

Post-Stratified Cross-Sectional Analysis Weights for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES data.

Prepared by the Sampling Section Division of Surveys and Technologies
Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

1. Overview: Why is NES issuing new weight variables?

A new set of weights has been constructed for use with the series of National Election Studies beginning with the 1992 Pre-Election Study. This series includes the 1992 Pre and Post, the 1994 Post, and the 1996 Pre and Post Election Studies. The main difference between these and the previously released weights is found in the post-stratification criteria. The new weights post-stratify the National Election Study data to match the Current Population Study (CPS) estimate of the distribution of age group by education level. The previous set of weights adjusted the NES sample to the CPS distribution for Census Region, sex, and age group. These new weights correct for an under-representation of younger and less educated respondents in each year's sample of respondents mainly due to attrition of these categories of respondents in the panel component.

The previous set of analysis weights developed for the 1996 NES public use data sets led to overestimation of reported voter turnout in the 1996 presidential election. A comparison between the 1992 and the 1996 presidential vote turnout estimates from the NES samples does not to reflect the trend of declining participation that has been evident from external sources, such as the Current Population Survey turnout estimates. Several sources of bias caused of this problem, leading to under-representation of 18-22 year olds in the 1996 NES sample, respondents with no high school diploma, or both.

The significance of this under-representation becomes clear when the rates of voting participation by age and education subgroups are examined. The results are summarized in Tables 1a and 1b, below. Table 1a clearly demonstrates the well-known strong relationship between education and voting: people with less education are less likely to vote. Table 1b shows that reported voter turnout is higher among older people. Since the age and education groups with the lowest voting rates are underrepresented, estimates of 1996 presidential election participation are skewed in the direction of higher rates of turnout.

Table 1a:

Reported turnout in the 1996 presidential election by education level of respondent (source: 1996 NES).

Education	% reporting				
	having voted				
No HS diploma High school diploma Some college College Graduate	57.1 69.1 80.7 89.9				
Total	76.6				

Table 1b:

Reported turnout in the 1996 presidential election by age group of the respondent (source: 1996 NES).

Age	<pre>% reporting having voted</pre>
18-21 22-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70+	54.6 59.2 73.3 80.7 81.0 81.8 84.5
Total	76.6

The following three sections describe the three major factors which contribute to the under-representation of specific age or education groups. These include "initial contact non-response bias," "coverage bias resulting from longitudinal sample design" and "education related attrition bias." Subsequent sections describe in detail the procedures used in the construction of the new weights.

2. Initial Contact Nonresponse Bias

The first important source of age and education related bias is nonresponse bias at the initial interview. Initial contact nonresponse bias occurs when people with a certain characteristic in common have a significantly different response rate from the overall response rate. For example, if women are found to have a much higher response rate than the combined response rate for men and women, then there is an initial contact nonresponse bias based on gender.

If there were no nonresponse bias based on age or education we would expect the NES cross-section samples to have age by education distributions similar to that of the Current Population Survey (CPS) population estimates. There would be minor differences attributable to sampling error, but we would not expect to find large or systematic differences. Table 2, which compares the weighted distributions of education for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES cross-section samples to CPS population estimates for the same years suggests that systematic differences are present.

The weight used in Table 2 is the calculated base weight. This weight is the product of a person-level selection weight and a household-level nonresponse adjustment factor. Since the selection probability of an eligible adult is inversely proportional to the number of eligible adults in the household it is important to use the selection weight based on the number of eligible adults in the household when comparing NES person-level statistics to CPS person-level distributions. The base weight also adjusts for the difference in response rates by region and by urbanicity. The construction of these weight factors is described in Sections 5 through 8. This part of the NES weight is essentially the same for the old and new weights.

In Table 2, CPS estimates for 1992, 1994 and 1996 are included in the shaded columns. Comparisons of the weighted cross-section data from 1992, 1994 and 1996 to the corresponding CPS estimates reveal clear systematic differences which cannot be wholly attributed to sampling error. In all three cross-section groups there is a strong relationship between the level of education achieved by the respondent and the nonresponse rate. Specifically, people with less education -- especially people without a high school diploma - tend to be underrepresented in the weighted cross-section samples.

Table 2: Summary of weighted cross-section distributions by education

		1992 pre weighted)	1994 CPS propor- tion	1994 post (weighted)	1996 CPS propor- tion	1996 pre (weighted)
No HS Diploma	0.208	0.144	0.195	0.161	0.189	0.103
HS Diploma	0.355	0.321	0.339	0.356	0.332	0.338
Some College	0.243	0.270	0.264	0.258	0.264	0.323
College Graduate	0.195	0.265	0.203	0.226	0.215	0.236

3. Coverage Bias Resulting from Longitudinal Sample Design

The longitudinal design of the National Election Study results in a coverage bias in the 1992 and 1994 cross-section component of the 1996 sample. Respondents age 18-19 had no chance of being observed in the panel. Respondents age 20 or 21 years old had a chance of inclusion in only the 1994 cross-section component of the 1996 panel. This structural bias in cross-sectional estimates based on the combined 1996 NES sample is an additional contributor to under-representation of the younger population. The age 18-21 bias in the sample also affects education since the youngest group (e.g., 18-22) has a natural constraint on the level of education that a respondent could have achieved by the time he or she was interviewed.

4. Education Related Attrition Bias

Differential reinterview rates (pre to post as well as across election year waves) based on education also contribute to over- estimation of voting in the 1996 presidential election. The relationship between education and cumulative attrition is shown in Tables 3a-3c.

Table 3a tracks the 1992 cross-section cases across subsequent interviews. The age groups listed in the left-most column refer to the respondent's age at the initial interview. Thus, a 29 year old respondent in 1992 would not move into the next higher age group in 1994. Columns labeled "%" indicate the percent of the original sample that was reinterviewed. For example, in Table 3a, under 1996 (pre), there is a column labeled "n" and a column labeled "%". The value in the top row in the "%" column is 71.4%. This means that 71.4 percent of the seven 18-21 year olds with no HS diploma were included in the panel component of the 1996 pre election interview. Sample Tables 3b and 3c show the attrition for the 1994 and 1996 cross-section components.

