

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

(ICPSR 6067)

Principal Investigators

Warren E. Miller, Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone,
and the National Election Studies

First ICPSR Edition
October 1993

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

□

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Miller, Warren E., Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1992: PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY [ENHANCED WITH 1990 AND 1991 DATA] [Computer file]. Conducted by University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies. ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies, and

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producers], 1993. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1993.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

□

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

- >> 1992 GENERAL INTRODUCTION
- >> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE 1990 POST-ELECTION SURVEY
- >> 1992 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION
- >> SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1990 NES ESTIMATES
- >> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE 1990-1991 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR
- >> ATTENDEES AT THE APRIL 1991 PLANNING MEETING FOR THE 1991 NES PANEL STUDY
- >> 1992 STUDY CHARACTERISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION
- >> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1992
- >> 1992 STUDY DESIGN, CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION
- >> 1992 Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers
- >> 1992 SURVEY FORMS: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION
- >> 1992 SAMPLE DESIGN OF THE 1992 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION STUDY
- >> WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1992 NES DATA
- >> COMPARING THE 1992 NES TO PREVIOUS NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES
- >> 1992 TECHNICAL REPORTS AND OTHER OCCASIONAL PAPERS
- >> NES 1989 PILOT STUDY REPORTS
- >> 1991 PILOT STUDY REPORTS
- >> 1992 FILE STRUCTURE
- >> 1992 CODEBOOK INFORMATION
- >> ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION, 1992
- >> 1992 NOTES
- >> 1990-1991 CROSS-REFERENCE LIST
- >> VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST 1990 POST-ELECTION SURVEY VARIABLES
- >> 1990-91 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR VARIABLES
- >> 1992 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION VARIABLES SAMPLING INFORMATION

CODEBOOK

1992 variables

APPENDICES

>> 1980 Census Definitions
 >> 1990 Census Definitions
 >> 1992 Party-Candidate Master Codes
 >> 1992 Campaign Issues Master Code
 >> 1992 Candidate Number Codes and Lists
 >> 1992 Important Problems Master Code
 >> 1992 Party Differences Master Code
 >> 1988/1992 Religious Preference Master Codes
 >> 1980 Census Occupation Code
 >> 1980 Census Industry Code
 >> ICPSR Occupation Recodes, 1992
 >> 1992 Nationality and Ethnicity Master Code
 >> 1992 ICPSR State and Country Codes
 >> Cities with Population Of 25,000 and Over, 1992
 >> 1991 Study Background Documents
 >> 1992 Gulf War Vote
 >> 1992 Gulf War Code
 >> Campaign Political Advertisements, 1992
 >> 1992 Liberal/Conservative Code
 >> 1992 Candidate Support Code
 >> Type of Race, 1992
 >> 1992 Sample Ballot Card
 >> 1992 State Primary Ballot Cards

□

>> 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,

University of Michigan; Mary Jackman, University of California at Davis, Gary C. Jacobson, University of California at San Diego; Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, Stanford University; 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 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

Response Rate:	71.4%
Length of Interview:	78.0 min
No. of Respondents:	2000

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

Nov. 07-Nov. 17	836	42%
Nov. 18-Dec. 01	594	72%

Dec. 02-Dec. 22	413	92%
Dec. 23-Jan. 05	106	97%
Jan. 06-Jan. 26	51	100%

SAMPLING INFORMATION[1]

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

REGION	SMSA STATUS		
	Self-representing SMSA's	Non self-representing SMSA's	Non-SMSA's
North-east	New York, NY-NJ Philadelphia,	Boston, MA* Pittsburgh, PA*	Schuyler, NY

	PA-NJ	Buffalo, NY New Haven, CT Atlantic City, NJ Manchester, NH	
North	Chicago, IL	St. Louis, MO*	Sanilac, MI
Central	Detroit, MI	Milwaukee, WI Dayton, OH Des Moines, IA Grand Rapids, MI Fort Wayne, IN Steubenville, OH	Phillips, KS Mower, MN
South		Houston, TX* Baltimore, MD* Birmingham, AL Columbus, GA-AL Miami, FL Lakeland, FL McAllen, TX Wheeling, WV Knoxville, TN Richmond, VA	Bulloch, GA Hale, TX Monroe, AR Bedford, TN Robeson, NC
West	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA	Seattle, WA Denver, WY Anaheim, CA Fresno, CA Eugene, OR	Eldorado- Albine, CA Carbon, WY

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 $f = .00003761$ or $.3761$ 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

	Original Specifications and Assumptions	Actual Outcome
Completed interviews	1,750	2,004
Response Rate	.68	.714
Eligible sample households	2,573	2,808
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate*	.87	.802
Final sample HU listings	3,256	3,503
Sample growth from update**	1.05	1.068
Sample listings from frame	3,100	3,280

* 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 ERRORS OF 1990 NES ESTIMATES

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 5: 1990 NES Post-Election Survey
Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations

Pair (Stratum)	(SECU) 1 of 2 Codes	(SECU) 2 of 2 Codes
1	103	104
2	105	106

3	99	100
4	101	102
5	95	96
6	97	98
7	93	94
8	91	92
9	89	90
10	83	84
11	81	82
12	77	78
13	75	76
14	73	74
15	2	6
16	7	8
17	14	16
18	17	18
19	19	21
20	24	28
21	63	65
22	30	33
23	37	43
24	40	48
25	42	45
26	50	51
27	52	36 + 55
28	57	64
29	60	61 + 63
30	67	68

□

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

Sample n	50%	40% or 60%	30% or 70%	20% or 80%	10% or 90%
----------	-----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	5.385	5.277	4.933	4.308	3.231
200	3.912	3.824	3.581	3.128	2.343
300	3.278	3.210	3.006	2.260	1.962
400	2.905	2.846	2.661	2.324	1.743
500	2.663	2.603	2.437	2.128	1.593
750	2.294	2.244	2.094	1.657	1.250
1000	2.078	2.039	1.907	1.657	1.250
1500	1.846	1.803	1.688	1.474	1.102
2000	1.722	1.691	1.568	1.368	1.030
2040	1.716	1.685	1.561	1.298	1.020

□

>> 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 Legee, 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 Leege, 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

□
>> 1992 STUDY DESIGN, CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

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.

See "Sample Design of the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Study", below, and the documentation for V3008, V3009, and V7000, for further information.

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

being held in reserve to be released for fieldwork October 1, 1992, if it was decided they were needed. Replicates 4 and 5 were released at that time.

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

Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face (A)	Full	1155	84.8%	951	76.1%
Phone (B)	Short	149	11.0%	186	14.9%
Phone	Full	57	4.2%	113	9.0%
	Subtotal	1361	100.0%	1250	100.0%

Cross Section Respondents

Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face (C)	Full	1053	93.6%	830	82.6%
Phone (D)	Short	5	.4%	4	.4%
Phone	Full	68	6.0%	171	17.0%
	Subtotal	1126	100.0%	1005	100.0%

Total Respondents

Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face	Full	2208	88.8%	1781	79.0%
Phone	Short	154	6.2%	190	8.4%
Phone	Full	125	5.0%	284	12.6%
	Total	2487	100.0%	2255	100.0%

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

DATES	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS	CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS	CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS
Nov. 4-Nov.10	237	237	10.5%
Nov.11-Nov.17	344	581	25.8
Nov.18-Nov.24	372	953	42.3
Nov.25-Dec. 1	245	1198	53.1

Dec. 2- Dec. 8	348	1546	68.6
Dec. 9-Dec.15	278	1824	80.9
Dec.16-Dec.22	175	1999	88.7
Dec.23-Dec.29	86	2085	92.5
Dec.30-Jan. 5	125	2210	98.0
Jan. 6-Jan.13	45	2255	100.0%

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.

