

Version 03 Codebook

-----

CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE  
1988-1990-1992 POOLED SENATE FILE  
(1988.SW92)

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES  
1988-1990-1992 POOLED SENATE ELECTION FILE

Principal Investigators

Warren E. Miller  
Donald R. Kinder  
Steven J. Rosenstone  
and the National Election Studies

ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER 9580

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by mea

Miller, Warren E., Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY: POOLED SENATE ELECTION STUDY, 1988, 1990, 1992 [Computer file]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer], 1993. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1993.

#### REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resourc

#### DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no r

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

- I. GENERAL INFORMATION
  - A. General Information about the National Election Study
  - B. Pooled Senate Data Collection Description (1988, 1990, 1992)
- II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SENATE STUDIES
  - A. Survey Content
  - B. Candidate Specific Information and Questionnaire Design
  - C. Recorded Variables (Derived Measures)
  - D. The Concept of Senate Seats
  - E. Contextual Data
- III. SAMPLING INFORMATION
  - A. The Sample Design
  - B. Determining Congressional District of Respondent
  - C. Study Parameters: Response Rate, Number of Cases, Time in Field

- IV. SPECIAL DATA NOTES
- V. HOW TO ORDER (AND TAPE FORM)
- VI. USER DOCUMENTATION
- VII. MASTER CODES - SURVEY VARIABLES
  - A. Party/Candidate ('Likes/Dislikes')
  - B. Campaign Issues
  - C. Congressional Leadership (1990 only)
  - D. Previously Held Elective Office (1990 only)
  - E. Religion
- VIII. MASTER CODES - CONTEXTUAL DATA VARIABLES
  - A. Contextual Seat #1/#2 Senators (1988-90 merged) and candidate/incumbent Unique Name Codes (1988-90-92 Pooled)
  - B. Democratic Campaign Managers (1988, 1992)
  - C. Democratic Consultants/Pollsters (1988, 1990, 1992)
  - D. Republican Campaign Managers (1988, 1992)
  - E. Republican Consultants/Pollsters (1992 only)
  - F. Campaign Content Codes (1988 only)
  - G. Sources of Senate Contextual Data (1988, 1990, 1992)
- IX. CANDIDATE LISTS
  - A. House (1988, 1990, 1992)
  - B. Senate (1988, 1990, 1992)
  - C. Governor (1990 only)
- X. APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM, 1992 SAMPLE SAMPLING SECTION, INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
- XI. APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM SAMPLING SECTION, 1990 SENATE ELECTION STUDY
- XII. APPENDIX C: BENCHMARK FREQUENCIES,(1988, 1990, 1992, Combined)

>> I.A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The NES/CPS senate election studies were conducted in 1988, 1990 and 1992 through  
 The 1988 Senate study was conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation  
 Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed by a National Board of  
 Planning for the initial Senate Study in 1988 extended over several years and included

- 1) For the comparative study of Senate elections, it was difficult, if not

impossible, to pool many separate surveys done by different organizations with different questionnaires, samples and modes of administration. Pooling the National Election Studies over several years was also inadequate as a solution since their sample design led to a concentration of voters in the most populous states.

- 2) It was important to study citizen reaction to Senators at all phases of their 6-year term. Consequently, the study sample should include states in which there was not a Senate election, and the questionnaires should include questions about Senators whose terms are not up.
- 3) The study of Senate elections will provide a unique opportunity to study the impact of context on electoral behavior.
- 4) Because an important unresolved puzzle in the study of congressional elections was the relationship between House and Senate evaluations and vote choice, any future study should also include House members as well as Senators.

A Standing Committee on Congressional Elections Research was appointed subsequent to the Wolfinger study. This committee met twice more, in February of 1986 and January of 1987,

The Planning Committee for the 1990 Senate Study consisted of Board members Fio

The Planning Committee for the 1992 Senate Study consisted of Board members Jac

#### >> I.B. POOLED SENATE DATA COLLECTION DESCRIPTION

Warren E. Miller, Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone and the National Election S

#### AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY:

POOLED SENATE ELECTION STUDY, 1988, 1990, 1992 (ICPSR 9580)

#### SUMMARY:

This dataset is a combination of the 1988, 1990 and 1992 Senate Election Studies. 0

#### UNIVERSE:

1988 Cases: All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 8, 1988, residing in households with telephones in the 50 states.

1990 Cases: All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 6, 1990, residing in

households with telephones in the 50 states. The only citizens with no chance of selection are those with unlisted numbers in a hundred series which has no listed numbers. See Appendix B.

