 What R Dislikes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 1st Mention
925421 What R Dislikes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 2nd Mention
925422 What R Dislikes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 3rd Mention
925423 What R Dislikes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 4th Mention
925424 What R Dislikes About Republican Candidate for U.S. House - 5th Mention

IMPORTANT ISSUES - HOUSE CAMPAIGN

925425 Most Important Issue - 1st Mention
925426 Most Important Issue - 2nd Mention
925427 Most Important Issue - 3rd Mention
925428 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Whether R Mentioned Issues

925429 Most Important Issue to R in U.S. House Campaign
925430 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Type of Race/Number of Candidates

925431 Did R Prefer One of the Candidates Because of This Issue
925432 Candidate R Preferred for U.S. House
925433 Party of U.S. House Candidate Named in V 5432
925434 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Type of Race/Number of
Candidates

925435 Whether Either U.S. House Candidate Was An Incumbent
925436 Candidate Number Code - U.S. House Incumbent
925437 Party of U.S. House Incumbent
925438 If Only 1 House Candidate: Was Candidate Incumbent
925439 If Only 1 House Candidate: Candidate Number Code
925440 Only 1 House Candidate: Party of Candidate

925501 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Democratic Candidate

PERSONAL CONTACT WITH DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES

925502 R Had Contact With Democratic House Candidate
925503 R Met Democratic House Candidate Personally
925504 R Attended Meeting Where Democratic House Candidate
Spoke
925505 R Talked With U.S. House Candidate's Staff/Office
925506 R Received Mail from Democratic House Candidate

925507 R Read About Democratic House Candidate in
Newspaper/Magazine
925508 R Heard Democratic House Candidate on Radio
925509 R Saw Democratic House Candidate on TV
925510 R Had Contact With Democratic House Candidate in Other
Ways
925511 Does R Know Anyone Who Had Contact With Democratic
House Candidate

PERSONAL CONTACT WITH REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

925512 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Republican Candidate

925513 R Had Contact With Republican House Candidate
925514 R Met Republican House Candidate Personally
925515 R Attended Meeting Where Republican House Candidate
Spoke
925516 R Talked to Republican House Candidate's Staff/Office
925517 R Received Mail From Republican House Candidate
925518 R Read About Republican House Candidate in
Newspaper/Magazine
925519 R Heard Republican House Candidate on Radio
925520 R Saw Republican House Candidate on TV
925521 R Had Contact With Republican House Candidate in Other
Ways
925522 Does R Know Anyone Who Has Had Contact With Republican
House Candidate

VOTING SECTION: VOTERS

925601 Did R Vote in Elections in November
925602 Was R Registered to Vote in November Election
925603 Is R Registered to Vote at Current Address
925604 County/State of Voter Registration
925605  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R Voted/Did Not Vote
925606  R Voted In Person/By Absentee Ballot
925607  Where Did R Go to Vote in the November Election
925608  Did R Vote for a Candidate for President
925609  Who Did R Vote for in the Presidential Election
925610  Strength of Preference for Presidential Candidate
925611  How Long Before Election Did R Decide How to Vote

PRESIDENTIAL VOTE

925612  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Presidential Vote

Voted for George Bush:
925613  Did R Ever Think of Voting for Clinton/Perot
925614  Which Candidate (Clinton/Perot) Did R Think of Voting for

Voted for Bill Clinton:
925615  Did R Ever Think of Voting for Bush/Perot
925616  Which Candidate (Bush/Perot) Did R Think of Voting for

Voted for Ross Perot:
925617  Did R Ever Think of Voting for Clinton/Bush
925618  Which Candidate (Clinton/Bush) Did R Think of Voting for

925619  Consideration of Other Candidates - Summary

925620  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: VOTING RESPONDENT; Registered In/Outside State of IW

925621  Did R Vote For U.S. House Candidate
925622  Who R Voted For in U.S. House Election
925623  Candidate Named - U.S. House of Representatives
925624  Strength of Preference for U.S. House Candidate

STATE SENATE RACES

925625  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Senate Race in State

925626  Did R Vote for U.S. Senate Candidate
925627  Who R Voted For in U.S. Senate Election
925628  Candidate Named - U.S. Senate
925629  U.S. Senate Candidate R Voted For