The summaries of cumulative attrition by education group portray a strong relationship between education and reinterview rate. Respondents with more education are more likely to participate in subsequent interviews. This difference in attrition rate is found between pre and post interviews of the same year (Table 3a - 1992 Post, Table 3c - 1996 Post) as well as across interview years (Table 3b - 1996 Pre). Initially biased samples are subjected to further nonresponse bias at every subsequent interview, causing significant under-representation of less educated, eligible voters. Since eligible adults with low education are less likely to vote and are under-represented in the sample, predictions of voting participation will be biased upward.

Table 3a: Cumulative attrition for the 1992 NES Cross-section sample

			199	2	1	L994		1996		
		(pı	re)	(post)	(<u>r</u>	post)	(p	ore)	(pc	ost)
AGE (in 1992)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
18-21	No HS Diploma HS Diploma	7 30	7 27		7 18	100.0	5 11	71.4 36.7	3 6	42.9 20.0
	Some College	24	23	95.8	18	75.0	15	62.5	14	58.3
	College Graduate	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0
TOTAL		62	58	93.5	44	71.0	31	50.0	23	37.1
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	15 53	15 47		8 29	53.3 54.7	6 17	40.0 32.1	6 15	40.0 28.3
	College College	63	56	88.9	44	69.8	38	60.3	34	54.0
	Graduate	42	38	90.5	29	69.0	26	61.9	23	54.8
TOTAL		173	156	90.2	110	63.6	87	50.3	78	45.1
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	23 89	22 78		16 56	69.6 62.9	11 44	47.8 49.4	11 41	47.8 46.1
	College College	93	86	92.5	72	77.4	54	58.1	49	52.7
	Graduate	107	103	96.3	78	72.9	62	57.9	58	54.2
TOTAL		312	289	92.6	222	71.2	171	54.8	159	51.0
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	13 52	13 48		9 35	69.2 67.3	6 28	46.2 53.8	5 24	38.5 46.2
	College College	48	40	83.3	27	56.3	21	43.8	20	41.7
	Graduate	70	62	88.6	50	71.4	41	58.6	38	54.3
TOTAL		183	163	89.1	121	66.1	96	52.5	87	47.5
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College	27 43 28	24 40 25	88.9 93.0 89.3	17 33 18	63.0 76.7 64.3	15 26 14	55.6 60.5 50.0	14 22 14	51.9 51.2 50.0
	College College Graduate	45	39	86.7	33	73.3	30	66.7	29	64.2
TOTAL	Graduale		128	89.5		70.6	85	59.4	79	55.2
60-69	No HS	113	140	07.3	T O T	70.0	00	JJ.4	13	JJ. Z
00-09	Diploma HS Diploma Some	37 50	30 39	81.1 78.0	23 30	62.2 60.0	17 24	45.9 48.0	16 24	43.2 48.0

	College College	19	14	73.7	10	52.6	9	47.4	9	47.4
	Graduate	16	16	100.0	13	81.3	12	75.0	11	68.8
TOTAL		122	99	81.1	76	62.3	62	50.8	60	49.2
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	54 31 27 19	42 30 24 16	77.8 96.8 88.9 84.2	28 22 20 15	51.9 71.0 74.1 78.9	22 15 16 12	40.7 48.4 59.3 63.2	21 14 14	38.9 45.2 51.9 52.6
TOTAL		131	112	85.5	85	64.9	65	49.6	59	45.0
		1126	1005		759		597		545	

1992 լ	pre	1992	post	199	94 post		1996 pr	e	1996 post
	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No HS									
Diploma	176	153	86.9	108	61.4	82	46.6	76	43.2
HS Diploma	348	309	88.8	223	64.1	165	47.4	146	42.0
Some									
College	302	268	88.7	209	69.2	167	55.3	154	51.0
College									
graduate	300	275	91.7	219	73.0	183	61.0	169	56.3
Total	1126	1005	89.3	759	67.4	597	53.0	545	48.4

Table 3b: Cumulative attrition for the 1994 NES Cross-section sample

	199	94		1996			
	(pos	st)	(pre	:)	(post	.)	
AGE (at 1994)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	n	n	%	n	%	
18-21	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	13 24 18	8 13 10	61.5 54.2 55.6	4 9 7	30.8 37.5 38.9	
TOTAL		55	31	56.4	20	36.4	
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	14 45 58 35	6 31 37 24	42.9 68.9 63.8 68.6	4 26 33	28.6 57.8 56.9	
TOTAL		152	98	64.5	85	55.9	
20 20	No IIC						

30-39 No HS

	Diploma HS Diploma Some	21 93	16 59	76.2 63.4	13 53	61.9 57.0
	College	73	45	61.6	40	54.8
	College Graduate	59	44	74.6	40	67.8
TOTAL		246	164	66.7	146	59.3
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	14 53	10 39	71.4 73.6	8 37	57.1 69.8
	College College	52	40	76.9	37	71.2
	Graduate	67	54	80.6	51	76.4
TOTAL		186	143	76.9	133	71.5
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	16 43 24 29	11 33 19	68.8 76.7 79.2 72.4	10 27 19	62.5 62.8 79.2
TOTAL		112	84	75.0	77	68.8
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	42 62 21 19	30 42 16	71.4 67.7 76.2 89.5	28 40 15	66.7 64.5 71.4 89.5
TOTAL		144	105	72.9	100	69.4
I H S C	No HS Diploma NS Diploma Some College College Graduate	51 42 22	32 30 12	62.7 71.4 54.5 76.9	31 29 11	60.8 69.0 50.0
TOTAL		141	94	66.7	91	64.5
		1036	719		652	

	1994 post	19	996 pre	1996	post
	n	n	%	n	90
No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	171 362 268 235	113 247 179 180	66.1 68.2 66.8 76.6	98 221 162 171	57.3 61.0 60.4 72.8
Total	1036	719	69.4	652	62.9