1992 Cases: All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 3, 1992, residing in households with telephones in the 50 states.

SAMPLING:

1988 Cases: Two-stage random sample, stratified by state

1990 Cases: Dual-frame (list and RDD) within each state

1992 Cases: One-stage, list-assisted RDD with no clustering

NOTE: The contextual data was originally collected for the Board of Overseers by the Contextual Data Committee, chaired by Gary Jacobson and Raymond Wolfinger. Many variables have been updated for the 1990 and 1992 contextual data sections (i.e. election returns, age of candidates/senators, campaign spending and certain state political, demographic, geographic and economic variables.) Certain variables have been padded with missing data (Some mass mailing variables, campaign manager, voting-indices and so on) which could not be found or were not available at the time of release.

>> II.A. CONTENT OF THE SENATE STUDIES

Survey Content

The study content was generally designed to parallel the questions used in the

The 1988, 1990 and 1992 surveys were 32 minutes, 41 minutes and 34 minutes in l

>> II.B. CANDIDATE SPECIFIC INFORMATION AND QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

Candidate Specific Information and Questionnaire Design

For the 1988 and 1990 studies, for a given congressional district, there were b

There were ten sections in each the 1988 and 1990 questionnaires (five for the

All three surveys were administered by means of PC-based CATI systems. However

Questions pertaining to the House always refer to a candidate; that is, they ar

Since 1978, the NES has used a Candidate Number Master Code to distinguish race type situations. This candidate number master code was used in the Senate surv

TABLE 1: CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODE

## U.S. SENATE RACES

STATES WITH NO INCUMBENT RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	STATES WITH INCUMBENT RUNNING	STATES WITH NO SENATE RACE
10. THIRD PARTY CAND.	10. THIRD PARTY CAND.	17. DEM. SENATOR
11. DEM. CANDIDATE	13. DEM. INCUMBENT	18. REP. SENATOR
12. REP. CANDIDATE	14. REP. INCUMBENT	27. DEM. SENATOR
	15. DEM. CANDIDATE	28. REP. SENATOR
	16. REP. CANDIDATE	
19. DEM. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	19. DEM. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	
29. REP. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	20. REP. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	
21. DEM. INCUMBENT RETIRING		
22. REP. INCUMBENT RETIRING		

## U.S. HOUSE RACES

DISTRICTS WITH NO INCUMBENT REPRESENTATIVE RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	DISTRICTS WITH INCUMBENT REPRESENTATIVE RUNNING
30. THIRD PARTY CANDIDATE	30. THIRD PARTY CANDIDATE
31. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	33. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT
32. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	34. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT
	35. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
41. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT RETIRING	36. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
42. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT RETIRING	

## U.S. GUBERNATORIAL RACES

STATES WITH NO INCUMBENT RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	STATES WITH INCUMBENT RUNNING	STATES WITH NO GUBERNATORIAL RACE
50. THIRD PARTY CAND	50. THIRD PARTY CAND.	57. DEM. GOVERNOR
51. DEM. CANDIDATE	53. DEM. INCUMBENT	58. REP. GOVERNOR
52. REP. CANDIDATE	54. REP. INCUMBENT	
	55. DEM. CANDIDATE	
	56. REP. CANDIDATE	
61. DEM. INC. RETIRING		
62. REP. INC. RETIRING		

TABLE 2. CANDIDATE AND QUESTION NUMBER

## A. RECALL OF SENATE CANDIDATES (B SERIES)

	Cand.#	Q#
CONTESTED RACES:	11-15	B9-B13
	19,29	B14-B16
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	B17-B21

## B. RECALL OF HOUSE CANDIDATES

ALL RACES:	30-36	B4-B8
------------	-------	-------

## C. LIKES/DISLIKES OF SENATORS/CANDIDATES (D SERIES)

CONTESTED RACE:	11,13,15	D1-D4
	12,14,16	D5-D8
	19,29	D9-D12
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	D13-D16
	17,18,27,28	D17-D20

## D. LIKES/DISLIKES OF HOUSE CANDIDATES (D SERIES) (Not Asked in 1992)

CONTESTED RACE:	31,33,35	D21-D24
	32,34,36	D25-D28
UNCONTESTED RACE:	33	D21-D24
	34	D25-D28

## E. CONTACT WITH SENATE CANDIDATES AND INCUMBENT SENATORS(F SERIES)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	F1-F8
	15,16	F9-F16
	19,29	F33-F40
*OPEN RACE:	11	F17-F24
	12	F25-F32
	19,29	F33-F40
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	F41-F48 (SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	F49-F56 (SENATOR 2)

