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**AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1996: PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEYS (ICPSR 6896)**

During the winter and early spring of 1997 the National Election Studies staff and ICPSR prepared a comprehensive version of the 1996 American National Election Study. The number of cases in this file, 1714, includes all...
respondents from the 1996 Pre- and Post-Election surveys. About three-fourths of these respondents or 1316 individuals also participated in the 1994 Post-Election survey (ICPSR 6507) or in both the 1992 American National Election Survey (ICPSR 6067) and the 1994 Post-Election survey.

Detailed variables from the Post on 'groups' which are of interest to a smaller number of users are not included in this dataset but are only available in the NES 1996 Auxiliary File: Group Membership mergeable dataset. Please note that UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES AND MARGINALS ONLY appear in the codebook.

>> STUDY DESCRIPTION FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1996

The 1996 American National Election Study was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of Steven J. Rosenstone, Donald R. Kinder and Warren E. Miller. M. Kathryn Cirksena was the Director of Studies for the National Election Studies and oversaw the study from early planning stages through release of the 1996 data collection. She was assisted by Santa Traugott, retiring Director of Studies, Michael J. Horvath, and Daniel Unger. This is the twenty-fourth in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the Center for Political Studies and the Survey Research Center, and it is the tenth traditional time-series study to be conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants (SBR-9317631, SES-9209410, SES-9009379, SES-8808361, SES-8341310, SES-8207580 and SOC77-08885) 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 1996 National Election Study included Larry Bartels (Princeton University), Gary Cox (University of California, San Diego), Charles Franklin (University of Wisconsin), Donald Kinder, ex officio (University of Michigan), David Leege, Chair (University of Notre Dame), Warren Miller, ex officio (Arizona State University), Wendy Rahn (University of Minnesota), as of September 1996, Steven Rosenstone, ex officio (University of Michigan), Virginia Sapiro (University of Wisconsin), W. Phillips Shively (University of Minnesota), Laura Stoker (University of California, Berkeley) and John Zaller (University of California, Los Angeles). 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. Board member Larry Bartels chaired the Planning Committee for the 1996 National Election Study which included from the Board: Donald Kinder (Michigan), Warren Miller (Arizona State), Steven Rosenstone (Michigan), Virginia Sapiro (Wisconsin), Laura Stoker (Berkeley), and John Zaller (UCLA) and four other scholars, R. Michael Alvarez (Cal Tech), Jonathan Krosnick (Ohio State), George Rabinowitz (North Carolina) and Wendy Rahn (Minnesota), as well as Kathryn Cirksena and Santa Traugott (NES staff).

A pilot study was carried out in September of 1995 for the purpose of developing new instrumentation for the 1996 Election Study. New items were tested in the areas of the environment and environmental politics, media exposure (including new media), issues, candidate evaluation, and new questions included as part of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. Data from the 1995 Pilot Study are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR 6636). Results from the Pilot Study (summarized in Appendix C "1995 Pilot Study Reports") were used by the Planning Committee in formulating recommendations to the Board about study content for the 1996 Pre- and Post-Election Survey. Copies of the Pilot Study
Reports are available on the NES Website (www.umich.edu/~nes), or may be obtained by contacting the NES project staff.

NES Project Staff
Center for Political Studies
Room 4026
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor MI  48106-1248
nes@umich.edu
http://www.umich.edu/~nes

>> 1996 STUDY DESIGN, CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

STUDY DESIGN

The 1996 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. About three-fourths of the 1996 cases consist of empaneled respondents who were first interviewed in the 1994 or 1992 National Election Study. A freshly drawn cross-section sample makes up the balance of the 1996 cases. (Details of the sample design are given in "Sample Design of the 1996 Pre/Post Election Studies", in Appendix B.) Altogether, 1714 citizens were interviewed in the 9 weeks prior to the November 5, 1996 election. To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign, the pre-election sample was divided into four subsample replicates, which were released approximately two weeks apart. 1316 of the pre-election interviews were conducted with panel respondents; 398 with cross-section respondents. In the weeks following the election, 1534 pre-election respondents were reinterviewed: 1197 panel, 337 cross-section. This post-election survey included a mode experiment in which respondents were randomly assigned to be interviewed either by telephone or face-to-face. 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 used together to create a combined nationally representative sample of the American electorate. The 1996 NES data set includes a weight which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors, (V3), for analysis of the 1996 NES combined sample (Panel component cases plus Cross-section supplement cases). A Time Series Weight (V5) which corrects for Panel attrition (but does not incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used in analyses 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 1996 Pre- and Post-Election Study" and the documentation for V3, and V5 for further information. The frequencies that appear in this codebook are unweighted. A set of files, data, weights, and data documentation, designed to enable panel analyses of the 1992-94-96 data become available sometime late in 1997; announcements concerning the release of data for panel analysis are found at the NES website, www.umich.edu/~nes. The present release has been prepared for cross-section and time series analyses.

STUDY CONTENT

Substantive themes

The content for the 1996 Election Study reflects its double duty, both as the traditional presidential election year time-series data collection and as a panel study. Substantive themes represented in the 1996 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 and evaluation of House candidates
* political participation: turnout 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
* positions on social welfare issues including: 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; women's roles; prayer in the schools; the rights of homosexuals and the death penalty
* racial and ethnic stereotypes; opinions on affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants
* opinions about the nation's most important problem
* values and predispositions: moral traditionalism; political efficacy;
egalitarianism; humanitarianism individualism; trust in government
* social altruism and social connectedness
* 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.

Several new themes are included in the 1996 study:

THE CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN: To better understand the dynamics of congressional campaigns, the pre-election wave contains a core battery of campaign-related congressional items (including candidate recall, thermometer ratings, ideological placements, and vote intention).

ISSUE IMPORTANCE AND UNCERTAINTY: Several issue questions include "uncertainty" and "importance" follow-ups for both respondent self-placements ("How certain are you of your position on this scale?" "How important is this issue to you?") and candidate placements (e.g. "How certain are you of Bob Dole's position on this scale?" "How important is this issue to Bob Dole?").

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS: An eight-minute module of questions developed by a consortium of electoral scholars from 52 polities is included in the post-election interview. Designed to facilitate comparative analysis of political attitudes and voting behavior, the same questions are being asked in similar form in national election studies around the world, and the resulting survey data will eventually be merged with contextual data on electoral laws and political institutions to produce a rich cross-national data set. This module is included as questions T1-T16 in the post-election survey.

ISSUE COVERAGE: New issue items in the areas of crime, the environment, gun control, and income inequality are included. A six-item battery carried forward from the 1995 Pilot Study taps respondents' reactions to proposed trade-offs among domestic spending, deficit reduction, and tax cuts.

THE ENVIRONMENT: New items from the 1995 Pilot Study tap perceptions of environmental conditions (air quality and the safety of drinking water in the nation and in the respondent's own community), environmental priorities (ranging from global warming to cleaning up lakes and parks),
self-placements and placements of candidates and parties on environmental issues (trading off environmental protection against jobs and living standards, and supporting or opposing government environmental regulations on businesses), and the relative effectiveness of national, state, and local governments in dealing with environmental problems.

SOCIAL CAPITAL: Several measures of social connectedness are repeated from the 1992 survey. Items tapping trust in people and trust in government are repeated in the pre- and post-election waves to facilitate analysis of the effect of the campaign and election on broader social attitudes. A battery of items on membership and activity in a wide variety of social, political, religious, and civic organizations is included in the post-election questionnaire. This battery includes several questions on as many as four groups in each of twenty-two categories of organizations. Because of the large number of variables produced from these questions, two means of accessing these data are provided; one set of variables which summarize the groups data is available without any unusual effort by the user. A full complement of variables of interest to the specialist in groups membership and participation is also readily available in a separate mergeable dataset called the NES 1996 Auxiliary File: Group Membership.

MEDIA EXPOSURE: New media exposure, reception, and attention items developed in the 1995 Pilot Study include talk radio items, more specific exposure items for network and local television news, and reception items asking respondents to match news anchors with the networks they work for. A battery of exposure items for entertainment television programs provides an indirect measure of exposure to campaign advertisements. There is also a new open-ended item on recollection of a memorable campaign ad, some expansion and reorganization of items tapping attention to the campaign in various media.

Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers

In the usual NES Post-Election survey, and for 1996, in the Pre-Election survey as well, respondents are asked several questions about their particular Congressperson and Senators. In previous years, 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). The use of Computer-Assisted Interviewing software means that information about respondents' congressional district and about candidates and incumbents names (including retiring incumbents) and parties is maintained and periodically updated in a computerized database; this information is loaded into the laptop computers used by interviewers and accessed to provide the correct CD and candidate information for displaying and entering responses to the relevant questions. Each candidate and Senator is assigned a unique number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. Particular questions in the survey, which include feeling thermometers for the various candidates, automatically appear on screen with the correct name filled in. The Candidate Lists stored in the database, which show which candidates are associated with which congressional district and with which numbers they are tagged, can also be found here, as can a sample ballot card. Candidates' names were identified by referring to the results of primary elections published in Congressional Quarterly. In 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. In these cases, the names of those candidates with the greatest chance of winning their party's nomination were loaded into the database. Forecasts of likely winners assumed that incumbents were likely to win their primaries and that unopposed non-incumbents would
win. Other races were forecast by Board member Charles Franklin, using a probit model of all 1996 contested primacies involving non-incumbents and utilizing FEC data from August 1, 1996. As soon as the outcome of the primary was known, the correct candidate information was entered into the database and the new version was loaded onto the appropriate interviewers' laptop computers. In nearly all races the forecasted winner was correct. Further details can be found at the documentation for Pre-Election questions B2a and B2b.

Features of a CAI questionnaire

Using the capabilities of computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) in the 1996 NES enabled the introduction of several features that would not be feasible using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. The most significant of these for users of this data are: randomization within batteries or sequences of questions; application of half-sampling to some questions; and random order of presentation of blocks of questions. Randomization within batteries refers to presenting, in a randomly determined order, a series of questions about the same objects (or people). An example would be the questions about the respondent's likes and dislikes of the three main Presidential candidates where the names of Clinton, Dole and Perot were inserted randomly as the first, second or third person to be asked about in this series. Randomization of names/objects in this way avoids ordering effects that might be obtained if, for example, the candidates were always asked about in the same order in every series of questions where a parallel question is asked about each of the three. Questions where randomization of order within a series was in force are clearly identified in the codebook. Randomization variables, which allow the user to identify the order of presentation, are provided for all instances of randomized presentation. A few questions, primarily open-ended questions, were half-sampled, so that a randomly selected half of respondents were asked the question. Finally, an order experiment, where a sequence of closed-ended questions was asked early in the interview for a random half of respondents and late in the interview for the other half, was included as part of the mode comparison experiment described below. For both of these features, the relevant codebook entries contain explanatory notes. All random selections were programmed into the computer application of the questionnaire and occurred automatically and independently of other circumstances of the interview. CAI eliminates the preparation of a paper and pencil version which would previously have been published in the codebook.

