```
Version 03 Codebook
-------------------
CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE
1998 POST-ELECTION STUDY (1998.T)
```

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1998

CODEBOOK

Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Sapiro, Virginia, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies.

NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES, 1998: POST-ELECTION STUDY [dataset]. Ann Arbor, MI:
University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer and
distributor], 1999.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

> Note: >> sections in the codebook introduction and
>   codebook appendix can be navigated in the
>   machine-readable files by searching ">>" .

>>   INTRODUCTION: 1998 STUDY DESCRIPTION

The NES/CPS American National Election Study 1998 was
conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the
Institute for Social Research, under the general direction
of Principal Investigators Virginia Sapiro and Steven Rosenstone.
Kathy Cirksena was the Project Manager and Michael Horvath was
the Study Manager for the National Election Studies.

This is the twenty-fifth in a series of studies of American
national elections produced by the Center for Political Studies and
the Survey Research Center. It is the eleventh such study to be
conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation
Grants providing long-term support for the National Election
Studies. The 1998 National Election Study was funded under
grant number SBR-9707741.

Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed under the
supervision of a National Board of Overseers. Board members during
the planning of the 1998 National Election Study included: Larry
Bartels, Princeton University; Gary Cox, University of California,
San Diego; Charles Franklin, University of Wisconsin - Madison;
Robert Huckfeldt, Indiana University; Jon Krosnick, Ohio
State University; David Leege, University of Notre Dame; Warren
E. Miller, Arizona State University, ex officio; Wendy Rahn,
University of Minnesota; W. Phillips Shively, University of
Minnesota; Laura Stoker, University of California, Berkeley;
and John Zaller, the University of California at Los Angeles.

As part of the planning process, a special planning
committee was appointed, a pilot study conducted, and
stimulus letters sent to the members of the scholarly
community soliciting input on study plans. The 1998 Study
Planning Committee, chaired by Wendy Rahn, University of
Minnesota, included Larry Bartels, Princeton University;
Gary Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; William Jacoby,
University of South Carolina; Kimberly Kahn, Arizona State
University; David Leege, University of Notre Dame; Sam Popkin,
University of California, San Diego; Virginia Sapiro,
University of Wisconsin - Madison; Laura Stoker, University
of California, Berkeley.

A pilot study was carried out in September of 1997 for the
purpose of developing new instrumentation for the 1998
Election Study. New or improved items were tested in the
areas of mobilization and non-electoral participation,
group-based politics, response latency, and religion and
politics. Data from the 1997 Pilot Study are available through
the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social
Research (ICPSR 2282), or from the NES web site
(www.umich.edu/~nes). Results from the pilot study (as
summarized in Pilot Study Reports which are listed in this
codebook) were used by the Planning Committee in formulating
recommendations to the Board about study content for the 1998
Election Study.

The Principal Investigators, Board of Overseers, and project staff
note with sadness that this is the last National Election Study

with which Warren E. Miller was associated before his death in
February, 1999.
He was a leader in every study from 1952 on, and he shepherded the
transformation of these studies into a national social science
resource. His important work lives on.

>> 1998 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SURVEY CONTENT

The Board of Overseers balanced a number of considerations in
selecting content for the Post-Election Survey. There was, as always,
the necessity of maintaining continuity with past surveys. All
congressional time-series items were evaluated by the Board, and
input was solicited from the research community about whether each
should be used for the 1998 Study.

The items that fall into the time-series, or "core" category, are:
campaign attention; media exposure; House candidate recall; feeling
thermometer ratings of congressional candidates and groups; likes and
dislikes of congressional candidates; registration and turnout; vote
for Representative, Senator and Governor; Presidential traits and
affects; Presidential performance items; most important problem;
campaign activities; system support and efficacy items; approval of
performance of Congress; House Representative performance rating;
incumbency status of House Candidates; retrospective and prospective
economic evaluations (national and individual); strength of the US
position in the world and isolationism; liberal-conservative scale
ratings of self, President and parties; party identification;
interest in politics and public affairs; how often Respondent
discusses politics; political knowledge/recognition items; seven-
point issue scales with placements; views on abortion, school prayer
and the death penalty; items of moral traditionalism and egalitarianism;
measures of religiosity; and the standard and extensive battery of
demographic questions.

A number of questions are new or relatively new to the Study. Some
came from the piloting work described above-- e.g., the Congressional
Traits section (allowing comparative evaluation of the president and
congress), Role of Religion and Religious Institutions in Society and
Politics, and the question on late-term abortions. This survey also
included a range of items relating to the the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal,
and some new questions on key issues, such as school vouchers, foreign
imports, and immigration.

It should be noted that the impeachment of President Clinton occurred
during the field period.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION: MIXED-MODE STRATEGY

NES election studies are traditionally based on personal rather
than telephone interviewing in order to preserve the quality of
sampling and survey response. Given questions that have been
raised within the research community about the relatively high
expense of face-to-face interviewing compared with the more
widely-used telephone mode, the NES Board of Overseers authorized
a series of efforts to investigate possibilities for maximizing
the use of telephone interviewing. The 1996 Post-Election Study
included a mode experiment, in which 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 in that study. In 1998 a panel of experts was assembled by the
Board to investigate the results of that mode experiment as well
as other empirical evidence available to determine their
implications for future administration of NES studies. That panel
will report to the Board during 1999. In the interim, the Board
of Overseers authorized the 1998 Election Study to be conducted in
a "mixed mode" to maximize telephone interviewing without accepting
the sacrifices in quality of sampling coverage that result from
random digit dialing strategies.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION: CONTACT AND CANDIDATE INFORMATION

NES and DST collaborated to develop a set of contact protocols
to most efficiently utilize this mixed mode strategy. Initial
face-to-face contact was made with as many respondents and informants
as possible. During this initial contact, interviewers attempted
to complete the screening and household listing at the doorstep
and to make an appointment to conduct a telephone interview with
the selected respondent. Interviewing materials, such as the
Respondent Book and Ballot Card were left for the respondent at
this time. If a respondent was unable or unwilling to do an interview
by telephone, arrangements were made to conduct the interview
face-to-face.

Candidate information (names, gender and candidate codes) were
"pre-loaded" into the application to be used during the interview.
The pre-loaded information is included in the released data. However,
since paper candidate lists are no longer utilized as field materials,
there is no "Candidate List" appended to this codebook, although the
term 'Candidate List' continues to be used in the codebook as a reference
to the candidate information available to the interviewer (CAPI preload).

RESPONSE RATE

Final result codes for the total sample were used to calculate two kinds
of response rates as presented in the table below. The summary response
rate (the ratio of completed interviews to the total number of potential
respondents) for the study was 63.9%. The completion rate (the ratio of
cases in which some responsible member of the housing unit was reached
to the total number of potential respondents) for the study was 92.1%.
(Note: Result codes for the full sample are included in the Study
nonresponse or 'bias' file.)

The administration of this survey posed special difficulties that
will require further investigation, and will be the subject of
future technical reports. Budgetary restrictions required that the
target number of interviews (1,500) be lower than was the case in
previous studies. In the end, the response rate was somewhat lower
than NES has experienced in the past for a number of reasons. The
mixed-mode strategy creates some inefficiencies in data collection.
Increases in the number of locked buildings, gated communities,
and seasonally-occupied dwelling units affected response rate.
Finally, it is likely that interviewing during the time period
that encompassed the presidential impeachment and related scandal
news reduced people's willingness to respond to political surveys.
The response rate difficulties became apparent early in the field

period. The field and study staff implemented a number of
strategies to bolster response rates, including using the most
experienced interviewers possible, and raising the respondent
incentives. At the outset of the field period, the respondent
incentive was $10. On November 25 it was raised to $30, and on
December 4 it was raised to $50. Two options for increasing the
number of interviews were rejected. First, no additional sample
lines were added because, while this would have increased the number
of respondents, it would have also lowered the response rate. Second,
although in some past studies the field period has been extended into
the new year to allow the interviewers to pursue the remaining resistant
cases, in 1998, given the likely effects of the impeachment of the
President on the quality of election-related survey responses, especially
in light of the likely per case expense, this option was not taken.

                    FIELD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

              Response Rate: 63.9%

             Completion rate: 92.1%

      Avg. Length of Interview: 65.9 min

          No. of Respondents: 1281

     The response rate is calculated as:
             IWS/(Sample N)-(NER+NS)
     The completion rate is calculated as:
             (Sample N-(NC+NS+NER))/Sample N -(NS+NER)

     where NS = Nonsample
            NER = No Eligible respondent
            IWS = Total interviews
             NC = No Contact.

WEIGHTING

The 1998 Post-Election Study data include analysis weight V980002.
This weight was created for the primary purpose of correcting for under-
representation in study data of younger and less-educated respondents,
and is post-stratified to match the Current Population Study (CPS) estimate
of the distribution of age group by education level. It is the product
of a within-household selection weight, a household-level nonresponse
adjustment factor, and the person-level post-stratification factor already
described. The nonresponse adjustment factor compensates for differential
response rates by Census Region and metropolitan status. Full information
about construction of the weight is found in the section "1998 WEIGHT
DOCUMENTATION".

 >> 1998 SAMPLING INFORMATION

                      Sampling Section
                   Survey Research Center
                Institute for Social Research
                    University of Michigan
                        March 1999

1998 NATIONAL POST-ELECTION STUDY SAMPLE DESIGN

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1998 National Post-election Study (NES) is
defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the
1998 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units in
the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living
in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United
States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 3rd of November
1998.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1998 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected
from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) 1990 National Sample design.
Identification of the 1998 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four
stage sampling process--a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan
Statistical Areas (MSAs) or New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs) and
non-MSA counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a
third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and
concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected
housing units. A detailed documentation of the 1990 SRC National Sample, from
which the 1998 NES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled
1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 1998 NES sample design called for an entirely new cross-section
sample to be drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample; no panel component was
included in 1998.   The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area
probability sample. Since the 1998 NES sample was drawn from the 1990 SRC
National Sample, the first stages of selection for the 1998 NES Sample
correspond to the first stages of selection for the 1990 SRC National Sample.

SELECTION STAGES FOR THE 1998 NES SAMPLE: 19990 SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs) for the 1990 SRC
National Sample, which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, New
England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs), single counties, independent
cities, county equivalents or groupings of small counties, is based on the
county-level 1990 Census Reports of Population and Housing (1). Primary stage
units were assigned to 108 explicit strata based on MSA/NECMA or non-MSA/NECMA
status, PSU size, Census Region and geographic location within region.
Twenty-eight of the 108 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU,
each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample
selection. The remaining 80 nonself-representing strata contain more than one
PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with
probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1990 occupied housing
units.

The full 1990 SRC National Sample of 108 primary stage selections was
designed to be optimal for surveys roughly three to five times the size of
the 1998 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller
survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily
partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs such as a one-half sample or a

three-quarter sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a
stratified subselection from the full 108 PSU design. The 1998 NES sample of
44 PSUs is a stratified random subsample of PSUs from the "A" half-sample
partition of the 1990 SRC National Sample. Because of the small size of this
NES sample, both the number of PSUs (selected primary areas) and the secondary
stage units (area segments) in the National half-sample were reduced by
subselection for the 1998 NES sample design. The 18 self-representing areas
in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all retained for the 1998 NES sample
(8 of these remained self-representing in the 1998 NES and 10 represent not
only their own MSA but their "pair" among the twenty additional
self-representing primary areas of the full 1990 SRC National Sample design).
Nineteen of the 26 nonself-representing half-sample MSAs and 7 of the 14
half-sample non-MSAs were retained by the subselection for the 1998 NES sample
(or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

     Table 1 identifies the 44 PSUs in the 1998 NES sample by MSA status and
Region and also indicates the number of area segments used for the 1998 NES
sample (see next section on second stage selection).

Table 1: PSU Name and Number of Area Segments in the 1998 NES Sample
         Showing 1990 SRC National-Sample Stratum and MSA Status

National Sample PSU	National Sample PSU Name	# of 1998 NES Segments
	Eight Largest Self-representing PSUs	
120	New York, NY MSA	12
190	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA	12
130	Chicago, IL MSA	9
121	Philadelphia, PA-NJ MSA	7
131	Detroit, MI MSA	6
150	Washington DC-MD-VA MSA	6
110	Boston, MA NECMA	6
171	Dallas and Ft Worth, TX CMSA	6
	Ten Remaining Largest MSA PSUs	
170	Houston, TX MSA	6
191	Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA	6
141	St Louis, MO-IL MSA	6
152	Baltimore, MD MSA	6
122	Nassau-Suffolk, NY MSA	6
194	Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA MSA	6
132	Cleveland, OH MSA	6
154	Miami-Hialeah, FL MSA	5 (2)
181	Denver, CO MSA	6
196	San Francisco, CA MSA	6
	Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast	
211	New Haven-Waterbury-Meriden, CT NECMA	6 / 6

```
    213        |         Manchester-Nashua NH NECMA      |         6
    220        |         Buffalo, NY MSA                 |         6
    226        |         Atlantic City, NJ MSA           |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing MSAs:  Midwest  |
               |                                         |
    230        |         Milwaukee, WI MSA               |         6
    236        |         Madison, WI MSA                 |         6
    239        |         Steubenville-Wheeling, OH (3)   |         6
    240        |         Des Moines, IA MSA              |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing MSAs:  South    |
               |                                         |
    250        |         Richmond-Petersburg, VA MSA     |         6
    255        |         Columbus, GA-AL MSA             |         6
    257        |         Jacksonville, FL MSA            |         6
    258        |         Lakeland, FL MSA                |         6
    260        |         Knoxville TN MSA                |         6
    262        |         Birmingham, AL MSA              |         6
    273        |         Waco, TX MSA                    |         6
    274        |         McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX MSA |        6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing MSAs:  West     |
               |                                         |
    280        |         Salt Lake City-Ogden etc, UT MSA |        6
    292        |         Fresno, CA MSA                  |         6
    293        |         Eugene-Springfield, OR MSA      |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:       |
               |             Northeast                   |
               |                                         |
    320        |         Elk County, PA                  |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Midwest |
               |                                         |
    332        |         Switzerland County, IN          |         6
    340        |         Steele County, MN               |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  South |
               |                                         |
    351        |         Harrisonburg IC, VA             |         6
    354        |         Whitfield County, GA            |         6
    370        |         Jim Wells County, TX            |         6
               |                                         |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               |                                         |
               |    Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  West |
               |                                         |
```

```
        381        |    Sandoval County, NM              |       6
                   |                                     |
--------------------------------------------------------------------------
                        Total Number of Segments                279
```

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

    The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 1998 NES
sample, was selected directly from computerized files that were extracted for
the selected PSUs from the 1990 U.S. Census summary file series STF1-B.
These files (on CD Rom) contain the 1990 Census total population and housing
unit (HU) data at the census block level. The designated second-stage sampling
units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in both
the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and in the rural areas of non-MSA primary
areas. Each SSU block or block combination was assigned a measure of size
equal to the total 1990 occupied housing unit count for the area. SSU
block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 1990 total HUs per MSA SSU and
a minimum measure of 48 total Hus per non-MSA SSU.   Second stage sampling of
area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned
measures of size (PPS).