Table 3c: Cumulative attrition for the 1996 NES Cross-section sample

1996

		(pre)	()	post)
AGE (at 1996)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	n	n	જ
18-21	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	3 9 23 0	2 7 21 0	66.7 77.8 91.3
TOTAL		35	30	85.7
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	4 19 13	2 13 10	50.0 72.2 76.9 94.1
TOTAL		52	41	78.8
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	4 36 31 28	4 29 29 23	100.0 80.6 93.5 82.1
TOTAL		99	85	85.9
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	5 23 25 22	4 18 20 19	80.0 78.3 80.0 86.4
TOTAL		75	61	81.3
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	7 17 17 15	6 15 15 15	85.7 88.2 88.2 100.0
TOTAL		56	51	91.1
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	9 12 9 7	9 11 7 6	100.0 91.7 77.8 85.7
TOTAL		37	33	89.2
H S	o HS Diploma S Diploma ome College ollege Graduate	13 22 6 3	10 18 5 3	76.9 81.8 83.3 100.0
TOTAL		44	36	81.8
		398	337	

Summary by Education level:

	1996 pre		1996 post
	n	n	%
No HS Diploma	45	37	82.2
HS Diploma	137	111	81.0
Some College	124	107	86.3
College Graduate	92	82	89.1
Total	398	337	84.7

5. Construction of the new weights

The revised NES final analysis weight is based on the product of a calculated base weight and a post-stratification factor. The base weight is constructed to adjust for selection probability and geographic differences in response rates at the time of the initial interview with each sample component. This weight is the product of a selection probability weight and the household nonresponse factor. The base weights for 1992, 1994, and 1996 cross-section cases are initially determined using the corresponding year's household nonresponse factor. Panel cases use this same base weight, carried over from the original interview. Since differences in selection probabilities for the NES sample household are due only to random selection of a single adult from households of various sizes, the selection probability weight is the number of eligible people in the household (up to three).

The post-stratification factor is the ratio of the census proportion for each age by education subgroup, to the corresponding weighted (base weight) sample proportion. Multiplication of the base weight by this post-stratification factor adjusts the weighted sample distribution to conform to the CPS population estimates. The following sections describe the base weight and post-stratification factors in further detail

Final Weight = base weight x post-stratification factor where: Base weight = selection weight x household nonresponse factor and: Selection weight = the number of eligible adults in household (up to three)

6. Construction of a Base Weight

The base weight is the product of two factors: the selection weight and the household nonresponse adjustment factor. Although the National Election Study uses an area probability sample design to achieve an equal probability sample of U.S. households, the NES design does not produce an equal probability sample of persons. Since only one person is chosen from each selected household, any particular individual's probability of selection is inversely proportional to the number of eligible adults in the household. The selection weight which is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household (inverse of the selection probability) adjusts for the under-representation of persons in larger households. The household nonresponse factor is used to adjust for the differential nonresponse rates found in different regions and PSU types (Self-representing MSA, Nonself-representing MSA, and non-MSA. Self-representing MSAs are the largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the nation and are therefore self-representing in the 1990 SRC National Sample; Nonself-representing MSAs are medium and smaller sized MSAs, and the non-MSAs are counties which are not designated as MSAs and are less urban.

7. Selection Probability Weight:

The National Election Study uses an area probability sample design to achieve an equal probability sample of U.S. households. If a household has only one eligible adult, that person is included in the sample. If a selected household has more than one eligible adult, one is selected at random. Since the number of eligible adults varies across households, the probability of selection for individuals is unequal and a weight which is the reciprocal of the probability of selection should be used. In the interest of limiting the variation of the weights, respondents selected from households with more than three eligible adults were assigned a weight of three; otherwise the selection weight is equal to the number of eligible adults.

8. Household Nonresponse Adjustment Factor:

Nonresponse bias is a potential source of nonsampling error in the NES data. It has been found that response rates vary significantly by geographic region and PSU type (MSA/non-MSA status). In an effort to counteract this potential source of bias, adjustment factors have been constructed at the household level to account for the geographic and urban/rural differences in response rates. Table 4 shows the initial contact response rates in the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES by PSU type and region.

The nonresponse adjustment factor was determined by dividing the cross-section cases among twelve cells of four regions (Northeast / Midwest / South /West) by three PSU types (SR MSA, NSR MSA, NSR Non- MSA). The cases in each cell share a nonresponse adjustment factor calculated as the inverse of the response rate of the cell. These response rates are for the initial cross-section components only. They do not include the panel cases.

Table 4: Initial contact response rates by PSU type and region

PSU Type	19 Region	992 Response rate	1994 Response rate	1996 Response rate
150 1750	Region	race	1466	Idee
SR MSA	Northeast	0.683	0.570	0.423
	Midwest	0.759	0.651	0.533
	South	0.724	0.620	0.539
	West	0.471	0.517	0.507
NSR MSA	Northeast	0.741	0.577	0.526
	Midwest	0.699	0.717	0.678
	South	0.727	0.813	0.646
	West	0.723	0.782	0.625
NSR Non-MSA	Northeast	0.820	0.725	0.600
	Midwest	0.917	0.878	0.721
	South	0.830	0.736	0.687
	West	0.762	0.946	0.810

9. Comparison of Weighted NES and CPS Age Group by Education Level Distributions

Table 5a below shows the current interview age by education distributions of 1992 cross-section cases in initial and subsequent interviews. The table includes weighted (base weight) percentages and unweighted percentages with estimates of the population percentages according to the Current Population Study included for comparison. We can see for example, that in the 1992 NES pre election sample there were 15 respondents age 22-29 with no high school diploma. These represent approximately 1.3 percent of the 1126 total respondents in this sample. When the base weight is used, the weighted percent for this group increases to about 1.6 percent. The 1992 CPS population estimates are listed in a column on the left. It is estimated that in 1992 about 2.4 percent of all eligible adults were 22-29 year-olds with no high school diploma. The shaded rows indicate totals by age group and a summary by education is provided at the bottom of the page. Table 5b gives the same information for the

1994 cross-section cases and Table 5c shows the 1996 cross-section distributions.

