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### Question-by-Questions Objectives

Wave I -- Form A

### Question-by-Question Objectives

Wave I -- Form B
SAMPLING NOTES

The Sampling Notes for this study consist of the sampling instructions memo sent with the sample. A reproduction of this memo follows.
TO: Interviewers Working on the Pilot Study for the 1980 Election Study - P. 24
FROM: Jeanne Castro/Tracy Berckmans - Field Office
RE: The Enclosed Sampling Material and Instructions for Use of the Sample

Study Dates:

Monday, February 12, 1979
Friday, February 23
Monday, March 5 - Monday March 19
Monday, March 26 - Monday, April 9

All Sampling Materials will be mailed
Questionnaires, Instruction Books and other study materials will be mailed on this date (First Class Mail unless otherwise specified)
Wave I Interviewing (10 interviews per Primary Area - 5 male heads of household - 5 female spouses or heads of household)
Wave II Reinterviewing same Rs as Wave I

Background of the Study

Before we begin putting together the questionnaires for the 1980 Election Study (which will begin in January 1980) we want to test some new questions and methods which have been proposed for that study. In order to do this, a sample of 30 Primary Areas has been selected, each of which will yield ten interviews (Wave I) and ten reinterviews with the same respondents (Wave II). There will be two different forms of the questionnaire in each wave. These questionnaires will vary a good deal in form and content and will take, we hope (!) not more than 75 minutes to administer.

The number of segments being sent to each Primary Area is far larger than necessary to yield ten interviews. This will allow interviewers to pick and choose among segments and among housing units and avoid those which might be problems (locked apartment buildings and trailer courts).

With these choices in mind the interviewer should "select" respondents so as to obtain interviews with five male heads of household (try to get these first as they are the most difficult to catch) and with five female heads or wives. We would also like some variation in age and socio-economic status if possible. Cover Sheets will be sent with study materials and should be made out only for those HUs where a contact is made (regardless of the outcome). Respondent letters are included with the Sampling Materials and should be sent to those addresses the interviewer thinks he or she will be calling upon. They should be addressed after the listing or updating has been completed (don't forget to get the zip code for the area you are listing/updating) and be ready to mail March 1 (or the day before if you have unusually slow local delivery).

Three weeks after the initial interview, interviewers will contact their respondents for a reinterview. The timing between the Wave I and Wave II interviews should come as close to 21 days as possible.

Obviously since we are not asking you to account for the entire sample, we are not interested in a response rate per se; we are interested in obtaining ten interviews and reinterviews and in the timing between these interviews and in the quality of the interviews.
The Sample

IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT YOU STUDY AND REVIEW CHAPTER 11 IN YOUR INTERVIEWER'S MANUAL CONCERNING LISTING AND UPDATING.

Interviews are to be conducted in segments from existing blue folders in our regular national sample (not the Congressional District pink folder sample). The chunks and segments were first used several years and several studies ago so you will need to update the selected segments, or, in a few cases, list a segment that has never been listed. No scouting will be required since the segments are all in existing folders, but the updating and listing (where needed) should be done as soon as you have received the materials and studied the instructions so that problems can be resolved and the way cleared for the start of interviewing promptly Monday, March 5.

Review the chapter on listing and updating in your Interviewer's Manual! The only difference between this pilot study and a regular cross section sample study is that you have some choice in the segments and households you will visit. You are to list or update only those segments which you feel you will need to obtain ten interviews. If you are a new interviewer or not familiar with the segments you may wish to visit each segment and then select the ones you will use. Please plan your trips and use your time as efficiently as possible.

Materials You Will be Using for the Sampling Phase of the Pilot Study

Transmittal (Form 150)
List of the segments and locations available for use on this study.

Blue Segment Control Folders
The segments available for use on this study are marked on the Blue Folder cover in Col. 2 (Project No.) as usual. The six digit project number used here in the office (495535) is shown above the 2 digit project number which you should use on your materials and pay forms.
Carry the blue folder with you when you go out to interview and return it to the Field Office when interviewing has been completed.

Segment Listing Sheets - Form S210 copy-sets
Segment Listing Sheets to be used for those segments that must be listed from scratch as well as for continuation sheets which may become necessary as you update the already listed segments.

Green and Cream Colored Sample Address Summary Copy-Sets
Use one of these copy sets for each of the segments in which you plan to interview. See pages 84 and 85 in your Interviewer's Manual. The cream colored copy of the SAS is to be returned to the Ann Arbor Office as soon as the segment has been listed or updated and will serve as our sample book for logging in completed interviews. The green copy of the SAS is for you to keep track of:

a. The addresses to which you send respondent letters
b. The addresses at which you make contact and make out cover sheets
c. The dates and the results of the calls at addresses you have selected.
It is essential that you keep careful, up-to-date records or you will find yourself in a terrible tangle when it comes time for the reinterview.
Respondent Letters (25 copies per Primary Area)

Print your name on the bottom of the letter and put your initials over the return address on the outside of the envelope as usual.

