TO : The 86 Pilot Planning Committe
REFE : Congressional District Assignment in an RDD sample
FROM : Giovanna Morchio, Santa Traugott

This memo reports on our use of the 1982 CATI Post-Election data to explore the utility of zip code and county in determining the respondent Congressional District, in comparison with the combination of telephone exchange maping and the recall-recognition routine used in 1982. (The analyses will be limited to the 497 ISR CATI cases for now because of the difficulties in getting address information for the Berkeley half sample on time for the May meeting).

The determination of the respondent congresional district was the bigest challenge faced by the 1982 Cati. As soon as the RDD sample was drawn an effort was made to determine the C.D. through telephone exchanges maps. This exercise placed respondents clearly in only one C.D. in 47% of the cases. 33% could have been in either of two C.D.s and 20% in one of 3. This information was used to complile a list of all the possible candidate slates for each telephone exchange.

The actual C. D. assignment was done during the interview process. Whenever the respondent recalled or recognized (in the thermometers) the name or names of "at least one" valid candidate for "only one" of the possible C.D.'s , he/she was automatically assigned to that district. When recall or recognition answers were in conflict the respondent was asked to choose between alternative local C.D.'s. During the interview we also asked respondents for the names of the two intersecting streets nearest to their home. This information was used after the study was finished to determine the real C.D. for the respondent, so as to be able to evaluate the C.D. assignment. Using Recall-Recognition, we were able to place 69% of our respondents in the correct C.D. 13% had been assigned to the wrong C.D. by the Recall-Recognition routine, and 18% were never assigned.

In 1982, recontact information was also collected: name, mailing address for respondent and a friend or relative who might know of his/her whereabouts. This information was not part of the interview schedule itself, but was asked at the end of the interview and stored in a separate note file in a free format fashion. No especial instructions were given to the interviewers regarding possible discrepancies between the respondent's residence and mailing address or the degree of completeness expected. In numerous cases we ended up with postal box addresses and in a few others we had complete addresses except zip code, with no comment to indicate if the respondent didn't know his/her zip or the interviewer didn't probe for it. The excercise yielded 432(87%) zips versus 65(13%) missing data for zip codes. This 13% reflects mainly address refusal.

For an estimate of Zip refusal in a more realistic context, we looked at the 84 Rolling Cross-Section data, where we asked for Zip, independently of address. The overall rate of missing data was only 4%.

In 1982 we also asked respondents for their county, gathering in this way a second piece of information which can be used for the purpose of C.D. identification. Slightly over 95% of our respondents gave us a valid county name. About 5% either didn't know their county or gave us a name that didn't correspond to a county.

We decided to use the 82 CATI-ISR study to simulate (even though we would be overestimating the amount of missing data for zip codes) a 3 step procedure based on county, zip and recall information to assign respondents to their C.D.'s. The Congressional District-Zip Cross Reference, 99th Congress (Grassroot Information Systems, The Tyson Capitol Institute) database was used to match zip codes with the respondents' C.D. The Tyson list offers unique matches between zip codes and C.D.s in a high proportion of cases. However, when 2 C.D.s are possible, it tells which one is the most likely. The Congressional District Atlas, Districts of the 99th Congress, US. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, was used to match counties to C.D.'s. Recall was measured by respondent answers to C2, our standard recall question (see appendix).

If the respondent gave us county information that allowed us to place him/her in "only one" C.D. and this assignment was not in conflict with zip information, he/she was automatically assigned to the C.D. identified from his/her county. When county pointed toward more than one C.D., and we had a zip which uniquely identified the C.D., (and this information was within the boundaries set by the county information), the respondent was assigned to the zip's uniquely identified C.D. If the zip didn't uniquely identify the C.D., but the two alternatives it pointed to were consistent with the alternatives offered by the county assignment, then the respondent was assigned to the C.D. designated as most likely by the Tyson Cross-Reference List. If a respondent remained unassigned by either county, or zip, but he/she recalled the name of at least one candidate then he/she was assigned to the recalled candidate's C.D. The above situations defined the "correctly assigned" category.