Table 5a:

Distribution of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

AGE (Cur- rent)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1992 CPS	Uı n	nwtd & (Se:	Wghte % l,NR)	ed U: n	nwtd % (S	Wghted % el,NR)
18-21	No College College	4.3 3.1	37 25	3.3	4.6	34 24	3.4 2.4	4.7 2.6
TOTAL		7.3	62	5.5	7.0	58	5.8	7.3
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.4 6.1	15 53	1.3 4.7	1.6 4.5	15 47	1.5 4.7	1.8 4.6
	College College	4.8	63	5.6	5.6	56	5.6	5.6
	Graduate	3.5	42	3.7	3.7	38	3.8	3.8
TOTAL		16.7	173	15.4	15.4	156	15.5	15.8
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	3.0 8.7	23 89	2.0 7.9	1.6	22 78	2.2	1.7 7.8
	College College	6.1	93	8.3	8.0	86	8.6	8.3
	Graduate	5.7	107	9.5	9.2	103	10.2	10.0
TOTAL		23.4	312	27.7	26.8	289	28.8	27.8
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.4 6.1	13 52	1.2 4.6	1.2 5.1	13 48	1.3	1.3 5.2
	College College	4.7	48	4.3	4.7	40	4.0	4.2
	Graduate	5.0	70	6.2	6.3	62	6.2	6.2
TOTAL		18.1	183	16.3	17.2	163	16.2	16.9
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.8 4.7	27 43	2.4	2.5 4.6	24 40	2.4 4.0	2.4 4.8
	College College	2.4	28	2.5	2.4	25	2.5	2.5
	Graduate	2.5	45	4.0	4.2	39	3.9	4.1
TOTAL		12.3	143	12.7	13.7	128	12.7	13.7
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	3.5 4.2	37 50	3.3 4.4	3.0 4.0	30 39	3.0 3.9	2.7
	College College	1.8	19	1.7	1.8	14	1.4	1.4
	Graduate	1.7	16	1.4	1.5	16	1.6	1.7

TOTAL		11.1	122	10.8	10.2	99	9.9	9.3		
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some			4.8			4.2	3.1		
	College College	1.5	27	2.4	2.3	24	2.4	2.2		
	Graduate	1.2	19	1.7	1.5	16	1.6	1.5		
TOTAL		11.1	131	11.6	9.8	112	11.1	9.2		
			1126			1005				
by Ed	ucation Sumr	mary l	evel:		1992	pre			1992 po	st
		92 C	CPS	n	Unwtd	%	Wtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %
HS Di	Diploma ploma College ge Graduate		5	176 348 302 300	15.6 30.9 26.8 26.6	2	14.4 32.1 27.0 26.5		30.7	13.9 32.1 26.7 27.4
Total				1126				1005		

Table 5a: (cont.): Distribution of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

AGE (Cur- rent)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1992 CPS	n	Unwto	l post l Wght % Sel,NF	td n	1996 Unwtd %		n R)	1996 p Unwtd % (Se		
18-21	No College College	4.3	13 4	1.7 0.5	2.5 0.7	0 1	0.0	0.0	0 1	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	7.3	17	2.2	3.2	1	6.2	0.3	1	0.2	0.3	
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	2.4	9	1.2	1.1	4	0.7	0.8	3	0.6	0.7	
	loma Some	6.1	27	3.6	4.2	20	3.4	4.1	15	2.8	3.2	
	College College	4.8	46	6.1	6.1	21	3.5	3.8	18	3.3	3.6	
	Graduate	3.5	16	2.1	2.1	22	3.7	4.0	20	3.7	4.0	
TOTAL		16.7	98	12.9	13.5	67	11.2	12.7	56	10.3	11.5	
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Dip- loma Some	3.0 8.7	16 54	2.1	1.7 7.2	10 40	1.7	1.6	10 37	1.8	1.7 6.5	
	College College	6.1	77	10.1	9.7	54	9.0	8.7	47	8.6	8.2	
	Graduate	5.7	74	9.8	9.6	54	9.0	9.3	50	9.2	9.4	
TOTAL		23.4	221	29.1	28.2	158	26.5	25.9	144	26.4	25.8	
40-49	No HS Diploma	2.4	11	1.4	1.3	6	1.0	0.7	5	0.9	0.6	

	HS Dip-											
	loma Some	6.1	39	5.1	5.7	40	6.7	7.3	35	6.4	7.1	
	College College	4.7	26	3.4	3.5	20	3.4	3.8	20	3.7	4.2	
	Graduate	5.0	63	8.3	8.1	59	9.9	9.4	53	9.7	9.3	
TOTAL		18.1	139	18.3	18.6	125	20.9	21.2	113	20.7	21.2	
50-59	No HS Diploma	2.8	13	1.7	1.8	10	1.7	1.9	10	1.8	2.1	
	HS Dip- loma	4.7	35	4.6	5.1	29	4.9	5.3	24	4.4	4.6	
	Some College	2.4	23	3.0	3.2	22	3.7	4.0	22	4.0	4.3	
	College											
moma r	Graduate	2.5	32	4.2	4.7	28	4.7	4.8	27	5.0	5.1	
TOTAL		12.3	103	13.6	14.8	89	14.9	15.9	83	15.2	16.1	
60-69	No HS Diploma	3.5	21	2.8	2.8	13	2.2	2.1	12	2.2	2.2	
	HS Dip- loma	4.2	28	3.7	3.6	22	3.7	3.6	22	4.0	3.9	
	Some College	1.8	10	1.3	1.2	10	1.7	1.6	10	1.8	1.8	
	College Graduate	1.7	15	2.0	1.8	18	3.0	2.9	17	3.1	3.1	
TOTAL		11.1	74	9.7	9.3	63	10.6	10.2	61	11.2	10.9	
70+	No HS		0.5									
	Diploma HS Dip-	4.8	35	4.6	3.5	32	5.4	4.2	30	5.5	4.3	
	loma Some	3.6	30	4.0	3.4	25	4.2	3.6	23	4.2	3.7	
	College College	1.5	23	3.0	2.9	21	3.5	3.2	19	3.5	3.2	
	Graduate	1.2	19	2.5	2.6	16	2.7	2.8	15	2.8	2.8	
TOTAL		11.1			12.4	94	15.7	13.8	87	16.0	14.1	
			759			597			545			
Summar	y by Educa	tion I	Level	: 199	94 pos	st 1	.996 pr	e 199	96 pc	st		
92 CPS	s n unw	rtd %	wtd	% 1	n ur	nwtd	% wt	d %	n	unwtd	% wtd	૾
No HS 20.8	Diploma 108 14	. 2	12.7	75	5 1	L2.6	11.	2 7	70	12.8	11.6	
HS Dip	loma											
35.5		. 4	31.1	176	5 2	29.5	30.	1 15	56	28.6	29.1	
Some C 24.3	ollege 209 27	.5	27.2	149	9 2	25.0	25.	4 13	37	25.1	25.6	
Colleg 19.5	e Graduate 219 28	. 8	29.0	19'	7 3	33.0	33.	2 18	32	33.4	33.7	
Total	759			59	7			54	15			