    For the 1998 NES sample the number of area segments used in each PSU
varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of area segments varies
in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 area
segments in the self-representing New York and Los Angeles MSA PSUs, to a low
of 6 area segments in the smaller self-representing PSUs such as Cleveland,
Miami-Hialeah or Nassau-Suffolk MSAs. All nonself-representing (NSR) PSUs
were represented by 6 area segments each. A total of 279 NES area segments
were selected as shown in Table 1.

Third Stage Selection of Housing Units: 1998 NES Sample

    For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing
had been made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of
the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units,
all housing units in a subselected part of the segment were listed. The final
equal probability sample of housing units for the 1998 NES sample was
systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area
segments.

    The 1998 NES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample
to yield an equal probability sample of 2557 listed housing units. The 1998
NES sample drawn was slightly smaller than the expected required sample size
of 2577 lines based on the assumptions detailed in Table 2 below. Additional
"reserve" sample was not drawn from the entire sample design; a decision was
made that if additional reserve sample was required to meet interview goals,
it would be drawn instead from a selected subsample of segments rather than
across all segments. The overall probability of selection for 1998 NES
cross-section sample of households was f=0.000023100 or 0.23100 in 10,000.
The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 1998 NES
sample by using the standard multi-stage sampling technique of setting the
sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be
inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the PSU and
area segment (Kish, 1965).

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection: 1998 NES Sample

Within each sampled 1998 NES occupied housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949) a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent.

1998 NES SAMPLE DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OUTCOME

The 1998 Post-election Study sought a total of 1500 interviews. It was estimated that this would require a NES sample draw of 2577 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.86, an eligibility rate of 0.94 and a response rate of 0.72. These assumptions were based on the 1994 NES Cross-section Sample field experience. The overall 1998 NES Post-election sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes are set out in Table 2, below.

2557 listed sample lines were actually selected for the 1998 NES study (resulting in 2568 sample households). There was no Panel component in 1998 and no reserve sample was selected. Selected sample lines having mailable addresses were sent to the Telematch for name and telephone number matching prior to release for field contact.

The 1998 NES Study design called for maximum use of telephone interviewing after initial face-to-face screening in the field to locate eligible households/respondents. It was hoped that this would maximize interviewing field efficiency and minimize the necessity to send traveler field personnel into the primary areas not staffed by permanent field personnel.

A comparison of the 1998 NES design specifications and assumptions to the outcome figures in Table 2 indicates that, although the assumed eligibility rate was met in the sample outcome, the occupancy rate estimation in the design was higher than that encountered and response rate specification in the design was much higher than that actually achieved. This, of course, resulted in fewer interviews taken than specified in the sample design.

Table 2:   1998 Post-election Survey Sample Design Specifications and
           Assumptions Compared to Sample Outcome

	1998 NES Design Specification	1998 NES Sample Outcome
Completed Interviews	1500	1281
Response Rate	0.72	0.638
Eligible Sample Households	2083	2008
Eligibility Rate	0.94	0.944
Occupied Households	2216	2127
Occupancy/growth Rate	0.86	0.828
Total Sample Lines	2577	2568

The study design for the 1998 NES Post-election Study called for initial contact to be made by field staff in a face-to-face screening effort to determine eligibility. This was to be followed by either an in-person or telephone interview--with the intention of obtaining as many interviews as possible by phone in an effort to reduce field costs. Screening and interviewing began on November 4, 1998--the day after election day. The data

collection period continued through December 22, 1998. 1281 interviews were
obtained. Table 3 shows the outcome for the 1998 Post Election Survey by
interview mode.

   Table 3. 1998 Post-election Survey: Interviews by Data Collection Mode

	Total	Telephone	Face-to-Face
Interviews	1281	991	290

NOTES
-----

(1)   Office of Management and Budget (OMB) June 1990 definitions of MSAs,
NECMAs, counties, parishes, independent cities. These, of course, differ in
some respects from the primary stage unit (PSU) definitions used in the 1980
SRC National Sample so will not be strictly comparable to the 1996 NES Panel
PSUs--particularly in New England where MSAs were used as PSUs in the 1980
National Sample and NECMAs were used as PSUs in the 1990 National Sample

(2)   One selected segment (023) was in a former trailer park that had no
housing units to be listed in January 1996; all had been destroyed in 1992 by
hurricane "Andrew" and there were no plans to rebuild.

(3)   In the 1990 SRC National Sample, U.S. Census Region boundaries were
maintained for purposes of stratification at the Primary Stage of selection.
Since some MSA definitions cross Region boundaries, such MSAs were split and
the MSA counties recombined in ways that maintained the Region boundary. This
PSU actually contains the Ohio counties from both the Steubenville-Wierton,
OH-WV MSA (Jefferson County, OH) and the Wheeling, WV-OH MSA (Belmont County,
OH) and although it is made up of MSA counties--it is not a cohesive MSA by
OMB 1990 definition.
 >> 1998 WEIGHT DOCUMENTATION

WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1998 NES DATA

     The 1998 NES data set includes a person-level analysis weight which
incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. Analysts
interested in developing their own nonresponse or post-stratification
adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data
from the NES Board.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Sample Selection Weight

     The area probability sample design for the 1998 NES results in an equal
probability sample of U.S. households. However, within sample households a
single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the
number of eligible adults may vary from one household to another, the random
selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection
probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to
compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The value of the
respondent selection weight is exactly equal to the number of eligible adults
in the household from which the random respondent was selected (variable

980035). The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations which have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

Household Nonresponse Adjustment Factor

    Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the 1998 NES sample were formed by crossing PSU type (largest MSAs, other MSAs, or non-MSA) by the four Census regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). A nonresponse adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases.

  Table 4. Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights--1998 NES Sample

PSU Type	Census Region	Response Rate (%)	Nonresponse Adjustment Factor
Large MSAs	Northeast	47.53	2.104
	Midwest	60.63	1.649
	South	55.37	1.806
	West	57.00	1.754
Smaller MSAs	Northeast	61.01	1.639
	Midwest	73.94	1.353
	South	65.88	1.518
	West	74.22	1.347
Non MSAs	Northeast	66.67	1.500
	Midwest	72.99	1.370
	South	67.12	1.490
	West	69.62	1.436

Post-stratification Factor

    The 1998 NES weights are post-stratified to 1998 CPS proportions for seven (7) age by four (4) education categories. There are actually 27 post-stratification cells because for the youngest age group (18-21) the highest two education categories (some college/college graduate) are combined. Table 5 shows the weighted estimates and proportions for the 27 cells for the 1998 CPS and the weighted 1998 CPS and NES percents. The Post-stratification adjustment is computed by dividing the CPS percent by the 1998 NES percent based on the nonresponse adjusted selection weight. The final two columns show the NES weighted totals using the final post-stratified analysis weight and the resulting percents which match the CPS percents.

FINAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

    The final analysis weight is the product of the household level non-response adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, and a person-level post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the 1998 NES sample (V980002) is scaled to sum to 1281, the total number of respondents. These weights were constructed using the 1998 NES Post-Election data set.

  Table 5: 1998 NES Sample Weight: Post-stratification Factor

Age	Education Level	n	1998 CPS Est.in 000s (4)	1998 CPS %	Prelim. 1998 NES wtd %	Post Strat. adjust	NES wtd n	Final NES wtd %
18-21	< High Sch. Graduation	18	3,787.9	2.069	1.595	1.297	26.5	2.1
	High School Graduate	29	4,409.7	2.408	2.747	0.877	30.8	2.4
	Some College/ College Grad.	50	5,477.1	2.991	5.240	0.571	38.3	3.0
22-29	< High Sch. Graduation	17	2,331.6	1.273	1.097	1.161	16.3	1.3
	High School Graduate	43	8,120.4	4.435	3.318	1.336	56.8	4.4
	Some College	51	9,119.7	4.981	4.292	1.160	63.8	5.0
	College Graduate	37	6,397.4	3.494	2.951	1.184	44.8	3.5
30-39	< High Sch. Graduation	22	3,653.8	1.996	1.804	1.106	25.6	2.0
	High School Graduate	89	13,743.3	7.506	6.563	1.144	96.2	7.5
	Some College	83	10,969.6	5.991	6.302	0.951	76.7	6.0
	College Graduate	81	10,422.0	5.692	6.846	0.831	72.9	5.7
40-49	< High Sch. Graduation	18	3,469.3	1.895	1.596	1.187	24.3	1.9
	High School Graduate	93	12,547.9	6.853	7.352	0.932	87.8	6.9
	Some College	73	11,050.4	6.035	5.546	1.088	77.3	6.0
	College Graduate	99	10,766.3	5.880	7.574	0.776	75.3	5.9
50-59	< High Sch. Graduation	18	3,695.1	2.018	1.409	1.432	25.8	2.0
	High School Graduate	49	9,175.9	5.012	3.681	1.361	64.2	5.0
	Some College	50	6,247.0	3.412	4.064	0.840	43.7	3.4
	College Graduate	71	6,972.5	3.808	5.591	0.681	48.8	3.8
60-69	< High Sch. Graduation	31	4,486.2	2.450	2.504	0.978	31.4	2.5
	High School Graduate	45	7,105.3	3.881	3.287	1.180	49.7	3.9
	Some College	26	3,516.0	1.920	1.919	1.000	24.6	1.9
	College Graduate	37	3,543.6	1.935	2.892	0.669	24.8	1.9
70 +	< High Sch. Graduation	45	7,686.8	4.198	2.631	1.595	53.8	4.2
	High School Graduate	43	7,636.0	4.170	2.896	1.440	53.4	4.2
	Some College	33	3,770.2	2.059	2.128	0.968	26.4	2.1

| College Graduate | 30 | 2,994.5 | 1.635 | 2.173 | 0.753 | 21.0 | 1.6 |
| Totals | 1281 | 183,080.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 1281.0 | 100.0 |

NOTES
-----

(4) Because U.S. citizenship is required for NES eligibility, the CPS counts used for post-stratification include only U.S. citizens.
 >> 1998 SAMPLING ERROR

PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLING ERROR ESTIMATION

     The 1998 NES sample design is based on a stratified multi-stage area probability sample of United States households. Although smaller in scale, the NES sample design is very similar in it basic structure to the multi-stage designs used for major federal survey programs such as the Health Interview Survey (HIS) or the Current Population Survey (CPS). The survey literature refers to the NES, HIS and CPS samples as complex designs, a loosely-used term meant to denote the fact that the sample incorporates special design features such as stratification, clustering and differential selection probabilities (i.e., weighting) that analysts must consider in computing sampling errors for sample estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. This section of the 1998 NES sample design description focuses on sampling error estimation and construction of confidence intervals for survey estimates of descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, ratios, and coefficients for linear and logistic linear regression models.

     Standard analysis software systems such SAS and SPSS assume simple random sampling (SRS) or equivalently independence of observations in computing standard errors for sample estimates. In general, the SRS assumption results in underestimation of variances of survey estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. Confidence intervals based on computed variances that assume independence of observations will be biased (generally too narrow) and design-based inferences will be affected accordingly.

SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATION METHODS AND PROGRAMS

     Over the past 50 years, advances in survey sampling theory have guided the development of a number of methods for correctly estimating variances from complex sample data sets. A number of sampling error programs which implement these complex sample variance estimation methods are available to NES data analysts.   The two most common approaches to the estimation of sampling error for complex sample data are through the use of a Taylor Series Linearization of the estimator (and corresponding approximation to its variance) or through the use of resampling variance estimation procedures such as Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR) or Jackknife Repeated Replication(JRR). New Bootstrap methods for variance estimation can also be included among the resampling approaches. See Rao and Wu (1988).

1. Taylor series linearization method:

     When survey data are collected using a complex sample design with unequal size clusters, most statistics of interest will not be simple linear functions

of the observed data. The linearization approach applies Taylor's method to
derive an approximate form of the estimator that is linear in statistics for
which variances and covariances can be directly and easily estimated
(Woodruff, 1971). SUDAAN and Stata are two commercially available statistical
software packages that include procedures that apply the Taylor series method
to estimation and inference for complex sample data.

     SUDAAN (Shah et al., 1996) is a commercially available software system
developed and marketed by the Research Triangle Institute of Research Triangle
Park, North Carolina (USA). SUDAAN was developed as a stand-alone software
system with capabilities for the more important methods for descriptive and
multivariate analysis of survey data, including: estimation and inference for
means, proportions and rates (PROC DESCRIPT and PROC RATIO); contingency table
analysis (PROC CROSSTAB); linear regression (PROC REGRESS); logistic
regression (PROC LOGISTIC); log-linear models (PROC CATAN); and survival
analysis (PROC SURVIVAL). SUDAAN V7.0 and earlier versions were designed to
read directly from ASCII and SAS system data sets. The latest versions of
SUDAAN permit procedures to be called directly from the SAS system.
Information on SUDAAN is available at the following web site address:
http://www.rti.org.