STUDY ADMINISTRATION

Interviewing for the pre-election survey began on September 3, 1996 and concluded on November 4, 1996. The average length of interview in the pre-election survey was 74 minutes. The overall response rate was 71%. (See "Response Rates" below for a complete discussion.) The post-election interviewing occurred between November 6 and December 31, 1996 inclusive, with an average interview length of 70 minutes. The overall reinterview rate was 90%, with further details available in the Response Rate section below.

Sample "Releases" in the Pre-election survey

Both parts of the sample (panel and cross-section) were randomly subdivided into four quarter sample releases, each of which is a proper, random subsample of the NES sample. Two additional 'reserve' replicates of cross-section cases were held in abeyance until it was determined that the
additional sample lines would be needed to attain study goals. Replicates 1 through 4 were considered the "base sample," certain to be released. The release dates for sample replicates were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replicate</th>
<th>Date of release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 3, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>September 12, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>September 26, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>October 10, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Reserve)</td>
<td>September 26, 1996 (with replicate 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Reserve)</td>
<td>October 10, 1996 (with replicate 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a full description of the sample design and implementation, see the 1996 NATIONA PRE/POST-ELECTION STUDY SAMPLE DESIGN.

Pre-election study: assignment to telephone mode

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 study staff are available to interview them. We estimated that between 40 and 80 respondents might have moved to areas in which SRC did not have interviewers in the field. Our priority was to interview as many panel respondents as possible, but we did not want to incur the additional costs associated with interviewer travel. Accordingly, panel respondents who had moved 'out-of-range' for a face-to-face interview were converted to phone mode. The criterion set for deciding if a case was 'out-of-range' was 90 minutes driving time one-way from the interviewer's home to the respondent's address under local usual driving conditions. The total number of panel respondents that we interviewed who were "out of range" for this reason was 47.

Post-Election Mode Experiment: Design and Implementation

In contrast with the usual NES practice of conducting all post-election interviews in person, half of the respondents in the post-election wave of the 1996 survey were interviewed by telephone, with post-election respondents randomly assigned (except in extreme circumstances) to phone or face-to-face administration. The telephone mode used the same computerized questionnaire developed for the face-to-face post-election interviews and was conducted by the same interviewers. The mode experiment provides a direct comparison of the effects of mode of interview on important indicators of data quality and comparability.

Cases were assigned to either telephone or face-to-face mode at the sample segment level. Every effort to retain randomly assigned cases in their assigned mode was made. Respondents who had been interviewed by telephone in the pre-election study were disqualified from random assignment to mode; all those reinterviews were done by telephone, a total of 47 cases. Respondents who did not have telephones and respondents who were not able to participate in the mode experiment because of a physical limitation that prevented them from being interviewed by one mode or another were also excluded, which totaled 130 additional cases (24 of these were completed by telephone). No changes in mode of interview because of respondent preference or for ease of administration were permitted.

All prospective respondents received two incentives in the mail: a check for $10 and a small gift. Included in the mailing to telephone mode respondents was a sealed respondent booklet with the candidate ballot folded inside. The contact letter instructed respondents to set these materials aside until told to open them by the interviewer. Interviewers followed procedures to ascertain that respondents were using the booklet and ballot
card appropriately and to note deviations from the instructions.

Evaluation of problems in study implementation

Two implementation problems arose in the post-election field administration. This resulted in two unintended systematic deviations from standard administration. 145 cases in the phone mode were mailed a respondent booklet that included the wrong ballot card. As soon as this problem was discovered, new respondent booklets with correct ballot cards were mailed by overnight mail to these respondents. Approximately 50 interviews were conducted where the respondent had the incorrect ballot card; in these cases interviewers read the correct ballot card information to the respondent. A full report to be issued will analyze these data to identify any systematic differences related to this implementation error. It was discovered early in the data collection period that 39 interviews were completed using the training version of the survey instrument, due to a technical problem in transmitting files to the field. The training version contained no randomized presentation of questions and lacked several last minute changes to the interview. Call-backs to 37 of these 39 respondents allowed us to collect data on the several missed questions. A report analyzing these cases for differential impact of the use of the training questionnaire is in preparation.

RESPONSE RATES

The response rate in the pre-election study was 71%. Among panel respondents the response (reinterview) rate was 76%; among cross-section respondents it was 60%.

The overall reinterview/response rate in the post-election interviewing was 90%. Among panel respondents in the post-election survey, the response rate was 91% and among cross-section respondents it was 85%. The response rate in face-to-face mode (including all cases in this mode, experimentally assigned and excluded) was 89% and for telephone mode it was 91%.

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE

Completion rates for the pre-election sample releases, for pre-election time periods, and for post-election time periods are presented here. Table 1 presents the percentage completions per quarter sample replicate (replicates 3 and 4 include the reserve cases added to those replicates); table 2 shows the percentage of completions per two week time period in the pre-election survey. Table 3 lays out the number of interviews taken for each week elapsing after the Nov. 5 General Election. In 1996, 29% of the interviews were completed in the first week after the election and 86% in the first three weeks; progress was evenly divided between face-to-face and telephone modes.

Table 1: % Completions by release (pre-election survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEASE</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Percent Completions by two week period (pre-election survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3-9/16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17-10/1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2-10/16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17-10/30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31-11/4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Number of and Cumulative Percent of Interviews Taken in the Post-Election Study by Week of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6-Nov.12</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.13-Nov.19</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.20-Nov.26</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.27-Dec. 3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.4- Dec. 10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.11-Dec.17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.18-Dec.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.25-Dec.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>> 1996 FILE STRUCTURE

The AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1996 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY are available in logical record length (LRECL) format. The data are sorted in ascending order by respondent number, and contain 1,657 variables for 1714 respondents.

The 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.

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.

NOTES ON 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.

>>1996 SPECIAL NOTE - CHANGES IN CODING BETWEEN PRE AND POST

Several questions which were asked in the Pre-election interview and then asked again in the Post-Election interview had some differences between the versions used.

Variables where pre and post codes (and some code labels) don't match on repeated questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>960369</td>
<td>1273 (code 4 label; Respon. booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960371</td>
<td>1275 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960370</td>
<td>1274 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960375</td>
<td>1277 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960376</td>
<td>1278 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960377</td>
<td>1279 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960378</td>
<td>1280 (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960566</td>
<td>1251 (code 7 in Pre; code 4 in Post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960569</td>
<td>1259 (codes 1,2 in Pre; codes 1,5 in Post)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For variables 960369-371, 960375-378 / 961273-1275, 961277-1280 (7-point liberal-conservative scale questions) the differences appeared onscreen to the interviewer but the labeled Respondent Booklet was accurate (complete code 4 label) and identical for both interviews.

>> NEW WEIGHTS FOR THE 1996 STUDY (RELEASED MARCH 1998)

The steps taken to address the 1996 NES overestimation of voting in the 1996 presidential election resulted in the development of post-stratified weights which account for individual selection probability, geographic related household nonresponse, and misrepresentation of any age by education.
These revised, CPS-standardized weights were computed for the 1992 NES Pre and Post (1992 fresh cross-section component), the 1994 NES Post and the 1996 NES Pre and Post Election data sets. Users of previous weights released with the 1994 and 1996 data will find that these weights extend and combine the features of previously released weights (the 1992 weight will be incorporated into the forthcoming 1992-1994-1996 Combined File).

V960005a and V960005b, the two new weight variables for 1996, are released for the first time with this version of the 1996 NES data. A review of the findings that led to the construction of these new weights and full details of their development and effect are described in Appendix G, "Post-Stratified Cross-sectional Analysis Weights for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES Data." The recommendation to explore developing these weights was made by Warren Miller and Merrill Shanks and authorized by the NES Board of Overseers at its September 1997 meeting. The SRC Sampling Section, under the direction of Steve Heeringa, completed the work and the technical report in consultation with the NES Director of Studies.

There are two weights, one to be applied to the pre-election sample (V960005a) and the other which is for use with the post-election sample (V960005b). The post-election sample weight takes into account attrition that occurred between the pre- and post-election surveys. In analyses using variables from the pre- and post-election data, the post-election weight should be applied. Use of either weight is appropriate only for the full sample, cross-section and panel cases combined.

>> 1996 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The format for the NES 1996 codebook differs from that of previous years due to changes in production mode; the codebook is no longer Osiris-generated. However, there are close similarities to the Osiris-generated codebooks of past studies. An example of a 1996 codebook (variable) record appears below with some explanatory material. The annotations refer to portions of the codebook record according to the numbers [1] - [10]

[1] This is the variable name according to the SAS and SPSS data definition files which accompany the raw data. Most of the names begin with 'V' followed
by a number.

[2] This describes whether the variable is character or numeric. If a numeric variable has decimal places, it appears below the variable type. If a numeric variable has no indication for decimal places, then there are 0 decimal places.

[3] Column locations (beginning and ending) in the raw ASCII data file are provided.

[4] Missing values, if they appear, identify the codes which are by default assigned to missing data in the SAS and SPSS data definition files which accompany the raw ASCII data. In the example above, the value 9 is considered missing data and is so assigned in the SAS and SPSS data definition files. If two missing data values appear, the second will appear preceded by "GE" to designate that codes equal to or greater than it are missing data.

[5] This is the question number. The survey questions have alphanumeric numbering (e.g. A1); the processing and administration variables have question numbers which are identified with the type of variable, for example, Iwr.1 is the first variable describing the interviewer.

[6] This is the question text for the administered question; it can also be, as in this example, a description of the processing or administration variable. All question text appears above the dashed line.

[7] Explanatory notes or other material provided by NES may appear below the dashed line, preceding the code values.

[8] These are the frequency counts for the code values. The frequency counts are unweighted in 1996.

[9] These are the code values representing response categories used for the question.