Table 5b:

Distribution of the 1994 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

			1994	post		19	996 pre	9		1996	post
	HIGHEST 199 EDUCATION CP9		unwt	d %	wghtd % Sel,NR)	n	unwtd	wghto % % (Sel,1	n	unwto (Se	wghtd l % % el,NR)
18-21	No College College	4.2 3.1	37 18	3.6 1.7	4.2 2.4	12 6	1.7 0.8	1.8 1.1	8 5	1.2	1.3 1.0
TOTAL		7.3	55	5.3	6.6	18	2.5	3.0	13	2.0	2.3
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.3 5.5	14 45	1.4 4.3	1.3 4.5	6 23	0.8	1.0	3 17	0.5 2.6	0.5
	College	5.3	58	5.6	5.7	31	4.3	4.0	27	4.1	3.9
	College Graduate	3.4	35	3.4	3.3	22	3.1	3.0	20	3.1	3.1
TOTAL		16.5	152	14.7	14.7	82	11.4	11.7	67	10.3	10.5
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.9	21 93	2.0	2.1	12 57	1.7 7.9	1.7 7.5	9 51	1.4 7.8	1.4 7.1
	College	6.6	73	7.1	6.8	53	7.4	7.3	47	7.2	7.2
	College Graduate	5.7	59	5.7	5.7	41	5.7	5.9	38	5.8	6.3
TOTAL		23.3	246	23.7	23.7	163	22.7	22.4	145	22.2	22.0
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.3	14 53	1.4 5.1	1.6 6.0	11 43	1.5 6.0	1.9 6.5	9 41	1.4 6.3	1.7 6.8
	College College	5.2	52	5.0	5.0	43	6.0	6.3	39	6.0	6.4
	Graduate	5.4	67	6.5	6.6	57	7.9	8.1	53	8.1	8.4
TOTAL		19.0	186	18.0	19.2	154	21.4	22.8	142	21.8	23.3
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College	2.8	16 43 24	1.5 4.2 2.3	1.6 4.4 2.2	12 36 16	1.7 5.0 2.2	1.6 5.4 2.1	12 29 16	1.8 4.4 2.4	1.8 4.9 2.3
5053	Graduate	2.8	29	2.8	3.1	25	3.5	3.8	25	3.8	4.2
TOTAL		12.5	112	10.8	11.1	89	12.4	13.0	82	12.6	13.3
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some		42 62	4.1 6.0	3.7 5.5	25 39	3.5 5.4	3.3 5.2	23 35	3.5 5.4	3.4 5.0
	College College	1.9	21	2.0	1.9	21	2.9	3.1	21	3.2	3.4
	Graduate	1.7	19	1.8	2.0	14	2.0	1.9	14	2.2	2.1

TOTA	L	10.3	144	13.9	13.2	99	13.8	13.4	93	14.3	13.9
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	4.6 3.7	51 42	4.9 4.1	4.1 3.6	37 33	5.1 4.6	4.4 4.1	36 32	5.5 4.9	4.9 4.4
	College College	1.7	22	2.1	1.8	22	3.1	2.4	21	3.2	2.6
	Graduate	1.3	26	2.5	2.0	22	3.1	2.8	21	3.2	2.9
TOTA	L	11.2	141	13.6	11.5	114	15.9	13.7	110	16.9	14.7
			1036			719			652		

1994 post					1996 pre	9		1996 post		
94 CPS	n	Unwtd	% Wtd	% n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	
No HS Dir 19.5 1	ploma 71		16.1	110	15.3	15.2	96	14.7	14.4	
HS Diplor	ma 62	34.9	35.6	236	32.8	33.1	209	32.1	31.8	
Some Coli 26.4 20	_	25.9	25.8	192	26.7	26.3	176	27.0	26.8	
College Graduate 20.3 23	35	22.7	22.6	181	25.2	25.4	171	26.2	27.0	
Total 10:	36			719			652			

Table 5c: Distribution of the 1996 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

1996 r	pre 1996 j	post						
AGE (Cur- rent)		1996 CPS	n	%	Wghtd % (Sel,NI	n	%	Wghtd % (Sel,NR)
18-21	No College College	4.4	12 23		4.1 7.5			3.6 8.2
TOTAL		7.3	35	8.8	11.6	30	8.9	11.8
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	2.0	4	1.0	0.8	2	0.6	0.5
	loma Some	4.9	18	4.5	3.9	13	3.9	3.3
	College College	5.0	13	3.3	2.9	10	3.0	2.9
	Graduate	3.7	17	4.3	4.0	16	4.8	4.4
TOTAL	:	15.6	52	13.1	11.5	41	12.2	11.0
30-39	No HS Diploma	2.9	4	1.0	0.8	4	1.2	0.9