     Stata (StataCorp, 1997) is a more recent commercial entry to the
available software for analysis of complex sample survey data and has a
growing body of research users. Stata includes special versions of its
standard analysis routines that are designed for the analysis of complex
sample survey data. Special survey analysis programs are available for
descriptive estimation of means (SVYMEAN), ratios (SVYRATIO), proportions
(SVYTOT) and population totals (SVYTOTAL). Stata programs for multivariate
analysis of survey data currently include linear regression (SVYREG), logistic
regression (SVYLOGIT) and probit regression (SVYPROBT). Information on the
Stata analysis software system can be found on the Web at:
http://www.stata.com.

2. Resampling methods:

     BRR, JRR and the bootstrap comprise a second class of nonparametric
methods for conducting estimation and inference from complex sample data. As
suggested by the generic label for this class of methods, BRR, JRR and the
bootstrap utilize replicated subsampling of the sample data base to develop
sampling variance estimates for linear and nonlinear statistics. WesVar PC
(Brick et al., 1996) is a publicly available software system for personal
computers that employs replicated variance estimation methods to conduct the
more common types of statistical analysis of complex sample survey data.
WesVar PC was developed by Westat, Inc. and is distributed along with
documentation free of charge to researchers from Westat's Web site:
http://www.westat.com/wesvarpc/. WesVar PC includes a Windows-based
application generator that enables the analyst to select the form of data
input (SAS data file, SPSS for Windows data base, dBASE file, ASCII data set)
and the computation method (BRR or JRR methods). Analysis programs contained
in WesVar PC provide the capability for basic descriptive (means, proportions,
totals, cross tabulations) and regression (linear, logistic) analysis of
complex sample survey data. WestVar Complex Samples 3.0 is the latest version
of WestVar PC that is licensed and distributed by SPSS. Information on the
latest developments can be obtained at http://www.spss.com.

     These new and updated software packages include an expanded set of user
friendly, well-documented analysis procedures. Difficulties with sample
design specification, data preparation, and data input in the earlier
generations of survey analysis software created a barrier to use by analysts

who were not survey design specialists. The new software enables the user to
input data and output results in a variety of common formats, and the latest
versions accommodate direct input of data files from the major analysis
software systems.   Readers who are interested in a more detailed comparison
of these and other survey analysis software alternatives are referred to Cohen
(1997).

Sampling Error Computation Models

     Regardless of whether linearization or a resampling approach is used,
estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires the
specification of a sampling error computation model. NES data analysts who
are interested in performing sampling error computations should be aware that
the estimation programs identified in the preceding section assume a specific
sampling error computation model and will require special sampling error
codes. Individual records in the analysis data set must be assigned sampling
error codes which identify to the programs the complex structure of the sample
(stratification, clustering) and are compatible with the computation
algorithms of the various programs. To facilitate the computation of sampling
error for statistics based on 1998 NES data, design-specific sampling error
codes will be routinely included in all public-use versions of the data set.
Although minor recoding may be required to conform to the input requirements
of the individual programs, the sampling error codes that are provided should
enable analysts to conduct either Taylor Series or Replicated estimation of
sampling errors for survey statistics.

     Table 6 defines the sampling error coding system for 1998 NES sample
cases. Two sampling error code variables are defined for each case based on
the sample design primary stage unit (PSU) and area segment in which the
sample household is located.

Sampling Error Stratum Code (V980103, first two digits). The Sampling
Error Computation Stratum Code is the variable which defines the sampling
error computation strata for all sampling error analysis of the NES data.
Each self-representing (SR) design stratum is represented by one sampling
error computation stratum. Pairs of similar nonself-representing (NSR)
primary stage design strata are "collapsed" (Kalton, 1977) to create NSR
sampling error computation strata. Since there was an uneven number of
nonself-representing MSA and non-MSA strata used in the 1998 NES, and since
it was felt that a nonself-representing MSA PSU should be paired with a
non-MSA PSU, one of each of these PSUs stands alone within its Sampling Error
Stratum Code.

     For the 1990 SRC National Sample design controlled selection and a
"one-per-stratum" PSU allocation are used to select the primary stage of the
1998 NES national sample. The purpose in using controlled selection and the
"one-per-stratum" sample allocation is to reduce the between-PSU component of
sampling variation relative to a"two-per-stratum" primary stage design.
Despite the expected improvement in sample precision, a drawback of the
"one-per-stratum" design is that two or more sample selection strata must be
collapsed or combined to form a sampling error computation stratum. Variances
are then estimated under the assumption that a multiple PSU per stratum design
was actually used for primary stage selection. The expected consequence of
collapsing design strata into sampling error computation strata is the
overestimation of the true sampling error; that is, the sampling error
computation model defined by the codes contained in Table 6 will yield
estimates of sampling errors which in expectation will be slightly greater
than the true sampling error of the statistic of interest.

     SECU - Stratum-specific Sampling Error Computation Unit code (V980103,

last digit) is a half sample code for analysis of sampling error
using the BRR method or approximate "two-per-stratum" Taylor Series method
(Kish and Hess, 1959). Within the SR sampling error strata, the SECU half
sample units are created by dividing sample cases into random halves, SECU=1
and SECU=2. The assignment of cases to half-samples is designed to preserve
the stratification and second stage clustering properties of the sample within
an SR stratum. Sample cases are assigned to SECU half samples based on the
area segment in which they were selected. For this assignment, sample cases
were placed in original stratification order (area segment number order) and
beginning with a random start entire area segment clusters were systematically
assigned to either SECU=1 or SECU=2.

In the general case of nonself-representing (NSR) strata, the half sample
units are defined according to the PSU to which the respondent was assigned at
sample selection (with the exception of the two unpaired NSR strata mentioned
above). That is, the half samples for each NSR sampling error computation
stratum bear a one-to-one correspondence to the sample design NSR PSUs. The
particular sample coding provided on the NES public use data set is consistent
with the "ultimate cluster" approach to complex sample variance estimation
(Kish, 1965; Kalton, 1977). Individual stratum, PSU and segment code
variables may be needed by NES analysts interested in components of variance
analysis or estimation of hierarchical models in which PSU-level and
neighborhood-level effects are explicitly estimated.

Table 6 shows the sampling error stratum and SECU codes to be used for
the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 1998 NES
analyses. Strata 01 through 27 reflect the half sample 1990 National Sample
design used for the 1998 NES cross-section sample. It can be seen from this
table that the three-digit 1998 SE code is comprised of, first, the two-digit
SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code.

Table 6: 1998 NES Post-Election Study Sampling Error Codes

SE Stratum	SECU	SE Code	PSU	Segment #s	Total Rs
01	1	011	120	015, 031, 047, 063, 079, 099	15
	2	012	120	007, 023, 039, 055, 071, 087	12
02	1	021	190	007, 023, 039, 055, 071, 087	12
	2	022	190	015, 031, 047, 063, 079, 095	13
03	1	031	130	012, 028, 044, 060	11
	2	032	130	004, 020, 036, 052, 068	14
04	1	041	121	002, 018, 034, 050	8
	2	042	121	010, 026, 042	8
05	1	051	131	016, 032, 048	18

	2	052	131	008, 024, 040	12
06	1	061	150	007, 023, 039	7
	2	062	150	015, 031, 047	12
07	1	071	171	010, 026, 042	8
	2	072	171	002, 018, 034	9
08	1	081	110	004, 020, 036	8
	2	082	110	012, 028, 044	8
09	1	091	170	007, 011, 019, 027, 031, 039	32
	2	092	154	003, 007, 011, 015, 019	6
10	1	101	122	008, 012, 016, 024, 028, 032	18
	2	102	152	004, 012, 016, 020, 028, 032	24
11	1	111	141	004, 008, 016, 020, 024, 032	20
	2	112	132	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021	22
12	1	121	191	001, 005, 009, 017, 021, 025	36
	2	122	181	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021	24
13	1	131	194	004, 008, 016, 020, 024, 032	16
	2	132	196	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	13
14	1	141	220	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021	44
	2	142	226	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	26
15	1	151	211	003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023	15
	2	152	213	004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024	12
16	1	161	230	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	55

	2	162	236	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	36
17	1	171	239	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021	21
	2	172	240	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	27
18	1	181	262	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	61
	2	182	255	004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024	17
19	1	191	257	004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024	25
	2	192	258	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	25
20	1	201	273	003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023	17
	2	202	274	002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022	20
21	1	211	260	003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023	23
	2	212	250	003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023	34
22	1	221	292	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 022	21
	2	222	293	003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023	33
23	1	231	280	002, 010, 018	15
	2	232	280	006, 014, 022	26
24	1	241	320	006, 014, 022	20
	2	242	320	002, 010, 018	18
25	1	251	332	004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024	55
	2	252	340	001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021	45
26	1	261	351	001, 005, 009, 013, 018, 021	68
	2	262	354	004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024	22
27	1	271	370	001, 005, 009, 013,	59

```
                            017, 021

        2     272    381     001, 005, 009, 013,          55
                            017, 021

   Total:                                          1281
```

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1998 NES

        To assist NES analysts, the PC SUDAAN program was used to compute
sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of proportions estimated from
the 1998 NES Post-election Survey data set. For each estimate, sampling
errors were computed for the total sample and for twenty demographic and
political affiliation subclasses of the 1998 NES Post-election Survey sample.
The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and
translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 7.
The mean value of deft, the square root of the design effect, was found to be
1.103. The design effect was primarily due to weighting effects (Kish, 1965)
and did not vary significantly by subclass size. Therefore the generalized
variance table is produced by multiplying the simple random sampling standard
error for each proportion and sample size by the average deft for the set of
sampling error computations.

        Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive
set of example computations, Table 7 provides approximate standard errors for
percentage estimates based on the 1998 NES. To use the table, examine the
column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value
of the estimated percentage that is of interest.(5) Next, locate the
approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand
row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a
percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column
(percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent
approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an
approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate
critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g., z=1.96 for a two-sided 95%
confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors
in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages not to the
difference between two percentage estimates.

        The generalized variance results presented in Table 7 are a useful tool
for initial, cursory examination of the NES survey results. For more in depth
analysis and reporting of critical estimates, analysts are encouraged to
compute exact estimates of standard errors using the appropriate choice of a
sampling error program and computation model.

                Table 7: Generalized Variance Table
                  1998 NES Post-election Survey

              APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

                For percentage estimates near:

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

              The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

```
100        5.52       5.40       5.06       4.41       3.31
200        3.90       3.82       3.57       3.12       2.34
300        3.18       3.12       2.92       2.55       1.91
400        2.76       2.70       2.53       2.21       1.66
500        2.47       2.42       2.26       1.97       1.48
600        2.25       2.21       2.06       1.80       1.35
700        2.08       2.04       1.91       1.67       1.25
800        1.95       1.91       1.79       1.56       1.17
900        1.84       1.80       1.68       1.47       1.10
1000       1.74       1.71       1.60       1.40       1.05
1100       1.66       1.63       1.52       1.33       1.00
1200       1.59       1.56       1.46       1.27       0.96
1300       1.53       1.50       1.40       1.22       0.92
```

NOTES
-----

(5) The standard error of a percentage is a symmetric function with its
maximum centered at p=50%; i.e., the standard error of p=40% and p=60%
estimates are equal.

REFERENCES

Alegria, M., Kessler, R., Bijl, R., Lin, E., Heeringa, S.G., Takeuchi, D.T.,
     Kolody, B. (1998). To appear in The Unmet Need for Treatment.
     Proceedings of a Symposium of the World Psychiatric Association, Sydney,
     Australia, October, 1997.

Binder, D.A. (1983), "On the variances of asymptotically normal estimators
     from complex surveys," International Statistical Review, Vol. 51,
     pp. 279-292.

Brick, J.M., Broene, P., James, P., & Severynse, J. (1996). "A User's Guide
     to WesVar PC." Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Cochran, W.G. (1977). Sampling Techniques. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cohen, S.B. (1997). "An evaluation of alternative PC-based software packages
     developed for the analysis of complex survey data," The American
     Statistician, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 285-292.

Goldstein, H. (1987). Multi-level Models in Educational and Social Research.
     London: Oxford University Press.

Kalton, G. (1977), "Practical methods for estimating survey sampling errors,"
     Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute, Vol 47, 3,
     pp. 495-514.

Kish, L. (1949). "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the
     household," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 44,
     pp. 380-387.

Kish, L. (1965), Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kish, L., & Frankel, M.R. (1974), "Inference from complex samples," Journal of
     the Royal Statistical Society, B, Vol. 36, pp. 1-37.

Kish, L., Groves, R.M., & Krotki, K.P. (1975). "Sampling errors for fertility surveys." Occasional Paper No. 17. Voorburg, Netherlands: World Fertility Survey, International Statistical Institute.

Kish, L., & Hess, I. (1959), "On variances of ratios and their differences in multi-stage samples," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 54, pp. 416-446.

LePage, R., & Billard, L. (1992), Exploring the Limits of Bootstrap. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mahalanobis, P.C. (1946), "Recent experiments in statistical sampling at the Indian Statistical Institute," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol 109, pp. 325-378.

McCullagh, P.M. & Nelder, J.A. (1989). Generalized Linear Models, 2nd Edition. Chapman and Hall. London.

Rao, J.N.K & Wu, C.F.J. (1988.), "Resampling inference with complex sample data," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83, pp. 231-239.

Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies "Sample Design: Technical Memoranda, 1994 Election Study" pp. 882-905 in Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies, AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1994: POST-ELECTION SURVEY (ENHANCED WITH 1992 AND 1993 DATA) (Computer file). Conducted by University of Michigan Center for Political Studies. 2nd ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies, and Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (producer), 1995. Ann Arbor MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 1995.