□

>> 1992 SAMPLE DESIGN OF THE 1992 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION STUDY[7]

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.

REGION	Self-representing MSAs
Northeast	New York, NY-NJ Philadelphia, PA-NJ Boston, MA* Nassau-Suffolk, NY Pittsburgh, PA*
North Central	Chicago, IL Detroit, MI St. Louis, MO* Minneapolis, MN-WI
South	Washington, DC-MD-VA Dallas-Ft Worth, TX Houston, TX* Baltimore, MD* Atlanta, GA
West	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA
REGION	Nonsell-representing MSAs
Northeast	Buffalo, NY Newark, NJ

	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
	xliv
	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 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

1980	1980 National Sample	# of 1992 NES	# of 1992 NES
------	----------------------	---------------	---------------

N. Samp PSU#	PSU Name	Cross-section Sample Segs.	Panel Sample Segments
-----------------	----------	-------------------------------	--------------------------

Six Largest Self-representing PSUs

1	A	New York, NY-NJ	12	12
2	A	Los Angeles, CA	12	9
3	A	Chicago, IL	8	8
4	A	Philadelphia, PA-NJ	6	6
5	A	Detroit, MI	6	6
6	A	San Francisco, CA	6	5

Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs

7	B1	Washington, DC-MD-VA	6	0
8	B1	Dallas-Ft Worth, TX	6	0
9	A	Houston, TX	0	7
10	A	Boston, MA	0	6
11	B1	Nassau-Suffolk, NY	4	0
12	A	St Louis, MO-IL	0	6
13	A	Pittsburgh, PA	0	6
14	A	Baltimore, MD	0	6
15	B1	Minneapolis, MN-WI	4	0
16	B1	Atlanta, GA	4	0

Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast

17	A	Buffalo, NY	2	6
18	B1	Newark, NJ	6	0
21	A	New Haven, CT	2	6
23	A	Atlantic City, NJ	2	6
24	A	Manchester, NH	2	6

Nonself-representing MSAs: North Central

26	A	Milwaukee, WI	2	6
27	A	Dayton, OH	2	6
28	B1	Kansas City, MO-KS	6	0
29	A	Des Moines, IA	2	6
31	A	Grand Rapids, MI	2	6
32	A	Fort Wayne, IN	2	6
33	A	Steubenville, OH-WV	2	6
34	B1	Saginaw, MI	6	0

1980 N. Samp PSU#	1980 National Sample PSU Name	# of 1992 NES Cross-section Sample Segs.	# of 1992 NES Panel Sample Segments
-------------------------	----------------------------------	--	---

Nonself-representing MSAs: South

36	A	Birmingham, AL	2	6
39	A	Columbus, GA-AL	2	6
40	A	Miami, FL	2	6
42	B1	Jacksonville, FL	6	0
43	A	Lakeland, FL	2	6
44	A	McAllen, TX	2	6
45	B1	Waco, TX	6	0
47	A	Wheeling, WV-OH	2	6
49	A	Knoxville, TN	2	6
50	A	Richmond, VA	2	6

Nonself-representing MSAs: West

53	A	Seattle, WA	2	6
55	A	Denver, CO	2	6
56	A	Anaheim, CA	2	6
57	B1	Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	6	0
58	A	Fresno, CA	2	6
59	A	Eugene, OR	2	6
60	B1	Phoenix, AZ	6	0

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

63	A	Schuyler, NY	2	6
64	B1	Gardner, MA	6	0

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: North Central

65	A	Sanilac, MI	2	6
66	B1	Decatur, IN	6	0
68	A	Phillips, KS/ Saline, NE	**	6
70	A	Mower, MN	2	6

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: South

73	A	Bulloch, GA	2	6
74	B1	Sabine, LA	5	0
76	A	Hale, TX	2	6
77	A	Monroe, AR/ Ashley, AR	**	6
78	A	Bedford, TN	2	6

80	B1	Montgomery, VA	5	0
81	A	Robeson, NC	2	6

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: West

82	A	ElDorado-Alpine, CA	2	6
84	A	Carbon, WY	2	6

		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 $f = .00003988$ or .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]	

lii

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

	Original Specifications & Assumptions (Reps. 1 & 2)	Original S & A Applied to Actual Release (Reps. 1,2,4 & 5)
Completed Post/Interviews	1,000	1,103
Contact/Response Rate	.95	.95
Released for Recontact	1,052	1,161
Completed Pre/ Interviews	1,052	1,161
Response Rate	.72	.72
Eligible Sample Households	1,462	1,613
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[17]	.83	.83
Subsampling for dangerous/ locked areas	--	--
Sample HU listings	1,760	1,943
Sample growth from update[18]	--	1.03
Selected Sample lines	1,760	1,886
	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	
	1,900	
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

	Original Specifications & Assumptions (Reps 1 & 2)	Original S & A Applied to Actual Release (Reps 1,2,4 & 5)
--	--	---

Completed Post/ Interviews	1,057	1,158
Contact/Response Rate	.95	.95
Released for Recontact	1,112	1,219
Completed Pre/ Interviews	1,112	1,219
Response Rate	.75[20]	.75
Eligible Sample Households	1,483	1,626
Panel Recontact Rate	.913	.913
Sample HU listings Released	1,625	1,781
 Total Panel cases	 1,989	 1,989

Actual
Outcome

Completed Post/ Interviews	1,250
Contact/Response Rate	.92
Released for Recontact	1,361
Completed Pre/ Interviews	1,361
Response Rate	.78
Eligible Sample Households	1,752
Panel Recontact Rate	.979
Sample HU listings Released	1,789
 Total Panel cases	 1,989

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

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

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)

Pair (Stratum)	(SECU)	(SECU)
	1 of 2	2 of 2
	Codes	Codes
1	103	104
2	105	106
3	99	100
4	101	102
5	95	96
6	97	98
7	93	94
8	91	92
9	89	90
10	83	84
11	81	82
12	77	78
13	75	76
14	73	74
15	2	6
16	7	8
17	14	16
18	17	18
19	19	21
20	24	28
21	11	29
22	30	33
23	37	43
24	40	48
25	42	45
26	50	51
27	52	36 + 55
28	57	64
29	60	61 + 63
30	67	68

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.

Table 16: 1992 Pre/Post-Election Survey: Cross-Section Analysis[23] Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations (1992 Sampling Error Coded - Variable #3068)

Pair (SE Stratum)	(SECU)	
	1 of 2	2 of 2
1	1	2
2	1	2
3	1	2
4	1	2
5	1	2
6	1	2
7	1	2
8	1	2
9	1	2
10	1	2
11	1	2
12	1	2
13	1	2
14	1	2
15	1	2
16	1	2
17	1	2
18	1	2
19	1	2
20	1	2
21	1	2
22	1	2
23	1	2
24	1	2
25	1	2
26	1	2
27	1	2
28	1	2
29	1	2
30	1	2
31	1	2
32	1	2
33	1	2
34	1	2
35	1	2
36	1	2
37	1	2
38	1	2
39	1	2
40	1	2
41	1	2
42	1	2

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.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

For percentage estimates near.