[10] These are the code labels for the numbered response categories (code values). "DK" is equivalent to "don't know," "NA" represents "not ascertained" and "INAP" indicates "inappropriate" (not applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Case ID</td>
<td>Primary 1996 case identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960002</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Panel/Cross indicator</td>
<td>Case identifier for Panel/Cross study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960003</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Full sample weight</td>
<td>Full sample weight for 1996 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960004</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Panel-only weight</td>
<td>Panel-only weight for 1996 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960005</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Time-series weight</td>
<td>Time-series weight for 1996 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960005a</td>
<td>Pre. New 1996 Time-series weight - Pre</td>
<td>Time-series weight for new data in Pre rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960005b</td>
<td>Pre. New 1996 Time-series weight - Post</td>
<td>Time-series weight for new data in Post rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960006</td>
<td>Pre. 1995 Case ID (panel)</td>
<td>Case identifier for 1995 study (panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960007</td>
<td>Pre. 1994 Case ID (panel)</td>
<td>Case identifier for 1994 study (panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960008</td>
<td>Pre. 1993 Case ID (panel)</td>
<td>Case identifier for 1993 study (panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960009</td>
<td>Pre. 1992 Case ID (panel)</td>
<td>Case identifier for 1992 study (panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960010</td>
<td>Pre. 1996 Pre Only or Pre-and-Post</td>
<td>Pre-only or Pre-and-Post identifiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
960013 Pre. Number of days between pre IW and election day
960014 Pre. Beginning time
960015 Pre. Ending time
960016 Pre. Interview length in minutes
960017 Pre. Interview number
960018 Pre. Date of beginning VQ file
960019 Pre. Date of ending VQ file
960020 Pre. Payment amount
960021 Pre. Was interview tape recorded
960022 Pre. Verification indicator
960023 Pre. Evaluation indicator
960024 Pre. Refusal conversion indicator
960025 Pre. Was persuasion letter sent
960026 Pre. Type of persuasion letter
960027 Pre. Number of telephone calls
960028 Pre. Number of face to face calls
960029 Pre. Total number of calls (Phone + FtF)
960030 Pre. Final result code
960031 Pre. Beginning interview mode
960031A Pre. Mode summary - pre and post
960032 Pre. Ending interview mode
960033 Pre. Sample release
960034 Pre. Sample release summary
960035 Pre. Question 'form' summary
960036 Pre. (Panel only) Does R still live at address on sample label
960037 Pre. (Panel only) New address is:
960038 Pre. Panel - correct name, birth date and gender on coversheet
960039 Pre. Panel - coversheet name marked different
960040 Pre. Panel coversheet - gender marked different
960041 Pre. Panel coversheet - birth data marked different
960042 Pre. Cross - Household listing obtained from
960043 Pre. Cross - Selection table
960044 Pre. Cross - Person number selected as R
960045 Pre. Cross - Total number of persons in HH
960046 Pre. Cross - Total number of eligible adults in HU
960046A Pre. Panel and Cross - Total number of eligible adults in HU
960047 Pre. Cross - Household composition code
960048 Pre. Cross - Number of children under 6 years old in household
960049 Pre. Cross - Number of children 6-9 years old in household
960050 Pre. Cross - Number of children 10-13 years old in household
960051 Pre. Cross - Number of children 14-17 years old in household
960052 Pre. Type of structure in which the respondent lives
960053 Pre. Is there a bldng manager, security grd, other gatekeeper
960054 Pre. Type of bldng manager, security grd, or other gatekeeper
960055 Pre. Did R refuse initially
960056 Pre. Did R break any appointment
960057 Pre. Was there resistance from R
960058 Pre. R Resistance: Waste of time; previous bad experience
960059 Pre. R Resistance: Very ill
960060 Pre. R Resistance: Too busy
960061 Pre. R Resistance: Stressful family situation
960062 Pre. R Resistance: Confidentiality
960063 Pre. R Resistance: Invasion of privacy
960064 Pre. R Resistance: No reason given
960065 Pre. R Resistance: Other
960066 Pre. R's gender
960067 Pre. R race
960068 Pre. Others present during IW
960069 Pre. R's cooperation
960070 Pre. R's general level of info about politics, public affairs
Pre. R's apparent intelligence
Pre. How suspicious did R seem to be about the study
Pre. R's interest in the interview
Pre. R's sincerity
Pre. Did R reported income correctly
Pre. Estimate of what R's actual family income is
Pre. R's reaction to interview 1
Pre. R's reaction to interview 2
Pre. R's reaction to interview 3
Pre. R's reaction to interview 4
Pre. R's reaction to interview 5
Pre. R's reaction to interview 6
Pre. R's reaction to interview 7
Pre. R's reaction to interview 8
Pre. R's reaction to interview 9
Pre. R's reaction to interview 10
Pre. R's reaction to interview 11
Pre. Interviewer of record ID
Pre. Supervisor ID
Pre. Interviewer gender
Pre. Interviewer education
Pre. Interviewer race
Pre. Interviewer ethnicity
Pre. Interviewer languages
Pre. Interviewer experience
Pre. Interviewer age (bracketed)
Pre. House race type
Pre. Senate race type
Pre. Democratic House candidate code
Pre. Republican House candidate code
Pre. Retiring House Representative code
Pre. Democratic Senate candidate code
Pre. Republican Senate candidate code
Pre. Retiring Senator code
Pre. State abbreviation and congressional district
Pre. State and CD of Rs who voted out of CD of Interview
Pre. State code and congressional district
Pre. State and Congressional District 1994 (Panel)
Pre. State and Congressional District 1992 (Panel)
Pre. State and Congressional District 1993 (Panel)
Pre. Congressional district number
Pre. FIPS state code
Pre. ICPSR state code of Interview Location
Pre. FIPS state and county
Pre. Primary area name
Pre. Primary area code
Pre. Segment Number
Pre. Number of household units
Pre. 1996 Census region of Interview Location
Pre. Census Region in 1994 (Panel Respondents)
Pre. Census Region in 1992 (Panel Respondents)
Pre. Belt Code
Pre. Population in 1000s
Pre. Size of Place
Pre. 1980 Census tract/ed indicator
Pre. 1996 Sampling Error Code
Pre. 1994 Sampling error code
Pre. 1992 Sampling error code
Pre. 1980 SMSA
Pre. 1990 SMSA/NECMA
960125 Pre. 1990 CMSA
960126 Pre. 1990 Census Tract 1
960126A Pre. 1990 Census Tract 2
960127 Pre. Flag - changed congressional race status
960128 Pre. Race type at time of interview
960129 Pre. CD error flag - Pre
960129A Pre. CD error flag - Post
960130 Pre. Was R's Congressional District redistricted in 1996
960131 Pre. (Panel only) Move status 1994-1996
960131A Pre. Move status 1996 Pre-1996 Post
960201 Pre. How interested has R been in campaigns this year
960202 Pre. How much does R care who wins the presidential election
960203 Pre. Did R vote for President in the 1992 election
960204 Pre. For whom did R vote in the 1992 presidential race
960205 Pre. Anything that would make R vote for Clinton ("likes")
960206 Pre. What would make R vote for Clinton ("likes") #1
960207 Pre. What would make R vote for Clinton ("likes") #2
960208 Pre. What would make R vote for Clinton ("likes") #3
960209 Pre. What would make R vote for Clinton ("likes") #4
960210 Pre. What would make R vote for Clinton ("likes") #5
960211 Pre. Anything that would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes")
960212 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes") #1
960213 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes") #2
960214 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes") #3
960215 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes") #4
960216 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Clinton ("dislikes") #5
960217 Pre. Anything that would make R vote for Dole ("likes")
960218 Pre. What would make R vote for Dole ("likes") #1
960219 Pre. What would make R vote for Dole ("likes") #2
960220 Pre. What would make R vote for Dole ("likes") #3
960221 Pre. What would make R vote for Dole ("likes") #4
960222 Pre. What would make R vote for Dole ("likes") #5
960223 Pre. Anything that would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes")
960224 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes") #1
960225 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes") #2
960226 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes") #3
960227 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes") #4
960228 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Dole ("dislikes") #5
960229 Pre. Anything that would make R vote for Perot ("likes")
960230 Pre. What would make R vote for Perot ("likes") #1
960231 Pre. What would make R vote for Perot ("likes") #2
960232 Pre. What would make R vote for Perot ("likes") #3
960233 Pre. What would make R vote for Perot ("likes") #4
960234 Pre. What would make R vote for Perot ("likes") #5
960235 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes")
960236 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes") #1
960237 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes") #2
960238 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes") #3
960239 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes") #4
960240 Pre. What would make R vote agnst Perot ("dislikes") #5
960241 Pre. Does R have cable or satellite TV
960242 Pre. How many days in past week R watched nat'l news on TV
960243 Pre. Attention R paid to TV nat news shows about pres campaign
960244 Pre. How many days in past week R watched the local news on TV
960245 Pre. Attention R paid to local TV news shows about pres campaign
960246 Pre. How many days in past week R read the newspaper
960247 Pre. Did R read about presidential campaign in the newspaper
960248 Pre. Attention R paid to presidential campaign in the newspaper
960249 Pre. Does R recall seeing any ads for political cand on TV
960250 Pre. R recall of cand who sponsored political ad remembers best
Pre. Content of political ad R remembers best -- #1
Pre. Content of political ad R remembers best -- #2
Pre. Content of political ad R remembers best -- #3
Pre. Content of political ad R remembers best -- #4
Pre. Content of political ad R remembers best -- #5
Pre. Does R care about result of House election
Pre. Does R remember names of House candidates in R's district
Pre. R's recall of name of House candidate (first mention)
Pre. R's recall of party of House candidate (first mention)
Pre. Actual party of House candidate recalled by R (#1 mention)
Pre. Accuracy of R's recall of House candidate (#1 mention)
Pre. R's recall of name of House candidate (#2 mention)
Pre. R's recall of party of House candidate (#2 mention)
Pre. Actual party of House candidate recalled by R (#2 mention)
Pre. Accuracy of R's recall of House candidate (#2 mention)
Pre. R's recall of name of House candidate (#3 mention)
Pre. R's recall of party of House candidate (#3 mention)
Pre. Actual party of House candidate recalled by R (#3 mention)
Pre. Accuracy of R's recall of House candidate (#3 mention)
Pre. Does R approve or disapprove of Congress
Pre. Does R strongly approve or disapprove of Congress
Pre. Clinton feeling thermometer
Pre. Dole feeling thermometer
Pre. Gore feeling thermometer
Pre. Kemp feeling thermometer
Pre. Choate feeling thermometer
Pre. Campbell feeling thermometer
Pre. Democratic House candidate feeling thermometer
Pre. Republican House candidate feeling thermometer
Pre. Retiring House incumbent feeling thermometer
Pre. Hillary Clinton feeling thermometer
Pre. Pat Buchanan feeling thermometer
Pre. Jesse Jackson feeling thermometer
Pre. Newt Gingrich feeling thermometer
Pre. Colin Powell feeling thermometer
Pre. Steve Forbes feeling thermometer
Pre. Phil Gramm feeling thermometer
Pre. Louis Farrakhan feeling thermometer
Pre. Lamar Alexander feeling thermometer
Pre. Elizabeth Dole feeling thermometer
Pre. Pat Robertson feeling thermometer
Pre. Democratic Party feeling thermometer
Pre. Republican Party feeling thermometer
Pre. Political parties feeling thermometer
Pre. Does R approve or disapprove of Clinton
Pre. Does R strongly approve or disapprove of Clinton
Pre. Does R approve or disapprove of Clinton's handling of the econ
Pre. Does R strongly approve or disapprove of Clinton's handling of the econ
Pre. Does R approve or disapprove of Clinton's handling of foreign rels
Pre. Does R strongly approve or disapprove of Clinton's handling for relat
Pre. Does R approve or disapp Clinton's handling the environment
Pre. Does R strongly approves of Clinton's hand of the envir
Pre. Does R approve or disapprove of Clinton's hand of hltth care
Pre. Does R strongly approve or disapp of Clinton's hand of hltth care