Rust, K. (1985). "Variance estimation for complex estimators in sample surveys," Journal of Official Statistics, Vol. 1, No. 4.

SAS Institute, Inc. (1990). SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 6, Fourth Ed., Vol. 2. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.

Shah, B.V., Barnwell, B.G., Biegler, G.S. (1996). SUDAAN User's Manual: Software for Statistical Analysis of Correlated Data. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Skinner, C.J., Holt, D., & Smith, T.M.F. (1989). Analysis of Complex Surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

SPSS, Inc. (1993). SPSS for Windows : BASE System User's Guide, Release 6.0. Chicago, Il: SPSS Inc.

Stata Corp. (1997). Stata Statistical Software: Release 5.0. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Wolter, K.M. (1985). Introduction to Variance Estimation. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Woodruff, R.S. (1971), "A simple method for approximating the variance of a complicated estimate," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 66, pp. 411-414.

Yamageuchi, K. (1991). Event History Analysis. Applied Social Research

Methods Series, Vol. 28. Newbury Park, CA/London: Sage Publications.

>> NOTES ON CONFIDENTIAL VARIABLES

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, occupation code variables
have been released in somewhat less detail than in preceding studies.
Datasets now include a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding
to Census Bureau occupational groupings. In addition, beginning in
1992 Prestige scoring of Census occupational codes have not been
released. Those who have need of the full occupation codes or prestige
scores for their research should contact the NES project staff for
information about the conditions under which access to these data may
be provided.

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

In addition, coding of the new religious denomination variable is in
some cases based on variables containing textual responses. These
variables are restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access
may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

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

>> 1998 FILE STRUCTURE

The data file for the AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY,
1998: POST-ELECTION SURVEY is constructed with a single
logical record for each respondent. The LRECL for the
raw (ASCII) data file is 1410 and there are 739 variables
for 1281 respondents.

Codebook marginals are unweighted.

NOTE ON "DATASET NUMBER" AND "VERSION NUMBER" OF THE 1998 POST

The 1998 Post is the first NES dataset to include a machine-readable NES
"Dataset number" and "Version number".

NES "Dataset number"

In early 1999, each unique dataset in the NES archive was assigned a
"Dataset number". The NES 1998 Post-Election Study dataset is the first
dataset to have its dataset number (1998.T) included in the machine-readable
ASCII data (variable VDSETNO) and documented in the codebook and SAS/SPSS
data definition files.   In addition to the 1998 Post, dataset numbers for
datasets from all archived NES studies are included in the NES "VERSION TABLE"
described below.

"Versions" of NES datasets

The term "dataset" used by NES refers to the following associated components:

    1- ASCII data file (.dat file)
    2- SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas, .sps files)
    3- Codebook files (.cbk file(s)) ^^

Components of the initial release of a dataset will be identified as version
01. According to this system, a corrected component of a specific dataset
is called a new "VERSION" of that component and is assigned a new "Version
Number."

Because the initial release of a dataset is sometimes followed by corrections
to one or more components, a labeling method has been implemented to identify
the release version of the datset component(s). In practice, the version label
will allow the analyst to easily verify if he or she has the most up to date
components for that dataset.

The version number of a particular component file is written as the first
information in the machine-readable component file:

    1) In the ASCII data file (.dat file), the version number of
       that data file is written in each record in columns 1-2.
    2) In the SAS and SPSS data definition files, the version number
       of the file** is written in the very first line as a comment
       similar to the following:
                * Version 01 SAS DATA DEFINITION FILE ;
                             or:
                * Version 01 SPSS DATA DEFINITION FILE
    3) In the codebook file**, the version number is written as the
       first line similar to the following example:
                Version 01 Codebook

NES Dataset "Version Table"

The NES Web site (www.umich.edu/~nes) includes an NES Dataset "Version Table"

which can be used to identify the latest version of component files for
released NES datasets.

_____

^^NOTE: A codebook usually comprises 3 files, an 'intro' file, variable file,
and appendix file
**NOTE: Since SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files)
are identified together as a single component, a new "version" of either
signifies a new "version" of both, even if only one data definition file
required correction. The "Note" field in the NES VERSION TABLE will indicate
if only one file has actually been corrected.
Similarly, since most codebooks are released as 3 files, a correction to any
one of the codebook files results in a new "version" of all 3 codebook files
at once. Again, the "Note" field in the NES VERSION TABLE will indicate if
only one codebook file has actually been corrected. (All 3 codebook files
will include the version number in the first line of the machine-readable
file, as indicated above.)

>> 1998 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The following example from the 1948 NES study provides the standard
format for codebook variable documentation.

Note that NES studies which are not part of the Time-Series usually
omit marginals and the descriptive content in lines 2-5 (except for
variable name).

Line

```
1   ================================
2   VAR 480026     NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
3                  COLUMNS 61   - 61
4                  NUMERIC
5                  MD=0 OR GE 8
6
7                     Q. 17.  (IF R DID NOT VOTE)  WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE)
8                  TO VOTE.
9                  ........................................................
10
11          82       1.  YES
12         149       2.  NO
13
14           0       8.  DK
15           9       9.  NA
16         422       0.  INAP., R VOTED
```

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

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

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

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

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

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of
         non-survey variables (for example, congressional district).
         Survey items usually include the question number (for example
         "B1a.") from the Study questionnaire; beginning in 1996
         non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example
         "CSheet.1").

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

Line 10- When present, annotation provided by Study staff is presented
         below the question text/description and preceding code values.

Lines 11-16
         Code values are listed with descriptive labels. Valid codes
         (those not having 'missing' status in line 5) are presented
         first, followed by the values described in line 5. For
         continuous variables, one line may appear providing the range
         of possible values. A blank line usually separates the 'valid'
         and 'missing' values.

Lines 11-16
         Marginals are usually provided for discrete variables. The
         counts may be unweighted or weighted; check the Study codebook
         introductory text to determine weight usage.

>> 1998 PROCESSING INFORMATION

The data collection was processed according to standard processing
procedures. The data were checked for illegal or inconsistent code
values which, when found, were corrected or recoded to missing data
values. Consistency checks were performed. Annotation was added by
the processors for explanatory purposes.

 >> NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS, 1998

1.   Sanchez, Maria. (July 1982) "7-Point Scales."

2.   Shanks, J. Merrill, Maria Sanchez, and Betsy Morton. (March 1983). "Alternative Approaches to Survey Data Collection for the National Election Studies."

3.   Lake, Celinda. (September 1983) "Similarity and Representativeness of 1983 Pilot Samples."

4.   Lake, Celinda. (November 1983) "Comparison of 3-point, 5-point, and 7-point Scales from the CATI Experiment 1982 Election Study."

5.   NES Staff. (December 1983) "1980 Precinct Data Returns Project."

6.   Lake, Celinda. (February 1984) "Coding of Independent/Independents and Apoliticals in the Party Identification Summary Code and Apoliticals in the Rolling Cross-Section."

7.   Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (February 1984) "Creation of a Filter Variable to be Used When Analyzing Questions about Congressional Candidates in the 1982 Integrated Personal/ISR CATI/Berkeley CATI Dataset: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

8.   Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (March 1984) "Comparison of the Michigan Method of District Assignment on the Telephone with the Personal Interview Simulated Data: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

9.   Traugott, Santa. (June 1984) "Two Versions of the Abortion Question."

10.   Sanchez, Maria.(July 1984) "Branching versus 7-point scale measurements."

11.   NES Staff. (August 1984) "Weekly Field Report for the National Election Studies Continuous Monitoring, Jan. 11 - Aug. 3, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

12.   NES Staff. (August 1984) "Questions and Versions in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

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

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

15.   Traugott, Santa. (n.d.) "The Political Interest Variable on the 1984 Election Study." Unpublished Staff Memo to NES Planning Committee.

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

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

18.   Bowers, Jake. (February 1995) NES Pilot Study Efforts to Measure Values and Predispositions.

19.   Traugott, Santa. (February 1985) "Some Analysis of Hard-to-Reach Rolling Thunder Respondents."

20.   Traugott, Santa. (April 1985) "Sample Weighting in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election

Studies."

21.   Traugott, Santa. (April 1985). "Sample Weighting in NES Pre-Post Election Survey,1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

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

23.   Brehm, John. (July 1985). "Question Ordering Effects on Reported Vote Choice."

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

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

26.   Brehm, John. (August 1985). "Analysis of Result Code Disposition for Continuous Monitoring by Time in Field: Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

27.   Morchio, Giovanna, Maria Sanchez and Santa Traugott. (November 1985). "Mode Differences: DK Responses in the 1984 Post-Election Survey: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

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

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

30.   Gronke, Paul. (September 1986) "NES Question C2: R's Party Registration."

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

32.   Morchio, Giovanna. (May 1987) "Trends in NES Response Rates."

33.   Brehm, John. (December 1987) "Who's Missing? an Analysis of NonResponse in the 1986 Election Study: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."

34.   Traugott, Santa. (August 1989) "Validating Self-Reported Vote: 1964-1988."

35.   Belli, Robert, Traugott, Santa, and Steven J. Rosenstone. (November, 1994) "Reducing Over-Reporting of Voter Turnout: An Experiment using a Source Monitoring Framework."

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

37.   "Post-Stratified Cross-Sectional Analysis Weights for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES data." (April 1998) Prepared by the Sampling Section Division of Surveys and Technologies.

38.   Gronke, Paul. (May 1990) "Assessing the Sample Quality of the 1988 Senate Election Study: A response to Wright."

39.   Presser, Stanley, Michael W. Traugott and Santa Traugott. (November 1990). "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents?"

40.   Bloom, Joel. (March 1991) "Sources of Pro-incumbent Bias in NES Survey Estimates for U.S. House Races since 1978: A Second Look."

41.   Mayer, Russell. (November 1991) "Identifying Bias in Voting Models."

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

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

44.   Luevano, Patricia. (March 1994) "Response Rates in the National Election Studies, 1948-1992."

45.   Traugott, Santa and Steven J. Rosenstone. (Nov. 1994) "Panel Attrition Among the 1990-1992 Panel Respondents."

46.   Traugott, Santa and Steven J. Rosenstone. (Nov. 1994) "Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the 1980, 1984 and 1988 NES Pre-Election Studies by Week of Interview."

47.   Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Candidate Traits Used in NES Studies, 1979-1994."

48.   Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Affects Towards Candidates Used in NES Studies, 1979-1994."

49.   Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Candidate Placements Used in NES Studies, 1968-1994."

50.   Sheng, Shing-Yuan. (Jan. 1995) "NES Measurements of Values and Pre-Dispositions, 1984-1992."

51.   Traugott, Santa. (Feb. 1995) "NES Question Batteries: Measuring Values and Dispositions, 1983-1994."

52.   Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue, et.al. (May 1994) "The Reliability, Validity, and Scalability of Indicators of Gender Role Beliefs and Feminismin the 1992 National Election Study: A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers."

53.   Heeringa, Steve. (April 1998) "The Surveycraft CATI system's 'Random Number Generation' features and their Effects on Analysis of the 1997 NES Pilot "Group threat" Experiment."

54.   Traugott, Santa and Giovanna Morchio. (March 1990) "Assessment of bias due to attrition and sample selection in the NES 1989 Pilot Study."

>> NES 1997 PILOT STUDY REPORTS

    Bowers, Jake. Black Threat and Christian Fundamentalist Threat: A National Election Study 1997 Pilot Study Report.

    Burden, Barry C. and Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier. Vote Likelihood and Institutional Trait Questions in the 1997 NES Pilot Study.

Carman, Christopher and Christopher Wlezien. Ideological Evaluations of Government Institutions and Policy.

Freedman, Paul and Ken Goldstein. Partial Birth Abortion Item, 1997 Pilot Study.

Rahn, Wendy and Christina Wessel. Perceptions of the Partisan Homogeneity of Social Groups: A Report to the NES Board of Overseers.

Sapiro, Virginia. Pro-Life People or Opponents of Abortion? Pro-Choice People or Supporters of Abortion? A Report on the NES 1997 Pilot Study.

Sapiro, Virginia. The Impact of "Groups Talk" A Report on the NES 1997 Pilot Study.

Wald, Kenneth D., et al. Evaluation of the New Religious Items on the NES 1997 Pilot Study: A Report to the NES Board.

Wlezien, Christopher. Liberal-Conservative Evaluations of Groups.

Wong, Cara. Group Closeness: 1997 National Election Study Pilot Report.

>> 1998 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST

Note: as in this Variable Description List, the variable names in the SAS
and SPSS data definition files have a "V" prefix, e.g. "V980003", "VICPSR98"
etc.; however in the codebook's variable documentation (file nes1998.cbk) the
"V" prefix is omitted (980003,ICPSR98).