Sample n	50%	40% or 60%	30% or 70%	20% or 80%	10% or 90%
----------	-----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	5.385	5.277	4.933	4.308	3.231
200	3.912	3.824	3.581	3.128	2.343
300	3.278	3.210	3.006	2.260	1.962
400	2.905	2.846	2.661	2.324	1.743
500	2.663	2.603	2.437	2.128	1.593
750	2.294	2.244	2.094	1.657	1.250
1000	2.078	2.039	1.907	1.657	1.250
1500	1.846	1.803	1.688	1.474	1.102

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."
3. Lake, Celinda. (September 1983) "Similarity and Representativeness of 1983 Pilot Samples."
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."
6. Lake, Celinda. (February 1984) "Coding of Independent/Independents and Apoliticals in the Party Identification Summary Code and Apoliticals in the Rolling Cross-Section."
7. Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (February 1984) "Creation of a Filter Variable to be Used When Analyzing Questions about Congressional Candidates in the 1982 Integrated Personal/ISR CATI/Berkeley CATI Dataset: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
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." .
11. NES Staff. (August 1984) "Weekly Field Report for the National Election Studies Continuous Monitoring, Jan. 11 - Aug. 3, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

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."
15. Traugott, Santa. (n.d.) "The Political Interest Variable on the 1984 Election Study." Unpublished Staff Memo to NES Planning Committee.
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"
19. Traugott, Santa. (February 1985) "Some Analysis of Hard-to-Reach Rolling Thunder Respondents."
20. Traugott, Santa. (April 1985) "Sample Weighting in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
21. Traugott, Santa. (April 1985). "Sample Weighting in NES Pre-Post Election Survey, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
22. Brehm, John. (June 1985) "Report on Coding of Economic Conditions Series in the 1984 Pre-Post Election Study"
23. Brehm, John. (July 1985). "Question Ordering Effects on Reported Vote Choice."
24. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in RXS."
25. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in Pre-Post"
26. Brehm, John. (August 1985). "Analysis of Result Code Disposition for Continuous Monitoring by Time in Field: Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
27. Morchio, Giovanna, Maria Sanchez and Santa Traugott. (November 1985). "Mode Differences: DK Responses in the 1984 Post-Election Survey: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
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."
30. Gronke, Paul. (September 1986) "NES Question C2: R's Party Registration."
 31. Brehm, John. (March 1987) "How Representative is the 1986 Post-Election Survey?"
 32. Morchio, Giovanna. (May 1987) "Trends in NES Response Rates."
 33. Brehm, John. (December 1987) "Who's Missing? an Analysis of NonResponse in the 1986 Election Study: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
 34. Traugott, Santa. (August 1989) "Validating Self-Reported Vote: 1964-1988."
 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."
 37. Downes-Le Guin, Theodore. (May 1990) "Nonresponse in the 1988 National Election Studies"
 38. Gronke, Paul. (May 1990) "Assessing the Sample Quality of the 1988 Senate Election Study: A response to Wright."
 39. Presser, Stanley, Michael W. Traugott and Santa Traugott. (November 1990). "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents?"
 40. Bloom, Joel. (March 1991) "Sources of Pro-incumbent Bias in NES Survey Estimates for U.S. House Races since 1978: A Second Look."
 41. Mayer, Russell. (November 1991) "Identifying Bias in Voting Models."
 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.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Thomas Nelson. Experimental Investigations of Opinion Frames and Survey Responses: A Report to the NES Board.
- 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.
- Leege, David, Ken Wald and Lyman Kellstedt. Religion and Politics. A Report on Measures of Religiosity in the 1989 NES Pilot Study.
- Markus, Gregory. Measuring Popular Individualism.
- Price, Vincent and John Zaller. Evaluation of Media Exposure Items in 1989.
Appendix 1: [Price & Zaller] Measuring individual differences...
Appendix 2: [Zaller & Price] In One Ear and Out the Other...
- Rosenstone, Steven J. and Gregory A. Diamond. Measuring Public Opinion on Political issues.
- Traugott, Michael. Memo to Pilot Study Committee, including as an Appendix: Understanding Campaign Effects on Candidate Recall and Recognition.
- Zaller, John. Experimental Tests of the Question Answering Model of the Mass Survey Response.

□

>> 1991 PILOT STUDY REPORTS

- Beebe, Tim. The Effects of Pre-Notification and Incentive on Panel Attrition. Undated.
- Brady, Henry E. Report on Feeling Thermometer for "Moderates." January 13, 1992.
- Citrin, Jack, Donald P. Green, Beth Reingold and David O.
- Conover, Pamela J., and Virginia Sapiro. Gender Consciousness and Gender Politics in the 1991 Pilot Study: A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers. January, 1992.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. An Analysis of Information Items on the 1990 and 1991 NES Surveys: A

Report to the Board of Overseers for the National Election Studies. January 14, 1992.

Highton, Benjamin, and Raymond E. Wolfinger. Estimating the Size of Minority Groups. January 13, 1992.

Huddy, Leonie. Analysis of Old-Age Policy Items in the 1991 Pilot Study. Undated.

Huddy, Leonie. Addendum. February 2, 1992.

Knack, Stephen. Social Connectedness and Voter Participation: Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study. January 1992.

Knack, Stephen. Social Altruism and Voter Turnout: Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study. January, 1992.

Knack, Stephen. Performance and Recommendations Summary for 1991 NES Pilot Variables #2828-2847. January 24, 1992.

Knack, Stephen. Deterring Voter Registration Through Juror Source Practices: Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study. January, 1992.

Oliver, Eric, and Raymond E. Wolfinger. Jury Duty as a Deterrent to Voter Registration. January 22, 1992.

Sears. A Report on Measures of American Identity and New "Ethnic" Issues in the 1991 NES Pilot Study. Undated.

Zaller, John. Report on 1991 Pilot Items on Environment. February 2, 1992.