Envelopes for Respondent Letters (25 per Primary Area)

Send the respondent letters on or slightly before March 1. You may feel confident that you can get your quota of ten interviews without sending all 25 letters and this is fine — especially as the letters say an interviewer will be calling and we don’t want a lot of disappointed potential respondents sitting at home waiting for you to stop by and interview them!

Instruction Memo - Sample Cover Sheet Attached

Summary of Sampling and Interviewing Steps for the Pilot Study

a. Study these instructions and Chapter 11 of your Interviewer’s Manual
b. Select enough segments from those enclosed to produce ten interviews.
c. List or update those segments you plan to use.
d. Make out Sample Address Summary Forms with all selected sample lines (shown on Blue Folder cover) for each segment you plan to use.
e. Send cream colored copy of the SAS to the Field Office
f. Address respondent letters for those households you plan to visit
g. Indicate on your green SAS form the households to which you are sending respondent letters
h. Send respondent letters on or slightly before March 1 so you are sure they will be received by March 5.
i. Conduct initial interviews — alternating two forms of the questionnaire and interviewing 5 male heads of household and five female heads or wives.
   March 5 - March 19 START EARLY! Interview male heads first. Do not spend time making call-backs for broken appointments or chasing reluctant respondents.
j. Mail interviews and cover sheets as they are completed
k. Conduct re-interviews with same respondents March 26 - April 9.
l. Mail re-interviews and cover sheets as they are completed.
m. Return all blue folders to the Field Office
n. Mail the green copy of the SAS form to your supervisor.

Communication

If you have questions about general sampling procedures, call your supervisor. If you have specific questions about a sample segment — can’t find a boundary etc., try to use another segment and failing that call the Field Office after 12 noon EST and explain the problem to Kathy LaDronka and she’ll get an answer for you from Sampling. Questions about the content of the questionnaires should be addressed (or phoned) to Jeanne Castro. Although Jeanne’s office is no longer physically in the Field Office she can be reached by calling our number (313) 764-8356 collect.
FIELD NOTES

A. STUDY DATES

Feb. 12  Sample sent from Field Office
Feb. 23  Bulk materials mailed for Wave I
March 5  Wave I interviewing begins
March 9  Remaining bulk materials mailed for Wave II
March 19 Wave I interviewing ends
March 23 All Wave I interviews must be in the Field Office
March 26 Wave II interviewing begins
April 9  Wave II interviewing ends
April 13 All Wave II interviews must be in the Field Office

B. DESCRIPTION

This study is divided into two "waves." In other words, we will first interview our respondents (Wave I), then reinterview them three weeks later (Wave II). In addition, each Wave is divided into two groups; respondents who receive a Form A interview and those who receive Form B. Respondents interviewed with Form A during Wave I will be reinterviewed with Form A in Wave II (note that Wave II-Form A is a different questionnaire from Wave I-Form A), and likewise for Form B. This means there are a total of four different questionnaires for you to deal with, along with their own set of respondent booklets, coversheets, and so on.

C. WAVE I -- WHOM TO INTERVIEW

You have been instructed in the Sample Notes to choose the "easiest" segments in your sample, meaning the simplest to update and the ones nearest your home. Once you have decided which segments you will use, and have updated them, the list of selected line numbers on the sample folder will determine which addresses you may use. In any selected segment you may visit any or all selected lines -- your goal is to obtain 10 interviews, 5 with Wave I-Form A and 5 with Wave I-Form B, with respondents you feel you have a good chance of interviewing a second time (Wave II). Extra copies of questionnaires are provided in case you run into a "never-darken-my-doorstep-again" respondent -- and you KNOW he'll never give you a Wave II interview.

Once you have 10 interviews (5 with each Form) with respondents you can reasonably expect will be willing to be reinterviewed, STOP - STOP. Any other coversheets you have made out will become noninterviews.
One of the first things you will note about the coversheet is that there is no selection table. This is because, in addition to giving you quite a bit of latitude about where to attempt interviews, we also give you latitude about who you interview. We do, however, have a few rules, and pleas, to help us get something akin to a "cross-section" of respondents:

1) Please interview 5 male and 5 female heads of household. Interview the male heads first, as they will probably be the most difficult to nail down.

2) Try to get an age spread among your respondents; at least one respondent from 18-30, one from 30-45, and one from 45-60.

3) It would help us out if you would make an effort to get a variety of respondents in terms of income and education levels. This is the 'plea' part -- we know your control over this will depend somewhat on time and chance.

If a household doesn't have a composition that suits you according to the above criteria, make that coversheet a noninterview and move on to the next. And, if you anticipate much difficulty obtaining an interview in a household (R is reluctant, hard to catch, whatever), again, make the coversheet a noninterview and move on. The time element on this study is important, so we don't want you to waste any energy on not-very-promising households.