## F. CONTACT WITH HOUSE CANDIDATES (G SERIES) (Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	33,34	G1-G8
	35,36	G9-G16
OPEN RACE:	31	G17-G24
	32	G25-G32
UNOPPOSED:	33,34	G1-G8

## G. RESPONDENT-INITIATED CONTACT WITH SENATORS AND EVALUATION (J SERIES)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	J1-J14
	19,29	J15-J28
OPEN RACE:	19,29	J15-J28
NO RACE:	17,18,27,28	J29-J42 (SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	J43-J56 (SENATOR 2)

H. RESPONDENT INITIATED CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENTS AND EVALUATION  
(Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	33,34	J57-J70
OPEN RACE:	None	None
UNOPPOSED RACE:	33,34	J57-J70

I. LEADERSHIP POSITION OF SENATORS (AND PREVIOUS OFFICE OF CANDS:1990)  
(Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	J71-J72
	19,29	J73-J74
	15,16	J81-J82 (1990 only)
OPEN RACE:	19,29	J71-J72
	11	J83-J84 (1990 only)
	12	J85-J86 (1990 only)
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	J75-J76 (SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	J77-J78 (SENATOR 2)

J. LEADERSHIP POSITION HELD BY HOUSE INCUMBENT (AND PREVIOUS OFFICE OF  
CANDIDATES: 1990) (Not Asked in 1992)

INCUMBENT RUNNING:	33,34	J79-J80
	35,36	J87-J88 (1990 only)
OPEN RACE:	31	J89-J90 (1990 only)
	32	J91-J92 (1990 only)

>> II.C. RECORDED VARIABLES (DERIVED MEASURES)

Recorded Measures

We have added five sets of reorganized measures (VST0642-VST0871) and a number of other analytic variables (VST0872-VST0892) described below. There are no new data in Variables VST0642-ST0871; they are merely reorganized versions of the original survey variables. The five series are:

1. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, organized by Party of Candidate. (VPS0642-VPS0687)
2. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, organized by incumbency/challenger status of candidate (VPS0688-VPS0733)
3. SENATE, organized by party of candidate (excludes Senators not running) (VPS0734-VPS0779)
4. SENATE, organized by incumbency/challenger status of candidate (excludes Senators not running) (VPS0780-VPS0825)
5. SENATE variables, organized by seat within state (excluding non-incumbent Senate candidates (1988), but including all other Senators.) (VPS0826-VPS0871.)

The Concept of Senate Classes

U.S. Senators belong to one of three possible Senate Classes, numbered as Class  
Since each state has two Senators, the states can be grouped by their combination of

TABLE 3

Classes 1 and 2	Classes 1 and 3	Classes 2 and 3
Maine	Connecticut	New Hampshire
Massachusetts	Vermont	Illinois
Rhode Island	New York	Iowa
Delaware	Pennsylvania	Kansas
New Jersey	Indiana	South Dakota
Michigan	Ohio	Alabama
Minnesota	Wisconsin	Arkansas
Nebraska	Missouri	Georgia
Virginia	North Dakota	Louisiana
Mississippi	Florida	North Carolina
Texas	Maryland	South Carolina
Tennessee	Arizona	Kentucky
West Virginia	Nevada	Oklahoma
Montana	Utah	Colorado
New Mexico	California	Idaho
Wyoming	Washington	Oregon
	Hawaii	Alaska

## &gt;&gt; II.D. THE CONCEPT OF SENATE SEATS

## The Concept of Senate Seats

Each of the 50 states has, of course, two Senate seats, which, for the purpose

## The Interaction of Candidate Numbers and Seat Numbers

As laid out in Table 1 above, Senators and candidates are assigned Candidate Nu

A perfect example of this situation is Democratic Senator George Mitchell of Ma

In some states, when a Senate Incumbent either retired or lost re-election, the

Within each of the five Recoded Measures series, the variables are organized by Democratic candidate (regardless of incumbency status) and variables 654-661 are the

In v873-v892 we have also added a number of variables intended to make analyses

## &gt;&gt; II.E. CONTEXTUAL DATA

## Contextual Data

In addition to the data drawn from the interview, this dataset includes a large

Specifically, the contextual variables include: election returns for the Senate

For 1990 and 1992, some variables have been padded with missing data (1989 mass

The contextual data contains two sections (Seat #1 Senator and Seat #2 Senator) Alabama, Senator Howell Heflin holds Seat #1, and has held that seat throughout all