□

>> 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.

```

.....
[1] VAR 0020   [2] FIPS SCSA CODE                               [3] MD=0
    REF 0020   [4] LOC    76 WIDTH  2
                                   [5]

[6] FIPS (CENSUS) 1980 STANDARD CONSOLIDATED STATISTICAL
    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

[1] Technical description of the 1990 National Election Study Sample Design prepared by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, February 1991.

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

[3] L. Kish, "A Procedure for Objective Respondent Selection Within the Household" JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION 44 (1949): 380-387.

[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.

[7] Text prepared by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, March, 1993.

[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.

[9] See Note 3.

[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.

[11] Based on field experience in 1986 NES study.

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

[13] Released to field October 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

1991 Var#	1990 Q #	QUESTION DESCRIPTION
		Approve/Disapprove of Bush on: Presidency; Economy; Foreign Relations
2112	B5	Approve or disapprove of Bush's presidency
2115	B5a/b	Summary Variable
2116	B6	Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of economy
2119	B6a/b	Summary Variable
2120	B7	Approve or disapprove of Bush's handling of foreign countries
2123	B7a/b	Summary Variable
		Thermometers and Probes
2203	B13b	Mario Cuomo
2205	B13a	George Bush
2211	B13f	Jesse Jackson
2212	B13d	Dan Quayle
2217	B13o/p	R's Congressperson
2218	B13g-n	R's Senator #1
2219	B13g-n	R's Senator #2
2220	B14f	Thermometer rating of Conservatives
2222	B14a	The Democratic Party
2226	B14m	Liberals
2228	B14b	The Republican Party
2232	B14e	Blacks

2239	B14h	Women's movement
2242	B14k*	People working to protect the environment * See wording change ('working' vs. 'seeking')
1991	1990	
Var#	Q #	QUESTION DESCRIPTION
		Approve/Disapprove of the Way Congress is handling its job
2300	B15	Approve or disapprove of way U.S. Congress is handling job
2303	B15a/b	Summary Variable
		Differences Between the Parties
2304	F14	Important differences in what Republicans and Democrats stand for 2305- Coded Differences from v2304 2316
		Approve/Disapprove of Representative and Senators
2317	H8	Approve or disapprove of the way Representative has been handling his/her job
2320	H8a/b	Summary Variable
		Party ID
2329	E7	R thinks of self as Republican, Democrat, Independent or other
2230	E7a	Strong Republican or not very strong Republican
2231	E7b	Strong Democrat or not very strong Democrat
2232	E7c	R closer to Republican Party or the Democratic Party
2333	E7x	Party ID Summary
		Most Important Problems Facing the Country
2334-	F2	What R thinks are most important problems facing this country
2337		
2238	F4	Single most important problem the country faces
1991	1990	
Var#	Q #	QUESTION DESCRIPTION
		Foreign Policy
2400	F17	Is Cold War between U.S. and Soviet Union coming to an end
2401	F18	U.S. to give economic assistance to countries in Eastern Europe somewhat, not very, never)
2408	F21	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

1991 1990
Var# Q # QUESTION DESCRIPTION

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

1991 1990
Var# Q # QUESTION DESCRIPTION

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

mention
 900094 What R dislikes about the Republican party - second
 mention
 900095 What R dislikes about the Republican party - third
 mention
 900096 What R dislikes about the Republican party - fourth
 mention
 900097 What R dislikes about the Republican party - fifth
 mention

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 -

candidate 1
 900126 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 2
 900127 From which party was the candidate - candidate 2
 900128 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 2
 900129 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 2
 900130 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 3
 900131 From which party was the candidate - candidate 3
 900132 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 3
 900133 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 3

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

- 900205 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate - first mention
- 900206 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate - second mention
- 900207 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate - third mention
- 900208 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate - fourth mention
- 900209 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate - fifth mention

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES HOUSE CANDIDATE: REPUBLICAN

- 900210 Is there anything R likes about Republican candidate for House of Representatives
- 900211 What R likes about House Republican candidate - first mention
- 900212 What R likes about House Republican candidate - second mention
- 900213 What R likes about House Republican candidate - third mention
- 900214 What R likes about House Republican candidate - fourth mention
- 900215 What R likes about House Republican candidate - fifth mention
- 900216 Is there anything R dislikes about Republican candidate for House of Representatives
- 900217 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - first mention
- 900218 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - second mention
- 900219 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - third mention
- 900220 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - fourth mention
- 900221 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - fifth mention
- 900222 Interviewer Checkpoint: Type of race - one or two candidates

IMPORTANT ISSUES: HOUSE CAMPAIGN

- 900223 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - first mention
- 900224 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - second mention
- 900225 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - third mention
- 900226 Interviewer Checkpoint: Has R mentioned issues
- 900227 Issue most important to R in campaign
- 900228 Did R prefer one of the candidates because of this issue
- 900229 Candidate R preferred
- 900230 Party of candidate named

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF HOUSE INCUMBENT

900231 Two House candidates running: was either candidate
already in House of Representatives
900232 Two House candidates running: which candidate was
already in House of Representatives
900233 Two House candidates running: party of candidate
already in House of Representatives
900234 One House candidate running: was candidate already
in House of Representatives
900235 One House candidate running: candidate number code
900236 One House candidate running: party of candidate

900237 Interviewer Checkpoint: Districts in which House
incumbent ran

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT

900238 Did R have any contact with incumbent
900239 Did R meet incumbent personally
900240 Did R attend meeting/gathering where incumbent spoke
900241 Did R talk with incumbent's staff/office
900242 Did R receive something in mail from incumbent
900243 Did R read about incumbent in newspaper/magazine
900244 Did R hear incumbent on radio
900245 Did R see incumbent on television
900246 R had contact with incumbent in other ways
900247 Does R know anyone who had contact with incumbent

900248 Interviewer Checkpoint: District in which House
incumbent had opposition

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE CHALLENGER

900249 Did R have any contact with candidate
900250 Did R meet candidate personally
900251 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
900252 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
900253 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
900254 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
900255 Did R hear candidate on radio
900256 Did R see candidate on television
900257 R had contact with candidate in other ways
900258 Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

R'S CONTACT WITH DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE, NO INCUMBENT

9000259 Did R have any contact with candidate
900260 Did R meet candidate personally
900261 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
900262 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
900263 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
900264 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
900265 Did R hear candidate on radio
900266 Did R see candidate on television