As soon as you have completed a Wave I interview you will fill out a re-contact sheet. During editing, you should also fill out a Wave II coversheet. The Wave II coversheet and the recontact sheet you will keep for use during the Wave II interviewing period. The Wave I coversheets and interviews should be sent to the Field Office as they are completed. Please don't hold them to send all at one time. We would like to begin coding the completed interviews as early as possible.

D. WAVE II

We will mail the questionnaires and related materials for Wave II on March 9. You will recontact R's for interviews beginning March 26. Recontact may be made by phone -- if you are reasonably certain you will not have trouble obtaining an appointment with your respondent. If you anticipate any kind of resistance, please make your recontact calls in person. Appointments for reinterviews should be made for 21 days after the Wave I interview, or as close to that day as you can possibly arrange. It is important to the study that there be a 21-day interval between interviews. Pursue your respondents vigorously, just as you would on any "regular" study. On Wave II, the response rate is important. We would like (LOVE) to have Wave II interviews for every Wave I respondent.
E. MATERIALS YOU SHOULD HAVE (Sent Feb. 23):

FOR USE IN WAVE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM A</th>
<th>FORM B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 questionnaires (white)</td>
<td>7 questionnaires (pink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 coversheets (white)</td>
<td>12 coversheets (pink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respondent Booklets (white)</td>
<td>3 Respondent Booklets (pink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 recontact sheets (white)</td>
<td>7 recontact sheets (cherry)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For use with both forms:

1 instruction book (containing Q-by-Q's for Wave I questionnaires)
3 sets issue cards (ivory)
4 100-Point scales (tan) (these scales will be used in Wave II as well)
10 respondent letters (for hand carrying)
20 interviewer cards
20 WHY WE ASK YOU folders
4 Field office addressed mailing envelopes (use a Supply Request form if you need more)

FOR USE IN WAVE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM A</th>
<th>FORM B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 coversheets (yellow)</td>
<td>7 coversheets (cherry)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. MATERIALS TO BE SENT ON MARCH 9:

FOR USE IN WAVE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM A</th>
<th>FORM B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 questionnaires (yellow)</td>
<td>7 questionnaires (cherry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respondent Booklets (Yellow)</td>
<td>3 Respondent Booklets (cherry)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For use with both forms:

1 set question-by-question objectives for the Wave II questionnaires
3 sets issue cards (blue)
(you will already have the 100 point scales, which were used in Wave I)
G. THE COVERSHEETS

Coversheets should be made only for addresses you visit, not for every eligible address.

Coversheets are identical across forms and waves, except in color.

For every Wave I coversheet which results in an interview, fill out a corresponding Wave II coversheet. For each Wave I-Form A (white) coversheet which results in an interview, complete a Wave II-Form A (yellow) coversheet. For each Wave I-Form B (pink) coversheet which results in an interview complete a Wave II-Form B (cherry) coversheet. Not keeping the questionnaire forms consistent across Waves will result in asking the respondent many of the same questions twice -- awkward for you, to say nothing of the havoc it would play with our analysis of the data. So keep the color scheme straight:

```
WAVE I-FORM A (white)  WAVE I-FORM B (pink)
      ↓                                ↓
WAVE II-FORM A (yellow) WAVE II-FORM B (cherry)
```

On the Wave II coversheets complete items 1 - 10 and item 12 (but verify item 12 when the Wave II interview takes place to make sure nothing changed in the interim between interviews). Keep the Wave II coversheet and the Recontact Sheet, ready to be used when Wave II interviewing begins. The Wave I coversheet should be mailed in with the Wave I interview.

H. THE COVERSHEET - ITEM-BY-ITEM

1. Affix your interviewer's label.
2. Enter the name of the primary area.
3. Enter your interview number. This is the sequential number you assign to completed interviews. Do not number coversheet for non-interviews. Number sequentially across waves, so that your final interview in Wave II should be around #20.
4. Enter the date on which the interview was taken.
5. Enter the exact length of the interview, in minutes.
6 - 7. Enter the segment and line numbers for the HU this coversheet represents.
8. Enter the address or description of this household (should be identical to the address or description as it appears in the sample folder).
9. Enter the sample location (from the sample folder).
10. Enter the state and the zip code for this address.
11. Call Record: Please record each call as it is made. Remember that we do not want to waste time chasing difficult respondents on Wave I -- but want to move heaven and earth to get them on Wave II.
12. List all Household members by relationship to Head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Members by Relationship to Head</th>
<th>(b) Sex</th>
<th>(c) Age</th>
<th>(d) Citizen? Yes/No</th>
<th>(e) Eligible Persons &quot;✓&quot;</th>
<th>(f) Enter &quot;R&quot; for Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 18 Years Old or Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 17 Years Old or Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

- # Persons
- Household Composition
- # Eligible Adults (✓)
- Children:
  - 5
  - 6-9
  - 10-13
  - 14-17

Step 1: Complete columns (a) - (c).

Step 2: Ask, "Are all of these persons U.S. citizens?" Write "yes" for those who are U.S. citizens and "no" for those who are not in column (d).