Pre. Which pres cand would do the best job of protect enviro
Pre. Which pres cand would do the best job of reducing budget def
Pre. Which pres cand would do the best job of improve education
Pre. Which pres cand would do the best job of campgn reform
Pre. Which pres cand would be most likely to raise taxes
960310 Pre. Which pres cand would be most likely to cut Soc Security
960311 Pre. Is Clinton or Congress more to blame for the budget def
960312 Pre. (Interviewer checkpoint) Was R random selected for q F1-F4
960313 Pre. Is there anything R likes about the Republican Party
960314 Pre. What does R like about the Republican Party #1
960315 Pre. What does R like about the Republican Party #2
960316 Pre. What does R like about the Republican Party #3
960317 Pre. What does R like about the Republican Party #4
960318 Pre. What does R like about the Republican Party #5
960319 Pre. Is there anything R dislikes about the Republican Party
960320 Pre. What does R dislike about the Republican Party #1
960321 Pre. What does R dislike about the Republican Party #2
960322 Pre. What does R dislike about the Republican Party #3
960323 Pre. What does R dislike about the Republican Party #4
960324 Pre. What does R dislike about the Republican Party #5
960325 Pre. Is there anything R likes about the Democrat Party
960326 Pre. What does R like about the Democrat Party #1
960327 Pre. What does R like about the Democrat Party #2
960328 Pre. What does R like about the Democrat Party #3
960329 Pre. What does R like about the Democrat Party #4
960330 Pre. What does R like about the Democrat Party #5
960331 Pre. Is there anything R dislikes about the Democrat Party
960332 Pre. What does R dislike about the Democrat Party #1
960333 Pre. What does R dislike about the Democrat Party #2
960334 Pre. What does R dislike about the Democrat Party #3
960335 Pre. What does R dislike about the Democrat Party #4
960336 Pre. What does R dislike about the Democrat Party #5
960337 Pre. Is R better or worse off financially than a year ago
960338 Pre. Is R much better or worse off financially than a year ago
960339 Pre. Does R think R will be better or worse off financ next yr
960340 Pre. Does R think R will be much better/worse off financ next yr
960341 Pre. Has Clinton ever made R feel angry
960342 Pre. How often has Clinton made R feel angry
960343 Pre. Has Clinton ever made R feel hopeful
960344 Pre. How often has Clinton made R feel hopeful
960345 Pre. Has Clinton ever made R feel afraid
960346 Pre. How often has Clinton made R feel afraid
960347 Pre. Has Clinton ever made R feel proud
960348 Pre. How often has Clinton made R feel proud
960349 Pre. Has Dole ever made R feel angry
960350 Pre. How often has Dole made R feel angry
960351 Pre. Has Dole ever made R feel hopeful
960352 Pre. How often has Dole made R feel hopeful
960353 Pre. Has Dole ever made R feel afraid
960354 Pre. How often has Dole made R feel afraid
960355 Pre. Has Dole ever made R feel proud
960356 Pre. How often has Dole made R feel proud
960357 Pre. Has Perot ever made R feel angry
960358 Pre. How often has Perot made R feel angry
960359 Pre. Has Perot ever made R feel hopeful
960360 Pre. How often has Perot made R feel hopeful
960361 Pre. Has Perot ever made R feel afraid
960362 Pre. How often has Perot made R feel afraid
960363 Pre. Has Perot ever made R feel proud
960364 Pre. How often has Perot made R feel proud
960365 Pre. R's self-placement on liberal/conservative scale
960366 Pre. If R had to choose, would R be lib or con
960367 Pre. How certain is R of self-placement on lib/con scale
960368 Pre. Summary of R's self-placement on lib/con scale
960369 Pre. R's placement of Clinton on liberal-con scale
960370 Pre. How certain is R of placement of Clinton on lib/con scale
960371 Pre. R's placement of Dole on lib-con scale
960372 Pre. How certain is R of placement of Dole on lib/con scale
960373 Pre. R's placement of Perot on lib-con scale
960374 Pre. How certain is R of placement of Perot on lib/con scale
960375 Pre. R's placement of Dem Hse cand on lib/con scale
960376 Pre. How certain is R of place of Dem Hse cand on lib/con scale
960377 Pre. R's placement of Rep Hse cand on lib/con scale
960378 Pre. How certain is R of place of Rep Hse cand on lib/con scale
960379 Pre. R's placement of Democratic Party on lib/con scale
960380 Pre. R's placement of Republican Party on lib/con scale
960381 Pre. Who does R think will be elected President
960382 Pre. Does R think the Presidential race will be close
960383 Pre. Which Pres cand does R think will carry R's state
960384 Pre. R think the Pres race will be close in R's state
960385 Pre. R think econ has gotten better/worse over past year
960386 Pre. R think econ has gotten much better/worse over past year
960387 Pre. R expect econ to get better/worse over the next year
960388 Pre. R expect econ to get much better or worse over the next year
960389 Pre. R think the stand of living will be better or worse in 20 yrs
960390 Pre. Have fed govt policy made the nation's econ better or worse
960391 Pre. Have fed gov policy made nation's econ much better or worse
960392 Pre. R think the budg def incr/decr under Clinton
960393 Pre. R think the budg def incr/decr a lot under Clinton
960394 Pre. R think avg fed income tax incr/decr under Clinton
960395 Pre. R think the avg fed income tax incr/decr a lot under Clinton
960396 Pre. (Interviewer checkpoint) Was R randomly select for q H4a-H8
960397 Pre. Which party would do a better job handling the economy
960398 Pre. Which party would do a better job handling for aff
960399 Pre. Which party would do a better job hlth care afford
960400 Pre. Which party would do a better job reform welfare
960401 Pre. Which party would do a better job hand the poverty prob
960402 Pre. Which party would do a better job hand the budget deficit
960403 Pre. Which party would do a better job hand the enviro
960404 Pre. Which party would do a better job dealing with crime
960405 Pre. Which party would be more likely to cut soc security
960406 Pre. Which party would be more likely to improve race relat
960407 Pre. Which party would be more likely to raise taxes
960408 Pre. Which party would be more likely to keep out of war
960409 Pre. Has the US pos in the world grown str/weaker in the past year
960410 Pre. Should the US not concern itself with problems abroad
960411 Pre. How willing should the US be to use military force
960412 Pre. Does R favor a 12-year term limit on members of Congress
960413 Pre. Does R know if either House cand the incumb
960414 Pre. Candidate code of recalled incumb (two-cand race)
960415 Pre. Does R know if the unopposed Hse cand is the incumbent
960416 Pre. Candidate code of recalled incumbent (unopposed race)
960417 Pre. R's party identification
960418 Pre. Strength of R's party identification
960419 Pre. (If R is independent/no preference) R closer to one party
960420 Pre. Summary of R's party identification
960421 Pre. Does R consider Clinton intelligent
960422 Pre. Does R consider Clinton compassionate
960423 Pre. Does R consider Clinton moral
960424 Pre. How certain is R about whether Clinton is moral
960425 Pre. Does R consider Clinton inspiring
960426 Pre. Does R think that Clinton provides strong leadership
960427 Pre. Does R think that Clinton really cares about people like R
960428 Pre. Does R consider Clinton knowledgeable
960429 Pre. Does R consider Clinton honest
Pre. Does R think that Clinton gets things done
Pre. How certain is R about whether Clinton gets things done
Pre. Does R consider Dole moral
Pre. How certain is R about whether Dole is moral
Pre. Does R consider Dole inspiring
Pre. Does R think that Dole provides strong leadership
Pre. Does R think that Dole really cares about people like R
Pre. Does R consider Dole knowledgeable
Pre. Does R consider Dole honest
Pre. Does R think that Dole gets things done
Pre. How certain is R about whether Dole gets things done
Pre. Does R consider Perot moral
Pre. How certain is R about whether Perot is moral
Pre. Does R consider Perot inspiring
Pre. Does R think that Perot provides strong leadership
Pre. Does R think that Perot really cares about people like R
Pre. Does R consider Perot knowledgeable
Pre. Does R consider Perot honest
Pre. Does R think that Perot gets things done
Pre. How certain is R about whether Perot gets things done
Pre. R's self-placement on services/spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of self-place on service/spend scale
Pre. How important is the services/spending issue to R
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on services/spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Clinton on service/spend scale
Pre. R's placement of Dole on services/spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Dole on service/spend scale
Pre. R's placement of Perot on services/spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Perot on service/spend scale
Pre. R's placement of Dem Hse cand on service/spending scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Hse cand on services/spending scale
Pre. R's placement of Dem Party on services/spending scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Party on services/spending scale
Pre. R's self-placement on defense spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of self-plac on defense spending scale
Pre. How important is the defense spending issue to R
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on defense spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Clinton on defense spend scale
Pre. How important does R think defense spending is to Clinton
Pre. R's placement of Dole on defense spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Dole on defense spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Dole on defense spending scale
Pre. How important does R think defense spending is to Dole
Pre. R's placement of Perot on defense spending scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Perot on defense spend scale
Pre. How important does R think defense spending is to Perot
Pre. R's placement of Dem Hse candidate on defense spend scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Hse candidate on defense spending scale
Pre. R's placement of Dem Party on defense spending scale
Pre. R's place of Rep Party on defense spending scale
Pre. R's self-placement on govt health insurance scale
Pre. R's place of Clinton on govt hlth insurance scale
Pre. R's place of Dole on gov hlth insurance scale
Pre. R's placement of Perot on govt hlth insurance scale
Pre. R's placement of Dem Hse candidate on guar job/standard of living scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Hse candidate on guar job/standard of living scale
Pre. R's placement of Dole on guar job/standard of living scale
Pre. R's place of Perot on guar job/standard of living scale
Pre. R's self-placement on aid to blacks scale
Pre. How certain is R of self-place on aid to blacks scale
Pre. How important is the aid to blacks issue to R
Pre. R's place of Clinton on aid to blacks scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Clinton on aid to blacks scale
Pre. R's place of Dole on aid to blacks scale
Pre. How certain is R of placement of Dole on aid to blacks scale
Pre. R's place of Perot on aid to blacks scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Perot on aid to blacks scale
Pre. Spending on food stamps should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on welfare programs should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on AIDS research should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on foreign aid should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on aid to college students should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on the homeless should be incr/decr
Pre. Spending on immigr control should be incr/decr
Pre. R's self-placement on abortion issue
Pre. How certain is R of self-placement on abortion issue
Pre. How important is the abortion issue to R
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on abortion issue
Pre. How certain is R of placement of Clinton on abortion issue
Pre. How important does R think the abortion issue is to Clinton
Pre. R's placement of Dole on abortion issue
Pre. How certain is R of placement of Dole on abortion issue
Pre. How important does R think the abortion issue is to Dole
Pre. R's placement of Perot on abortion issue
Pre. How certain is R of placement of Perot on abortion issue
Pre. How important does R think the abortion issue is to Perot
Pre. R's placement of Dem House candidate on abortion issue
Pre. R's placement of Rep House candidate on abortion issue
Pre. R's placement of Dem Party on abortion issue
Pre. R's placement of Rep Party on abortion issue
Pre. R's self-placement on reduction of crime scale
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on reduction of crime scale
Pre. R's placement of Dole on reduction of crime scale
Pre. R's placement of Perot on reduction of crime scale
Pre. R's self-placement on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How certain is R of self-placement on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How important is the jobs/environment issue to R