925630  Candidate Named - U.S. Senate, California
925631  2nd U.S. Senate Candidate R Voted For - California
925632  2nd Candidate Named - U.S. Senate, California

925633  Did R Prefer One Candidate for President
925634  Presidential Candidate R Preferred
925635  Strength of Preference for Presidential Candidate

925636  Did R Prefer One Candidate for U.S. House
925637  U.S. House Candidate Preferred by R
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925638</td>
<td>Candidate Named - U.S. House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPOUSE/PARTNER VOTED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925639</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Martial Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925640</td>
<td>Did Spouse/Partner Vote in November Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925701</td>
<td>Did R/Family Contact U.S. House Incumbent/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925702</td>
<td>Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Express Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925703</td>
<td>Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Seek Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925704</td>
<td>Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Seek Help On a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925705</td>
<td>Did R Get Response From House Incumbent/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925706</td>
<td>Level of Satisfaction With Response From House Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925707</td>
<td>Does R Know Anyone Else Who Contacted House Incumbent/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925708</td>
<td>Did Those Who Contacted House Incumbent Get a Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925709</td>
<td>Level of Satisfaction of Those Who Contacted House Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925710</td>
<td>Approval Rating of House Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925711</td>
<td>Strength of Approval Rating of House Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925712</td>
<td>Helpfulness of House With Another Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925713</td>
<td>Anything Special Done by House Incumbent for District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925714</td>
<td>Is House Incumbent Keeping in Touch with R's District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925715</td>
<td>Has R Heard/Read About U.S. Representatives Writing Bad Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925716</td>
<td>Opinion on Bad Checks Written by U.S. Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROBLEMS WITH THE HOUSE BANK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925717</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Candidate List Includes House Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925718</td>
<td>Did House Incumbent Write Any Bad Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925719</td>
<td>Did House Incumbent Write A Lot/A Few Bad Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925720</td>
<td>Does R Think That Reps Who Wrote Bad Checks Broke Any Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925721</td>
<td>How Often R Follows Government/Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925722</td>
<td>Most Important Problem - 1st Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925723</td>
<td>Most Important Problem - 2nd Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925724</td>
<td>Most Important Problem - 3rd Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925725</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Important Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925726</td>
<td>The Single Most Important Problem the Country Faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925727</td>
<td>How Good A Job Government is Doing With This Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925728</td>
<td>Political Party Most Likely to Get Gov't to Do Better Job on Problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R'S OPINION ON VARIOUS POLITICAL ISSUES  
(See also Variables 5922-5938)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925729</td>
<td>Opinion on Less/More Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925730</td>
<td>Government/Free Market Should Handle Economic Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925731</td>
<td>Reason Government Has Become Bigger Over the Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925732</td>
<td>Better When One Party Controls Both Presidency and Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925801</td>
<td>Political Party Contact R to Talk About Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925802</td>
<td>Which Party Contacted R to Talk About Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925803</td>
<td>Anyone Else Contact R About Supporting Specific Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925804</td>
<td>Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 1st Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925805</td>
<td>Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 2nd Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925806</td>
<td>Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 3rd Mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925807</td>
<td>Did R Try to Influence Someone Else's Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925808</td>
<td>Was R Contacted in Order to Influence His/Her Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925809</td>
<td>Did R Wear Button/Use Car Sticker/Place Sign in Window During Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925810</td>
<td>Did R Attend Political Meetings/Rallies to Support a Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925811</td>
<td>Was R Invited to Political Rallies/Meetings to Support a Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925812</td>
<td>Did R Do Any Other Work for One of the Parties/Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925813</td>
<td>Was R Asked to do Work for Candidate/Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R'S POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925814</td>
<td>Did R Use $1 Political Contribution Option on Federal Tax Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925815</td>
<td>Did R Give Money to a Candidate Running for Public Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925816</td>
<td>Party of Candidate to Whom R Made Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925817</td>
<td>Did R Give money to a Political Party During Election Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925818</td>
<td>Political Party to Which R Gave Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925819</td>
<td>Did R Give Money to Other Group That Supported/Opposed Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925820</td>
<td>Did Anyone Talk to R About Registering to Vote/Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925821</td>
<td>Did R Receive Requests Through Mail for Political Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925822</td>
<td>How Many Mail Requests for Political Contributions Did R Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925823</td>
<td>Did R Contribute Because of Mail Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925824</td>
<td>Did R Receive Telephone Requests for Political Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925825</td>
<td>How Many Telephone Requests for Political Contributions Did R Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925826</td>
<td>Did R Contribute Because of Telephone Calls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Was R Contacted in Person for Political Contributions
Did R Receive Quite a Few Personal Contacts for Contributions
Did R Contribute Because of Personal Contacts