Step 3: Enter a check mark (✓) in column (e) for each person eligible for selection. Eligible persons are U.S. citizens who are 18 years of age or older.

Step 4: Indicate the person you select to be interviewed by entering "R" in column (f).

NONINTERVIEW CATEGORIES

1. Refusal (explain below).
2. NER (no eligible respondent): No one in the household over 18 years of age or no U.S. citizens in household.
3. NI-0 (noninterview for other reasons): explain below.
12. Household listing: Fill this out COMPLETELY for every coversheet which results in an interview. Verify with your informant that you have listed all members of the household, and check to see you have completed columns b - f before sending the interview and coversheet in. (I stress this because many interviewers omitted information from the listing boxes on the Post-Election study. This gives us big problems and costs oodles of money and time to correct—so please send us complete information. Most importantly, don't forget to indicate who you selected as RI!)

J. NONINTERVIEW CATEGORIES

1. REFUSAL - We would like to know the circumstances of the refusal and who in the household the refusal came from.

2. NER (no eligible respondent) - This box can be checked only when:
   a. there are no persons in the household 18 years of age or older
   OR
   b. there are no U.S. citizens in the household.

3. NI-O (noninterview for other reasons) - This is a catch-all category for any noninterview which does not fall into category 1 or 2 above. However, we are interested in what the reason for the noninterview was, so please write an explanation of the situation.
K. THE RECONTACT SHEET

The recontact sheets are color coded to help you keep the Forms straight - white for Form A and cherry for Form B. They're also on heavy paper, which we hope will help you keep track of them.

The recontact sheet contains the closing statement for the Wave I interview and a suggestion that we will be back for more information. It is primarily for your use for recontacting R for Wave II. You should keep the completed recontact sheet with the Wave II coversheet which you make out after the Wave I interview. Send in the recontact sheet with the completed Wave II interview (or noninterview coversheet - heaven forbid!).

Note that nowhere do we mention a report for respondents. This is because there won't be one. This is a very small study with a very tight budget, and the report to respondents was one of the things we had to give up in order to conduct the pilot at all.

L. THE RECONTACT SHEET - ITEM-BY-ITEM

1. Affix your interviewer's label.
2. Enter the primary area.
3. Enter your interview number (corresponds with item 3 on the coversheet).
4. Enter the segment and line numbers at which the Interview was taken (corresponds to items 6 and 7 on the coversheet).
5. Enter the date on which the Wave I interview was completed. The Wave II interview should occur 21 days after the Wave I interview. You, therefore, must have a record of the date on which the Wave I interview took place in order to determine when during Wave II you should recontact R.

The rest of the form is straightforward. The information you gather is mainly for your use when the time comes to recontact R. So the thoroughness with which you complete this form will have an impact on your success in recontacting the respondent three weeks hence. Don't rely on your memory for details and tips for recontacting R. In the words of a popular song, make it easy on yourself -- by writing everything useful on the front (and back) of the form.
Thank you for this interview. We value people like you who are willing to contribute their thoughts to our research. Our office may wish to get in touch with you by phone or mail to verify this interview. Also, in the next few weeks we may want to contact you again to arrange for one more meeting to talk just as we did, about a number of different topics. For these reasons, I would like to have your address and telephone number.

NAME: 

ADDRESS: 

TELEPHONE NUMBER: / 

IF R REFUSES ANY OF THIS INFORMATION, PLEASE EXPLAIN ON BACK OF THIS FORM.

Which days of the week and times of the day are generally good if we wish to reach you at home?

GOOD DAYS OF THE WEEK

GOOD TIMES OF THE DAY

USE BACK OF FORM FOR OTHER INFORMATION WHICH MIGHT BE HELPFUL WHEN YOU ATTEMPT TO RECONTACT THE RESPONDENT.
QUESTION - BY - QUESTION OBJECTIVES

WAVE I -- FORM A

The purpose of the present test was to determine what the perception of the local residents is on the things they consider important for the town's well-being and future development. The test was designed to gather information on various aspects, including economic stability, environmental concerns, and community involvement. The respondents were asked to rate their agreement with statements related to these topics. The results will be used to inform local policy decisions and community planning processes. This document contains the question-by-question objectives for the test, along with the data collected from the participants.
It is important that you get the FULL NAME OF THE PAPER AND THE CITY WHERE PUBLISHED if R can supply it. We need this level of detail in order to code the newspaper names accurately. "The Tribune" won't help much -- there must be 500 papers in this country called "The Tribune."

In this study, we are using a modified version of the traditional feeling thermometer scale. If you look at page 1 of the Respondent Booklet, you will see that the thermometer scale has only three points labeled $0^\circ$ - $50^\circ$ - $100^\circ$), instead of the traditional labeling at nine points. Any number of degrees from 0 to 100 is acceptable for rating. The modified thermometer scale allows the respondent more freedom in selecting feeling ratings from the scale.