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Clinton on jobs/enviro scale
Pre. How important does R think jobs/enviro issue is to Clinton
Pre. R's placement of Dole on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How certain is R of place of Dole on jobs/enviro scale
Pre. How important does R think jobs/enviro issue is to Dole
Pre. R's placement of Perot on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How certain is R of placement of Perot on jobs/environment scale
Pre. How important does R think jobs/enviro issue is to Perot
Pre. R's placement of Dem Party on jobs/environment scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Party on jobs/environment scale
Pre. R's self-placement on environmental regulation scale
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on environmental regulation scale
Pre. R's placement of Dole on environmental regulation scale
Pre. R's placement of Perot on environmental regulation scale
Pre. R's placement of Dem Party on enviro regulation scale
Pre. R's placement of Rep Party on enviro regulation scale
Pre. R's self-placement on women's rights scale
Pre. R's placement of Clinton on women's rights scale
Pre. R's placement of Dole on women's rights scale
Pre. R's placement of Perot on women's rights scale
Pre. Does R expect to vote in the national elections
Pre. (Voters) For whom does R plan to vote for President
Pre. (Voters) Strength of R's Presidential candidate preference
Pre. (Nonvoters) For whom would R vote for President
Pre. (Nonvoters) Strength of R's Presidential cand preference
Pre. Who would R most like to see elected President
Pre. Which other Pres cand would R find acceptable
Pre. (Voters) For whom does R plan to vote for House
Pre. (Voters) Candidate code of R's House vote
Pre. (Voters) Strength of R's House candidate preference
Pre. (Nonvoters) For whom would R vote for House
Pre. (Nonvoters) Candidate code of R's preferred House candidate
Pre. (Nonvoters) Strength of R's House candidate preference
Pre. Spending on Soc Sec should be incr or decr
Pre. Spending on env protection should be incr or decreased
Pre. Spending on public schools should be increased or decreased
Pre. Spending on crime reduction should be increased or decreased
Pre. Spending on child care should be increased or decreased
Pre. Spending on poor people should be incr/decr
Pre. How much of the time does R trust the fed govt to do right
Pre. Does R think that most people can be trusted
Pre. Does R agree that "People like me have no say in government"
Pre. Does R think that most pple would try to take advan of R
Pre. How similar does R think other people are to R
Pre. Is religion an important part of R's life
Pre. How much guidance does religion provide in R's life
Pre. How frequently does R pray
Pre. How frequently does R read the Bible
Pre. R's view on whether the Bible is the word of God
Pre. Does R attend religious services (apart from special events)
Pre. Does R consider himself/herself part of a church
Pre. How frequently does R attend religious services
Pre. Does R attend religious services more often than once a week
Pre. (Interviewer checkpoint) Does R attend a place of worship
Pre. Religious affiliation of R's place of worship
Pre. R's religious affiliation
Pre. (Protestant) R's church/denomination
Pre. With what Baptist group is R's church affiliated
Pre. (Baptist) Is R's church local or affil with a Baptist grp
Pre. With what Lutheran group is R's church affiliated
Pre. With what Methodist group is R's church affiliated
Pre. With what Presbyterian group is R's church affiliated
Pre. With what Reformed group is R's church affiliated
Pre. With what Brethren group is R's church affiliated
Pre. By "Christian" does R mean Disciples of Christ
Pre. With what Church of Christ group is R's church affiliated
Pre. With what Church of God group is R's church affiliated
Pre. (Holiness or Pentecostal) What is R's church
Pre. (Other Protestant group) What is the name/affil of R's church
Pre. (Not Prot/Cath/Jewish) What is R's place of worship
Pre. (R not alry ident as Chrst) Is R's place of worship Christian
Pre. (Jewish) Is R (or R's place of worship) Orth, Conser, or Ref
Pre. Is R officially a member of a place of worship
Pre. Type of R's Christianity
Pre. Is R a born-again Christian
Pre. Summary of R's religion
Pre. R's month of birth
Pre. R's year of birth
Pre. R's Age
Pre. R's marital status
Pre. Highest grade R has completed
Pre. Has R earned a high school diploma/passed the GED
Pre. Highest degree R has earned
Pre. Summary of R's education
Pre. Highest grade R's spouse has completed
Pre. Has R's spouse earned a high school diploma earned/pass the GED
Pre. Highest degree R's spouse has earned
Pre. Summary of R's spouse's education
Pre. R's employment status
Pre. R's employment status (collapsed)
Pre. (Unemployed) Has R ever worked for pay
Pre. (Unemployed) Past occupation code
Pre. (Unemployed) Collapsed past occupation code
Pre. (Unemployed) Past occupation prestige score
Pre. (Unemployed) Past business/industry code
Pre. (Unemployed) Was R self-employed
Pre. (Unemployed) Did R work for the government
Pre. (Unemployed) Has R worked for pay in the last six months
Pre. (Unemployed) Hours per week R worked
Pre. (Unemployed) Is R looking for work
Pre. (Unemployed) How worried is R about finding work
Pre. (Retired) Month of retirement
Pre. (Retired) Year of retirement
Pre. (Retired) Past occupation code
Pre. (Retired) Collapsed past occupation code
Pre. (Retired) Past occupation prestige score
Pre. (Retired) Past business/industry code
Pre. (Retired) Was R self-employed
Pre. (Retired) Did R work for the government
Pre. (Retired) Has R worked for pay in the last six months
Pre. (Retired) Hours per week R worked
Pre. (Retired) Is R looking for work
Pre. (Retired) How worried is R about finding work
Pre. (Disabled) Has R ever worked for pay
Pre. (Disabled) Past occupation code
Pre. (Disabled) Collapsed past occupation code
Pre. (Disabled) Past occupation prestige score
Pre. (Disabled) Past business/industry code
Pre. (Disabled) Was R self-employed
Pre. (Disabled) Did R work for the government
Pre. (Disabled) Has R worked for pay in the last six months
Pre. (Disabled) Hours per week R worked
Pre. (Disabled) Is R currently working for pay
Pre. (Disabled) Is R looking for work
Pre. (Disabled) How worried is R about finding work
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Is R currently working for pay
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Has R worked for pay in the last 6 mos
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Past occupation code
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Collapsed past occupation code
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Past occupation prestige score
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Past business/industry code
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Was R self-employed
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Did R work for the government
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Hours per week R worked
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) Is R looking for work
Pre. (Homemaker/Student) How worried is R about finding work
Pre. (Working now) Occupation code
Pre. (Working now) Collapsed occupation code
Pre. (Working now) Occupation prestige score
Pre. (Working now) Business/industry code
Pre. (Working now) Is R self-employed
Pre. (Working now) Does R work for the government
Pre. Forbes Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Gramm Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Farrakhan Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Alexander Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Elizabeth Dole Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Robertson Position Thermometer Random (D1d-D1w)
Pre. Republican Party Position Thermometer Random (D2a-D2b)
Pre. Economy Position in Presidential Performance Random E2-E5
Pre. Foreign Affairs Position in Pres Performance Random E2-E5
Pre. Environment Position in Pres Performance Random E2-E5
Pre. Health Care Position in Pres Performance Random E2-E5
Pre. Order: random Pres Cand names E6a-E6d,E7,E8 perform items
Pre. Environment Position in Cand Performance Random E6a-E6b
Pre. Budget Deficit Position in Cand Performance Random E6a-E6b
Pre. Public Educ- Position in Cand Performance Random E6a-E6b
Pre. Reduce Spec Interests -Pos in Cand Perform Random E6a-E6b
Pre. Republican Party Position F1-F4a(5) Random [Likes/Dislikes]
Pre. Democratic Party Position F1-F4a(5) Random [Likes/Dislikes]
Pre. Clinton Position in G1a-G3d(1) Random [Pres Candidate Affects]
Pre. Dole Position in G1a-G3d(1) Random [Pres Candidate Affects]
Pre. Perot Position in G1a-G3d(1) Random [Pres Candidate Affects]
Pre. Angry in G1a-G1d(1) Randomization [Clinton Affects]
Pre. Hopeful in G1a-G1d(1) Randomization [Clinton Affects]
Pre. Afraid in G1a-G1d(1) Randomization [Clinton Affects]
Pre. Proud in G1a-G1d(1) Randomization [Clinton Affects]
Pre. Angry in G2a-G2d(1) Randomization [Dole Affects]
Pre. Hopeful in G2a-G2d(1) Randomization [Dole Affects]
Pre. Afraid in G2a-G2d(1) Randomization [Dole Affects]
Pre. Proud in G2a-G2d(1) Randomization [Dole Affects]
Pre. Angry in G3a-G3d(1) Randomization [Perot Affects]
Pre. Hopeful in G3a-G3d(1) Randomization [Perot Affects]
Pre. Afraid in G3a-G3d(1) Randomization [Perot Affects]
Pre. Proud in G3a-G3d(1) Randomization [Perot Affects]
Pre. Clinton Pos in G5-G7a Random [Lib-Con Place of Pres.Cands]
Pre. Dole Pos in G5-G7a Random [Lib-Con of Pres. Cand]
Pre. Perot Pos in G5-G7a Random [Lib-Con of Pres. Cand]
Pre. Dem Hse Cand Pos in G8-G9a Random [Lib-Con Hse Cand Pl]
Pre. Rep Hse Cand Pos in G8-G9a Random [Lib-Con Hse Cand Pl]
Pre. Order of randomized parties in H4a-H4h performance items
Pre. Pos of Nation's Econ in H4a-H4h Rand [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Foreign Affairs in H4a-H4h Rand [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Health Care in H4a-H4h Random [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Welfare Reform in H4a-H4h Random [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Poverty in H4a-H4h Randomization [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Budget Deficit in H4a-H4h Random [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Pollut/Envir in H4a-H4h Random [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Pos of Crime in H4a-H4h Random [Pres Cand Perform]
Pre. Order of parties in H5 perform item [Cut Soc Security]
Pre. Order of parties in H6 perform item [Imprve Race Relat]
Pre. Order of parties in H7 perform item [Raise Taxes]
Pre. Order of parties in H8 perform item [Keep Out of War]
Pre. Order of House cand names in H13a [Incumbency Status]
Pre. Pos of Intelligent in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Compassionate in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Moral in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Inspiring in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Strong Leadership in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Really Cares in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Knowledgeable in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Honest in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Gets Things Done in K2a-j Random [Clinton Traits]
Pre. Pos of Dole in K3a-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Pres Cand Traits]
Pre. Pos of Perot in K3a-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Pres Cand Traits]
Pre. Pos of Moral in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Pos of Inspiring in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Pos of Strong Lead in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Really Cares in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Knowledgeable in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Honest in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Gets Things Done in K3-K3g/K4a-K4g Random [Dole/PerotTraits]
Pre. Clinton in L1b-L1d Random [Pres Cand Services/Spend scales]
Pre. Dole in L1b-L1d Random [Pres Cand Services/Spending scales]
Pre. Perot in L1b-L1d Random [Pres Cand Services/Spending scales]
Pre. Dem House Cand in L1e-L1f Random [Services/Spending scale]
Pre. Rep House Cand in L1e-L1f Random [Services/Spending scale]
Pre. Dem Party in L1g-L1h Random [Services/Spending scale]
Pre. Rep Party in L1g-L1h Random [Services/Spending scale]
Pre. Clinton in L2b-L2d Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Dole in L2b-L2d Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Perot in L2b-L2d Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Dem House cand in L2e-L2f Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Rep House cand in L2e-L2f Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Dem Party in L2g-L2h Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Rep Party in L2g-L2h Random [Defense Spending scale]
Pre. Clinton in L3b-L3d Random [Gov Health Insurance scale]