PARTY DIFFERENCES

Does R See Important Differences Between Parties
Important Differences: Party Reference - 1st Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 1st Mention
Important Differences: Party Reference - 2nd Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 2nd Mention
Important Differences: Party Reference - 3rd Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 3rd Mention
Important Differences: Party Reference - 4th Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 4th Mention
Important Differences: Party Reference - 5th Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 5th Mention
Important Differences: Party Reference - 6th Mention
Party Difference Content Code - 6th Mention
Whether One Party is More Conservative at the National Level
Party R Thinks is More Conservative

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

Job/Political Office Held by Dan Quayle
Job/Political Office Held by William Rehnquist
Job/Political Office Held by Boris Yeltsin
Job/Political Office Held by Tom Foley
Who Has Final Responsibility to Decide Constitutionality of Law
Who Nominates Judges to the Federal Courts

OPINIONS ON VARIOUS SOCIAL/POLITICAL ISSUES
(See also Variables 5729-5732)

Is R Willing to Pay More Tax to Increase Gov't. Spending

Homosexuals

Does R Favor/Oppose Laws Against Job Discrimination of Homosexuals
Strength of Favor/Opposition to Homosexual Job Discrimination Laws
Should Homosexuals Be Allowed to Serve in U.S. Armed Forces
Strength of Opinion on Homosexuals Serving in U.S. Armed Forces
Should Homosexual Couples Be Legally Permitted to Adopt Children
Strength of Opinion on Homosexual Couples Adopting Children

Civil Rights
925929  Are Civil Rights Leaders Pushing Too Fast/Going Too Slowly/About Right
925930  Amount of Change in Position of Black People in Past Few Years

School Prayer
925931  Does R Favor One Side in Debate Re: Gov't. Integration of Schools
925932  Opinion on Gov't. Integration of Schools

Death Penalty
925933  Does R Favor/Oppose Death Penalty For Persons Convicted of Murder
925934  Strength of Favor/Opposition to Death Penalty for Murder

Affirmative Action
925935  Is R For/Against Preferential Hiring/Promotion of Blacks
925936  Strength of Opinion on Preferential Hiring/Promotion of Blacks
925937  Does R Take a Side Re: Gov't. Ensuring Fair Treatment
925938  Should Gov't. See to it That Blacks Get Fair Treatment
925939  INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Panel/Cross-Section R

Importance of Foreign Policy Goals:
925940  Securing Adequate Energy Supplies
925941  Preventing Spread of Nuclear Weapons
925942  Reducing Environmental Pollution
925943  Protecting Weaker Nations
925944  Bringing Democracy to Other Nations
925945  Opinion on Issue of School Prayer
925946  Strength of Opinion on School Prayer
925947  Is R For/Against Quotas to Admit Black Students
925948  Strength of Opinion on Quotas
925949  Approval Rating of U.S. Congress
925950  Strength of Approval/Disapproval of U.S. Congress
925951  Which Party Had Most Members in House Before Election
925952  Which Party Had Most Members in Senate Before Election

WOMEN'S ISSUES
926001  Attention R Pays to Women's Issues in the News
926002  Does R Think of Self as a Feminist
926003  Is R a Strong Feminist
926004  Best Way for Women to Improve Their Position
926005  Sense of Pride in the Accomplishments of Women
926006  Angry About the Way Women are Treated in Society
926007  Power and Influence of Women Compared to Men
926008  Power and Influence Women Ought to Have Compared to Men
Women's Power/Influence Compared to Men
Power/Influence of Men and Women in Most Families
Men or Women Should Have More Power/Influence in Most Families
How Strongly R Feels About Men's/Women's Power/Influence in Families

NATIONAL GOALS

Most Desirable Goal for a Nation
Second Choice for Most Desirable National Goal
Power of the Government in Washington
Gov't. is Getting Too Powerful/Not Getting Too Strong
Gov't. Should Become More Powerful/Stay the Way it is
Party Most Likely to Favor a Powerful Government in Washington