Watch to be sure that warmth of feeling is not equated with anger. To avoid such a mix-up, make sure R understands that warm or favorable is the same as "liking" someone and cold means "disliking" someone.

When the respondent is not able to rate a person -- for instance, R only says "I don't know" -- try to determine which of the following two situations applies:

1) Is R trying to tell you that he knows the person (recognizes the name), but doesn't know (can't decide) how to rate the person because he is unfamiliar with the ideas, stances, personality, etc. of the political figure? This answer belongs in the column labeled: R DOESN'T KNOW WHERE TO RATE: CAN'T JUDGE.

OR

2) Does R mean that the name just doesn't "ring a bell," that he really doesn't know who the person is, in which case the answer should be marked in the column labeled: R DOESN'T RECOGNIZE NAME.

To clarify which situation applies, use the probe: "When you say "don't know" do you mean that you don't know who the person is, or do you have something else in mind?"

Please take time to be sure R understands the mechanics of the feeling thermometer.
Here, we want to get as complete a picture as possible of what R feels are the positive and negative characteristics of the two candidates. Therefore, if R mentions only one thing, probe, "Anything else?"

Specificity probes are also particularly important for this set of questions. You are likely to get responses such as: "I like the candidate's stand on issues" -- we want to know what issues and what stands; "He would be (is) a better president" -- but why would (is) he better; or "he is influenced by certain interests" -- which interests?

We would also like you to probe a little behind the standard adjectives, cliches, and slogans that are used. When R gives such responses as, "He is more progressive," "conservative," "socialistic," "better for the country," "for the working man," "it's time for a change," etc, use such probes as: "Could you tell me a little more about this?"; "Can you give me some examples of what you mean?"; etc.

We recognize the necessity, however, for not forcing R to respond beyond the point where he has something meaningful to say. Also, the probing should not be carried to the point of being offensive and irritating to the R who cannot provide more particulars.

This question is a new way of measuring partisan identification, a concept that is central to our political studies.

Here we are trying to determine what is R's conception of the Ideal President, what things should the Ideal President be and not be, do and not do.

The entire Section E is devoted to the examination of seven different issues using a variety of techniques which are, for the most part, exploratory and innovative.

The pattern followed for each issue is generally as follows: an issue is introduced (for example, inflation and unemployment) and R is asked to define his position for the issue. Next, he is asked to define the position of one or more political leaders and, in some cases, the position of current federal government policy. The series ends when R is told to use the 100-point scale to rate the personal importance of the issue. At this time, R is asked to place the card for that issue at his selected rating on the 100-point scale.

After all seven issues are handled in this fashion, the respondent is asked to reevaluate the positioning of the issue cards on the 100-point scale. R may decide then to rearrange the issue cards to provide the final composite
picture of the personal importance of each issue after taking other issues into account. Some of the techniques that are being tested in Section F will, no doubt, be used again in the 1980 Election Study. The data we are gathering now will help us select the most successful techniques for that study.

A couple of comments are worth making:

1. You will need a flat and stable surface to spread the 100-point scale and allow for issue cards to be placed on the scale and remain on the scale after placement.

2. Interviewers who pretested this section generally felt respondents enjoyed dealing with the issue cards and the 100-point scale. The opportunity to reevaluate the placement of the cards at the end was taken up by many respondents in the pretest.

3. Be sure to check additional instructions that apply to specific issues in the several q-by-q's that follow.

Our first task for the respondent is to place himself on the scale. NOTE that if R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS with regard to his own placement on the scale, we don't want any information for the other political leaders on that particular scale. Simply check the appropriate box and follow the skip instruction. While we always want as much information as possible, we do not care in this case to elicit further answers from those respondents indicating lack of interest or familiarity with the issue in question.

It is important that R understand that he should place the political leaders on the scale in terms of where he thinks they stand now, NOT in terms of where he would like them to be. If you get a response with all 1's or all 7's, R may be falling into the trap of putting the leaders or parties where he wants them to be and not where he thinks they are. Whenever such confusion becomes apparent to you, please try to get R to think in terms of where he thinks the leader or party position is now. (Needless to say, it is possible R does think everyone is with him at 1 or 7, and that's a legitimate answer -- just make sure that's what you're getting before you go on.)
As is customary with 7-point scales, definitely try to get R to specify his response in terms of a number on the scale. If R gives a range (e.g., 5-7) record this but also ask R, "Which point comes closest to the way you feel?" A "DON'T KNOW" answer for any of the parties or political leaders is a perfectly acceptable response to be handled by checking the DON'T KNOW box and moving on to the next party or leader on the list.

These 7-point scales have been pretested and we think their meaning will be fairly clear to everyone. If you are questioned about a particular term, it is probably best to reply: "Whatever that means to you" -- otherwise, too much interpretation for one R without interpretation for all of them would create problems of comparability between interviews.