	IIG Di-							
	HS Dip- loma Some	7.6	36	9.0	9.0	29	8.6	8.7
	College College	6.3	31	7.8	7.6	29	8.6	8.4
	Graduate	5.9	28	7.0	6.6	23	6.8	6.3
TOTAL		22.8	99	24.9	24.1	85	25.2	24.4
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	2.4	5	1.3	1.0	4	1.2	0.9
	loma Some	6.6	23	5.8	6.2	18	5.3	5.6
	College College	5.5	25	6.3	6.8	20	5.9	6.3
	Graduate	5.7	22	5.5	5.5	19	5.6	5.7
TOTAL		20.1	75	18.8	19.6	61	18.1	18.5
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	2.3	7	1.8	1.7	6	1.8	1.7
	loma	4.6	17	4.3	4.9	15	4.4	4.9
	Some College College	2.9	17	4.3	3.6	15	4.4	3.8
	Graduate	3.0	15	3.8	4.8	15	4.4	5.7
TOTAL		12.8	56	14.1	15.2	51	15.1	16.1
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	2.8	9	2.3	1.9	9	2.7	2.3
	loma Some	3.7	12	3.0	2.3	11	3.3	2.6
	College College	1.9	9	2.3	2.5	7	2.1	2.2
	Graduate	1.8	7	1.8	2.2	6	1.8	2.3
TOTAL		10.1	37	9.3	8.9	33	9.8	9.3
	o HS iploma S Dip-	4.3	13	3.3	2.8	10	3.0	2.5
10	oma ome	3.7	22	5.5	4.6	18	5.3	4.5
C	ollege ollege	1.9	6	1.5	1.3	5	1.5	1.4
	raduate	1.5	3	0.8	0.5	3	0.9	0.6
TOTAL		11.3	44	11.1	9.2	36	10.7	8.9
			398			337		

		1996 pre					1996 post		
	96 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%		
No HS Diploma HS Diploma	18.9 33.2		11.3 34.4	10.3 33.8			9.8 32.1		

Some College College	26.4	124	31.2	32.3	107	31.8	33.1
Graduate	21.5	92	23.1	23.6	82	24.3	25.0
Total		398			337		

9. Post-stratification Factor for the Revised Weights:

The post-stratification factor for the revised NES cross-sectional weights was developed to address problems caused by under-representation of age or education groups. To do this, the corresponding CPS estimates were used as the benchmark standard. The post-stratification factor was calculated by dividing the CPS percent by the weighted (base weight) NES percent for each of the age by education subgroups. Note that the youngest age group consists of only two education groups (no college / at least some college) because of the small number of 18 to 21 year olds in the samples (especially in 1994 and 1996) and because level of education is not as meaningful for the youngest age group since they may still be in school.

Tables 6a, 6b and 6c show the data used to construct the post-stratification factors for the combined panel and cross-section NES samples for each year. As an example of the calculation, in the 1994 NES sample (Table 6b) there were fifty 18-21 year olds with no college education. These people represent approximately 2.8 percent (unweighted) of the 1994 sample. When the base weight is applied, the weighted percent is about 3.5. On the left side of each table the CPS statistics for the corresponding year are listed. These are used as estimates of the population percentages by age and education. The post-stratification factor is calculated for each subgroup by dividing the CPS estimate by the weighted percent. In the 1994 example this is 4.2 divided by approximately 3.5. Although the percentages in the tables are shown to the nearest tenth of a percent, the calculation of the post-stratification factors used percents to the nearest hundredth of a percent.

Table 6a: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1992 samples

1992 pre 1992 post

AGE (Cur- rent)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1992 CPS	Unwtd n %		% fa	st-strat actor n 92 cps)	%	%	htd 1,NR)	Post-strat factor (92 cps)
18-21	No College College	e 4.3 3.1	37 25	3.3	4.6	0.918 1.313	34 24	3.4 2.4	4.7 2.6	
TOTAL		7.3	62	5.5	7.0		58	5.8	7.3	
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.4 6.1 4.8 3.5	15 53 63 42	1.3 4.7 5.6 3.7	1.6 4.5 5.6 3.7	1.506 1.354 0.857 0.935	15 47 56 38	1.5 4.7 5.6 3.8		1.319
TOTAL		16.7	173	15.4	15.4		156	15.5	15.8	
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Dip-	3.0	23	2.0	1.6	1.833	22	2.2	1.7	1.747

	oma ome	8.7	89	7.9	8.0	1.083	78	7.8	7.8	1.109
Со	ollege ollege	6.1	93	8.3	8.0	0.763	86	8.6	8.3	0.733
	raduate	5.7	107	9.5	9.2	0.615	103	10.2	10.0	0.567
TOTAL		23.4	312	27.7	26.8		289	28.8	27.8	
	iploma	2.4	13	1.2	1.2	2.009	13	1.3	1.3	1.794
10	S Dip- oma	6.1	52	4.6	5.1	1.204	48	4.8	5.2	1.180
Co	ome ollege	4.7	48	4.3	4.7	1.013	40	4.0	4.2	1.113
	ollege raduate	5.0	70	6.2	6.3	0.791	62	6.2	6.2	0.797
TOTAL		18.1	183	16.3	17.2		163	16.2	16.9	
50-59 No										
Di	iploma	2.8	27	2.4	2.5	1.118	24	2.4	2.4	1.155
10	S Dip- oma	4.7	43	3.8	4.6	1.020	40	4.0	4.8	0.973
Со	ome ollege	2.4	28	2.5	2.4	0.959	25	2.5	2.5	0.955
	ollege raduate	2.5	45	4.0	4.2	0.594	39	3.9	4.1	0.609
TOTAL		12.3	143	12.7	13.7		128	12.7	13.7	
60 60 Ma	- 110									
	iploma	3.5	37	3.3	3.0	1.182	30	3.0	2.7	1.282
lo	S Dip- oma	4.2	50	4.4	4.0	1.055	39	3.9	3.5	1.199
Co	ome ollege	1.8	19	1.7	1.8	1.000	14	1.4	1.4	1.250
	ollege raduate	1.7	16	1.4	1.5	1.114	16	1.6	1.7	0.994
TOTAL		11.1	122	10.8	10.2		99	9.9	9.3	
E0. 37										
Di	o HS iploma	4.8	54	4.8	3.8	1.268	42	4.2	3.1	1.540
10	S Dip- oma	3.6	31	2.8	2.2	1.633	30	3.0	2.4	1.490
Co	ome ollege	1.5	27	2.4	2.3	0.642	24	2.4	2.2	0.671
	ollege raduate	1.2	19	1.7	1.5	0.791	16	1.6	1.5	0.818
TOTAL		11.1	131	11.6	9.8		112	11.1	9.2	
			1126				1005			