DESIRABLE QUALITIES FOR CHILDREN

Independence or Respect for Others
Obedience or Self-Reliance
Curiosity or Good Manners
Being Considerate or Well Behaved
Gov't. Funds to Support Public/Private/Parochial Schools

R AGREES/DISAGREES:

Society Should Ensure Equal Opportunity to Succeed
U.S. Better Off if Worried Less About Equality
Not Problem if Some Have More of a Chance in Life
Fewer Problems in U.S. if People Treated Equally
Big Problem in U.S. With Not Giving Equal Chances
Should not Vote if You Don't Care About Outcome
People Like R Have No Say About What Gov't. Does
Public Officials Don't Care What R Thinks
Politics/Government Too Complicated to Understand
Understands Important Political Issues Facing U.S.
Well-Qualified to Participate in Politics
Could Do as Good a Job in Public Office as Others
Better Informed About Politics/Gov't. Than Most

R'S DEFINITION OF LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE

What "Liberal" Means to R - 1st Mention
What "Liberal" Means to R - 2nd Mention
What "Liberal" Means to R - 3rd Mention
What "Conservative" Means to R - 1st Mention
What "Conservative" Means to R - 2nd Mention
What "Conservative" Means to R - 3rd Mention

R AGREES/DISAGREES:
926115 Adjust Morals to Changing World
926116 Tolerate Different Moral Standards
926117 Fewer Problems in U.S. if Emphasis on Family Ties
926118 New Lifestyles Contribute to Breakdown of Society
926119 Sex With Someone Other Than Spouse Always Wrong
926120 Much of the Time Gov't. Can Be Trusted to Do What is Right
926121 Does Government Waste Tax Money
926122 Gov't. Run by Big Interests or For Benefit of all People
926123 Many of the People Running the Government are Crooked
926124 Do Elections Make Gov't. Pay Attention to What People Think
926125 Amount of Attention Gov't. Pays to What People Think When Deciding

R AGREES/DISAGREES:

926126 Blacks Should Work Way Up Without Special Favors
926127 Blacks Have Gotten Less Than They Deserve
926128 If Blacks Tried Harder Could Be Well Off as Whites
926129 Difficult for Blacks to Work Out of Lower Class

PATRIOTISM

926130 How Does R Feel When He/She Sees the American Flag Flying
926131 How Strong is Love for Country

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS

926132 Are Social Security Benefits Too Low/About Right/Too High
926133 Are Social Security Benefits Much Too Low/High, Somewhat Too Low/High
926134 Does R Favor/Oppose Taxes on Social Security Benefits
926135 Strength of Favor/Opposition Re: Taxing Social Security Benefits
926136 Does R Favor/Oppose Expanding Medicare to Pay for Nursing Home Care
926137 Does R Favor/Oppose Expanding Medicare Strongly/Not so Strongly

VOLUNTEERISM AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

926138 Was R Able to Devote Any Time to Volunteer Work in Last 12 Months
926139 Would R Say Most People Can be Trusted or You Can't be Too Careful
926140 Would R Say People Are Helpful or That They Look Out For Themselves
926141 Does R Have Neighbors That He/She Knows and Talks to Regularly
926142 How Many Neighbors Does R Talk to Regularly
926143 Would R be Happy to Serve/Rather Not Serve on a Jury
926144 Has R Worked on Some Community Problem in Last 12
Months

926145 Was R Able to Contribute Money to Church/Charity in Last 12 Months

ECONOMIC PROJECTIONS

926146 Will R Be Better/Worse Off/Same Financially 1 Year From Now
926147 Will R Be Much/Somewhat Better/Worse Off Financially 1 Year From Now
926148 Does R Think National Economy Will Get Better/Worse/Stay Same
926149 Will National Economy Be Much/Somewhat Better/Worse
926150 Will What R Pays in Taxes Over Next Year Go Up/Down/Stay Same
926151 Will What R Pays in Taxes Go Up a Lot/a Little
926152 Does R Think There Will Be More/Less/Same Unemployment in 12 Months