As you read the introductory statement to E12, you will realize that in E12 and E13 we are encouraging respondents to express uncertainty by allowing them to choose a range of points to define their own placement on the issue, or the perceived position of leaders and government policy. Therefore, for these two questions, you should not follow the standard practice associated with 7-point scales; namely, the practice of asking R to pick a single point on the scale when a range of points is initially given. Do not probe for a "closest point" in the event R gives a range; we will gladly accept ranges as answers for these two questions.

Our intent is to compare the data gathered for these two questions in Wave I to the data gathered for the same questions in Wave II, where the standard "closest point" probe will be used. Such a comparison will tell us whether uncertainty makes a difference in the analysis phase of the study.

Our first task for the respondent is to place himself on the scale. NOTE that if R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS with regard to his own placement on the scale, we don't want any information for the other political leaders on that particular scale. Simply check the appropriate box and follow the skip instruction.
It is important that R understand that he should place the political leaders on the scale in terms of where he thinks they stand now, NOT in terms of where he would like them to be. If you get a response with all 1's or all 7's, R may be falling into the trap of putting the leaders or parties where he wants them to be and not where he thinks they are. Whenever such confusion becomes apparent to you, please try to get R to think in terms of where he thinks the leader or party position is now. (Needless to say, it is possible R does think everyone is with him at 1 or 7, and that's a legitimate answer -- just make sure that's what you're getting before you go on.)

These 7-point scales have been pretested and we think their meaning will be fairly clear to everyone. If you are questioned about a particular term, it is probably best to reply: "Whatever that means to you" -- otherwise, too much interpretation for one R without interpretation for all of them would create problems of comparability between interviews.

You will discover that one or more issue cards may never be used in the course of the rating process by some respondents. This is because when R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS for an issue, he is skipped out of the question that asks for the importance rating using the 100-point scale. If this happens, put an "X" in the "FINAL RATINGS" column for such issue(s).

This is yet another new way of measuring party identification and strength of partisan affiliation. Some respondents may tell you that they think they've already answered this question. (Indeed, they have in C1, but part of what we want to find out in this study is whether the two different and new party identification questions are interchangeable, and the only way we can address this problem is by asking the two questions of the same respondent.) Reassure R by telling him that although some questions do, indeed, sound alike, they answer different questions when analyzed.

These questions ask R to evaluate Ford and Cater by using the same categories of qualities and behaviors used in C2-C5 to describe the Ideal President.
If R mentions either now, at the time you took the household listing, or at some other time that he is "living with someone" (meaning common law marriage) as opposed to being "married to someone," record (or cross reference) this information here and treat the R as "married" throughout the remainder of Section S.

In S3, "grades of school" refers to elementary and secondary school, not to college or technical school. Under COLLEGE, categories 13-16 refer to the usual four years of college while 17 would be marked for anyone beyond the Bachelor's level or anyone in a program requiring more than the normal four years to receive a college degree.

In S3e, under "other schooling" we want to be able to distinguish between noncollege courses (which are primarily technical or vocational) and college courses (which include liberal arts requirements). Please record enough information about the schooling to make this distinction clear.

The category "unemployed" refers to a person who at the present time is not working for pay and says he is "looking for work" or "seeking employment."

It is also possible that R may feel he is both "working now" and either "retired," "permanently disabled," a "housewife," or a "student." In this case, check "WORKING NOW" but make marginal notes about what other category R selects, and if he mentions it, why.
If necessary, make sure the respondent understands that (1) this information is strictly confidential; (2) an answer to this question makes the information in the rest of the interview more valuable to us.

NOTE: The figure we want is the total family income from all sources before taxes, for the years 1978 and 1973, not just the respondent's own earnings. The question is designed so that the respondent will not have to name a specific figure, or even to give a narrow range.

In S6, "family" means those living with R at the present time; in S6a "family" means those living with R in 1973.

This includes only the respondent's own earnings for the years 1978 and 1973.
QUESTION - BY - QUESTION OBJECTIVES

WAVE I -- FORM B

This question is a new way of measuring political identification, a concept that is central to our political studies.

Here, we want to get as complete a picture as possible of what a person's political and non-political characteristics are. In prioritizing the questions, we want to find out what issues and what stands. "It is a better party" versus, "Is it better?" or "It is run by certain interests" -- which interests?

We would also like you to probe a little behind the standard definitions, cliches, and slogans that are used. When it gives such responses as, "The Democratic party is more progressive," "Conservative," "Reformative," "Better for the country," "party of the great majority," "party of a change," etc, ask such probes as, "Could you tell me a little more about this?" "Can you give me some examples of what you mean?" etc.

We recognize the necessity, however, for not forcing a person to respond beyond the point where he has something meaningful to say. Also, the probing should not be confined to the point of being offensive or irritating to the person or to provide mere particulars.
It is important that you get the FULL NAME OF THE PAPER AND THE CITY WHERE PUBLISHED if R can supply it. We need this level of detail in order to code the newspaper names accurately. "The Tribune" won't help much -- there must be 500 papers in this country called "The Tribune."