900267 R had contact with candidate in other ways
900268 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 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

900614 Summary: husband/partner's working status
 900615 Has husband/partner (unemployed) ever done any work for
 pay
 900616 When did husband/partner retire
 900617 Has husband/partner (disabled) ever done any work for
 pay
 900618 Is husband/partner (homemaker/student) doing any work
 for pay at the present time
 900619 Has husband/partner (homemaker/student) worked for pay
 in the last six months

Husband/Partner Working or Temporarily Laid Off

900620 Husband/partner's present occupation - census occupation
 code
 900621 Husband/partner's present occupation - collapsed
 census occupation code
 900622 Husband/partner's present occupation - census industry
 code
 900623 Is husband/partner self-employed
 900624 Is husband/partner employed by federal/state/local
 government
 900625 Number of hours per week husband/partner works
 900626 Is husband/partner satisfied with number of hours worked
 900627 How worried is husband/partner about job security

 900628 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner working now
 900629 Was husband/partner out of work within the last six
 months
 900630 Has husband/partner had to take a pay cut/reduce
 hours within the last six months

Husband/Partner Unemployed, Retired, or Disabled

900631 Husband/partner's last occupation - census occupation
 code
 900632 Husband/partner's last occupation - collapsed
 census occupation code
 900633 Husband/partner's last occupation - census industry code
 900634 Was husband/partner self-employed on last job
 900635 Was husband/partner employed by federal/state/local
 government on last job
 900636 Was husband/partner employed in the last six months
 900637 Number of hours per week husband/partner worked on last
 job

 900638 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner unemployed

 900639 Is husband/partner doing any work for pay at the present
 time
 900640 Is husband/partner looking for work at the present time
 900641 How worried is husband/partner about not being able to
 find a job

Husband/Partner Homemaker or Student

900642 Husband/partner's last regular occupation - census
 occupation code
 900643 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

□

>> 1990-91 PANEL STUDY OF THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WAR VARIABLES

912002 1991 Case ID
 912003 Time Zone
 912004 Daylight Savings Time Indicator

 912006 Form # of 1991 Questionnaire
 912007 Status of Case
 912008 Result Code
 912009 Incentive Offered

 912011 Total Calls Counter

 912018 Interview Length in Minutes

 912026 1990 Case ID Repeated
 912028 Alpha Date Last Called

 912030 Interview Time Start
 912031 Interview Time End
 912032 Interview Date Start
 912033 Interview Date End

 912050 Interviewer ID
 912051 Interviewer Birth Month
 912052 Interviewer Birth Year
 912053 Interviewer Sex
 912054 Interviewer Education Level
 912055 Interviewer Race
 912056 Interviewer Hire Month
 912057 Interviewer Hire Year
 912058 Interviewer Languages Spoken
 912059 Interviewer Ethnicity

 912068 Respondent Birth Month
 912069 Respondent Birth Day
 912070 Respondent Birth Year

 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

912241 Housewives
 912242 People working to protect the environment
 912243 People who oppose the use of nuclear power
 912244 The elderly

Feeling Thermometer Probes:

912245 Probe, Norman Schwartzkopf
 912246 Probe, Richard Cheney
 912247 Probe, Lloyd Bentsen
 912248 Probe, Mario Cuomo
 912249 Probe, Bill Clinton
 912250 Probe, George Bush
 912251 Probe, James Baker
 912252 Probe, Al Gore
 912253 Probe, Richard Gephardt
 912254 Probe, L. Douglas Wilder
 912255 Probe, Saddam Hussein
 912256 Probe, Jesse Jackson
 912257 Probe, Dan Quayle
 912258 Probe, Paul Tsongas
 912259 Probe, Jay Rockefeller
 912260 Probe, Bob Kerrey
 912261 Probe, Colin Powell
 912262 Probe, Respondent's Congressperson
 912263 Probe, Respondent's Senator #1
 912264 Probe, Respondent's Senator #2

Approve/Disapprove of the Way Congress is handling its job

912300 Approve or disapprove of way U.S. Congress is
 handling job
 912301 Approve strongly or not strongly
 912302 Disapprove strongly or not strongly
 912303 Summary Variable

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES

912304 Important differences in what Republicans and
 Democrats stand for
 912305 Republican and Democratic differences <1st mention>
 912306 Republican and Democratic differences <2nd mention>
 912307 Republican and Democratic differences <3rd mention>
 912308 Republican and Democratic differences <4th mention>
 912309 Republican and Democratic differences <5th mention>
 912310 Republican and Democratic differences <6th mention>
 912311 Republican and Democratic differences <7th mention>
 912312 Republican and Democratic differences <8th mention>
 912313 Republican and Democratic differences <9th mention>
 912314 Republican and Democratic differences <10th mention>
 912315 Republican and Democratic differences <11th mention>
 912316 Republican and Democratic differences <12th mention>

Approve/Disapprove of Representative and Senators

912317 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
 912230 Strong Republican or not very strong Republican
 912231 Strong Democrat or not very strong Democrat
 912232 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

912560 Oppose preference in hiring and promotion
 912561 Summary Variable

912562 Democratic party: preferential hiring and promotion
 of blacks
 912563 Republican party: preferential hiring and promotion
 of blacks

Respondent's Attention to Religious Programming

912580 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

923004 1992 Pre-Election Study Case ID
 923005 1992 Panel or Cross-Section Indicator
 923006 1990 Post Election Study Case ID
 923007 Panel Status For The 1991 Panel/Pilot
 Study
 923008 Full Sample Weight
 923009 Panel Only Weight
 923010 Pre-Post Indicator: 1992 Election Study
 923011 Pre-Election Form-Sample Indicator
 923012 Primary Area Code (3 digits)
 923013 PRIMARY AREA NAME
 923014 Census Region
 923015 State Abbreviation
 923016 ICPSR State and 1992 Congressional District
 923017 ICPSR State Code
 923018 FIPS State Code
 923019 1992 Congressional District Number (2 digits)
 923020 1990 Congressional District Number
 923021 Type of Race: House of Representatives
 923022 Type of Race: Senate

PRE-ELECTION INFORMATION

923023 Pre-Election Sample Releases and Replicates
 923024 Pre-Election Sample Release -- Summary
 923025 A0. Pre-Election: Beginning Time (local)--Exact Time
 Now
 923026 Pre-Election: Date of Interview: MONTH
 923027 Pre-Election: Date Interview: Day
 923028 Pre-Election: Interviewer's Interview Number
 923029 Pre-Election: Interview Length in Minutes
 923030 Pre-Election: Post-Edit Length, in Minutes
 923031 Pre-Election: Mode of Interview: Telephone or Personal
 923032 Pre-Election: Total Number of Calls to Obtain
 Interview
 923033 Pre-Election: Result Code
 923034 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

923081 Cross-Section: Number of Children 10-13 Years Old in
HH
923082 Cross-Section: Number of Children 14-17 Years Old in
HH

Interviewer Variables

923083 Interviewer's ID Number
923084 Supervisor ID Number
923085 Interviewer's Race
923086 Interviewer's Ethnicity
923087 Interviewer's Age Bracketed
923088 Interviewer's Years of Experience
923089 Interviewer's Gender
923090 Interviewer's Education
923101 Interest in the Campaign

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

923102 Prediction of Winner in Presidential Election
923103 Does R Think Presidential Race Will Be Close
923104 Which Presidential Candidate Does R Think Will Carry
State
923105 Does R Think the Presidential Race Will Be Close in
State
923106 Does R Care Which Party Wins the Presidential Election
923107 Did R Vote in 1988 Presidential Election
923108 Vote for President in 1988

BUSH AS CANDIDATE

923109 Is There Anything About Bush That Would Make R Vote
For Him
923110 Reasons Would Vote For Bush - First Mention
923111 Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Second Mention
923112 Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Third Mention
923113 Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Fourth Mention
923114 Reasons Would Vote For Bush - Fifth Mention
923115 Is There Anything About Bush That Would Make R Vote
Against Him
923116 Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - First Mention
923117 Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Second Mention