		19	92 pre			1992 po	ost
9	2 CPS	n U	nwtd%	Wtd%	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%
No HS Diploma HS Diploma						15.2 30.8	
Some College						26.7	

College Graduate	19.5	300	26.6	26.5	275	27.4	27.4
Total		1126			1005		

Table 6b: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1994 samples

1994 post

AGE (Cur- rent)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1994 CPS	n	Unwtd % (%	Post-strat factor (94 cps)
18-21	No College College	4.2 3.1	50 22	2.8 1.2		
TOTAL		7.3	72	4.0	5.2	
22-29	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.3 5.5	23 72	1.3		1.924 1.252
	College College	5.3	104	5.8	5.9	0.898
	Graduate	3.4	51	2.8	2.8	1.230
TOTAL		16.5	250	13.9	14.2	
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.9 8.1	37 147	2.1 8.2	2.0	1.503 0.979
	College College	6.6	150	8.4	8.1	0.822
	Graduate	5.7	133	7.4	7.4	0.776
TOTAL		23.3	467	26.0	25.6	
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.3 6.1 5.2 5.4	25 92 78 130	1.4 5.1 4.4 7.2	5.9 4.4	1.575 1.041 1.189
TOTAL		19.0	325	18.1	18.9	
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.4 4.6 2.8 2.8	29 78 47 61		4.7 2.6	1.407 0.983 1.069 0.736
TOTAL		12.5	215	12.0	12.7	
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	3.0	63 90			0.895 0.805

	College	1.9	31	1.7	1.6	1.175
	College Graduate	1.7	34	1.9	1.9	0.869
TOTAL		10.3	218	12.1	11.6	
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	4.6 3.7 1.7	86 72 45	4.8 4.0 2.5 2.5	3.8 3.5 2.2 2.3	1.188 1.046 0.744 0.559
TOTAL		11.2	248	13.8	11.9	
			1795			

Summary by Education level: 1994 post

	94 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%
No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	19.5 33.9 26.4 20.3	279 585 477 454	15.5 32.6 26.6 25.3	14.7 33.7 26.4 25.3
Total		1795		

Table 6c: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1996 samples

1996 pre 1996 post

AGE HIGHEST (Cur- EDUCATION rent)	1996 CPS	Unw n	td Wg %	htd 1 %	Post-strat factor	Un n	wtd V %	Wghtd %	Post-strat factor
18-21 No College College	4.4	24 30	1.4 1.8	1.8 2.6	2.383 1.140	17 27	1.1	1.5 2.6	
TOTAL	7.3	54	3.2	4.4		44	2.9	4.1	
22-29 No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.0 4.9 5.0 3.7	14 61 65 61	0.8 3.6 3.8	0.9 3.9 3.6		8 45 55 56	0.5 2.9 3.6 3.6	0.6 3.1 3.5 3.8	1.554
TOTAL	15.6	201	11.7	12.0		164	10.7	11.0	
30-39 No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.9 7.6 6.3 5.9	27 133 138 123	1.6 7.8 8.1 7.2	1.5 7.5 7.9	1.013	24 117 123 111	1.6 7.6 8.0	1.5 7.3 7.9	1.041

TOTAL		22.8	421	24.6	24.1			375	24.	4	24.0	
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma	2.4 a 6.6	22 106	1.3 6.2	1.3 6.7			18 94	1. 6.		1.1 6.6	2.080
	Some College	5.5	88	5.1	5.6	0.9	79	79	5.	1	5.6	0.982
	College Graduate	5.7	138	8.0	7.8	0.7	26	125	8.	2	8.0	0.706
TOTAL		20.1	354	20.7	21.4			316	20.	6	21.4	
50-59	No HS Diploma	2.3	29	1.7	1.8			28	1.		1.9	
	HS Diploma Some		82	4.8	5.2			68	4.		4.8	0.958
	College College	2.9	55	3.2	3.1			53	3.		3.4	
	Graduate	3.0	68	4.0	4.4	0.6	72	67	4.	4	4.9	0.606
TOTAL		12.8	234	13.7	14.5		,	216	14.	1	15.0	
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma	2.8 a 3.7	47 73	2.7 4.3	2.5			44 68	2. 4.		2.7 4.0	1.030 0.923
	Some College	1.9	40	2.3	2.4	0.7	78	38	2.	5	2.5	0.744
	College Graduate	1.8	39	2.3	2.3	0.7	71	37	2.	4	2.5	0.715
TOTAL		10.1	199	11.6	11.1			187	12.	2	11.7	
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some	4.3 a 3.7	81 80	4.7 4.7	3.9 4.1			75 73	4. 4.		4.0 4.2	1.063 0.890
	College College	1.9	49	2.9	2.4	0.7	89	45	2.	9	2.5	0.757
	Graduate	1.5	41	2.4	2.2	0.6	94	39	2.	5	2.3	0.664
TOTAL		11.3	251	14.6	12.5			232	15.	1	12.9	
			1714				1	534				
Summa	ry by Educa	ation	level	: 19	96 pr	е			1	996	o pos	t
	9	96 CPS	n	Unwt	d% W	td%			n	Unv	vtd%	Wtd%
HS Di	College	18.9 33.2 26.4	230 549 465	32.	0 3	2.5 2.3 7.6		4	03 76 20	31	3.2 L.0 7.4	12.2 31.0 28.0
Gradu		21.5	470	27.	4 2	7.5		4	35	28	3.4	28.8
Total			1714					15	34			

10. "Trimming of weights

The new weights for each sample -- 1992 pre and post, 1994 post and 1996 pre and post - were calculated as the product of the corresponding base weight and the post-stratification factor. The

resulting products were then "trimmed" at the 1st and 99th percentiles in order to control the potential for high variation caused by these weights. The results of trimming at the 1st and 99th percentiles are shown in Table 7. The column labels "Before" and "After" indicate whether the statistics refer to the weight before or after trimming.

