

anes2002prepost_app.txt
THIS FILE IS: anes_2002prepost_app.txt (codebook appendix file)
RELEASE VERSION: 20051116 (Nov 16, 2005)

DEFAULT DIRECTORY: C:\ANES\anes_2002prepost\20051116\

2002 APPENDICES

>> 2002 CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODE

Note: the candidate number Master Code has been revised in 2002.

SENATE

RACE IN STATE

01. Democratic candidate in open Senate race
 02. Republican candidate in open Senate race
 03. Democratic Senate running incumbent
 04. Republican Senate running incumbent
 05. Democratic Senate challenger
 06. Republican Senate challenger
 07. Independent/3rd-party Senate candidate - nonincumbent
 08. Independent/3rd-party Senate candidate - 2nd nonincumbent
 09. Independent/3rd-party Senate incumbent
 21. Retiring Democratic Junior Senator in state with open race
 22. Retiring Republican Junior Senator in state with open race
 23. Retiring Independent/3rd Party Junior Senator in state with open race
 27. Retiring Democratic Senior Senator in state with open race
 28. Retiring Republican Senior Senator in state with open race
 29. Retiring Independent/3rd Party Senior Senator in state with open race
- SENATOR WITH TERM NOT UP (NOT RUNNING FOR RETIRING)
11. Democratic Junior Senator
 12. Republican Junior Senator
 13. Independent/3rd-Party Junior Senator
 17. Democratic Senior Senator
 18. Republican Senior Senator
 19. Independent/3rd Party Senior Senator

HOUSE

31. Democratic candidate in open House race
32. Republican candidate in open House race
33. Democratic House running incumbent
34. Republican House running incumbent
35. Democratic House challenger
36. Republican House challenger
37. Independent/3rd-party House candidate - nonincumbent
38. Independent/3rd-party House candidate - 2nd nonincumbent
39. Independent/3rd-party House incumbent
41. Retiring Democratic House Representative
42. Retiring Republican House Representative
43. Retiring Independent/3rd-Party House Representative

||>>2002 TYPE RACE MASTER CODE

HOUSE TYPE RACE

INCUMBENT RUNNING

12. Democratic incumbent running - Republican challenger

anes2002prepost_app.txt

13. Democratic incumbent running - other challenger
14. Democratic incumbent running - unopposed
19. Democratic incumbent running - Repub and other challengers
21. Republican incumbent running - Democratic challenger
23. Republican incumbent running - other challenger
24. Republican incumbent running - unopposed
29. Republican incumbent running - Dem and other challengers
31. Other incumbent running - Democratic challenger
32. Other incumbent running - Republican challenger
34. Other incumbent running - unopposed
35. Other incumbent running - Dem and Repub challengers

SPECIAL TYPE RACE DUE TO REDISTRICTING

40. Dem and Repub incumbents running - no other candidate
41. 2 Democratic incumbents running - no other candidate
42. 2 Republican incumbents running - no other candidate
43. Dem and Repub incumbents running - other candidate(s)
44. Dem non-incumbent only - no retiree/unclear who is retiree
45. Repub non-incumbent only - no retiree/unclear who is retiree
46. Dem and Rep candidates - no retiree/unclear who is retiree
47. Dem and other candidates - no retiree/unclear who is retiree
48. Rep and other candidates - no retiree/unclear who is retiree
49. Dem, Rep and other cand s - no retiree/unclear who is retiree

NO INCUMBENT RUNNING

51. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic cand unopposed
52. Dem incumbent not running - Republican cand unopposed
53. Dem incumbent not running - Other cand unopposed
55. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic and Republican cand s
56. Dem incumbent not running - Republican and other candidates
57. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic and other candidates
59. Dem incumbent not running - Democr, Repub, other cand s
61. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic cand unopposed
62. Rep incumbent not running - Republican cand unopposed
63. Rep incumbent not running - Other cand unopposed
65. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic and Republican cand s
66. Rep incumbent not running - Republican and other candidates
67. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic and other candidates
69. Rep incumbent not running - Democr, Repub, other cand s

LOUISIANA DISTRICT 05 ONLY

80. Rep incumbent not running - Democr and 2 Repub candidates
97. Washington DC

ISENATE TYPE RACE

INCUMBENT RUNNING

12. Democratic incumbent running - Republican challenger
13. Democratic incumbent running - other challenger
14. Democratic incumbent running - unopposed
19. Democratic incumbent running - Repub and other challengers
21. Republican incumbent running - Democratic challenger
23. Republican incumbent running - other challenger
24. Republican incumbent running - unopposed
29. Republican incumbent running - Dem and other challengers
31. Other incumbent running - Democratic challenger
32. Other incumbent running - Republican challenger
34. Other incumbent running - unopposed
35. Other incumbent running - Dem and Repub challengers

NO INCUMBENT RUNNING

- 51. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic cand unopposed
- 52. Dem incumbent not running - Republican cand unopposed
- 53. Dem incumbent not running - Other cand unopposed
- 55. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic and Republican cand
- 56. Dem incumbent not running - Republican and other candidates
- 57. Dem incumbent not running - Democratic and other candidates
- 59. Dem incumbent not running - Democr, Repub, other cand
- 61. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic cand unopposed
- 62. Rep incumbent not running - Republican cand unopposed
- 63. Rep incumbent not running - Other cand unopposed
- 65. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic and Republican cand
- 66. Rep incumbent not running - Republican and other candidates
- 67. Rep incumbent not running - Democratic and other candidates
- 69. Rep incumbent not running - Democr, Repub, other cand