Pre. Dole in L3b-L3d Random [Gov Health Insurance scale]
Pre. Perot in L3b-L3d Random [Gov Health Insurance scale]
Pre. Clinton in L5b-L5d Randomization [Gov Ass to Blacks scale]
Pre. Dole in L5b-L5d Randomization [Gov Ass to Blacks scale]
Pre. Perot in L5b-L5d Randomization [Gov Ass to Blacks scale]
Pre. Food Stamps in L6a-L6g Randomization [Federal Spending]
Pre. Welfare Programs in L6a-L6g Randomization [Federal Spending]
Pre. AIDS Research in L6a-L6g Randomization [Federal Spending]
Pre. Aid to College Students in L6a-L6g Random [Fed Spending]
Pre. Assistance to the Homeless in L6a-L6g Random [Fed Spending]
Pre. Prevent Illegal Immigr in L6a-L6g Random [Fed Spending]
Pre. Clinton in M1b-M1d Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Dole in M1b-M1d Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Perot in M1b-M1d Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Dem House Cand in M1e-M1f Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Rep House Cand in M1e-M1f Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Dem Party in M1g-M1h Randomization [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Republican Party in M1g-M1h Random [Abortion Scale]
Pre. Clinton in M2b-M2d Random [Crime Scale]
Pre. Dole in M2b-M2d Random [Crime Scale]
Pre. Perot in M2b-M2d Random [Crime Scale]
Pre. Clinton in M3b-M3d Random [Jobs/Environment Scale]
Pre. Dole in M3b-M3d Random [Jobs/Environment Scale]
Pre. Perot in M3b-M3d Random [Jobs/Environment Scale]
Pre. Dem Party in M3e-M3f Random [Jobs/Environment Scale]
Pre. Rep Party in M3e-M3f Random [Jobs/Environment Scale]
Pre. Clinton in M4b-M4d Random [Environmental Regulation Scale]
Pre. Dole in M4b-M4d Random [Environmental Regulation Scale]
Pre. Perot in M4b-M4d Random [Environmental Regulation Scale]
Pre. Dem Party in M4e-M4f Random [Environmental Regulation Scale]
Pre. Rep Party in M4e-M4f Random [Environmental Regulation Scale]
Pre. Clinton in N1b-N1d Random [Women's Role]
Pre. Dole in N1b-N1d Random [Women's Role]
Pre. Perot in N1b-N1d Random [Women's Role]
Pre. Pres. cand names in text of N3a [Who R Would Most Like Pres]
Pre. Social Security Benefits in N5a-N5f [Social Security]
Pre. Improve/Protect the Environment in N5a-N5f [Fed Spending]
Pre. Public Schools in N5a-N5f [Fed Spending]
Pre. Dealing with Crime in N5a-N5f [Fed Spending]
Pre. Child Care in N5a-N5f [Fed Spending]
Pre. Poor People in N5a-N5f [Fed Spending]
Post. 1996 Post ID
Post. Form of questionnaire
Post. Day of interview
Post. Month of interview
Post. Number of days since election day
Post. Beginning time (local)
Post. Ending time (local)
Post. Interview length in minutes
Post. Interview number
Post. Date of beginning VQ file
Post. Date of ending VQ file
Post. Respondent payment amount
Post. Was the interview tape recorded
Post. Verification indicator
Post. Evaluation indicator
Post. Refusal conversion indicator
Post. Was R sent a persuasion letter
Post. Type of persuasion letter sent to R
Post. Number of telephone calls
Post. Number of face to face calls
Post. Total number of calls (phone + FtF)
Post. Final result on interview
Post. Beginning mode of interview
Post. Ending mode of interview
Post. R live at same address
Post. R name/birth/gender same
Post. Type of structure in which R lives
Post. Did R refuse initially
Post. Did R break any appointments
Post. Was there resistance from this person
Post. Reason for resistance - waste of time/bad experience
Post. Reason for resistance - very ill
Post. Reason for resistance - too busy
Post. Reason for resistance - stressful family situation
Post. Reason for resistance - confidentiality
Post. Reason for resistance - invasion of privacy
Post. Reason for resistance - no reason given
Post. Reason for resistance - other
Post. Others present at the interview
Post. R's level of cooperation
Post. R's level of information about politics
Post. R's apparent intelligence
Post. R's suspiciousness
Post. R's interest in interview
Post. R's sincerity
Post. #1 reaction to interview
Post. #2 reaction to interview
Post. #3 reaction to interview
Post. #4 reaction to interview
Post. #5 reaction to interview
Post. #6 reaction to interview
Post. #7 reaction to interview
Post. #8 reaction to interview
Post. Interviewer of record ID
Post. Field supervisor ID
Post. Interviewer gender
Post. Interviewer education
Post. Interviewer race
Post. Interviewer ethnicity
Post. Interviewer languages
Post. Interviewer experience
Post. Interviewer age
Post. R's interest in the political campaign
Post. Did R watch any programs about the campaign
Post. Amount of programs R watched about the campaign
Post. Did R discuss politics with family/friends
Post. Frequency of political discussion w/ friends/family
Post. Does R recall names of congressional candidates
Post. #1 recall - code
Post. #1 recall - party
Post. #1 recall - actual party
Post. #1 recall - summary
Post. #2 recall - code
Post. #2 recall - party
Post. #2 recall - actual party
Post. #2 recall - summary
Post. #3 recall - code
Post. #3 recall - party
Post. #3 recall - actual party
Post. #3 recall - summary
Post. Feeling thermometer - Bill Clinton
Post. Feeling thermometer - Bob Dole
Post. Feeling thermometer - Ross Perot
Post. Feeling thermometer - Democratic House Candidate
Post. Feeling thermometer - Republican House Candidate
Post. Feeling thermometer - Retiring House Candidate
Post. Feeling thermometer - Supreme Court
Post. Feeling thermometer - Congress
Post. Feeling thermometer - The military
Post. Feeling thermometer - Federal government
Post. Feeling thermometer - blacks
Post. Feeling thermometer - whites
Post. Feeling thermometer - conservatives
Post. Feeling thermometer - liberals
Post. Feeling thermometer - labor unions
Post. Feeling thermometer - big business
Post. Feeling thermometer - poor people
Post. Feeling thermometer - people on welfare
Post. Feeling thermometer - Hispanics
Post. Feeling thermometer - Christian fundamentalists
Post. Feeling thermometer - the women's movement
Post. Feeling thermometer - older people
Post. Feeling thermometer - environmentalists
Post. Feeling thermometer - gay men and lesbians
Post. Feeling thermometer - the Christian coalition
Post. Was there anything R liked about Dem House candidate
Post. #1 mention - R like of Democratic House candidate
Post. Level of govt effort to protect the environment
Post. Level of govt effort to reduce air pollution
Post. Level of govt effort to manage natural resources
Post. Level of govt effort to clean up lakes and parks
Post. Level of govt effort to clean up toxic waste
Post. Level of govt effort to clean up solid waste
Post. Level of govt effort to address global warming
Post. Trait: Clinton - moral
Post. Certainty of Clinton - moral
Post. Trait: Clinton - gets things done
Post. Certainty of Clinton - gets things done
Post. Trait: Dole - moral
Post. Certainty of Dole - moral
Post. Trait: Dole - gets things done
Post. Certainty of Dole - gets things done
Post. Trait: Perot - gets things done
Post. Certainty of Perot - gets things done
Post. Checkpoint: Running incumbent in R's district
Post. Does R approve/disapprove of running House incumbent
Post. Strength of R's approval/disapproval of House incumbent
Post. Does R know the number yrs that incum has been in House
Post. (If yes) How many years has incumbent been in House
Post. (If DK) Has incum been in House less/about/more 12 yrs
Post. How well has incumbent kept in touch with district
Post. Does R know House incumbent's vote on welfare reform
Post. (If DK) R's guess -House incumb vote on welfare reform
Post. How often does R thinkHouse incumbent supports Clinton
Post. (If more than half) Almost always
Post. (If less than half) Almost never
Post. How much does R follow government and public affairs
Post. Checkpoint: Half-sample
Post. What does R think is most imp prob facing country - #1
Post. What does R think is most imp prob facing country - #2
Post. What does R think is most imp prob facing country - #3
Post. What does R think is most imp prob facing country - #4
Post. Checkpoint: Number of mentions- 'Most important problem'
Post. What does R think is the single most important problem
Post. How does R think fed govt is handling most imp problem
Post. Which party would do better job on most imp prob
Post. Does R think: Less govt the better /govt should do more
Post. Does R think: Strg govt for econ prob /free markts handle
Post. Does R think: Govt big -too involved/govt big -probs big
Post. Does R think: More import to be cooperative / self-reliant
Post. How often does R watch 'Jeopardy' and 'Wheel of Fortune'
Post. How often does R watch sports on TV
Post. How often does R watch 'ER' on TV
Post. How often does R watch 'Frasier' on TV
Post. How often does R watch 'Dr. Quinn' on TV
Post. How of does R watch 'Friends' on TV
Post. How often does R watch 'Prime Time Live' on TV
Post. Does R ever listen to political talk radio programs
Post. How often does R listen to polit talk radio program
Post. How much attention does R pay polit talk radio programs
Post. Does R ever listen to Rush Limbaugh
Post. How often does R listen to Rush Limbaugh
Post. Does R have access to the Internet or the World Wide Web
Post. Did R see any information about campaign on the Internet
Post. Was R contacted by any political party
Post. Which party contracted R
Post. Did anyone else contact R about candidate in the election
Post. Did R talk to others about voting for/against party or cand
Post. Did R wear a button, place a sign, or put a sticker on car
Post. Did R attend any meetings, speeches, rallies for cand
Post. Did R work for any one of the parties or candidates
Post. Did R contribute money to a candidate running for office
Post. Which party the candidate that R contributed to belong
Post. Did R give money to a polit cand during election year
Post. Which party did R contribute money to
Post. Did R give money to other group that supported/opposed cand
Post. Did anyone talk to R about registering to vote
Post. Did relig/moral group contact R about R's vote
Post. Campaign information available at R's place of worship
Post. Did R's clergy give advice to R on how to vote
Post. Which candidate did R's clergy recommend - #1 mention
Post. Which candidate did R's clergy recommend - #2 mention
Post. Which candidate did R's clergy recommend - #3 mention
Post. Checkpoint: Half-sample
Post. Does R think there are imp diffs between Reps and Dems
Post. Important difference: #1 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #1 mention
Post. Important difference: #2 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #2 mention
Post. Important difference: #3 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #3 mention
Post. Important difference: #4 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #4 mention
Post. Important difference: #5 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #5 mention
Post. Important difference: #6 mention
Post. Important difference: Party reference - #6 mention
Post. Does R know what office Al Gore holds
Post. Does R know what office William Rehnquist hold
Post. Does R know what office Boris Yeltsin holds
Post. Does R know what office Newt Gingrich holds
Post. Does R favor/oppp laws to protect homosexuals fr job discrim
Post. How strongly favor/oppose laws protecting homosexuals
Post. Does R think homosexuals should be allowed in the army
Post. How strongly feel homosexuals serve / not serve in army
Post. Does R favor or oppose the death penalty
Post. How strongly favor /oppose death penalty
Post. R agree/disagree: mothers w/ children should not work
Post. Which level of govt should handle envir problems
Post. Which level of govt should handle welfare
Post. Which level of govt should handle crime
Post. In which level govt does R have most faith /confidence
Post. In which level govt does R have least faith / confidence
Post. Does R have opinion: govt see to fair job treatmt for blacks
Post. R opinion: govt see to fair job treatment for blacks
Post. How strongly feel about fair job treat for blacks
Post. Does R favor affirmative action in hiring and promotion
Post. Does R favor/oppose affir action strongly / not strongly
Post. R's position on aid to blacks - 7 point scale
Post. Clinton's position on aid to blacks - 7 point scale
Post. Dole's position on aid to blacks - 7 point scale
Post. Perot's position on aid to blacks - 7 point scale
Post. R's opinion on the issue of school prayer
Post. Strength of R's position on school prayer
Post. How afraid is R of being crime victim in the coming year
Post. Does R favor / oppose handgun control
Post. (Phone IW only) Does R have a handgun in the house
Post. R favor increasing deficit to increase domestic programs
Post. R favor cuts in domestic programs to cut taxes
Post. R favor an increase in the deficit to cut taxes
Post. How would R rate quality of air in our nation
Post. How would R rate quality of air in R's local community
Post. How would R rate quality of drinking water in our nation
Post. How would R rate quality of drinking water in community
Post. R favor tax increase to increase spending on domestic progs