923118 Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Third Mention
923119 Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Fourth Mention
923120 Reasons Would Vote Against Bush - Fifth Mention
923121 Is There Anything About Clinton That Would Make R Vote
For Him

CLINTON AS CANDIDATE

923122 Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - First Mention
923123 Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Second Mention
923124 Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Third Mention
923125 Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Fourth Mention
923126 Reasons Would Vote For Clinton - Fifth Mention
923127 Is There Anything About Clinton That Would Make R Vote

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

923305 Feeling Thermometer - George Bush
 923306 Feeling Thermometer - Bill Clinton
 923307 Feeling Thermometer - Ross Perot
 923308 Feeling Thermometer - Dan Quayle
 923309 Feeling Thermometer - Albert Gore
 923310 Feeling Thermometer - Anita Hill
 923311 Feeling Thermometer - Tom Foley
 923312 Feeling Thermometer - Barbara Bush
 923313 Feeling Thermometer - Hillary Clinton
 923314 Feeling Thermometer - Clarence Thomas
 923315 Feeling Thermometer - Pat Buchanan
 923316 Feeling Thermometer - Jesse Jackson
 923317 Feeling Thermometer - Democratic Party
 923318 Feeling Thermometer - Republican Party

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

923319 Approves/Disapproves of Bush's Handling of His Job as President
 923320 How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of His Job
 923321 Approves/Disapproves of Bush's Handling of Foreign Relations
 923322 How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Foreign Relations
 923323 Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of the Economy
 923324 How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Economy
 923325 Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Persian Gulf Crisis
 923326 How Strongly Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Gulf

R'S OPINION ABOUT CANDIDATES AND PARTIES

Candidate Best Able to Handle...

923327 ...The Nation's Economy
 923328 ...Foreign Affairs
 923329 ...Poverty
 923330 ...Pollution and the Environment
 923331 ...Health Care
 923332 ...the Budget Deficit

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

923401 Whether R Likes Anything About the Democratic Party
 923402 Likes About the Democratic Party - First Mention
 923403 Likes About the Democratic Party - Second Mention
 923404 Likes About the Democratic Party - Third Mention
 923405 Likes About the Democratic Party - Fourth Mention
 923406 Likes About the Democratic Party - Fifth Mention

923407 Whether R Dislikes Anything About the Democratic Party
 923408 Dislikes About the Democratic Party - First Mention
 923409 Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Second Mention
 923410 Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Third Mention
 923411 Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Fourth Mention
 923412 Dislikes About the Democratic Party - Fifth Mention

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY

923413 Whether R Likes Anything About the Republican Party
 923414 Likes About the Republican Party - First Mention
 923415 Likes About the Republican Party - Second Mention
 923416 Likes About the Republican Party - Third Mention
 923417 Likes About the Republican Party - Fourth Mention
 923418 Likes About the Republican Party - Fifth Mention
 923419 Whether R Dislikes Anything About the Republican Party
 923420 Dislikes About the Republican Party - First Mention
 923421 Dislikes About the Republican Party - Second Mention
 923422 Dislikes About the Republican Party - Third Mention
 923423 Dislikes About the Republican Party - Fourth Mention
 923424 Dislikes About the Republican Party - Fifth Mention

R'S PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

923425 Better/Worse Off Financially Than a Year Ago
 923426 How Much Better/Worse Off Financially Than a Year Ago
 923427 Better/Worse Off Financially a Year From Now
 923428 Much or Somewhat Better/Worse Off a Year From Now
 923429 Income Stayed At/Above/Below the Cost of Living
 923430 Income Gone Up/Fallen Behind the Cost of Living
 923431 Federal Economic Policy Has Affected R Financially
 923432 How Much Federal Economic Policy Has Affected R Financially
 923433 Been Able to Buy/Had to Put Off Buying Things During Past Year
 923434 Put Off Medical/Dental Treatment Due to Lack of Money
 923435 Borrow Money to Make Ends Meet
 923436 Dip Into Savings to Make Ends Meet
 923437 Look for Job, Work 2nd Job/More Hours to Make Ends Meet
 923438 Able to Save Any Money Over the Past Year
 923439 Fallen Behind in Rent/House Payments This Past Year

R Has Received Payments

923440 Receive Payments From Social Security
 923441 Receive Payments From Food Stamps
 923442 Receive Payments From Medicare
 923443 Receive Payments From Medicaid
 923444 Receive Payments From Unemployment Compensation
 923445 Receive Payments From AFDC
 923446 Receive Payments From Veterans Benefits
 923447 Receive Payments From Government Retirement Pensions
 923448 Receive Payments From Disability Payments
 923449 Receive Payments From Workman's Compensation
 923450 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

923534 How Much Better/Worse is Economy in Past Few Months
 923535 Economy Has Gotten Better/Worse Compared to Four Years Ago
 923536 How much Better/Worse is Economy Compared to Four Years Ago
 923537 Economy Will Get Better/Worse in Next 12 Months
 923538 America's Ability to Compete in World Economy Gotten Better/Worse
 923539 How Much Better/Worse is America's Ability to Compete in World Economy
 923540 Standard of Living Will be Better/Worse 20 Years From Now
 923541 Federal Economic Policies Have Made Economy Better/Worse
 923542 How Much Better/Worse Have Federal Economic Policies Made Economy
 923543 Economic Conditions in State Have Gotten Better/Worse
 923544 How Much Better/Worse Are Economic Conditions in State

R'S OPINION ON POLITICAL PARTIES

Which Party Would Do a Better Job...

923545 ...Handling Economy
 923546 ...Handling Foreign Affairs
 923547 ...Solving Problem of Poverty
 923548 ...Making Health Care More Affordable
 923549 ...Cut Social Security Benefits

Taxes and the Deficit

923550 Which Party is More Likely to - Raise Taxes
 923551 Who is More to Blame for Federal Budget Deficit

R'S OPINION ON MILITARY ISSUES

923601 Unites States' World Position Has Grown Weaker/Stronger
 923602 Party Best Able to Keep United States Out of War
 923603 Should U.S. Maintain Military Power Through High Defense Spending
 923604 U.S. Should Not Concern Itself With Problems in Other Parts of World
 923605 How Willing Should U.S. be to Use Force to Solve Intl. Problems
 923606 How Worried is R About U.S. Getting into a Nuclear War
 923607 How Worried is R About U.S. Getting into Conventional War
 923608 Did U.S. Do the Right Thing in Sending Military Forces to Persian Gulf
 923609 Was One Party Was More in Favor of Military Force in Persian Gulf
 923610 Which Party Supported Use of Force in Persian Gulf More

Incumbent's Support of Persian Gulf War

923611 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Candidate Named

923612 Remembers How Incumbent Voted on Use of Force in Persian Gulf
 923613 Did Incumbent Vote For/Against Use of Force
 923614 Would R Have Gessed Incumbent Would Vote For/Against Use of Force

923615 Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handing of War in Persian Gulf
 923616 Approve/Disapprove of Bush's Handling of Gulf War

Effects of Persian Gulf War

923617 Did Anything Good Come Out of the Persian Gulf War for the U.S.
 923618 Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - First Mention
 923619 Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Second Mention
 923620 Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Third Mention
 923621 Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Fourth Mention
 923622 Good Effects of the Persian Gulf War - Fifth Mention
 923623 Did Anything Bad Come Out of the War for the U.S. Besides Losing Lives
 923624 Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - First Mention
 923625 Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Second Mention
 923626 Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Third Mention
 923627 Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Fourth Mention
 923628 Bad Effects of Persian Gulf War - Fifth Mention
 923629 Was the War Worth the Cost
 923630 Should the War Have Continued After Kuwait Was Liberated

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

923631 Party Identification
 923632 Strength of Party Identification