Conflicting assignments between zip and county, or between the result of the three step process and the variable defined as the "true" C.D. (after maps look ups in 82), were classified as "wrong assignment". The remnant cases went to the "not assigned" category. Table 1 summarizes the assignment procedure just outlined, and compares it with the Rcall-Recognition routine used in 1982

Table 1

C.D. Assignment: 3 Steps vs Recall-Recognition

	1982 Recall-Recog	Proposed 3 Steps
C. D. correctly assigned	338 69%	430 88%
C. D. wrongly assigned	65 13%	25 5%
C. D. not assigned	86 18%	34 7%

By far the most powerful source of identification is zip code. By itself it allowed us to place 83% of the respondent in their correct C.D. County information marginally improved the assignment figure by 4% and recall added only 1%.

The 25 cases classified as wrongly assigned (where "right" is the actual 1982 C.D. as looked up by staff after the interview) represent a range of situations. Three of them correspond to cases not uniquely identified by the Tyson Cross-Reference list. The C.D. defined as "most likely" by the list, proved to be wrong in 3 out of 29 cases. A few wrongly assigned respondents are found in C.D's whose boundaries were changed in 1983. Since the Tyson Cross-Reference list corresponds to the 99th Congress, some cases were bound to be missplaced. We don't have detailed enough maps to be certain that this is the cause of the discrepancy in all of the likely cases.

Some respondents gave us zips belonging to their postal boxes which appear to be in a different C.D. than their homes. A couple of respondents gave somebody else's address (a student gave his parents). We counted as error too several cases of Zip misspunch, which were so obviously wrong that an interviewer would be bound to realize the error (the zip didn't exist or placed the respondent in a different state) and correct the mistake during the interview process.

Two other possible sources of discrepancy are errors either in our 1982 assignments or in the Tyson Zip C.D. cross reference list. Since several of the above mentioned errors are unlikely to happen in a real study, the 5% wrongly assigned category might be somewhat inflated.

A 7% non-assignment is a very conservative estimate. We started out with about double the number of zip's missing data we are likely to get if we ask for zip code independently from address. The results of the 3 steps assignment routine are very positive, both in terms of the correct assignment rate, and the staff amount of work needed to implement it.

In Rolling Cross-Section we collected both zip code and address information independently of each other, at different times of the interview. The possession of these two overlaping pieces of information gave us the opportunity to tackle the question: how accurate is zip reporting. We performed a check on a random third of the sample (1161 cases), which involved looking up every address in a zip directory. The exercise resulted in 33 (3)% of the respondents giving us the wrong zip for their address, 49 (4%) who didn't give us any zip, and 96 cases (8%) who might have been in more than one C.D.'s acordingly to the Tyson Cross-Reference list. Unfortunately we could not determine what proportion of the 96 would have been assigned correctly by choosing the C.D. listed as most likely by Tyson. We didn't have the respondent C.D. in Rolling Cross-section, but by extrapolating from the 82 CATI experience, (where only 1% of the automatically assigned respondents ended up in the wrong C.D.) we can expect a rate of assignment in the neigborhood of 92%.

The next question to be answered is, how well is the 3 Step routine likely to work in highly populated areas where several C.D.'s are possible. One way of assesing the difficulty of identifying the Respondent's C.D. is to look at the number of C.D.'s estimated to be represented in the geographic area covered by the telephone exchange, the assumption would be that in highly populated areas a telephone exchange is likely to cover several C.D.'s. In 1982 we ended up with 3 different situations: exchages where only one C.D. was possible, and those in which 2 or even 3 C.D.'s were possible. Table 2 compares the performance of the two assignment methods for these 3 different situations.

TAble 2

Three Step and Recall-Recognition by Number of Possible C.D.'s

	Assigned Correctly		Wrongly Assigned		Not Assigned	
	RR	3 Step	RR	3 Step	RR	3 Steps
Only One C.D.	178 78%	216 95%	0 -	4 2%	50 22%	8 3%
Two Possible C.D.	102 63%	142 87%	37 23%	8 5%	24 15%	13 8%
Three Possible C.D.	58 59%	72 74%	28 29%	13 13%	12 12%	13 13%

In the 82 sample, 53% of our respondents' exchanges covered 2 or 3 C.D.'s. We were in counties like Los Angeles, San Diego, Philadelphia, Queens, Cook, Middlesex, Worcester, Norfolk, Dade, etc., which can easily qualify as "most difficult" situations. Table 2 shows a 21% point difference in the level of assignment between respondents living in areas where only one C.D. was possible as oppose to those living in areas where 3 were possible. The magnitude of the gap is similar to the one produced by the Recall-Recognition method, but the overall level of assignment is better for the 3 Step routine by a 15% margin. Furthermore the use of 99th Congress Tyson Cross-Reference list, (instead of the one corresponding to the 98th Congress) and the use of zip codes corresponding to postal boxes, are most likely to disproportionately affect the wrongly assigned category for the 3 possible C.D.'s group. In fact the percentage of wrongly assigned almost doubled with respect to the only one, and two possible C.D.'s combined.