LOUISIANA ONLY

- 80. Democratic incumbent running - 2 Republican challengers

NO RACE IN STATE

- 81. Democratic incumbents, no race in state
- 82. Republican incumbents, no race in state
- 83. Democratic and other incumbent, no race in state
- 84. Republican and other incumbent, no race in state
- 85. Democratic and Republican incumbents, no race in state
- 86. 2 Other incumbents - no race

- 97. Washington DC

↳> 2000 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY SAMPLE DESIGN

>> STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 2000 Pre- and Post-Election Study is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 2000 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 7th of November 2000.

>> DUAL FRAME SAMPLE DESIGN

The 2000 NES is a dual frame sample with both an area sample and an RDD component. The RDD frame provides coverage of telephone households while the area sample provides full coverage of all U.S. households including those without telephones. Each of these sample designs will be described in the following sections. The 2000 NES data set contains 1006 area sample cases and 801 telephone sample cases.

>> FTF SAMPLE DESIGN - MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY

The area sample is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) 1990 National Sample design. Identification of the 2000 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 2000 NES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 2000 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 2000. The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area probability sample. The 2000 NES sample was drawn from both the 1990 SRC National Sample strata (MSA PSUs) and the 1980 SRC National Sample strata (non-MSA PSUs). The modification of the 1990 design in which the 1980 strata definitions were used for the non-MSA counties fully represents the non-MSA domain of the 48 contiguous states. This modification was made for cost and interviewing efficiency reasons related to the availability of interviewers in these areas who work on some of SRC's large panel studies. The following sections will focus on the 1990 SRC National Sample design.

Selection Stages for the 2000 NES FTF Sample: 1990 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 2000 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 2000 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 2000 NES sample design. The 18 self-representing areas in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all retained for the 2000 NES sample (8 of these remained self-representing in the 2000 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 2000 NES sample (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

Table 1 identifies the 44 PSUs in the 2000 NES sample by MSA status and Region and also indicates the number of area segments used for the 2000 NES sample (see next section on second stage selection).

Table 1: PSU Name and Number of Area Segments in the 2000 NES Sample Showing 1990 SRC National-Sample Stratum and MSA Status.

National Sample PSU	National Sample PSU Name	# of 2000 NES
---------------------	--------------------------	---------------

Eight Largest Self-representing PSUs		

120	New York, NY MSA	12
190	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA130	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
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
434	Saginaw, MI 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		

464	Gardner, MA	6

anes2002prepost_app.txt		
Nonsel f-representi ng Non-MSAs: Mi dwest		

466	Decatur County, IN	6
470	Mower County, MN	6
Nonsel f-representi ng Non-MSAs: South		

474	DeSoto Pari sh, LA	6
477	Chi cot County, AR	6
480	Montgomery County, VA	6
Nonsel f-representi ng Non-MSAs: West		

482	El Dorado County, CA	6
Total Number of Segments		279

(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 State 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.

Second Stage Selection Area Segments

The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 2000 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 2000 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 Housing Units

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 2000 NES sample was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The 2000 NES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of 2269 listed housing units. This total included 1972 housing units for the main sample and three reserve replicates of 99 cases each. Table 2 below shows the assumptions that were used to determine the number of sample housing units. The overall probability of selection for 2000 NES cross-section sample of households was $f=0.00002116$ or 0.2116 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 2000 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 Selection - Respondent Selection

Within each sampled 2000 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.

>> AREA SAMPLE DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OUTCOMES

The 2000 National Election Study sought a total of 1000 in-person interviews. It was estimated that this would require a NES sample draw of 1972 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.83, an eligibility rate of 0.94 and a response rate of 0.65. These assumptions were based on the 1998 NES field experience. The overall 2000 NES area sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes are set out in Table 2, below. A sample of 2269 listed housing units was actually selected for the 2000 NES study. This allowed for three reserve replicates of 99 cases each. There was no panel component in 2000.

A comparison of the 2000 NES sample outcome figures to the design specifications and assumptions in Table 2 shows that the actual occupancy, eligibility, and response rates were very close to the expected rates. The actual response rate for the Post-Election Telephone sample was 0.86, which was slightly higher than the assumed rate of 0.85.

Table 2: 2000 NES Area Sample Pre and Post-Election Design Specifications and Assumptions Compared to Sample Outcome.

	2000 NES Pre-Election Design Specifications	2000 NES Pre-Election Sample Outcome	2000 NES Post-Election Design Specifications	2000 NES Post-Election Sample Outcome
Completed Interviews	1000	1006	847	693

anes2002prepost_app.txt

Response Rate	0.65	0.64	.85	0.86
Eligible Sample Households	1538	1564	1000	805 (4)
Eligibility Rate	0.94	0.95		
Occupied Households	1634	1639		
Occupancy/ growth Rate	0.83	0.82		
Total Sample Lines	1972	1986		

(4) Initial sample lines (FTF and Phone) are different from the Pre-Election completed interviews because of the switch in mode for randomly selected sample cases.