 923633 Is R Closer to Republican/Democratic Party
 923634 Summary: Party Identification

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: BUSH

923635 How Well Does "Intelligent" Describe Bush
 923636 How Well Does "Compassionate" Describe Bush
 923637 How Well Does "Moral" Describe Bush
 923638 How Well Does "Inspiring" Describe Bush
 923639 How Well Does "Provides Strong Leadership" Describe Bush
 923640 How Well Does "Really Cares About People Like You" Describe Bush
 923641 How Well Does "Knowledgeable" Describe Bush
 923642 How Well Does "Honest" Describe Bush
 923643 How Well Does "Gets Things Done" Describe Bush

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: CLINTON

923644 How Well Does "Intelligent" Describe Clinton
 923645 How Well Does "Compassionate" Describe Clinton
 923646 How Well Does "Moral" Describe Clinton
 923647 How Well Does "Inspiring" Describe Clinton
 923648 How Well Does "Provides Strong Leadership" Describe

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

923731 Increase/Decrease Federal Spending on Programs That Assist Blacks

VIEWS ON ABORTION

923732 Respondent's Position on Abortion
 923733 Respondent's View of Bush's Position on Abortion
 923734 Respondent's View of Clinton's Position on Abortion
 923735 Would Respondent Favor/Oppose Parental Consent Law for Teenage Abortions
 923736 How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Parental Consent Law for Abortions
 923737 Would Respondent Favor/Oppose Government Funding for Abortions
 923738 How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Government Funding for Abortions
 923739 Spousal Notification Law for Married Women Seeking Abortion
 923740 How Strongly Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Spousal Notification Law

VIEWS ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

923741 Respondent's View of Seriousness of Sexual Harassment in the Work Place
 923742 Has Respondent or Anyone Respondent Knows Been Subject to Sexual Harassment in Workplace
 923743 Status of Protection for Women From Sexual Harassment in Workplace
 923744 Is Respondent More Inclined to Believe the Woman/Man in Sexual Harassment

CONGRESSIONAL ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

923745 Should Gov't Provide Child Care Assistance to Low/Mid Income Parents
 923746 Dealing With Urban Unrest/Rioting Scale - R
 923747 Does Respondent Favor/Oppose Term Limits For Congress
 923748 Has Respondent Heard/Read About Problems in Savings and Loan Business
 923749 Respondent's View of Who is to Blame for Problems of Savings and Loan Business
 923801 Women's Rights Scale - R
 923802 Does Respondent Favor/Oppose New Limits on Foreign Imports
 923803 Respondent's View of Japanese Business Competition and U.S. Response

RESPONDENTS PLANS FOR NOVEMBER ELECTION

923804 Does Respondent Expect to Vote in November
 923805 Who Will Respondent Vote for in the Presidential Election
 923806 How Strong is Respondent's Preference for Presidential Candidate
 923807 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
 923839 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
 Christian
 923840 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
 Church/Churches of Christ
 923841 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
 Church of God
 923842 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
 Holiness/Pentecostal
 923843 Respondent's Specific Denominational Affiliation -
 Other
 923844 Is "Other" Group Mentioned in V 3844 Christian
 923845 If Jewish: Is Respondent Orthodox/Conservative/Reform
 923846 Description of Respondent's Kind of Christianity
 923847 Is Respondent a Born-Again Christian
 923848 Is Respondent Officially a Member of a Place of
 Worship
 923849 Does Respondent Participate in Religious Group
 Outside of Place of Worship
 923850 Respondent's Religious Affiliation - Summary

PERSONAL INFORMATION

923901 Respondent's Date of Birth - Month
 923902 Respondent's Date of Birth - Year
 923903 Respondent's Recoded Age
 923904 Respondent's Marital Status

R'S EDUCATION

923905 Years of Education Completed - R
 923906 Did Respondent Get High School Diploma/Pass
 Equivalency Test
 923907 Highest Degree Earned - R
 923908 Summary: R's Education

EDUCATION OF SPOUSE/PARTNER

923909 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Respondent Married/Living with
 Partner
 923910 Years of Education Completed - Respondent's
 Spouse/Partner
 923911 Did Respondent's Spouse/Partner Get High School
 Diploma/Pass Equivalency Test
 923912 Highest Degree Earned - Respondent's Spouse/Partner
 923913 Summary: Spouse's Education

R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

923914 Respondent's Working Status
 923915 Summary: Respondent's Working Status
 923916 If Unemployed: Has Respondent Ever Worked for Pay
 923917 If Retired: When Did Respondent Retire
 923918 If Disabled: Has Respondent Ever Worked for Pay
 923919 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
924104 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

924221 Reaction to Interview - 8th Mention
 924222 Reaction to Interview - 9th Mention
 924223 Reaction to Interview - 10th 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

925202 Does R Remember Names of Candidates for U.S. Senate

925203 Number of Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
 925204 Party of Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
 925205 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 1st Mention
 925206 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 1st
 Mention

925207 Number of Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
 925208 Party of Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
 925209 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention
 925210 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 2nd
 Mention

925211 Number of Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
 925212 Party of Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
 925213 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention
 925214 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate - 3rd
 Mention

California Senate Race

925215 Does R Remember Names of Candidates in California
 Senate Race

925216 Number of Senate Candidate: California - 1st Mention
 925217 Party of Senate Candidate: California - 1st Mention
 925218 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 1st Mention,
 California
 925219 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 1st
 Mention

925220 Number of Senate Candidate: California - 2nd Mention
 925221 Party of Senate Candidate: California - 2nd Mention
 925222 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 2nd Mention,
 California
 925223 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 2nd
 Mention

925224 Number of Senate Candidate: California - 3rd Mention
 925225 Party of Senate Candidate: California - 3rd Mention
 925226 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 3rd Mention,
 California
 925227 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 3rd
 Mention

925228 Number of Senate Candidate: California - 4th Mention
 925229 Party of Senate Candidate: California - 4th Mention
 925230 Collapsed Code: Senate Candidate - 4th Mention,
 California
 925231 Knowledge of Names/Parties: Senate Candidate, CA - 4th
 Mention

FEELING THERMOMETERS: POLITICAL FIGURES AND GROUPS

925301 Feeling Thermometer - George Bush
 925302 Feeling Thermometer - Bill Clinton
 925303 Feeling Thermometer - Ross Perot

925304 Feeling Thermometer - Democratic U.S. Senate Candidate
 925305 Feeling Thermometer - Republican U.S. Senate Candidate
 925306 Feeling Thermometer - Democratic U.S. Senate
 Candidate, California
 925307 Feeling Thermometer - Republican U.S. Senate
 Candidate, California
 925308 Feeling Thermometer - Dem/Rep Senator: Term not up in
 state with race
 925309 Feeling Thermometer - Senator #1
 925310 Feeling Thermometer - Senator #2
 925311 Feeling Thermometer - Democratic House Candidate
 925312 Feeling Thermometer - Republican House Candidate
 925313 Feeling Thermometer - Retiring Democratic
 Representative
 925314 Feeling Thermometer - Third Party/Independent House
 Candidate
 925315 Feeling Thermometer - James Stockdale

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

925638 Candidate Named - U.S. House

SPOUSE/PARTNER VOTED

925639 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Martial Status

925640 Did Spouse/Partner Vote in November Election

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

925701 Did R/Family Contact U.S. House Incumbent/Office

925702 Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Express
Opinion