GROUP IDENTIFICATION

926201 Group R Feels Close To - Poor People
926202 Group R Feels Close To - Asian Americans
926203 Group R Feels Close To - Liberals
926204 Group R Feels Close To - The Elderly
926205 Group R Feels Close To - Blacks
926206 Group R Feels Close To - Labor Unions
926207 Group R Feels Close To - Feminists
926208 Group R Feels Close To - Southerners
926209 Group R Feels Close To - Business People
926210 Group R Feels Close To - Young People
926211 Group R Feels Close To - Conservatives
926212 Group R Feels Close To - Hispanic-Americans
926213 Group R Feels Close To - Women
926214 Group R Feels Close To - Working-Class People
926215 Group R Feels Close To - Whites
926216 Group R Feels Close To - Middle-Class People

926217 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Mention of Group
926218 Single Group R Feels Closest to
926219 Organization/Activity Representing Interests of Group(1)
926220 Organization/Activity Representing Interests of Group(2)

Work Ethic Scales

926221 Work Ethic Scale - Whites
926222 Work Ethic Scale - Blacks
926223 Work Ethic Scale - Asian Americans
926224 Work Ethic Scale - Hispanic Americans

Intelligence Scales

926225 Intelligence Scale - Whites
926226 Intelligence Scale - Blacks
926227 Intelligence Scale - Asian Americans
926228 Intelligence Scale - Hispanic Americans
Disposition Scales

926229  Disposition Scale - Whites
926230  Disposition Scale - Blacks
926231  Disposition Scale - Asian Americans
926232  Disposition Scale - Hispanic Americans

English as Official Language of U.S.

926233  Does R Favor/Oppose Law Making English Official Language of U.S.
926234  How to Teach Children Who Don't Speak English When Entering School
926235  Foreign Immigrants Permitted to U.S. Increase/Decrease

Effect of Hispanics on U.S.:

926236  Improve Culture With New Ideas/Customs
926237  Higher Taxes Due to Demand for Services
926238  Jobs Taken Away From People Already Here
926239  Improve Culture With New Ideas/Customs
926240  Higher Taxes Due to Demand for Services
926241  Take Away Jobs From People Already Here

926242  Should Foreign Immigrants Be Immediately Eligible for Gov't. Services

PARTY IDENTIFICATION OF R'S PARENTS

926243  Was R's Father/Stepfather Democrat/Republican/Independent/Other
926244  Was R's Mother/Stepmother Democrat/Republican/Independent/Other

POST INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION VARIABLES

926245  Ending Time of Interview
926246  Sex
926247  Race
926248  Other Persons Present at Interview
926249  Cooperation
926250  General Level of Information About Politics/Public Affairs
926251  Was Interview Conducted Entirely in English
926252  Language in Which Interview Was Conducted Other Than English

PROBE INDICATORS:

926301  George Bush
926302  Bill Clinton
926303  Ross Perot
926304  NAME # 11, 13 or 15: Democratic Senate Candidate
926305  Name # 12, 14 or 16: Republican Senate Candidate
926306  Name # 11a: California Democratic Senate Candidate
926307  Name # 14a: California Republican Senate Candidate
926308  Name # 19, 29: Democratic/Republican Senator
ERRATA IN DATA - 1992 Congressional Districts
Late in 1994 it became apparent that in some cases of the 1992 NES Study an incorrect congressional district number had been assigned. These errors affect all questions related to House race which are administered according to assigned-CD candidate names. Below is a listing of affected 1992 (pre) case IDs with correct congressional districts, however no data have been changed in the 1992 data as a result. Data users can delete these cases from affected vars if desired. NES plans in 1995 to produce a technical report examining the 1992 incidence of CD misassignment and its possible effects on 1992 NES data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>ST/CD OLD</th>
<th>ST/CD CORRECT</th>
<th>TYPERACE CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3406</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0056</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0071</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404/3406</td>
<td>12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0124</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0137</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0167</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0180</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0188</td>
<td>4707</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0211</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0212</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0233</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0249</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0304</td>
<td>7144</td>
<td>7148</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0332</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0345</td>
<td>4707</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0355</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0376</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404/3406</td>
<td>12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0381</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0383</td>
<td>7144</td>
<td>7148</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0428</td>
<td>4707</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0441</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0442</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0452</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0508</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0524</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0587</td>
<td>4707</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0703</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0709</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0710</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0746</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>