Post. R favor cuts in spending on domestic progs to cut taxes
Post. Does R favor an increase in taxes to cut budget deficit
Post. R opinion: Society should see to equal opportunity
Post. R opinion: We have gone too far pushing equal rights
Post. R opinion: Big problem is that we don't give an equal chance
Post. R opinion: Better off if we worried less about equality
Post. R opinion: Not a problem if not equal chance
Post. R opinion: Fewer problems if people treated more equally
Post. R opinion: One should help those less fortunate
Post. R opinion: One should always be concerned with others
Post. R opinion: It is best not to get involved helping others
Post. R opinion: People pay too much attn to others' wellbeing
Post. Which network does R think that Tom Brokaw works for
Post. Which network does R think that Peter Jennings works for
Post. Which network does R think that Dan Rather works for
Post. Which network does R think that Bernard Shaw works for
Post. What does R think of his/her financial situation
Post. R opinion: pub officials don't care what people like R think
Post. R opinion: People like R don't have much say in govt
Post. R opinion: Politics and govt are too complicated
Post. R opinion: Newer lifestyles contribute to social breakdown
Post. R opinion: We should adjust moral behavior to world changes
Post. R opinion: Fewer problems if more emphasis on trad'l family
Post. R opinion: We should be more tolerant of other moral stds
Post. How much of the time R trusts the govt to do what is right
Post. How much of tax money does R think the govt wastes
Post. Is govt run by a few big interests or the benefit of all
Post. How many of the people in govt are crooked
Post. How much does R think elections make govt pay attention
Post. How much attention does govt pay to people in decisions
Post. Does R have time to do volunteer work
Post. Does R think that people can be trusted
Post. Does R think that most people would take advantage of R
Post. Does R talk to neighbors regularly
Post. How many neighbors does R talk to regularly
Post. Would R be willing to serve on a jury
Post. Has R worked with others or in a community organization
Post. Has R contributed money to church or charity last 12 months
Post. R's tax burden up / down during the Clinton administration
Post. Has R's tax burden gone up / done a lot / a little
Post. Companies which discriminate shd have to have affirm action
Post. Does R feel strong / not strong about forced affirm action
Post. R's self-placement on lib-con 7 point scale
Post. How certain is R of placement on lib-con scale
Post. If R had to choose - placement on lib-con scale
Post. Summary: Self-placement on lib-con scale
Post. R's placement of Clinton - lib-con 7 point scale
Post. How certain is R of Clinton's placement on lib-con
Post. R' placement of Dole - lib-con 7 point scale
Post. How certain is R of Dole's placement on lib-con
Post. R's placement of Dem Hse cand - lib-con 7 point scale
Post. How certain is R of Dem Hse cand placement
961279  Post. R's placement of Rep Hse cand - lib-con 7 point scale
961280  Post. How certain is R of Rep Hse cand placement
961281  Post. Does R feel that he/she pays the right amount in taxes
961282  Post. Does R have an opinion on the 15% tax cut issue
961283  Post. R's opinion on tax cut
961284  Post. What does R think that Clinton's position on tax cut is
961285  Post. What does R think that Dole's position on tax cut is
961286  Post. What does R think that Perot's position on tax cut is
961287  Post. Has R heard anything about the effects of a tax cut
961288  Post. Does R think that inflation would increase w/ tax cut
961289  Post. Does R think that employment would increase w/ tax cut
961290  Post. Does R think tax cut would benefit business more than R
961291  Post. Does R think services would be cut because of tax cut
961292  Post. Does R think deficit would increase because of tax cut
961293  Post. Does R think govt revenue be same even after tax cut
961294  Post. Does R feel close to poor people
961295  Post. Does R feel close to Asian-Americans
961296  Post. Does R feel close to liberals
961297  Post. Does R feel close to the elderly
961298  Post. Does R feel close to blacks
961299  Post. Does R feel close to labor unions
961300  Post. Does R feel close to feminists
961301  Post. Does R feel close to southerners
961302  Post. Does R feel close to business people
961303  Post. Does R feel close to young people
961304  Post. Does R feel close to conservatives
961305  Post. Does R feel close to Hispanic Americans
961306  Post. Does R feel close to women
961307  Post. Does R feel close to working-class people
961308  Post. Does R feel close to whites
961309  Post. Does R feel close to middle-class people
961310  Post. Does R feel close to men
961311  Post. Where would R rate whites on hardworking scale
961312  Post. Where would R rate blacks on hardworking scale
961313  Post. Where would R rate Hispanics on hardworking scale
961314  Post. Where would R rate whites on intelligent scale
961315  Post. Where would R rate blacks on intelligent scale
961316  Post. Where would R rate Hispanics on intelligent scale
961317  Post. Where would R rate whites on trustworthy scale
961318  Post. Where would R rate blacks on trustworthy scale
961319  Post. Where would R rate Hispanics on trustworthy scale
961320  Post. R position: Govt reduce diff betw rich/poor 7 point scale
961321  Post. R favor/oppose welfare limit women having more children
961322  Post. Strength - position on limiting welfare for more children
961323  Post. Does R favor/oppose 2 year limit on welfare
961324  Post. Strength - position on 2 year limit on welfare
961325  Post. Should number of immigrants should be increase/decreased
961326  Post. Does R think immigrants should be eligible for benefits
961327  Post. Does R favor/oppose limiting imports
961328  Post. Which network new programs does R watch most often
961329  Post. Did R watch 1st presidential debate
961330  Post. Did R watch the entire debate or just part of it
961331  Post. Did R watch 2nd presidential debate
961332  Post. Did R watch the entire debate or just part of it
961333  Post. Did R read about the campaign in any magazine
961334  Post. R's attention to articles about campaign in magazines
961335  Post. Did R listen to speeches/discussions on the radio
961336  Post. How many programs did R listen to on the radio
961337  Post. R's attention to news about presidential campaign
961338  Post. R's attention to news about congressional campaign
961339  Post. How much of the time R trusts news media to report fairly
961340  Post. Does R think the political system should remain two party
961341  Post. How similar are R's beliefs to other people
961342  Post. Is R a smoker
961343  Post. Has R ever smoked
961344  Post. Number of labor unions R is involved with
961345  Post. Number of labor groups R is a member of
961346  Post. Number of labor unions groups R pays dues to
961347  Post. Number of labor unions groups R has had activities in
961348  Post. Number of labor unions groups which discuss politics
961349  Post. Number of business groups R is involved with
961350  Post. Number of business groups R is a member of
961351  Post. Number of business groups R pays dues to
961352  Post. Number of business groups R has had activities in
961353  Post. Number of business groups which discuss politics
961354  Post. Number of veterans groups R is involved with
961355  Post. Number of veterans groups R is a member of
961356  Post. Number of veterans groups R pays dues to
961357  Post. Number of veterans groups R has had activities in
961358  Post. Number of veterans groups which discuss politics
961359  Post. Number of church groups R is involved with
961360  Post. Number of church groups R is a member of
961361  Post. Number of church groups R pays dues to
961362  Post. Number of church groups R has had activities in
961363  Post. Number of church groups which discuss politics
961364  Post. Number of other religious groups R is involved with
961365  Post. Number of other religious groups R is a member of
961366  Post. Number of other religious groups R pays dues to
961367  Post. Number of other religious groups R has had activities in
961368  Post. Number of other religious groups which discuss politics
961369  Post. Number of elderly groups R is involved with
961370  Post. Number of elderly groups R is a member of
961371  Post. Number of elderly groups R pays dues to
961372  Post. Number of elderly groups R has had activities in
961373  Post. Number of elderly groups which discuss politics
961374  Post. Number of ethnic groups R is involved with
961375  Post. Number of ethnic groups R is a member of
961376  Post. Number of ethnic groups R pays dues to
961377  Post. Number of ethnic groups R has had activities in
961378  Post. Number of ethnic groups which discuss politics
961379  Post. Number of women's groups R is involved with
961380  Post. Number of women's groups R is a member of
961381  Post. Number of women's groups R pays dues to
961382  Post. Number of women's groups R has had activities in
961383  Post. Number of women's groups which discuss politics
961384  Post. Number of polit. issue groups R is involved with
961385  Post. Number of polit. issue groups R is a member of
961386  Post. Number of polit. issue groups R pays dues to
961387  Post. Number of polit. issue groups R has had activities in
961388  Post. Number of polit. issue groups which discuss politics
961389  Post. Number of civic groups R is involved with
961390  Post. Number of civic groups R is a member of
961391  Post. Number of civic groups R pays dues to
961392  Post. Number of civic groups R has had activities in
961393  Post. Number of civic groups which discuss politics
961394  Post. Number of liberal/conserv groups R is involved with
961395  Post. Number of liberal/conserv groups R is a member of
961396  Post. Number of liberal/conserv groups R pays dues to
961397  Post. Number of liberal/conserv groups R has had activities in
961398  Post. Number of liberal/conserv groups which discuss politics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>961399</td>
<td>Post. Number of party/cand groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961400</td>
<td>Post. Number of party/cand groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961401</td>
<td>Post. Number of party/cand groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961402</td>
<td>Post. Number of party/cand groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961403</td>
<td>Post. Number of party/cand groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961404</td>
<td>Post. Number of children's groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961405</td>
<td>Post. Number of children's groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961406</td>
<td>Post. Number of children's groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961407</td>
<td>Post. Number of children's groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961408</td>
<td>Post. Number of children's groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961409</td>
<td>Post. Number of literary/art groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961410</td>
<td>Post. Number of literary/art groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961411</td>
<td>Post. Number of literary/art groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961412</td>
<td>Post. Number of literary/art groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961413</td>
<td>Post. Number of literary/art groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961414</td>
<td>Post. Number of hobby groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961415</td>
<td>Post. Number of hobby groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961416</td>
<td>Post. Number of hobby groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961417</td>
<td>Post. Number of hobby groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961418</td>
<td>Post. Number of hobby groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961419</td>
<td>Post. Number of community groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961420</td>
<td>Post. Number of community groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961421</td>
<td>Post. Number of community groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961422</td>
<td>Post. Number of community groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961423</td>
<td>Post. Number of community groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961424</td>
<td>Post. Number of fraternal groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961425</td>
<td>Post. Number of fraternal groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961426</td>
<td>Post. Number of fraternal groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961427</td>
<td>Post. Number of fraternal groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961428</td>
<td>Post. Number of fraternal groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961429</td>