In this study, we are using a modified version of the traditional feeling thermometer scale. If you look at page 1 of the Respondent Booklet, you will see that the thermometer scale has only three points labeled (0° - 50° - 100°), instead of the traditional labeling at nine points. Any number of degrees from 0 to 100 is acceptable for rating. The modified thermometer scale allows the respondent more freedom in selecting feeling ratings from the scale.

Watch to be sure that warmth of feeling is not equated with anger. To avoid such a mix-up, make sure R understands that warm or favorable is the same as "liking" someone and cold means "disliking" someone.

When the respondent is not able to rate a person -- for instance, R only says "I don't know" -- try to determine which of the following two situations applies:

1) Is R trying to tell you that he knows the person (recognizes the name), but doesn't know (can't decide) how to rate the person because he is unfamiliar with the ideas, stances, personality, etc. of the political figure? This answer belongs in the column labeled: R DOESN'T KNOW WHERE TO RATE: CAN'T JUDGE.

OR

2) Does R mean that the name just doesn't "ring a bell," that he really doesn't know who the person is, in which case the answer should be marked in the column labeled: R DOESN'T RECOGNIZE NAME.

To clarify which situation applies, use the probe: "When you say "don't know" do you mean that you don't know who the person is, or do you have something else in mind?" Please take time to be sure R understands the mechanics of the feeling thermometer.
We would like as complete a picture as possible of the images R has of Carter and Ford as persons.

Here we are trying to determine what is R's conception of the Ideal President, what things should the Ideal President be and not be, do and not do.

This question is a new way of measuring partisan identification, a concept that is central to our political studies.

Here, we want to get as complete a picture as possible of what R feels are the positive and negative characteristics of the two parties. Therefore, if R mentions only one thing, probe, "Anything else?"

Specificity probes are also particularly important for this set of questions. You are likely to get responses such as: "I like the party's stand on issues" -- we want to know what issues and what stands; "It is a better party" -- but why is it better; or "It is run by certain interests" -- which interests?

We would also like you to probe a little behind the standard adjectives, cliches, and slogans that are used. When R gives such responses as, "The party is more progressive," "conservative," "socialistic," "better for the country," "party of the working man," "time for a change," etc.; use such probes as: "Could you tell me a little more about this?"; "Can you give me some examples of what you mean?"; etc.

We recognize the necessity, however, for not forcing R to respond beyond the point where he has something meaningful to say. Also, the probing should not be carried to the point of being offensive and irritating to the R who cannot provide more particulars.
The response to this question will be political or governmental in nature. Please try to get the specific problem R has in mind. Answers like, "the economic situation" or "foreign affairs" or "national health" are too vague and, for this reason, difficult if not impossible for us to code sensibly. For example, when R says, "national health," does he mean that the current quality of health services is poor because too many doctors are not qualified? or that the costs are too high? or that the current level of health services is bad because not enough people have access to them? or that we should have socialized medicine? or that we shouldn't?

We need to answer questions like these before we can code R's response. Probe with questions like, "Could you tell me what you have in mind?" and "Could you tell me a little more about that?"

Respondents may want to know if "approve" means the same as "satisfied." (Answer: "Whatever it means to you.") Or whether they can choose a middle category. (Answer: "Well, in general, which is closer to the way you feel? [repeat the questions]

The entire Section F is devoted to the examination of seven different issues using a variety of techniques which are, for the most part, exploratory and innovative.

The pattern followed for each issue is generally as follows: an issue is introduced (for example, inflation and unemployment) and R is asked to define his position for the issue. Next, he is asked to define the position of one or more political leaders and, in some cases, the position of current federal government policy. The series ends when R is told to use the 100-point scale to rate the personal importance of the issue. At this time, R is asked to place the card for that issue at his selected rating on the 100-point scale.

After all seven issues are handled in this fashion, the respondent is asked to reevaluate the positioning of the issue cards on the 100-point scale. R may decide then to rearrange the issue cards to provide the final composite picture of the personal importance of each issue after taking other issues into account. Some of the techniques
that are being tested in Section F will, no doubt, be used again in the 1980 Election Study. The data we are gathering now will help us select the most successful techniques for that study.

A couple of comments are worth making:

1. You will need a flat and stable surface to spread the 100-point scale and allow for issue cards to be placed on the scale and remain on the scale after placement.

2. Interviewers who pretested this section generally felt respondents enjoyed dealing with the issue cards and the 100-point scale. The opportunity to reevaluate the placement of the cards at the end was taken up by many respondents in the pretest.

3. Be sure to check additional instructions that apply to specific issues in the several q-by-q's that follow.

Our first task for the respondent is to place himself on the scale. NOTE that if R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS with regard to his own placement on the scale, we don't want any information for the other political leaders on that particular scale. Simply check the appropriate box and follow the skip instruction. While we always want as much information as possible, we do not care in this case to elicit further answers from those respondents indicating lack of interest or familiarity with the issue in question.