Since the committee may want to restrict the full scale interview to voters, we have looked at what happens to the proportion of respondents who are correctly assigned to their C.D. if the sample is restricted to voters. Table 3 presents the results of both the 3 Step assignment, and the Recall-Recognition routines by vote.

Table 3

Three Step and Recall-Recognition by Vote

	Assigned Correctly		Wrongly Assigned		Not Assigned	
	RR	3 Step	RR	3 Step	RR	3 Steps
Yes, Respon. did vote	240 76%	283 90%	33 10	16 5%	43 14%	17 5%
No, Respon. didn't vote	97 57%	146 85%	32 19%	9 5%	42 24%	16 9%

There is a strong relationship between ability to recall or recognize correctly and reported vote. In the recall dependent method there is a large gain when the sample is restricted to voters (76% versus 57%), but it makes little difference in the 3 steps method where recall is of marginal importance.

The Recall-Recognition assignment routine used in 82 raised the question of the quality and quantity of the congressional data gathered from respondents who were unable to recall or recognize any candidate running in their C.D. The general practice of NES personal interviews has been to ignore the fact that a respondent didn't show any knowledge about the candidates running in their C.D.'s. They were fed the candidates names for their C.D.'s as the congressional battery is asked.

In 1982 we created a filter variable which allowed us to parallel the Recall-Recognition C.D. assignment for the Personal sample. We run some analyses of the filter by congressional questions to have some estimate of what we gain by asking congressional questions of respondents who didn't know who their candidates were.

Table 4

Personal Interview Respondents who Didn't Recall or Recognize any Candidate running in their C.D.'s. (N=247)

Questions	n	%
Yes, Like something about democratic candidate	6	1%
Yes, Didn't like democratic candidate	0	
Yes, Like something about democratic candidate	8	2%
Yes, Didn't like something about rep candidate	2	1%
Report of contact with Incumbent (C.D. 1 Inc running)	65	7%
Report any contact with candidate(C.D. 1 Inc running)	22	5%
Liberal/Conservative Placement. Democratic Candidate	8	2%
Liberal/Conservative Placement. Republican Candidate	9	2%
Defense Spending Placemen Democratic Candidate	12	3%
Defense Spending Placemen Republican Candidate	10	3%
Help to Minorities Placement Democratic Candidate	8	2%
Help to Minorities Placement Republican Candidate	11	3%
Government Standard of Living Democratic Candidate	13	3%
Government Standard of Living Republican Candidate	14	4%
Women Equality Placement Democratic Candidate	14	3%
Women Equality Placement Republican Candidate	14	4%
Government Services Placement Dem Candidate	12	2%
Government Services Placement Rep Candidate	10	3%

Table 4 shows as expected a rather meager rate of response. Respondents who don't know who their candidates are, and moreover can't recognize them, are very unlikely to answer any question about them.

CONCLUSIONS

A Congressional District assignment routine based mainly in Zip code and County book seems very promising. The overall rate of assignment is impressive (88%) and conservative. The internal consistency between Zip and County assignments is very strong (only a handful of cases have discrepant assignments results). Since about half of our respondents fell in situations where more than one C.D. was possible for their telephone exchange, we feel confident that the method works reasonably well even in highly populated areas (74% assignment where 3 C.D.'s were possible). An added bonus of this approach is the fact that it doesn't require map look ups, which are both time consuming and error prone. This method cannot be implemented on our present hardware, at least utilizing CATI.

The very success of Zip and County in determining the respondent C.D., makes assignment an irrelevant criteria to help decide if non-voters should be dropped from the interview. The difference in assignment between voters and non voters is only 5% as shown in table 3.