IDENTIFICATION AND WEIGHTS
Variable
Name   Item   Description
-------- --------- --
VVERSION Process.1 VERSION NUMBER
VDSETNO   Process.2 NES DATASET NUMBER
VICPSR98 Process.3 ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER
V980001   Process.4 1998 CASE ID
V980002   Process.5 POST-STRATIFIED SAMPLE WEIGHT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FIELD VARS
Variable
Name   Item   Description
-------- --------- --
V980003   Admin.1   MONTH OF INTERVIEW
V980004   Admin.2   DAY OF INTERVIEW
V980005   Admin.3   # OF DAYS AFTER ELECTION DAY
V980006   Admin.4   BEGINNING TIME (LOCAL)
V980007   Admin.5   ENDING TIME (LOCAL)
V980008   Admin.6   LENGTH OF INTERVIEW IN MINUTES
V980009   Admin.7   INTERVIEWER'S INTERVIEW NUMBER
V980010   Admin.8   DATE OF BEINNING VQ FILE
V980011   Admin.9   DATE OF ENDING VQ FILE
V980012   Admin.10   FLAG - CHANGE IN VQ VERSION
V980013   Admin.11   PAYMENT AMOUNT
V980013a Admin.11a PAYMENT MODE
V980013b Admin.11b PAYMENT DATE

```
V980014    Admin.12    WAS INTERVIEW TAPE RECORDED
V980015    Admin.13    VERIFICATION INDICATOR
V980016    Admin.14    EVALUATION INDICATOR
V980017    Admin.15    REFUSAL CONVERSION INDICATOR
V980018    Admin.16    WAS PERSUASION LETTER SENT
V980018a   Admin.16a   PERSUASION LETTER REQUESTED
V980018b   Admin.16b   PERSUASION LETTER SENT
V980019    Admin.17    TYPE OF PERSUASION LETTER SENT
V980020    Admin.18    NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS
V980021    Admin.19    NUMBER OF FACE TO FACE CALLS
V980022    Admin.20    TOTAL NUMBER OF CALLS (PHONE+FTF) MADE BY IWR
V980023    Admin.21    CODE FOR FINAL RESULT OF INTERVIEW
V980024    Admin.22    BEGINNING MODE--PERSONAL OR PHONE
V980025    Admin.23    ENDING MODE -- PERSONAL OR PHONE
V980026    Admin.24    FLAG - CHANGE IN IW MODE
V980027    Admin.25    SAMPLE RELEASE
V980028    Admin.26    LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW

COVERSHEET
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   ------------------------------------------------------
V980029    CSheet.1    FLAG - MISSING COVERSHEET
V980030    CSheet.2    COLOR OF COVERSHEET
V980031    CSheet.3    CS -SOURCE OF HOUSEHOLD LISTING
V980032    CSheet.4    CS - SELECTION TABLE
V980033    CSheet.5    CS - PERSON # SELECTED AS R
V980034    CSheet.6    CS - TOTAL # OF PERSONS IN HH
V980035    CSheet.7    CS - TOTAL # OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS
V980036    CSheet.8    CS - HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION CODE
V980037    CSheet.9    CS - NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 6 YRS OLD
V980038    CSheet.10   CS - NUMBER OF CHILDREN 6-9 YRS OLD
V980039    CSheet.11   CS - NUMBER OF CHILDREN 10-13 YRS OLD
V980040    CSheet.12   CS - NUMBER OF CHILDREN 14-17 YRS OLD
V980041    CSheet.13   CS - SUMMARY - Number of Children in HH
V980042    CSheet.14   CS - TYPE OF HOUSING UNIT
V980043    CSheet.15   CS - GATEKEEPER REQUIRED TO ACCESS HU
V980044    CSheet.16   CS - GATEKEEPER DESCRIPTION
V980045    CSheet.17   CS - CONTACT DESC: INITIAL REFUSAL?
V980046    CSheet.18   CS - CONTACT DESC: BROKEN APPOINTMENT?
V980047    CSheet.19   CS - RESISTANCE TO INTERVIEW?
V980048    CSheet.20   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: WASTE TIME
V980049    CSheet.21   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: VERY ILL
V980050    CSheet.22   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: TOO BUSY
V980051    CSheet.23   CS - REASON:STRESSFUL FAMILY SITUATION
V980052    CSheet.24   CS - REASON RESISTANCE: CONFIDENTIALTY
V980053    CSheet.25   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: INV OF PRIVACY
V980054    CSheet.26   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: NONE GIVEN
V980055    CSheet.27   CS - REASON FOR RESISTANCE: OTHER
NOTE: IWR observation is at end of survey vars (not coversheet)

INTERVIEWER DESCRIPTION
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   ------------------------------------------------------
V980056    IWR.1       INTERVIEWER OF RECORD ID
V980057    IWR.2       SUPERVISOR ID
V980058    IWR.3       INTERVIEWER GENDER
V980059    IWR.4       INTERVIEWER EDUCATION
V980060    IWR.5       INTERVIEWER RACE
```

```
V980061    IWR.6       INTERVIEWER ETHNICITY
V980062    IWR.7       INTERVIEWER LANGUAGES
V980063    IWR.8       INTERVIEWER YEARS EXPERIENCE
V980064    IWR.9       INTERVIEWER AGE (BRACKETTED)


CANDIDATE AND TYPE RACE INFORMATION
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   -------------------------------------------------
V980065    Cand.1      RACE TYPE: HOUSE
V980065a   Cand.1a     RACE TYPE: HOUSE OUTSIDE CD)
V980066    Cand.2      RACE TYPE: SENATE
V980066a   Cand.2a     RACE TYPE: SENATE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980067    Cand.3      RACE TYPE: GUBERNATORIAL
V980067a   Cand.3a     RACE TYPE: GUBERNATORIAL (OUTSIDE CD)
V980068    Cand.4      DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE CODE
V980068a   Cand.4a     DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980069    Cand.5      DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE GENDER
V980069a   Cand.5a     DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980070    Cand.6      DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE NAME
V980070a   Cand.6a     DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)
V980071    Cand.7      REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE CODE
V980071a   Cand7a      REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980072    Cand.8      REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE GENDER
V980072a   Cand.8a     REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980073    Cand.9      REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE NAME
V980073a   Cand.9a     REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)
V980074    Cand.10     DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE CODE
V980074a   Cand.10a    DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980075    Cand.11     DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE GENDER
V980075a   Cand.11a    DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980076    Cand.12     DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE NAME
V980076a   Cand.12a    DEMOCRATIC SENATE CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)
V980077    Cand.13     REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE CODE
V980077a   Cand.13a    REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980078    Cand.14     REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE GENDER
V980078a   Cand.14a    REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980079    Cand.15     REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE NAME
V980079a   Cand.15a    REPUBLICAN SENATE CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)
V980080    Cand.16     DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE CODE
V980080a   Cand.16a    DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980081    Cand.17     DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE GENDER
V980081a   Cand.17a    DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980082    Cand.18     DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE NAME
V980082a   Cand.18a    DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)
V980083    Cand.19     REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE CODE
V980083a   Cand.19a    REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE CODE (OUTSIDE CD)
V980084    Cand.20     REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE GENDER
V980084a   Cand.20a    REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE GENDER (OUTSIDE CD)
V980085    Cand.21     REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE NAME
V980085a   Cand.21a    REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE NAME (OUTSIDE CD)


SAMPLING INFORMATION
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   -------------------------------------------------
V980086    Sample.1    ICPSR ST CODE - INTERVIEW LOCATION
V980087    Sample.2    FIPS ST CODE - INTERVIEW LOCATION
V980088    Sample.3    1996 STATE ABBREV AND CONG DISTR
V980089    Sample.4    1996 STATE AND CD
```

```
V980090     Sample.5    CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NUMBER
V980091     Sample.6    DID R VOTE OUTSIDE OF IW CONGR DISTRICT
V980092     Sample.7    STATE AND CD FOR VOTERS OUT OF CD
V980093     Sample.8    FIPS STATE AND COUNTY
V980094     Sample.9    PRIMARY AREA NAME
V980095     Sample.10   PRIMARY AREA CODE
V980096     Sample.11   SEGMENT NUMBER
V980097     Sample.12   NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD UNITS
V980098     Sample.13   CENSUS R
V980099     Sample.14   BELT CODE
V980100     Sample.15   POPULATION IN 1000S
V980101     Sample.16   CENSUS SIZE OF PLACE
V980102     Sample.17   CENSUS TRACT/ED INDICATOR
V980103     Sample.18   1996 SAMPLING ERROR CODE
V980104     Sample.19   1990 CENSUS NECMA/SMSA
V980105     Sample.20   1990 CENSUS CMSA
V980106     Sample.21   1990 CENSUS TRACT 1
V980107     Sample.22   1990 CENSUS TRACT 2

SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS/CALCULATIONS
Variable
Name        Item        Description
--------    ---------   ----------------------------------------------------
V980108     Summary.1   WRONG CD ADMINISTERED IN PRE-FLAG
V980108a    Summary.1a  INCORRECT TYPE RACE/CANDIDATE PRELOAD
V980109     Summary.2   Section timing - Section A
V980110     Summary.3   Section timing - Section B
V980111     Summary.4   Section timing - Section C
V980112     Summary.5   Section timing - Section D
V980113     Summary.6   Section timing - Section E
V980114     Summary.7   Section timing - Section F
V980115     Summary.8   Section timing - Section G
V980116     Summary.9   Section timing - Section H
V980117     Summary.10  Section timing - Section J
V980118     Summary.11  Section timing - Section K
V980119     Summary.12  Section timing - Section M
V980120     Summary.13  Section timing - Section N
V980121     Summary.14  Section timing - Section P
V980122     Summary.15  Section timing - Section X
V980123     Summary.16  Section timing - Section Y
Note: Length of IW is item Admin.6

SURVEY SECTION A
Variable
Name        Item        Description
--------    ---------   ----------------------------------------------------
V980201     A1          HOW INTERESTED WAS R IN THE CAMPAIGNS THIS YEAR
V980202     A2          HOW MANY DAYS IN PAST WEEK DID R READ THE NEWSPAPER
V980203     A3          DOES R HAVE CABLE OR SATELLITE TV
V980204     A4          HOW MANY DAYS IN PAST WEEK R WATCHED THE NAT NEWS ON TV
V980205     A5          DAYS R WATCH LOCAL NEWS LAST WEEK
V980206     A6          DID R LISTEN TO SPEECHES/DISCUSSIONS ON THE RADIO?
V980207     A7          R LISTEN TO POLITICAL TALK RADIO
V980208     A7a         FREQ R LISTEN TO POLITICAL TALK RADIO
V980209     A8          DOES R HAVE ACCESS TO THE INTERNET OR WORLD WIDE WEB?
V980210     A8a         DID R SEE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT CAMPAIGN ON INTERNET?
V980211     A9          DOES R DISCUSS POLITICS WITH FAMILY/FRIENDS?
V980212     A9a         FREQUENCY OF POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS
V980213     A9b         FREQ PAST WEEK POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS W/ FRIENDS/FAMILY
V980214     A10         DID R VOTE FOR PRESIDENT IN THE 1996 ELECTION
```

```
V980215    A10a        WHO DID R VOTE FOR IN THE 1996 PRESIDENTIAL RACE
V980216    A11         DOES R APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE OF CLINTON HANDLING JOB
V980217    A11a/b      DOES R STRGLY APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE OF CLINTON
V980218    A12         DOES R APP/DISAPP OF CLINTON'S HANDLING OF THE ECON
V980219    A12a/b      DOES R STRGLY APP/DISAPP OF CLINTON'S HANDLING OF ECON
V980220    A13         DOES R APP/DISAPP OF CLINTON'S HANDLING OF FOR RELAT
V980221    A13a/b      DOES R STRGLY APP OR DISAPP CLINTON'S FORGN RELAT


SURVEY SECTION B
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   ----------------------------------------------------
V980222    B1          DID R CARE ABOUT RESULT OF HOUSE ELECTION
V980223    B2          DOES R REMEMBER NAMES OF HOUSE CANDS IN R'S DISTRICT
V980224    B2a1        R'S RECALL OF NAME OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (FIRST MENTION)
V980225    B2a2        R'S RECALL OF PARTY OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (FIRST MENTION)
V980226    B2a3        #1 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACTUAL PARTY
V980227    B2a4        #1 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACCURACY
V980228    B2b1        R'S RECALL OF NAME OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (SECOND MENTION)
V980229    B2b2        R'S RECALL OF PARTY OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (SECOND MENTION)
V980230    B2b3        #2 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACTUAL PARTY
V980231    B2b4        #2 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACCURACY
V980232    B2c1        R'S RECALL OF NAME OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (THIRD MENTION)
V980233    B2c2        R'S RECALL OF PARTY OF HOUSE CANDIDATE (FIRST MENTION)
V980234    B2c3        #3 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACTUAL PARTY
V980235    B2c4        #3 HOUSE CAND RECALL- ACCURACY
V980236    B3          DOES R APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE OF CONGRESS
V980237    B3a/b       DOES R STRONGLY APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE OF CONGRESS
V980238    B4a         CLINTON FEELING THERMOMETER
V980239    B4b1        DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980240    B4b2        REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980241    B4c1        THERMOMETER DEM SEN CAND
V980242    B4c2        THERMOMETER REP SEN CAND