It is important that R understand that he should place the political leaders on the scale in terms of where he thinks they stand now, NOT in terms of where he would like them to be. If you get a response with all 1's or all 7's, R may be falling into the trap of putting the leaders or parties where he wants them to be and not where he thinks they are. Whenever such confusion becomes apparent to you, please try to get R to think in terms of where he thinks the leader or party position is now. (Needless to say, it is possible R does think everyone is with him at 1 or 7, and that's a legitimate answer -- just make sure that's what you're getting before you go on.)
As is customary with 7-point scales, definitely try to get R to specify his response in terms of a number on the scale. If R gives a range (e.g., 5-7) record this but also ask R, "Which point comes closest to the way you feel?" A "DON'T KNOW" answer for any of the parties or political leaders is a perfectly acceptable response to be handled by checking the DON'T KNOW box and moving on to the next party or leader on the list.

These 7-point scales have been pretested and we think their meaning will be fairly clear to everyone. If you are questioned about a particular term, it is probably best to reply: "Whatever that means to you" -- otherwise, too much interpretation for one R without interpretation for all of them would create problems of comparability between interviews.

As you read the introductory statement to F16, you will realize that in F16 and F17 we are encouraging respondents to express uncertainty by allowing them to choose a range of points to define their own placement on the issue, or the perceived position of leaders and government policy. Therefore, for these two questions, you should not follow the standard practice associated with 7-point scales; namely, the practice of asking R to pick a single point on the scale when a range of points is initially given. Do not probe for a "closest point" in the event R gives a range; we will gladly accept ranges as answers for these two questions.

Our intent is to compare the data gathered for these two questions in Wave I to the data gathered for the same questions in Wave II, where the standard "closest point" probe will be used. Such a comparison will tell us whether uncertainty makes a difference in the analysis phase of the study.

Our first task for the respondent is to place himself on the scale. NOTE that if R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS with regard to his own placement on the scale, we don't want any information for the other political leaders on that particular scale. Simply check the appropriate box and follow the skip instruction.
It is important that R understand that he should place the political leaders on the scale in terms of where he thinks they stand now, NOT in terms of where he would like them to be. If you get a response with all 1's or all 7's, R may be falling into the trap of putting the leaders or parties where he wants them to be and not where he thinks they are. Whenever such confusion becomes apparent to you, please try to get R to think in terms of where he thinks the leader or party position is now. (Needless to say, it is possible R does think everyone is with him at 1 or 7, and that is a legitimate answer -- just make sure that's what you're getting before you go on.)

These 7-point scales have been pretested and we think their meaning will be fairly clear to everyone. If you are questioned about a particular term, it is probably best to reply: "Whatever that means to you" -- otherwise, too much interpretation for one R without interpretation for all of them would create problems of comparability between interviews.

You will discover that one or more issue cards may never be used in the course of the rating process by some respondents. This is because when R responds either DK or HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS for an issue, he is skipped out of the question that asks for the importance rating using the 100-point scale. If this happens, put "X" in the "FINAL RATINGS" column for such issue(s).

This is yet another new way of measuring party identification and strength of partisan affiliation. Some respondents may tell you that they think they've already answered this question. (Indeed, they have in C1-C2, but part of what we want to find out in this study is whether the two different and new party identification questions are interchangeable, and the only way we can address this problem is by asking the two questions of the same respondent.) Reassure R by telling him that although some questions do, indeed, sound alike, they answer different questions when analyzed.

These questions ask R to evaluate Ford and Carter by using the same categories of qualities and behaviors used in B4-B7 to describe the Ideal President.
If R mentions either now, at the time you took the household listing, or at some other time that he is "living with someone" (meaning common law marriage) as opposed to being "married to someone," record (or cross reference) this information here and treat the R as "married" throughout the remainder of Section S.

In S3, "grades of school" refers to elementary and secondary school, not to college or technical school. Under COLLEGE, categories 13-16 refer to the usual four years of college while 17 would be marked for anyone beyond the Bachelor's level or anyone in a program requiring more than the normal four years to receive a college degree.

In S3e, under "other schooling" we want to be able to distinguish between noncollege courses (which are primarily technical or vocational) and college courses (which include liberal arts requirements). Please record enough information about the schooling to make this distinction clear.

The category "unemployed" refers to a person who at the present time is not working for pay and says he is "looking for work" or "seeking employment."

It is also possible that R may feel he is both "working now" and either "retired," "permanently disabled," a "housewife," or a "student." In this case, check "WORKING NOW" but make marginal notes about what other category R selects, and if he mentions it, why.
If necessary, make sure the respondent understands that (1) this information is strictly confidential; (2) an answer to this question makes the information in the rest of the interview more valuable to us.

NOTE: The figure we want is the total family income from all sources before taxes, for the years 1978 and 1973, not just the respondent's own earnings. The question is designed so that the respondent will not have to name a specific figure, or even to give a narrow range.

In S6, "family" means those living with R at the present time; in S6a "family" means those living with R in 1973.

This includes only the respondent's own earnings for the years 1978 and 1973.