The Board might consider skipping the congressional battery for respondents who cannot recall or recognize any of the candidates running in their C.D. on two grounds. For the most part they answer don't know to these questions (more than 95%, see table 4) and given their total lack of knowledge the quality of the answers we do get is questionable. Telephone interviewing is especially vulnerable to respondent annoyance and lack of motivation. It is doubtful if people would answer "don't know" for 10 or 15 minutes without expressing a strong desire to stop the interview.

Sample page. The Congressional District-Zip Cross Reference, 99th Congress, The Tyson Capitol Institute.

78060-TX15	78061-TX15	78062-TX15	78063-TX21	78064-TX15	78065-TX15	78066-TX23	78067-TX15
78069-TX23	78070-TX21	78071-TX15	78072-TX15	78073-TX23	78074-TX21	78075-TX15	78076-TX15
78101-TX23	78102-TX14	78103-TX14	78107-TX14	78108-TX14	78109-TX23	78111-TX15	78112-TX23
78113-TX15	78114-TX15	78115-TX14	78116-TX15	78117-TX15	78118-TX15	78119-TX15	78121-TX15
78122-TX14	78123-TX14	78124-TX14	78125-TX14	78130-TX21	78131-TX21	78140-TX15	78141-TX14
78142-TX14	78143-TX15	78144-TX15	78145-TX14	78146-TX14	78147-TX15	78148-TX23	78150-TX23
78151-TX15	78152-TX23	78153-TX15	78154-TX14	78155-TX14	78159-TX14	78160-TX15	78161-TX15
78162-TX14	78163-TX23#1	78163-TX21#2	78164-TX14	78201-TX20	78202-TX20	78203-TX20	78204-TX20
78205-TX20	78206-TX20	78207-TX20	78208-TX20	78209-TX21	78210-TX20#1	78210-TX23#2	78211-TX23#1
78211-TX20#2	78212-TX20#1	78212-TX21#2	78213-TX21#1	78213-TX20#2	78214-TX20#1	78214-TX23#2	78215-TX20
78216-TX20#1	78216-TX21#2	78217-TX21	78218-TX20#1	78218-TX23#2	78219-TX20#1	78219-TX23#2	78220-TX20#1
78220-TX23#2	78221-TX23#1	78221-TX20#2	78222-TX20#1	78222-TX23#2	78223-TX23#1	78223-TX20#2	78224-TX23
78225-TX20#1	78225-TX23#2	78226-TX20	78227-TX20	78228-TX20	78229-TX21#1	78229-TX23#2	78229-TX20#3
78230-TX21	78231-TX21	78232-TX21	78233-TX21#1	78233-TX23#2	78234-TX20	78235-TX23	78236-TX23
78237-TX20	78238-TX23#1	78238-TX20#2	78239-TX23	78240-TX23#1	78240-TX21#2	78241-TX20	78242-TX20
78244-TX23	78245-TX23	78246-TX21	78247-TX21#1	78247-TX23#2	78248-TX21	78249-TX21	78250-TX23
78251-TX23	78252-TX23	78253-TX23	78254-TX23	78255-TX21	78256-TX23	78257-TX21	78258-TX21
78259-TX21	78260-TX21	78261-TX21	78262-TX20#1	78262-TX23#2	78263-TX23	78264-TX20#1	78264-TX23#2
78265-TX20	78280-TX20	78283-TX23	78284-TX20	78285-TX20	78286-TX20	78287-TX21	78288-TX23
78291-TX20	78292-TX20	78293-TX20	78294-TX20	78295-TX20	78296-TX20	78297-TX20	78298-TX20
78299-TX20	78330-TX27	78332-TX15	78333-TX15	78336-TX15	78338-TX27	78339-TX27	78340-TX14
78341-TX15	78342-TX15	78343-TX27	78344-TX23	78347-TX27	78349-TX15	78350-TX15	78351-TX27
78352-TX15	78353-TX15	78355-TX15	78357-TX15	78358-TX14	78359-TX15	78360-TX15	78361-TX15
78362-TX15	78363-TX27	78364-TX27	78368-TX15	78369-TX23	78370-TX15	78371-TX23	78372-TX15
78373-TX27	78374-TX15	78375-TX15	78376-TX15	78377-TX14	78379-TX27	78380-TX27	78382-TX14
78383-TX15	78384-TX15	78385-TX27	78387-TX15	78389-TX14	78390-TX15	78391-TX14	78393-TX14
78400-TX27	78401-TX27	78402-TX27	78403-TX27	78404-TX27	78405-TX27	78406-TX27	78407-TX27
78408-TX27	78409-TX27	78410-TX27	78411-TX27	78412-TX27	78413-TX27	78414-TX27	78415-TX27
78416-TX27	78417-TX27	78418-TX27	78419-TX27	78426-TX27	78469-TX27	78470-TX27	78471-TX27
78472-TX27	78473-TX27	78474-TX27	78475-TX27	78476-TX27	78477-TX27	78478-TX27	78482-TX27
78501-TX15	78502-TX15	78504-TX15	78516-TX15	78520-TX27	78521-TX27	78522-TX27	78523-TX27