V980243    B4d         AL GORE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980244    B4e         NEWT GINGRICH FEELING THERMOMETER
V980245    B4f         GEORGE BUSH JR FEELING THERMOMETER
V980246    B4g         DAN QUAYLE THERMOMETER
V980247    B4h         STEVE FORBES FEELING THERMOMETER
V980248    B4i         KEN STAR FEELING THERMOMETER
V980249    B4j         PAT BUCHANAN FEELING THERMOMETER
V980250    B4k         ELIZABETH DOLE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980251    B4m         RICHARD GEPHARDT FEELING THERMOMETER
V980252    B4n         PAUL WELLSTONE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980253    B4o         JOHN MCCAIN FEELING THERMOMETER
V980254    B4p         BILL BRADLEY FEELING THERMOMETER
V980255    B4q         BOB KERREY FEELING THERMOMETER
V980256    B4r         JOHN KERRY FEELING THERMOMETER
V980257    B4s         GARY BAUER FEELING THERMOMETER
V980258    B4t         JOHN ASHCROFT FEELING THERMOMETER
V980259    B4u         HILLARY CLINTON FEELING THERMOMETER
V980260    B5a         DEMOCRATIC PARTY FEELING THERMOMETER
V980261    B5b         REPUBLICAN PARTY FEELING THERMOMETER
V980262    B5c         BLACKS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980263    B5d         THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT FEELING THERMOMETER
V980264    B5e         CONSERVATIVES FEELING THERMOMETER
V980265    B5f         GAY MEN AND LESBIANS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980266    B5g         LABOR UNIONS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980267    B5h         LIBERALS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980268    B5j         POOR PEOPLE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980269    B5k         RICH PEOPLE FEELING THERMOMETER
```

```
V980270     B5m          WHITES FEELING THERMOMETER
V980271     B5n          COLLEGE-EDUCATED PEOPLE FEELING THERMOMETER
V980272     B5p          BUSINESS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980273     B5q          CONGRESS FEELING THERMOMETER
V980274     B5r          NEWS MEDIA FEELING THERMOMETER
```

```
SURVEY SECTION C
Variable
Name        Item         Description
--------    ---------    ----------------------------------------------------
V980275     C1           WAS THERE ANYTHING R LIKED ABOUT DEM HOUSE CANDIDATE?
V980276     C1a1         #1 MENTION - R LIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980277     C1a2         #2 MENTION - R LIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980278     C1a3         #3 MENTION - R LIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980279     C1a4         #4 MENTION - R LIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980280     C1a5         #5 MENTION - R LIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980281     C2           WAS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKED ABOUT DEM HOUSE CAND?
V980282     C2a1         #1 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980283     C2a2         #2 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980284     C2a3         #3 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980285     C2a4         #4 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980286     C2a5         #5 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980287     C3           WAS THERE ANYTHING R LIKED ABOUT REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE?
V980288     C3a1         LIKE #1 REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980289     C3a2         LIKE #2 REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980290     C3a3         LIKE #3 REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980291     C3a4         LIKE #4 REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980292     C3a5         LIKE #5 REPUB HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980293     C4           WAS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKED ABOUT REPUB HOUSE CAND?
V980294     C4a1         #1 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980295     C4a2         #1 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980296     C4a3         #3 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980297     C4a4         #4 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980298     C4a5         #1 MENTION - R DISLIKE OF REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE
V980299     C5           DOES R KNOW IF EITHER HOUSE CAND IS THE INCUMBENT?
V980300     C5a          CODE-CAND IDENTIFIED AS INCUM-2 CAND RACE
V980301     C6           IF ONLY 1 CANDIDATE RAN - WAS THAT CANDIDATE INCUMBENT?
V980302     C6a          CODE-CAND IDENTIFIED AS INCUM-1 CAND RACE
```

```
SURVEY SECTION D
Variable
Name        Item         Description
--------    ---------    ----------------------------------------------------
V980303     D1           DID R VOTE IN 1998?
V980304     D1a          WAS R REGISTERED?
V980305     D2           IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN COUNTY?
V980306     D2a          (IF NOT REGISTERED IN COUNTY) WHAT COUNTY REGISTERED?
V980307     D2b          (OUT OF COUNTY) STATE OF REG- CODE
V980307a    D2c          DATA CHECKPOINT:  DID R VOTE IN CD OF IW?
V980307b    D2d          DATA CHECKPOINT: R VOTE OUTSIDE OF STATE AND CD
V980308     D3           DID R VOTE ON NOV 3RD OR BEFORE THAT?
V980309     D3a          (IF BEFORE NOV 3) HOW LONG BEFORE NOV 3RD?
V980310     D4           DID R VOTE IS PERSON OR BY ABSENTEE BALLOT?
V980311     D5           DID R VOTE FOR U.S. HOUSE CANDIDATE?
V980312     D5a/D5aa     R'S VOTE- U.S. HOUSE CANDIDATE- CODE
V980313     D5b          PARTY OF HOUSE VOTE
V980314     D5x          CKPOINT: SENATE RACE IN STATE OF IW?
V980314a    D5x1         CKPOINT: SENATE RACE IN STATE OF VOTE?
V980315     D6           DID R VOTE FOR A SENATE CANDIDATE
V980316     D6a/D6aa     R'S SENATE VOTE- CODE
```

```
V980317    D6b          PARTY OF SENATE VOTE
V980318    D6x          CKPOINT: GUBERNATORIAL RACE IN STATE OF IW?
V980318a   D6x1         CKPOINT: SENATE RACE IN STATE OF VOTE?
V980319    D7           DID R VOTE FOR GOVERNOR
V980320    D7a/D7aa     R GUBERNATORIAL VOTE- CODE
V980321    D7b          PARTY OF GUBERNATORIAL VOTE
V980322    D8           (IF R DID NOT VOTE) DID R PREFER CAND FOR U.S. HOUSE?
V980323    D8a          (IF R DID NOT VOTE) WHICH HSE CAND DID R PREFER -CODE
V980324    D8b          PARTY OF NONVOTER HOUSE PREFERENCE
```

```
SURVEY SECTION E
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    -------------------------------------------------------
V980325    E0           DATA CKPT: RUNNING INCUMBENT IN RACE?
V980326    E1           DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF RUNNING HOUSE INCUMBENT?
V980327    E1a/b        STRENGTH OF R'S APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL OF HOUSE INCUMBENT
V980328    E2           HOW WELL HAS INCUMBENT KEPT IN TOUCH WITH DISTRICT?
V980329    E3           DOES R KNOW THE NO. YRS THAT INCUM HAS BEEN IN HOUSE?
V980330    E3a          (IF YES) HOW MANY YEARS HAS INCUMBENT BEEN IN HOUSE?
V980331    E3b          (IF DK) HAS INCUM BEEN IN HOUSE LESS/ABOUT/MORE 12 YRS?
V980332    E4           HOW OFTEN DOES R THINKHOUSE INCUMBENT SUPPORTS CLINTON?
V980333    E4a          (IF MORE THAN HALF) ALMOST ALWAYS?
V980334    E4b          (IF LESS THAN HALF) ALMOST NEVER?
V980335    E5           DOES R FAVOR 12-YEAR TERM LIMIT ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
V980336    E6           R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION
V980337    E6a/b        STRENGTH OF R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION
V980338    E6c          (IF R IS INDEP/NO PREFERENCE) R CLOSER TO ONE PARTY
V980339    E6x          SUMMARY - PARTY ID
```

```
SURVEY SECTION F
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    -------------------------------------------------------
V980340    F1           HOW MUCH DOES R FOLLOW GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS?
V980341    F2(1)        MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM - #1
V980342    F2(2)        MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM - #2
V980343    F2(3)        MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM - #3
V980344    F2(4)        MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM - #4
V980345    F3           CKPT: # MENTIONS MOST IMPORTANT PROB
V980346    F4           CHOICE - MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM
V980347    F5           GOVT PERFORMANCE ON MOST IMP PROBLEM
V980348    F6           PARTY PERFORMANCE ON MOST IMP PROBLEM
```

```
SURVEY SECTION G
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    -------------------------------------------------------
V980349    G1           WAS R CONTACTED BY ANY POLITICAL PARTY?
V980350    G1a          WHICH PARTY CONTACTED R?
V980351    G2           DID ANYONE ELSE CONTACT R ABOUT CAND IN THE ELECTION?
V980352    G2a(1)       WHICH CAND WAS R ASKED TO SUPPORT (1)
V980353    G2a(2)       WHICH CAND WAS R ASKED TO SUPPORT (2)
V980354    G3           DID ANYONE TALK TO R ABOUT REGISTERING TO VOTE?
V980355    G4           DID RELIG/MORAL GROUP CONTACT R ABOUT R'S VOTE?
V980356    G5           CAMPAIGN INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT R'S PLACE OF WORSHIP?
V980357    G5a          DID R' CLERGY GIVE ADVICE TO R ON HOW TO VOTE?
V980358    G5b(1)       WHICH CANDIDATE DID R' CLERGY RECOMMEND - #1 MENTION
V980359    G5b(2)       WHICH CANDIDATE DID R' CLERGY RECOMMEND - #2 MENTION
V980360    G5b(3)       WHICH CANDIDATE DID R' CLERGY RECOMMEND - #3 MENTION
```

```
V980361    G6             R TALK TO OTHERS ABOUT VOTING FOR/AGAINST PARTY/ CAND?
V980362    G7             DID R WEAR BUTTON, PLACE A SIGN, PUT A STICKER ON CAR?
V980363    G8             DID R ATTEND ANY MEETINGS, SPEECHES, RALLIES FOR CAND?
V980364    G9             DID R WORK FOR ANY ONE OF THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES?
V980365    G10            DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO A CAND RUNNING FOR OFFICE?
V980366    G10a           WHICH PARTY THE CANDIDATE THAT R CONTRIBUTED TO BELONG?
V980367    G11            DID R GIVE MONEY TO A POLIT CAND DURING ELECTION YEAR?
V980368    G11a           WHICH PARTY DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO?
V980369    G12            DID R GIVE $ TO OTHER GROUP THAT SUPPORTED/OPP CAND?


SURVEY SECTION H
Variable
Name       Item           Description
--------   ---------      ------------------------------------------------------
V980370    H1             DOES R THINK THERE ARE IMP DIFF BETWEEN REPS AND DEMS?
V980371    H1a1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #1 MENTION
V980372    H1a2           PARTY REFERENCE #1 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980373    H1b1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #2 MENTION
V980374    H1b2           PARTY REFERENCE #2 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980375    H1c1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #3 MENTION
V980376    H1c2           PARTY REFERENCE #3 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980377    H1d1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #4 MENTION
V980378    H1d2           PARTY REFERENCE #4 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980379    H1e1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #5 MENTION
V980380    H1e2           PARTY REFERENCE #5 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980381    H1f1           IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE: #6 MENTION
V980382    H1f2           PARTY REFERENCE #6 - IMP PARTY DIFF
V980383    H2             WHICH PARTY WOULD DO A BET JOB OF DEALING WITH CRIME
V980384    H2a            WHICH PARTY WOULD DO A BET JOB OF HANDLING THE ECONOMY
V980385    H2b            WHICH PARTY HANDLE ENVIRONMENT BEST
V980386    H2c            WHICH PARTY WOULD BETTER HANDLE FOREIGN AFFAIRS
V980387    H2d            WHICH PARTY PROTECT SOC SECURITY BEST
V980388    H3             WHICH PARTY BEST FOR AM FAMILIES
V980389    H4a            HAS CLINTON EVER MADE R FEEL ANGRY
V980390    H4a1           HOW OFTEN HAS CLINTON MADE R FEEL ANGRY
V980391    H4b            HAS CLINTON EVER MADE R FEEL HOPEFUL
V980392    H4b1           HOW OFTEN HAS CLINTON MADE R FEEL HOPEFUL
V980393    H4c            HAS CLINTON EVER MADE R FEEL AFRAID
V980394    H4c1           HOW OFTEN HAS CLINTON MADE R FEEL AFRAID
V980395    H4d            HAS CLINTON EVER MADE R FEEL PROUD
V980396    H4d1           HOW OFTEN HAS CLINTON MADE R FEEL PROUD
V980397    H4e            DISGUSTED - CLINTON AFFECT
V980398    H4e1           HOW OFTEN DISGUSTED CLINTON AFFECT
V980399    H5a            R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE
V980400    H5a1           HOW CERTAIN IS R OF SELF-PLACEMENT ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980401    H5aa           IF R HAD TO CHOOSE, WOULD R BE LIB OR CON
V980402    H5x            SUMMARY- SELF-PLACEMENT LIB-CON
V980403    H5b            R'S PLACEMENT OF CLINTON ON LIBERAL-CON SCALE
V980404    H5b1           HOW CERTAIN PLACEMENT OF CLINTON ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980405    H5c            GORE PLACEMENT LIB-CON SCALE
V980406    H5c1           CERTAIN- GORE LIB-CON PLACEMENT
V980407    H5d            R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM HSE CAND ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980408    H5d1           HOW CERT IS R OF PLACE OF DEM HSE CAND ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980409    H5e            R'S PLACEMENT OF REP HSE CAND ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980410    H5e1           HOW CERTAIN PLACEMT OF REP HSE CAND ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980411    H5f            R'S PLACEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON LIB/CON SCALE
V980412    H5g            R'S PLACEMENT OF REPUBLICAN PARTY ON LIB/CON SCALE