Table 7: Comparison of final weight statistics before and after trimming

	-			post	-		
	Before	Aiter	Before	Aiter	Before	After	
mean std dev max	2.4136 1.1252 9.6008 5.5521 0.7796	2.4038 1.0841 5.5521	1005 2.4092 1.1075 8.5612 5.2942 0.7471 0.6644	1.0773 5.2942 5.2942 0.7471	2.4201 1.1817 8.8935 6.6514 0.7999	6.5143	
	19 Before	96 pre After		1996 post ore Aft	er		
n mean std dev max 99th 1st min	1714 2.5241 1.3853 13.277 7.5774 0.8930 0.7104	1.2720 7.5774 7.5774 0.8930	3 2.53 0 1.57 4 16.7 4 8.47 0 0.84	112 2.47 714 1.33 753 8.47 760 8.47 496 0.84	727 887 660 760 96		

11. Results:

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

Table 8 compares the weighted (final weights) distributions by age and education to the CPS estimates. It is evident that the use of the final weights results in a distribution which is more similar to CPS population estimates.

Table 8: Comparison of weighted (final weights) NES distribution to CPS population estimates for age by education subgroups.

	HIGHEST EDUCATION	'92 CPS	'92pre NES	'92post NES	'94 CPS	'94post NES	'96 CPS	'96pre NES	'96post NES
18-21	No College College			4.27 3.08	4.2 3.1	4.22 2.85	4.4 2.9	3.63 2.97	3.38 2.99
TOTAL		7.3	7.33	7.33	7.3	7.07	7.3	6.61	6.36
22-29	No HS								

	Diploma HS Diploma Some	2.4 a 6.1	2.15 6.10	2.19 6.09	2.3 5.5	2.25 5.47	2.0 4.9	1.90 4.93	1.55 4.95
	College College	4.8	4.86	4.85	5.3	5.30	5.0	5.09	5.11
	Graduate	3.5	3.48	3.48	3.4	3.43	3.7	3.72	3.73
TOTAL		16.7	16.60	16.61	16.5	16.45	15.6	15.63	15.35
30-39	No HS Diploma HS Diploma	3.0 a 8.7	2.99 8.69	2.99 8.68	2.9 8.1	2.94 8.09	2.9 7.6	2.96 7.68	2.99 7.73
	Some College	6.1	6.13	6.13	6.6	6.63	6.3	6.38	6.42
	College Graduate	5.7	5.68	5.69	5.7	5.72	5.9	5.92	5.96
TOTAL		23.4	23.49	23.48	23.3	23.38	22.8	22.94	23.11
40-49	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.4 6.1 4.7 5.0	2.19 6.11 4.75 4.97	2.23 6.11 4.74 4.97	2.3 6.1 5.2 5.4	2.27 6.13 5.18 5.45	2.4 6.6 5.5 5.7	2.37 6.61 5.56 5.73	2.39 6.65 5.59 5.76
TOTAL		18.1	18.02	18.05	19.0	19.03	20.1	20.27	20.39
50-59	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	2.8 4.7 2.4 2.5	2.76 4.68 2.36 2.51	2.75 4.68 2.36 2.51	2.4 4.6 2.8 2.8	2.36 4.61 2.78 2.77	2.3 4.6 2.9 3.0	2.36 4.64 2.89 3.01	2.37 4.67 2.92 3.03
TOTAL		12.3	12.31	12.30	12.5	12.51	12.8	12.90	12.99
60-69	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	3.5 4.2 1.8	3.52 4.24 1.76 1.67	3.50 4.24 1.75 1.67	3.0 3.8 1.9	2.99 3.81 1.89	2.8 3.7 1.9	2.78 3.72 1.91 1.80	2.79 3.75 1.92 1.81
TOTAL		11.1	11.19	11.17	10.3	10.35	10.1	10.21	10.27
70+	No HS Diploma HS Diploma Some College College Graduate	4.8 3.6 1.5	4.84 3.52 1.48	4.83 3.53 1.48	4.6 3.7 1.7	4.57 3.68 1.67	4.3 3.7 1.9	4.28 3.75 1.88 1.52	4.32 3.78 1.90
TOTAL		11.1	11.06	11.06	11.2	11.22	11.3	11.44	11.53

'92pre '92post '94post '96pre '96post '92CPS NES NES '94CPS NES '96CPS NES NES

No HS Diploma	20.8	19.19	19.32	19.5	18.83	18.9	18.25	17.63
HS Diploma	35.5	36.88	36.77	33.9	34.53	33.2	33.37	33.69
Some College	24.3	24.26	24.24	26.4	26.31	26.4	26.69	26.85
College								
Graduate	19.5	19.68	19.68	20.3	20.33	21.5	21.70	21.84

The final check on the revised weight is to use this trimmed final weight to estimate presidential election voting rates in 1992 and 1996. Table 9 shows that in both 1992 and 1996 the use of the final weight results in significantly lower estimates of voting.

Table 9: Calculated Voting Rates in the 1992 and 1996 Presidential elections

1992			1996		
unwghtd	base weight	final weight	unwghtd	base weight	final weight
0.77	0.78	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.72