78524-TX27	78526-TX27	78535-TX27	78536-TX15	78537-TX15	78538-TX15	78539-TX15	78540-TX15
78543-TX15	78544-TX15	78545-TX15	78547-TX15	78548-TX15	78549-TX15	78550-TX27	78551-TX27
78552-TX27	78557-TX15	78558-TX15	78559-TX27	78560-TX15	78561-TX27	78562-TX15	78563-TX15
78564-TX15	78565-TX15	78566-TX27	78567-TX27	78568-TX27	78569-TX27	78570-TX15	78572-TX15
78575-TX27	78576-TX15	78577-TX15	78578-TX27	78579-TX15	78580-TX27	78582-TX15	78583-TX27
78584-TX15	78585-TX15	78586-TX27	78588-TX15	78589-TX15	78590-TX27	78591-TX15	78592-TX27
78593-TX27	78594-TX27	78595-TX15	78596-TX15	78597-TX27	78598-TX27	78601-TX21	78602-TX10
78603-TX14	78604-TX14	78605-TX10	78606-TX10	78607-TX21	78608-TX11	78609-TX21	78610-TX10
78611-TX10	78612-TX10	78613-TX11	78614-TX14	78615-TX14	78616-TX10	78617-TX10	78618-TX21
78619-TX10	78620-TX10	78621-TX10	78622-TX10	78623-TX21	78624-TX21	78626-TX14	78627-TX14
78629-TX14	78631-TX21	78632-TX14	78634-TX14	78635-TX10	78636-TX10	78638-TX14	78639-TX21
78640-TX10	78641-TX11#1	78641-TX10#2	78642-TX11	78643-TX21	78644-TX10	78646-TX21	78648-TX10
78650-TX10	78651-TX10	78652-TX10	78653-TX10	78654-TX10#1	78654-TX21#2	78655-TX10	78656-TX10
78658-TX14	78659-TX10	78660-TX10	78661-TX10	78662-TX10	78663-TX10	78664-TX14	78665-TX10
78666-TX10	78667-TX10	78669-TX10	78670-TX14	78671-TX21	78672-TX21	78673-TX11	78674-TX11
78675-TX21	78676-TX10	78677-TX14	78680-TX10	78700-TX10	78701-TX10	78702-TX10	78703-TX10
78704-TX10	78705-TX10	78710-TX10	78711-TX10	78712-TX10	78713-TX10	78718-TX10	78719-TX10
78721-TX10	78722-TX10	78723-TX10	78724-TX10	78725-TX10	78726-TX10	78727-TX10	78728-TX10
78729-TX10	78730-TX10	78731-TX10	78732-TX10	78733-TX10	78734-TX10	78735-TX10	78736-TX10
78737-TX10	78738-TX10	78739-TX10	78741-TX10	78742-TX10	78743-TX10	78744-TX10	78745-TX10
78746-TX10	78747-TX10	78748-TX10	78749-TX10	78750-TX10	78751-TX10	78752-TX10	78753-TX10
78754-TX10	78755-TX10	78756-TX10	78757-TX10	78758-TX10	78759-TX10	78760-TX10	78761-TX10
78762-TX10	78763-TX10	78764-TX10	78765-TX10	78766-TX10	78767-TX10	78768-TX10	78769-TX10
78770-TX10	78771-TX10	78772-TX10	78773-TX10	78774-TX10	78776-TX10	78777-TX10	78778-TX10
78779-TX10	78780-TX10	78781-TX10	78782-TX10	78783-TX10	78784-TX10	78785-TX10	78786-TX10
78787-TX10	78788-TX10	78789-TX10	78801-TX23	78827-TX23	78828-TX21	78829-TX23	78830-TX23
78832-TX23	78833-TX21	78834-TX23	78835-TX21	78836-TX23	78837-TX23	78838-TX23	78839-TX23
78840-TX23	78841-TX23	78842-TX23	78843-TX23	78850-TX23	78851-TX21	78852-TX23	78853-TX23
78860-TX23	78861-TX23	78870-TX23	78871-TX23	78872-TX23	78873-TX21	78877-TX23	78879-TX21
78880-TX21	78881-TX23	78882-TX23	78883-TX21	78884-TX23	78885-TX21	78886-TX23	78931-TX14
78932-TX14	78933-TX14	78934-TX14	78935-TX14	78938-TX14	78940-TX14	78941-TX14	78942-TX14
78943-TX14	78944-TX14	78945-TX14	78946-TX14	78947-TX14	78948-TX14	78949-TX14	78950-TX14
78951-TX14	78952-TX14	78953-TX10	78954-TX14	78956-TX14	78957-TX10	78959-TX14	78960-TX14
78961-TX14	78962-TX14	78963-TX14	78964-TX14	79001-TX13	79002-TX13	79003-TX13	79004-TX19
79005-TX13	79007-TX13	79008-TX13	79009-TX19	79010-TX13	79011-TX13	79012-TX13	79013-TX13
79014-TX13	79015-TX13	79016-TX13	79018-TX13	79019-TX13	79021-TX19	79022-TX13	79024-TX13
79025-TX19	79027-TX19	79029-TX13	79031-TX19	79032-TX19	79033-TX13	79034-TX13	79035-TX19
79036-TX13	79037-TX13	79039-TX13	79040-TX13	79041-TX19	79042-TX13	79043-TX19	79044-TX13
79045-TX19	79046-TX13	79051-TX13	79052-TX13	79053-TX19	79054-TX13	79056-TX13	79057-TX13