SURVEY SECTION J
Variable
```

```
Name        Item        Description
--------    ---------   ------------------------------------------------------
V980413     J1          COUNTRY IN RIGHT DIRECTION/WRONG TRACK
V980414     J2          IS R BETTER OR WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY THAN A YEAR AGO
V980415     J2a/b       IS R MUCH BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY THAN A YEAR AGO
V980416     J3          DOES R THINK R WILL BE BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANC NEXT YR
V980417     J3a/b       DOES R THINK MUCH BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANC NEXT YR
V980418     J4          R THINK ECON HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE OVER PAST YEAR
V980419     J4a/b       R THINK ECON HAS GOTTEN MUCH BETTER/WORSE OVER PAST YR
V980420     J5          R EXPECT ECON TO GET BETTER/WORSE OVER THE NEXT YEAR
V980421     J5a/b       R EXPECT ECON TO GET MUCH BETTER/WORSE OVER THE NEXT YR
V980422     J6          ECON BETTER/WORSE SINCE CLINTON TOOK OFC
V980423     J6a/b       ECON HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE SINCE CLINTON
V980424     J7          WHO MOST RESPONSIBLE FOR ECON CONDITION
V980425     J8          IS R INVESTED IN STOCK MARKET
V980426     J9          BETTER ONE PARTY OR SPLIT CONTROL
V980427     J10         DOES R THINK THE POLIT SYSTEM SHOULD REMAIN TWO PARTY?
V980428     J11         SOCIETY SHOULD SEE TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
V980429     J12         TOO FAR PUSHING EQUAL RIGHTS
V980430     J13a        DOES R CONSIDER CLINTON MORAL
V980431     J13b        DOES R THINK THAT CLINTON CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE R
V980432     J13c        DOES R CONSIDER CLINTON KNOWLEDGEABLE
V980433     J13d        DOES R CONSIDER CLINTON HONEST
V980434     J13e        DOES R CONSIDER CLINTON STRONG LEADER
V980435     J14a        GORE TRAIT- MORAL
V980436     J14b        GORE TRAIT- REALLY CARES
V980437     J14c        GORE TRAIT- KNOWLEDGEABLE
V980438     J14d        GORE TRAIT- HONEST
V980439     J14e        GORE TRAIT- STRONG LEADER
V980440     J15a        CONGRESS TOO LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE 1
V980441     J15a1       CONGRESS TOO LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE 2
V980442     J15b        CONGRESS DOESN'T ACCOMPLISH MUCH
V980443     J15c        CONGRESS TOO INVOLVED IN PARTISAN POL
V980444     J15d        CONGESS DOESN'T CARE WHAT ORDIN THINK


SURVEY SECTION K
Variable
Name        Item        Description
--------    ---------   ------------------------------------------------------
V980445     K1          CREDIT FOR BUDGET SURPLUS
V980446     K2          ETHNIC GROUPS- DISTINCT CULTURE/MELT POT
V980447     K3          FAVOR/OPPOSE ENGLISH OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
V980448     K4a         R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE
V980449     K4b         R'S PLACEMENT OF CLINTON ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE
V980450     K4c         R'S PLACEMENT OF GORE ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE
V980451     K4d         DEM HSE CAND PLACEMENT EQUAL ROLE SCALE
V980452     K4e         REP HSE CAND PLACEMENT EQUAL ROLE SCALE
V980453     K4f         DEM PARTY PLACEMENT EQUAL ROLE SCALE
V980454     K4g         REP PARTY PLACEMENT EQUAL ROLE SCALE
V980455     K5          R'S OPINION ON THE ISSUE OF SCHOOL PRAYER
V980456     K5a         STRENGTH OF R'S POSITION ON SCHOOL PRAYER
V980457     K6a         R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON GUAR JOB/STANDARD OF LIVING SCALE
V980458     K6b         R'S PLACE OF CLINTON ON GUAR JOB/STD OF LIVING SCALE
V980459     K6c         GORE- GUAR JOB/STD LIV SCALE
V980460     K6d         DEM HSE CAND- GUAR JOB/STD LIV SCALE
V980461     K6e         REP HSE CAND- GUAR JOB/STD LIV SCALE
V980462     K7a         R'S SELF-PLACE ON AID TO BLACKS SCALE
V980463     K8a         R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE
V980464     K8b         R'S PLACEMENT OF CLINTON ON SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE
V980465     K8c         GORE- SERVICES/SPEND SCALE
```

```
V980466    K8d          R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM HSE CAND ON SERVICE/SPENDING SCALE
V980467    K8e          R'S PLACEMENT OF REP HSE CAND ON SERV/SPENDING SCALE
V980468    K8f          R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM PARTY ON SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE
V980469    K8g          R'S PLACEMENT OF REP PARTY ON SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE
V980470    K9           DOES R FAVOR AFFIRM ACTION IN HIRING AND PROMOTION?
V980471    K9a/b        DOES R FAVOR/OPPOSE AFFIR ACTION STRONGLY / NOT
V980472    K10          RELIGIOUS GROUPS STAY IN/OUT OF POLITICS
V980473    K11          RELIGION DIVIDES/ RELIGIOUS TAKE ACTION
V980474    K12          HOW MUCH OF THE TIME R TRUSTS NEWS MEDIA
V980475    K13a         GORE OFFICE - KNOWLEDGE
V980476    K13b         REHNQUIST OFFICE - KNOWLEDGE
V980477    K13c         YELTSIN OFFICE - KNOWLEDGE
V980478    K13d         GINGRICH OFFICE - KNOWLEDGE
V980479    K14          DOES R RECALL WHICH PARTY WAS IN MAJORITY IN THE HOUSE?
V980480    K15          DOES R RECALL WHICH PARTY WAS IN MAJORITY IN SENATE?
V980481    K16          OFFICIALS SHD HAVE HIGHER MORAL STDS
V980482    K17          R FAVOR/OPPOSE SCHOOL VOUCHER SYSTEM
V980483    K17a/b       HOW MUCH FAVOR/OPP SCHOOL VOUCHER SYSTEM

SURVEY SECTION M
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    ----------------------------------------------------
V980484    M1           HAS US POS IN THE WRLD GROWN STR/WEAKER IN THE PAST YR
V980485    M2           HOW WILLING SHOULD THE US BE TO USE MILITARY FORCE
V980486    M3           HOW WILLING- HUMANITARIAN AID
V980487    M4           HOW WILLING- AID TO WORLD ECON CRISES
V980488    M5           SHOULD THE US NOT CONCERN ITSELF WITH PROBLEMS ABROAD
V980489    M6           SHOULD NO. IMMIGRANTS SHOULD BE INCREASE/DECREASED?
V980490    M7           DOES R FAVOR/OPPOSE LIMITING IMPORTS?
V980491    M8           VIETNAM OBJECTORS SHOULD HAVE SERVED
V980492    M9           IS RELIGION AN IMPORTANT PART OF R'S LIFE
V980493    M10          HOW MUCH GUIDANCE DOES RELIGION PROVIDE IN R'S LIFE
V980494    M11          HOW FREQUENTLY DOES R PRAY
V980495    M12          HOW FREQUENTLY DOES R READ THE BIBLE
V980496    M13          R'S VIEW ON WHETHER THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD
V980497    M14a         R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION SCALE
V980498    M14b         GORE -SCALE ENVIR REGULATION
V980499    M14c         DEM HSE CAND- SCALE ENVIR REGULATION
V980500    M14d         REP HSE CAND- SCALE ENVIR REGULATION
V980501    M14e         R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM PARTY ON ENVIRO REGULATION SCALE
V980502    M14f         R'S PLACEMENT OF REP PARTY ON ENVIRO REGULATION SCALE
V980503    M15          DOES R FAVOR OR OPPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY?
V980504    M15a/b       HOW STRONGLY FAVOR /OPPOSE DEATH PENALTY?
V980505    M16a         R'S SELF-PLACEMENT ON ABORTION ISSUE
V980506    M16b         GORE- ABORTION SCALE
V980507    M16c         R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM HOUSE CANDIDATE ON ABORTION ISSUE
V980508    M16d         R'S PLACEMENT OF REP HOUSE CANDIDATE ON ABORTION ISSUE
V980509    M16e         R'S PLACEMENT OF DEM PARTY ON ABORTION ISSUE
V980510    M16f         R'S PLACEMENT OF REP PARTY ON ABORTION ISSUE
V980511    M17          FAV/OPP LATE-TERM ABORTION BAN
V980512    M17a/b       STRENGTH FAV/OPP LATE-TERM ABORTION BAN

SURVEY SECTION N
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    ----------------------------------------------------
V980513    N1           IRISH ETC. NO SPECIAL FAVORS- BLACK NTHR
V980514    N2           BLACKS HAVE GOTTEN LESS THAN DESERVE
V980515    N3           SHOULD ADJUST MORAL BEHAVIOR TO CHANGE
```

```
V980516    N4          R OPINION: WE SHOULD BE MORE TOLERANT- OTHER MORAL STDS
V980517    N5          MORE EMPHASIS ON TRADITIONAL FAM TIES
V980518    N6          SHOULD BE MORE TOLERANT OF OTHER MORALS
V980519    N7          MARITAL INFIDELITY ALWAYS WRONG
V980520    N8          R PLACMENT- VOTING MAKES DIFF SCALE
V980521    N9          HOW MUCH ATTENTION DOES GOVT PAY TO PEOPLE IN DECISIONS
V980522    N10         DOW MUCH DOES R THINK ELECTIONS MAKE GOVT PAY ATTENTION
V980523    N11         OPINION: POLITICS AND GOVT ARE TOO COMPLICATED
V980524    N12         OPINION: PUBL OFFICIALS DON'T CARE WHAT PEOPLE THINK
V980525    N13         R OPINION: PEOPLE LIKE R DON'T HAVE MUCH SAY IN GOVT
V980526    N14         HOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN GOVT ARE CROOKED?
V980527    N15         HOW MUCH OF TAX MONEY DOES R THINK THE GOVT WASTES?
V980528    N16         HOW MUCH OF THE TIME R TRUSTS GOVT TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT
V980529    N17         IS GOVT RUN BY A FEW BIG INTERESTS OR BENEFIT OF ALL?
V980530    N18         US DOESN'T NEED POLITICAL PARTIES
V980531    N19         DOES R THINK THAT MOST PPLE WOULD TRY TO TAKE ADVANT
V980532    N20         DOES R THINK THAT MOST PEOPLE CAN BE TRUSTED


SURVEY SECTION P
Variable
Name       Item        Description
--------   ---------   -----------------------------------------------------
V980533    P1          SHOULD CLINTON RESIGN
V980534    P2          SHOULD CLINTON BE IMPEACHED
V980535    P3          APP/DIS CONGRESS HANDLE CLINTON SCANDAL
V980536    P3a/b       STRNGTH APP/DIS CONGRSS ON CLINTON SCAND
V980537    P4          APPROVE/DISAPP MEDIA ON CLINTON SCANDAL
V980538    P4a/b       STRENGTH APP/DIS MEDIA ON CLINTON SCAND
V980539    P5          CLINTON MATTER PUBLIC OR PRIVATE ISSUE
V980540    P6          IS KENNETH STARR IMPARTIAL OR PARTISAN


SURVEY SECTION X (RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION)
Variable
Name       Item         Description
--------   ---------    -----------------------------------------------------
V980541    X1           DOES R ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES
V980542    X1a          DOES R CONSIDER HIMSELF/HERSELF PART OF A CHURCH
V980543    X2           HOW FREQUENTLY DOES R ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES
V980544    X2a          DOES R ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES MORE THAN ONCE/WEEK
V980545    X3           (INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT) DOES R ATTEND WORSHIP
V980546    X3a          RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF R'S PLACE OF WORSHIP
V980547    X3b          R'S RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
V980548    X4           (PROTESTANT) R'S CHURCH/DENOMINATION
V980549    X4(1)        DENOMINATION OTHER SPECIFY
V980550    X4a          WITH WHAT BAPTIST GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980551    X4b          (BAPTIST) IS R'S CHURCH LOCAL OR AFFIL
V980552    X4c          WITH WHAT LUTHERN GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980553    X4d          WITH WHAT METHODIST GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980554    X4e          WITH WHAT PRESBYTERIAN GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980555    X4f          WITH WHAT REFORMED GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980556    X4g          WITH WHAT BRETHREN GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980557    X4h          BY "CHRISTIAN" DOES R MEAN DISCIPLES OF CHRIST
V980558    X4i          WHAT CHURCH OF CHRIST GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFIL
V980559    X4j          WITH WHAT CHURCH OF GOD GROUP IS R'S CHURCH AFFILIATED
V980560    X4k          (HOLINESS OR PENTECOSTAL) WHAT IS THE NAME/AFFIL
V980561    X4kx         'OTHER' TEXTS - BLANKED
V980562    X4m          (NOT PROT/CATH/JEWISH) WHAT IS THE NAME/AFFIL
V980563    X4m(1)       (R NOT ALRY IDENT AS CHRST) IS THAT CHRISTIAN?
V980564    X6a/b        (JEWISH) ORTHODOX, CONSERV, OR REFORMED
V980565    X7           IS R OFFICIALLY A MEMBER OF A PLACE OF WORSHIP
```

```
V980566     X8          TYPE OF R'S CHRISTIANITY
V980567     X8a         CHRISTIANITY TYPE - OPEN
V980568     X9          IS R A BORN-AGAIN CHRISTIAN
V980569     X10         RELIGION SUMMARY

SURVEY SECTION Y (DEMOGRAPHICS/PERSONAL INFORMATION)
Variable
Name        Item        Description
--------    ---------   ----------------------------------------------------
V980570     Y1a         R'S MONTH OF BIRTH
V980571     Y1b         R'S YEAR OF BIRTH
V980572     Y1c         AGE OF RESPONDENT
V980573     Y2          R'S MARITAL STATUS
V980574     Y3          HIGHEST GRADE R HAS COMPLETED
V980575     Y3a         HAS R EARNED A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/PASSED THE GED
V980576     Y3b         HIGHEST DEGREE R HAS EARNED
V980577     Y3x         SUMMARY - RESPONDENT EDUCATION
V980578     Y5          ASSIGNED EMPLOYMENT SERIES
V980579     Y6          R'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS- FULL
V980579a    Y7          R'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1 CATEGORY
V980580     Y9          (UNEMPLOYED) HAS R EVER WORKED FOR PAY
V980581     Y10/Y10a    (UNEMPLOYED) PAST OCCUPATION CODE (2 DIGIT)
V980581a    Y10x(1)     (UNEMPLOYED) PAST OCCUPATION (BLANKED)
V980582     Y10x(2)     (UNEMPLOYED) PAST OCCUPATION COLLAPSED (1 DIGIT)
V980583     Y10x(3)     (UNEMPLOYED) PAST OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980584     Y10b        (UNEMPLOYED) PAST BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CODE
V980585     Y10c        (UNEMPLOYED) WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED
V980586     Y10d        (UNEMPLOYED) DID R WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT
V980587     Y10e        (UNEMPLOYED) HAS R WORKED FOR PAY IN THE LAST 6 MOS
V980588     Y10f        (UNEMPLOYED) HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED
V980589     Y10g        (UNEMPLOYED) IS R LOOKING FOR WORK
V980590     Y10h        (UNEMPLOYED) HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT FINDING WORK
V980591     Y11         (RETIRED) MONTH OF RETIREMENT
V980592     Y11a        (RETIRED) YEAR OF RETIREMENT
V980593     Y12/Y12a    (RETIRED) PAST OCCUPATION CODE (2 DIGIT)
V980593a    Y12x(1)     (RETIRED) PAST OCCUPATION (BLANKED)
V980594     Y12x(2)     (RETIRED) PAST OCCUPATION (BLANKED) COLLAPSED (1 DIGIT)
V980595     Y12x(3)     (RETIRED) PAST OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980596     Y12b        (RETIRED) PAST BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CODE
V980597     Y12c        (RETIRED) WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED
V980598     Y12d        (RETIRED) DID R WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT
V980599     Y12e        (RETIRED) HAS R WORKED FOR PAY IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
V980600     Y12f        (RETIRED) HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED
V980601     Y12g        (RETIRED) IS R CURRENTLY WORKING FOR PAY
V980602     Y12h        (RETIRED) IS R LOOKING FOR WORK
V980603     Y12j        (RETIRED) HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT FINDING WORK
V980604     Y13         (DISABLED) HAS R EVER WORKED FOR PAY
V980605     Y14/Y14a    (DISABLED) PAST OCCUPATION CODE
V980605a    Y14x(1)     (DISABLED) PAST OCCUPATION CODE (BLANKED)
V980606     Y14x(2)     (DISABLED) PAST OCCUPATION CODE COLLAPSED (1 DIGIT)
V980607     Y14x(3)     (DISABLED) PAST OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980608     Y14b        (DISABLED) PAST BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CODE
V980609     Y14c        (DISABLED) WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED
V980610     Y14d        (DISABLED) DID R WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT
V980611     Y14e        (DISABLED) HAS R WORKED FOR PAY IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
V980612     Y14f        (DISABLED) HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED
V980613     Y14g        (DISABLED) IS R CURRENTLY WORKING FOR PAY
V980614     Y14h        (DISABLED) IS R LOOKING FOR WORK
V980615     Y14j        (DISABLED) HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT FINDING WORK
V980616     Y15         (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) IS R CURRENTLY WORKING FOR PAY
```

```
V980617   Y15a       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) HAS R WORKED FOR PAY IN LAST 6 MOS
V980618   Y16/Y16a   (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) PAST OCCUPATION CODE
V980618a  Y16x(1)    (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) PAST OCCUPATION CODE (BLANKED)
V980619   Y16x(2)    (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) PAST OCCUPATION COLLAPSED (1 DIGIT)
V980620   Y16x(3)    (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) PAST OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980621   Y16b       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) PAST BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CODE
V980622   Y16c       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED
V980623   Y16d       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) DID R WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT
V980624   Y16f       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED
V980625   Y16h       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) IS R LOOKING FOR WORK
V980626   Y16j       (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT FINDING WORK
V980627   Y7/Y7a     (WORKING NOW) OCCUPATION CODE
V980627a  Y7x(1)     (WORKING NOW) OCCUPATION CODE (BLANKED)
V980628   Y7x(2)     (WORKING NOW) OCCUPATION CODE COLLAPSED (1 DIGIT)
V980629   Y7x(3)     (WORKING NOW) OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980630   Y7b        (WORKING NOW) BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CODE
V980631   Y7c        (WORKING NOW) IS R SELF-EMPLOYED
V980632   Y7d        (WORKING NOW) DOES R WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT
V980633   Y7e        (WORKING NOW) HOURS PER WEEK R WORKS
V980634   Y7f        (WORKING NOW) IS R SATISFIED WITH NUM HRS R WORKS/WEEK
V980635   Y7g        (WORKING NOW) HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT LOSING JOB
V980636   Y7h        (WORKING NOW) WAS R OUT OF WORK IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS
V980637   Y7j        (WORKING NOW) DID R HAVE REDUCT IN WRK HRS LAST 6 MOS
V980638   RC1        STACKED OCCUPATION CODE
V980638a  RC1a       STACKED OCCUPATION (BLANKED)
V980639   RC2        STACKED OCCUPATION COLLAPSED
V980640   RC3        STACKED OCCUPATION PRESTIGE
V980641   RC4        STACKED INDUSTRY CODE
V980642   RC5        STACKED- R WORK FOR SELF/OTHERS
V980643   RC6        STACKED- R EMPLOYED BY GOVERNMENT
V980644   RC7        STACKED- NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED
V980645   RC8        STACKED- WORRIED ABOUT LOSING/FINDING JOB
V980646   RC9        STACKED- (UNEMP/DISAB) HAD JOB IN LAST 6 MOS.
V980647   RC10       STACKED- (R/UN/DIS) LOOKING FOR WORK
V980648   RC11       UN/DIS) EVER WORKED FOR PAY
V980649   Y18        DO ANY OF R'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS BELONG TO A LABOR UNION
V980650   Y18a       R'S HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS WHO BELONG TO A LABOR UNION
V980651   Y19        (INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT) IS R THE ONLY HH MEMBER 14+
V980652   Y20        R'S FAMILY INCOME IN 1995
V980653   Y20a/Y21   R'S OWN INCOME IN 1995
V980654   Y22(1)     R'S ETHNIC/NATIONALITY GROUP -- MENTION 1
V980655   Y22(2)     R'S ETHNIC/NATIONALITY GROUP -- MENTION 2
V980656   Y22(3)     (INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT) # OF ETHNIC/NAT GRPS R MENT
V980657   Y22a       ETHNIC/NAT GROUP WITH WHICH R MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFIES
V980658   Y22b       WERE BOTH OF R'S PARENTS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES
V980659   Y23        IS R OF SPANISH/HISPANIC ORIGIN OR DESCENT
V980660   Y23a       CATEGORY OF HISPANIC ORIGIN THAT BEST DESCRIBES R
V980661   Y26        HOW LONG HAS R LIVED IN R'S PRESENT CITY
V980662   Y27        HOW LONG HAS R  LIVED IN R'S PRESENT HOUSE
V980663   Y28        DOES R OWN A HOME OR PAY RENT
V980664   Y29        DOES R HAVE CHILDREN
V980665   Y29a       HOW MANY CHILDREN R HAS <6 YRS OLD
V980666   Y29a1      NO. CHILDREN <6 WITH R AT LEAST HALF TIM
V980667   Y29b       HOW MANY CHILDREN R HAS 6-18 YRS OLD
V980668   Y29b1      NO. CHILDREN 6-18 W/ R AT LEAST HALF TIM
V980669   Y30        CKPOINT: IS R ENDING IW FTF OR PHONE?

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION
Variable
Name      Item       Description
```

```
-------- --------- ----------------------------------------------------
V980670   Z0         IWR: NUMBER OF TIMES R CONTACTED HU
V980671   Z0a        IWR: WHY DI DR CONDUCT FTF
V980672   Z1         IWR OBSERVATION: R GENDER
V980673   Z2         IWR OSERVATION: R RACE
V980674   Z3         IWR OSERVATION:OTHERS PRESENT DURING IW
V980675   Z4         IWR OBSERVATION: R COOPERATION
V980676   Z5         IWR OBSERVATION: R LEVEL INFORMATION ABT POLITICS
V980677   Z6         IWR OBSERVATION: R APPARENT INTELLIGENCE
V980678   Z7         IWR OBSERVATION: R SUSPICIOUSNESS
V980679   Z8         IWR OBSERVATION: R INTEREST IN IW
V980680   Z9         IWR OBSERVATION: R SINCERITY
V980681   Z10        IWR OBSERVATION: R REPORT INCOME ACCURATELY
V980682   Z10a       IWR OBSERVATION: ESTIMATED INCOME
V980683   Z11(1)     IWR OBSERVATION: #1 R REACTIONS TO IW
V980684   Z11(2)     IWR OBSERVATION: #2 R REACTIONS TO IW
V980685   Z11(3)     IWR OBSERVATION: #3 R REACTIONS TO IW
V980686   Z11(4)     IWR OBSERVATION: #4 R REACTIONS TO IW
V980687   Z11(5)     IWR OBSERVATION: #5 R REACTIONS TO IW
Note: there are no variables V980688-980690
V980691   Z12        IWR OBSERVATION: R DIFFICULTY W/BOOKLET
V980692   Z13        IWR OBSERVATION: REASONS FOR DIFFICULTY W/BOOKLET
V980693   Z14        IWR OBSERVATION: DID R STATE PROBLEM W/BKLET
V980694   Z15        IWR OBSERVATION: HOW MUCH OF THE BOOKLET WAS A PROBLEM
V980695   Z16        IWR TELEPHONE OBSERV: DID R HAVE BOOKLET
V980696   Z17        IWR TEL OBSERV: HOW SURE THAT R HAD BOOKLET
V980697   Z18        IWR TEL OBSERV: R DIFFICULTY W/BOOKLET
V980698   Z19        IWR TEL OBSERV: HOW MUCH DIFFICULTY W/BKLET
V980699   Z20        IWR TEL OBSERV: WHY DID IT SEEM DIFFICULTY W/BKLET
V980700   Z21        IWR TEL OBSERV: WHY NO BOOKLET
V980701   Z22        IWR TEL OBSERV: DID R USE BKLET MID-IW
V980702   Z23        IWR TEL OBSERV: DID NO BOOKLET INTERFERE W/ IW


RANDOMIZATION
Variable
Name      Item      Description
-------- --------- ----------------------------------------------------
V980703   Rand.A12/13 Order of A12-A12a/b and A13-A13a/b
V980704   Rand.B4b1  Position of Democratic House candidate in thermometers
V980705   Rand.B4b2  Position of Democratic House candidate in thermometers
V980706   Rand.B4c1  Position of Democratic Senate candidate in thermometers
V980707   Rand.B4c2  Position of Democratic Senate candidate in thermometers
V980708   Rand.B4d   Position of Al Gore in thermometers
V980709   Rand.B4e   Position of Newt Gingrich in thermometers
V980710   Rand.B4f   Position of George Bush Jr. in thermometers
V980711   Rand.B4g   Position of Dan Quayle in thermometers
V980712   Rand.B4h   Position of Steve Forbes in thermometers
V980713   Rand.B4i   Position of Ken Starr in thermometers
V980714   Rand.B4j   Position of Pat Buchanan in thermometers
V980715   Rand.B4k   Position of Elizabeth Dole in thermometers
V980716   Rand.B4m   Position of Richard Gephardt in thermometers
V980717   Rand.B4n   Position of Paul Wellstone in thermometers
V980718   Rand.B4o   Position of John McCain in thermometers
V980719   Rand.B4p   Position of Bill Bradley in thermometers
V980720   Rand.B4q   Position of Bob Kerrey in thermometers
V980721   Rand.B4r   Position of John Kerrey in thermometers
V980722   Rand.B4s   Position of Gary Bauer in thermometers
V980723   Rand.B4t   Position of John Ashcroft in thermometers
V980724   Rand.B4u   Position of Hillary Clinton in thermometers
V980725   Rand.B5a/b  Position of Democratic Party in thermometers
```

```
V980726    Rand.B5c    Position of Blacks in thermometers
V980727    Rand.B5d    Position of the Religious Right in thermometers
V980728    Rand.B5e    Position of Conservatives in thermometers
V980729    Rand.B5f    Position of Gay Men and Lesbians in thermometers
V980730    Rand.B5g    Position of Labor Unions in thermometers
V980731    Rand.B5h    Position of Liberals in thermometers
V980732    Rand.B5j    Position of Poor People in thermometers
V980733    Rand.B5k    Position of Rich People in thermometers
V980734    Rand.B5m    Position of Whites in thermometers
V980735    Rand.B5n    Position of College Educated People  in thermometers
V980736    Rand.B5p    Position of Business in thermometers
V980737    Rand.B5q    Position of the U.S. Congress in thermometers
V980738    Rand.B5r    Position of the News Media in thermometers
V980739    Rand.C1-C4  Position of Dem Party and Rep Party Likes/Dislikes
V980740    Rand.C5     Order of Dem candidate name and Rep candidate name
V980741    Rand.F6     Order of F6 "Republican Party" and "Democratic Party"
V980742    Rand.H2     Position of "crime" in party performance series
V980743    Rand.H2a    Position of "handling the nation's economy"
V980744    Rand.H2b    Position of "handling the problems of pollution"
V980745    Rand.H2c    Position of "handling foreign affairs"
V980746    Rand.H2d    Position of "Social Security" in party performance
V980747    Rand.H2-H2d Order of "Republican Party" and "Democratic Party"
V980748    Rand.H4a    Position of of "angry" in Clinton affects series
V980749    Rand.H4b    Position of of "hopeful" in Clinton affects series
V980750    Rand.H4c    Position of of "afraid" in Clinton affects series
V980751    Rand.H4d    Position of of "proud" in Clinton affects series
V980752    Rand.H4e    Position of of "disgusted" in Clinton affects series
V980753    Rand.H5d/e  Position of Demo and Repub cands in Liberal/Cons
V980754    Rand.H5f/g  Position of Dem party, Repub party in Liberal/Conserv
V980755    Rand.J13-15 Order of exec level (Clinton, Gore) traits series
V980756    Rand.J13a   Position of "is moral" in J13 Clinton traits series
V980757    Rand.J13b   Position of "really cares about people" in J13
V980758    Rand.J13c   Position of "is knowledgeable" in J13
V980759    Rand.J13d   Position of "is honest" in J13 Clinton traits series
V980760    Rand.J13e   Position of "provides strong leadership" in J13
V980761    Rand.J14a   Position of "is moral" in J14 Gore traits series
V980762    Rand.J14b   Position of "really cares about people" in J14
V980763    Rand.J14c   Position of "is knowledgeable" in J14
V980764    Rand.J14d   Position of "is honest" in J14 Gore traits series
V980765    Rand.J14e   Position of "provides strong leadership" in J14
V980766    Rand.J15a   Selection of "too liberal"/"too cons" Congr trait
V980767    Rand.J15b   Position of "doesn't get much accomplished" in J15
V980768    Rand.J15c   Position of "too involved in partisan politics" in J15
V980769    Rand.J15d   Position of "doesn't care what ordinary Am think"
V980770    Rand.K4d/e  Position of Dem and Repub candidates in Women's Role
V980771    Rand.K4f/g  Position of Dem and Repubparties in Women's Role
V980772    Rand.K6d/e  Position of Dem and Repub cands in Guar Jobs
V980773    Rand.K8d/e  Position of Dem and Repub candidates in Serv/Spend
V980774    Rand.K8f/g  Position of Dem and Repub parties in Serv/Spend
V980775    Rand.M14c/d Position of Dem and Repub candidates in Serv/Spend
V980776    Rand.M14e/f Position of Dem and Repub parties in Serv/Spend
```