925703 Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Seek
Information

925704 Reason for Contact With House Incumbent - Seek Help On
a Problem

925705 Did R Get Response From House Incumbent/Office

925706 Level of Satisfaction With Response From House
Incumbent

925707 Does R Know Anyone Else Who Contacted House
Incumbent/Office

925708 Did Those Who Contacted House Incumbent Get a Response

925709 Level of Satisfaction of Those Who Contacted House
Incumbent

925710 Approval Rating of House Incumbent

925711 Strength of Approval Rating of House Incumbent

925712 Helpfulness of House With Another Problem

925713 Anything Special Done by House Incumbent for District

925714 Is House Incumbent Keeping in Touch with R's District

925715 Has R Heard/Read About U.S. Representatives Writing
Bad Checks

925716 Opinion on Bad Checks Written by U.S. Representatives

PROBLEMS WITH THE HOUSE BANK

925717 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Candidate List Includes House
Incumbent

925718 Did House Incumbent Write Any Bad Checks

925719 Did House Incumbent Write A Lot/A Few Bad Checks

925720 Does R Think That Reps Who Wrote Bad Checks Broke Any
Laws

IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

925721 How Often R Follows Government/Public Affairs

925722 Most Important Problem - 1st Mention

925723 Most Important Problem - 2nd Mention

925724 Most Important Problem - 3rd Mention

925725 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: Important Problem

925726 The Single Most Important Problem the Country Faces

925727 How Good A Job Government is Doing With This Problem

925728 Political Party Most Likely to Get Gov't to Do Better
Job on Problem

R'S OPINION ON VARIOUS POLITICAL ISSUES
(See also Variables 5922-5938)

925729 Opinion on Less/More Government
 925730 Government/Free Market Should Handle Economic Problems
 925731 Reason Government Has Become Bigger Over the Years
 925732 Better When One Party Controls Both Presidency and Congress

PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

925801 Political Party Contact R to Talk About Campaign
 925802 Which Party Contacted R to Talk About Campaign
 925803 Anyone Else Contact R About Supporting Specific Candidates
 925804 Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 1st Mention
 925805 Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 2nd Mention
 925806 Which Candidate Was R Asked to Support - 3rd Mention

R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

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

R'S POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

925814 Did R Use \$ 1 Political Contribution Option on Federal Tax Return
 925815 Did R Give Money to a Candidate Running for Public Office
 925816 Party of Candidate to Whom R Made Contribution
 925817 Did R Give money to a Political Party During Election Year
 925818 Political Party to Which R Gave Money
 925819 Did R Give Money to Other Group That Supported/Opposed Candidates
 925820 Did Anyone Talk to R About Registering to Vote/Voting
 925821 Did R Receive Requests Through Mail for Political Contributions
 925822 How Many Mail Requests for Political Contributions Did R Receive
 925823 Did R Contribute Because of Mail Received
 925824 Did R Receive Telephone Requests for Political Contributions
 925825 How Many Telephone Requests for Political Contributions Did R Receive
 925826 Did R Contribute Because of Telephone Calls

925827 Was R Contacted in Person for Political Contributions
 925828 Did R Receive Quite a Few Personal Contacts for
 Contributions
 925829 Did R Contribute Because of Personal Contacts

PARTY DIFFERENCES

925901 Does R See Important Differences Between Parties
 925902 Important Differences: Party Reference - 1st Mention
 925903 Party Difference Content Code - 1st Mention
 925904 Important Differences: Party Reference - 2nd Mention
 925905 Party Difference Content Code - 2nd Mention
 925906 Important Differences: Party Reference - 3rd Mention
 925907 Party Difference Content Code - 3rd Mention
 925908 Important Differences: Party Reference - 4th Mention
 925909 Party Difference Content Code - 4th Mention
 925910 Important Differences: Party Reference - 5th Mention
 925911 Party Difference Content Code - 5th Mention
 925912 Important Differences: Party Reference - 6th Mention
 925913 Party Difference Content Code - 6th Mention
 925914 Whether One Party is More Conservative at the National
 Level
 925915 Party R Thinks is More Conservative

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

925916 Job/Political Office Held by Dan Quayle
 925917 Job/Political Office Held by William Rehnquist
 925918 Job/Political Office Held by Boris Yeltsin
 925919 Job/Political Office Held by Tom Foley
 925920 Who Has Final Responsibility to Decide
 Constitutionality of Law
 925921 Who Nominates Judges to the Federal Courts

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

925922 Is R Willing to Pay More Tax to Increase Gov't.
 Spending

Homosexuals

925923 Does R Favor/Oppose Laws Against Job Discrimination of
 Homosexuals
 925924 Strength of Favor/Opposition to Homosexual Job
 Discrimination Laws
 925925 Should Homosexuals Be Allowed to Serve in U.S. Armed
 Forces
 925926 Strength of Opinion on Homosexuals Serving in U.S.
 Armed Forces
 925927 Should Homosexual Couples Be Legally Permitted to
 Adopt Children
 925928 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

926009 Women's Power/Influence Compared to Men
 926010 Power/Influence of Men and Women in Most Families
 926011 Men or Women Should Have More Power/Influence in Most Families
 926012 How Strongly R Feels About Men's /Women's Power/Influence in Families

NATIONAL GOALS

926013 Most Desirable Goal for a Nation
 926014 Second Choice for Most Desirable National Goal
 926015 Power of the Government in Washington
 926016 Gov't. is Getting Too Powerful/Not Getting Too Strong
 926017 Gov't. Should Become More Powerful/Stay the Way it is
 926018 Party Most Likely to Favor a Powerful Government in Washington

DESIRABLE QUALITIES FOR CHILDREN

926019 Independence or Respect for Others
 926020 Obedience or Self-Reliance
 926021 Curiosity or Good Manners
 926022 Being Considerate or Well Behaved

 926023 Gov't. Funds to Support Public/Private/Parochial Schools

R AGREES/DISAGREES:

926024 Society Should Ensure Equal Opportunity to Succeed
 926025 Gone Too Far in Pushing Equal Rights in U.S.
 926026 U.S. Better Off if Worried Less About Equality
 926027 Not Problem if Some Have More of a Chance in Life
 926028 Fewer Problems in U.S. if People Treated Equally
 926029 Big Problem in U.S. With Not Giving Equal Chances
 926101 Should not Vote if You Don't Care About Outcome
 926102 People Like R Have No Say About What Gov't. Does
 926103 Public Officials Don't Care What R Thinks
 926104 Politics/Government Too Complicated to Understand
 926105 Understands Important Political Issues Facing U.S.
 926106 Well-Qualified to Participate in Politics
 926107 Could Do as Good a Job in Public Office as Others
 926108 Better Informed About Politics/Gov't. Than Most

R'S DEFINITION OF LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE

926109 What "Liberal" Means to R - 1st Mention
 926110 What "Liberal" Means to R - 2nd Mention
 926111 What "Liberal" Means to R - 3rd Mention

 926112 What "Conservative" Means to R - 1st Mention
 926113 What "Conservative" Means to R - 2nd Mention
 926114 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

926309 Name, Senator #1: Probe Indicator
 926310 Name, Senator #2: Probe Indicator
 926311 Name #31, 33 or 35: Democratic House Candidate
 926312 Name #32, 34 or 36: Republican House Candidate
 926313 Name #41, 42: Democratic/Republican Rep. Retiring
 926314 Name #30: 3rd Party/Independent House Candidate
 926315 James Stockdale

 927000 Time Series Weight Variable
 927001 Incumbent Candidate R's Representative in
 Last Congress

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.

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

0753	7144	7148	21
0757	7144	7148	21
0770	1205	1209	12
0781	4707	4708	12
0808	7144	7148	21
0828	2310	2312	12
0865	3405	3404	12
0866	1319	1317	12
0867	1319	1317	12
0879	3306	3305	12
0932	2310	2312	12
0938	7144	7148	21
0943	2103	2101	12
0945	4404	4406	21
0986	1205	1209	12
0992	1205	1209	12
1007	1319	1317	12
1013	1319	1317	12
1045	4707	4708	12
1058	7144	7148	21
1059	7144	7148	21
1065	1302	1301	12
1068	1302	1301	12
1085	7144	7148	21
1087	7144	7148	21
1092	7144	7148	21
1096	3306	3305	12
1119	7144	7148	21
1122	7144	7148	21
1123	7144	7148	21
1124	7144	7148	21
1125	7144	7148	21
2322	4707	4708	12
2358	4707	4708	12
2468	4707	4708	12
2496	4707	4708	12
2595	4707	4708	12