Var #

64 TP C1. As you know, representatives to Congress in Washington were chosen in this last election from congressional districts all around the country. How much would you say that you personally cared about the way the election to the U.S. House of Representatives came out: Did you care very much, pretty much, not very much, or not at all?

1. VERY MUCH
2. PRETTY MUCH
4. NOT VERY MUCH
5. NOT AT ALL

8. DON'T KNOW
9. NA

0. (TEL)

RECALL TEST FOR TELEPHONE RESPONDENTS (V65, V66, V70, V74)

65 TP C2. Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--that is, for the House of Representatives--that ran in your district this November?

(For LA05 and LA07 where the Representatives were elected in the primary)

Do you happen to remember the name of the candidate for Congress--that is the House of Representatives in Washington--that was elected in this district?

1. YES
5. NO; DON'T KNOW

0 in 66-77

9. NA; District of Columbia

0. (TEL)

Var #

66(#1)T(P)C2aa. Who were they?
70(#2)
74(#3)

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

CLUSTER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT #1

01. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
02. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
03. THIRD PARTY/INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE

71. OTHER CANDIDATE FOR CD #1

CLUSTER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT #2

04. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
05. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
06. THIRD PARTY/INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE

72. OTHER CANDIDATE FOR CD #2

CLUSTER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT #3

07. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
08. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
09. THIRD PARTY/INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE

73. OTHER CANDIDATE FOR CD #3

97. Name given not in HOUSE Candidate List for any of the possible congressional districts in cluster

98. Don't know any names (first mention); Don't know candidate name but know party (second & third mentions)
99. Refused

00. Inap, 5 or 9 in V65; no further mentions (V70 and V74 only)

PERSONAL INTERVIEW

BUILT from V67, 71, 75 - PERSONAL INTERVIEW

01. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE (31, 33, 35 in V67, 71, 75)
02. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE (32, 34, 36 in V67, 71, 75)
03. THIRD PARTY/INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (37, 39, 80 in V67, 71, 75)

97. Name given not in Candidate List for that race (97 in V67, 71, 75)

98. DON'T KNOW name but know party (98 in V67, 71, 75)

99. NA (99 in V67, 71, 75)

00. Inap, NO MENTION; 0 in 71 or 75; 5 or 9 in 65