<td>Post. Number of service to needy groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961430</td>
<td>Post. Number of service to needy groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961431</td>
<td>Post. Number of service to needy groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961432</td>
<td>Post. Number of service to needy groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961433</td>
<td>Post. Number of service to needy groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961434</td>
<td>Post. Number of educational groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961435</td>
<td>Post. Number of educational groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961436</td>
<td>Post. Number of educational groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961437</td>
<td>Post. Number of educational groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961438</td>
<td>Post. Number of educational groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961439</td>
<td>Post. Number of cultural groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961440</td>
<td>Post. Number of cultural groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961441</td>
<td>Post. Number of cultural groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961442</td>
<td>Post. Number of cultural groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961443</td>
<td>Post. Number of cultural groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961444</td>
<td>Post. Number of self-help groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961445</td>
<td>Post. Number of self-help groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961446</td>
<td>Post. Number of self-help groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961447</td>
<td>Post. Number of self-help groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961448</td>
<td>Post. Number of self-help groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961449</td>
<td>Post. Number of other groups R is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961450</td>
<td>Post. Number of other groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961451</td>
<td>Post. Number of other groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961452</td>
<td>Post. Number of other groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961453</td>
<td>Post. Number of other groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961454</td>
<td>Post. Total Number of groups R is involved in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961455</td>
<td>Post. Total Number of groups R is a member of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961456</td>
<td>Post. Total Number of groups R pays dues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961457</td>
<td>Post. Total Number of groups R has had activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961458</td>
<td>Post. Total Number of R groups which discuss politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post. Is R satisfied with the way that democracy works in the US
Post. Does R think that the last election was conducted fairly
Post. Does R think to self as close to a particular party
Post. Which party does R think of self as close to - #1
Post. Which party does R think of self as close to - #2
Post. Checkpoint: Number of parties that R feels close to
Post. Does R feel a little closer to one of the parties
Post. Which party does R feel closer to
Post. Strength of R's to closeness to political party
Post. R self placement on scale -'party cares what people think'
Post. Where does R place self on need for polit. parties scale
Post. R's placement of Dem party on like / dislike scale
Post. R's placement of Rep party on like / dislike scale
Post. R's placement of Reform party on like / dislike scale
Post. R's placement of Clinton on like / dislike scale
Post. R's placement of Dole on like / dislike scale
Post. R's placement of Perot on like / dislike scale
Post. How would R rate the state of the economy in the US
Post. Has the state of the economy gotten better / worse / same
Post. Has economy gotten much better / much worse
Post. R's placement on 'Congress knows what people think' scale
Post. Has R had contact with a member of Congress
Post. R's placement on 'make difference who is in power' scale
Post. R's placement on 'voting makes a difference' scale
Post. R's placement on 'people say what they think' scale
Post. R's placement on left / right scale
Post. Position of House candidates in Thermometers
Post. Position of Supreme Court in Thermometers
Post. Position of Congress in Thermometers
Post. Position of the Military in Thermometers
Post. Position of Federal Govt in Thermometers
Post. Position of Blacks in Thermometers
Post. Position of Whites in Thermometers
Post. Position of Conservatives in Thermometers
Post. Position of Liberals in Thermometers
Post. Position of Labor Unions in Thermometers
Post. Position of Big Business in Thermometers
Post. Position of Poor People in Thermometers
Post. Position of People on Welfare in Thermometers
Post. Position of Hispanics in Thermometers
Post. Position of Christian Fundamentalists in Thermometers
Post. Position of Women's Movement in Thermometers
Post. Position of Older People in Thermometers
Post. Position of Environmentalists in Thermometers
Post. Position of Gay Men and Lesbians in Thermometers
Post. Position of Christian Coalition in Thermometers
Post. Order of House candidates in Likes/Dislikes
Post. Order of Clinton and Dole in Traits
Post. Order of Clinton, Dole, Perot in Aid to Blacks scale
Post. Order of Clinton and Dole in Liberal/Conserv scale
Post. Order of House candidates in Liberal/Conserv scale
Post. Order of Clinton, Dole, Perot in Tax Cut scale
Post. Order of Blacks and Hispanics in Hardworking scale
Post. Order of Blacks and Hispanics in Intelligent scale
Post. Order of Blacks and Hispanics in Trustworthy scale
Congressional district number
FIPS state code
ICPSR state code
FIPS state and county code
State abbreviation
967001 Number of Democrats in lower state house 1994
967002 Number of Republicans in lower state house 1994
967003 Number of Democrats in upper state house 1994
967004 Number of Republicans in upper state house 1994
967005 Party of state governor pre-election 1996
967006 State percent vote for Clinton 1992
967007 State percent vote for Bush 1992
967008 State percent vote for Perot 1992
967009 Number of U.S. House districts in state
967010 Number of Democrats U.S. House pre-election 1996
967011 Number of Republicans U.S. House pre-election 1996
967012 Erikson-Wright-McIver percent Democrats in state
967013 Erikson-Wright-McIver percent Republicans in state
967014 Erikson-Wright-McIver percent liberals in state
967015 Erikson-Wright-McIver percent conservatives in state
967016 Name of Senator #1
967017 Party of Senator #1
967018 Is Senator #1 running for reelection?
967019 Name of Senator #2
967020 Party of Senator #2
967021 Is Senator #2 running for reelection?
967022 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl economic liberalism score
967023 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl social liberalism score
967024 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign liberalism score
967025 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl economic conservatism score
967026 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl social conservatism score
967027 Senator #1 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign conservatism score
967028 Senator #1 1995 U.S. Chamber of Commerce score
967029 Senator #1 1995 Party unity support score
967030 Senator #1 1995 Party unity opposition score
967031 Senator #1 1995 Party unity adjusted support score
967032 Senator #1 1995 Presidential support score
967033 Senator #1 1995 Presidential opposition score
967034 Senator #1 1995 Presidential adjusted support score
967035 Senator #1 1995 Conserv coalition support score
967036 Senator #1 1995 Conserv coalition opposition score
967037 Senator #1 1995 Conserv coalition adjusted support
967038 Senator #1 1995 Americans for Democratic Action score
967039 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl economic liberalism score
967040 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl social liberalism score
967041 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl foreign liberalism score
967042 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl economic conservatism score
967043 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl social conservatism score
967044 Senator #1 1996 Natl Jrnl foreign conservatism score
967045 Senator #1 1996 U.S. Chamber of Commerce score
967046 Senator #1 1996 Party unity support score
967047 Senator #1 1996 Party unity opposition score
967048 Senator #1 1996 Party unity adjusted support score
967049 Senator #1 1996 Presidential support score
967050 Senator #1 1996 Presidential opposition score
967051 Senator #1 1996 Presidential adjusted support score
967052 Senator #1 1996 Conserv coalition support score
967053 Senator #1 1996 Conserv coalition opposition score
967054 Senator #1 1996 Conserv coalition adjusted support
967055 Senator #1 1996 Americans for Democratic Action score
967056 Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl economic liberalism score
967057 Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl social liberalism score
967058 Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign liberalism score
967059 Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl economic conservatism score
967060 Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl social conservatism score
Senator #2 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign conservatism score
Senator #2 1995 U.S. Chamber of Commerce score
Senator #2 1995 Party unity support score
Senator #2 1995 Party unity opposition score
Senator #2 1995 Party unity adjusted support score
Senator #2 1995 Presidential support score
Senator #2 1995 Presidential opposition score
Senator #2 1995 Presidential adjusted support score
Senator #2 1995 Conserv coalition support score
Senator #2 1995 Conserv coalition opposition score
Senator #2 1995 Conserv coalition adjusted support
Senator #2 1995 Americans for Democratic Action score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl economic liberalism score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl social liberalism score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl foreign liberalism score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl economic conservatism score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl social conservatism score
Senator #2 1996 Natl Jrnl foreign conservatism score
Senator #2 1996 U.S. Chamber of Commerce score
Senator #2 1996 Party unity support score
Senator #2 1996 Party unity opposition score
Senator #2 1996 Party unity adjusted support score
Senator #2 1996 Presidential support score
Senator #2 1996 Presidential opposition score
Senator #2 1996 Presidential adjusted support score
Senator #2 1996 Conserv coalition support score
Senator #2 1996 Conserv coalition opposition score
Senator #2 1996 Conserv coalition adjusted support
Senator #2 1996 Americans for Democratic Action score
CQ pre-election Senate race outlook
Democratic Senate candidate prior political experience
Republican Senate candidate prior political experience
Kansas race #2: Democratic political experience
Kansas race #2: Republican political experience
Total votes cast for Democratic Senate candidate 1996
Total votes cast for Republican Senate candidate 1996
Total votes cast in Senate race 1996
Kansas race #2: Total votes Democratic candidate
Kansas race #2: Total votes Republican candidate
Kansas race #2: Total votes cast in Senate race
Campaign receipts by Democratic Senate candidate 1996
Campaign receipts by Republican Senate candidate 1996
Campaign expenditures by Democratic Senate candidate
Campaign expenditures by Republican Senate candidate
Kansas race #2: Democratic campaign receipts
Kansas race #2: Republican campaign receipts
Kansas race #2: Republican campaign expenditures
House incumbents party
Year House incumbent was first elected
House incumbents seniority in party
House incumbents sex
House incumbents race
House incumbents number of district offices
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl economic liberalism
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl social liberalism
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign liberalism
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl economic conservatism
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl social conservatism
House incumbent 1995 Natl Jrnl foreign conservatism
967181 County percent vote for Perot 1992
967182 Estimated number of DMA households
967183 Estimated average DMA cost per point
967184 Estimated DMA Early News cost per point
967185 Estimated DMA Prime Access cost per point
967186 Estimated DMA Prime Time cost per point
967187 Estimated DMA Late News cost per point