Use the unique name list (found in the blue section, Master Codes--Contextual V

Notice that the occupants of Seat #1 and/or Seat #2 could have had their survey

- >> III. SAMPLING INFORMATION  
 >> III.A. THE SAMPLE DESIGN

#### The Sample Design

The objectives of the study dictated that roughly equal sampling variances be obtained. Three different algorithms for selecting household telephone numbers were used. The result then was an equal two-stage probability for working telephone number. Because the target number of interviews per state was 75, and a roughly 57% cooperation rate, the 1990 Senate Election Study used a dual-frame design telephone sample with a 50% probability of selection. Within each of the fifty states, an equal probability sample of random numbers was selected. The 1992 Senate Election Study used a "list assisted" or "listed hundred series

- >> III.B. DETERMINING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE RESPONDENT  
 Determining Congressional District of Respondent

Since 1978, NES strategy has been to provide for respondents the names of the congressional district. In the traditional NES post-election studies, the sample frame is geographically defined by zip code. The correspondence of telephone number to any other geographic boundary is far from perfect. The MOR Hundred Number Block sampling database shows the residential listed file for each zip code. The allocation of zip code geography across CD boundaries is documented in the MOR file. Essentially, the telephone number was assigned into a CD based on the joint probability of zip code and telephone number. This led to a fairly clear decision rule for most cases. Because of the relationship between zip code and telephone number, MOR sampling staff took a sample of the lower-probability assignment telephone numbers. In 1990, the 'list' half of the sample purchased from Survey Sampling Inc. identified the congressional district. For 1992 cases - PLEASE USE EXTREME CAUTION WHEN REFERENCING CD INFORMATION. NES used the 1992 CD assignments were made in the following way: NES passed the respondent's zip code to the MOR staff.

- >> III.C. STUDY PARAMETERS: RESPONSE RATE, NUMBER OF CASES, TIME IN FIELD  
 Study Parameters: Response Rate, Number of Cases, Days in Field

The study response rates were 43% for 1988, 46% for 1990 and 56% for 1992. By

TABLE 4a: Cumulative 1988 Interview production by Week in %

WK# 1	WK# 2	WK# 3	WK# 4	WK# 5
Nov.14-	Nov.21-	Nov.28-	Dec.5-	Dec.12-

	Nov. 20	Nov. 27	Dec. 4	Dec. 11	Dec. 20	N
OVERALL	6.8	18.6	46.1	78.7	100%	3145
Version #1	8.1	23.4	54.8	83.1	100%	124
Version #2	--	--	27.6	70.5	100%	105
Version #3	--	--	18.2	66.7	100%	33
Version #4	--	--	46.7	83.8	100%	197
Version #5	9.6	24.7	51.9	80.9	100%	1392
Version #6	7.5	22.2	56.0	83.9	100%	953
Version #7	--	--	--	56.9	100%	72
Version #8	--	--	--	51.3	100%	152
Version #9	--	--	--	56.4	100%	117

Table 4b: 1990 Cumulative Interview production by Week in %

	Wk# 1 Nov. 7- Nov. 13	Wk# 2 Nov. 14- Nov. 20	Wk# 3 Nov. 21- Nov. 27	Wk# 4 Nov. 28- Dec. 3	Wk# 5 Dec. 4- Dec. 10	Wk# 6 Dec. 11 Dec. 17	Wk#7 Dec. 18 Dec. 22	N
Total	13.3	32.5	51.5	72.3	85.8	97.7	100%	3349
V#1	16.7	38.6	42.8	48.0	78.2	99.0	100%	96
V#2	15.9	31.5	48.7	65.6	83.8	98.1	100%	308
V#3	5.3	5.3	5.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100%	38
V#4	29.2	41.7	48.6	75.0	91.0	99.7	100%	144
V#5	9.5	32.6	55.0	74.7	86.5	98.2	100%	1565
V#6	17.7	31.3	51.4	67.6	82.4	96.6	100%	667
V#8	14.8	37.2	56.4	74.0	87.5	97.1	100%	459
V#9	19.4	19.4	19.4	86.1	100.0	100.0	100%	72

\* NO CASES IN VERSION 7

Table 4c: 1992 Cumulative Interview production by Week in %

Wk# 1 Nov. 4- Nov. 10	Wk# 2 Nov. 11- Nov. 17	Wk# 3 Nov. 18- Nov. 24	Wk# 4 Nov. 25- Dec. 1	Wk# 5 Dec. 2- Dec. 8.	N
-----------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---

OVERALL      31.6      59.9      78.3      89.9      100.0      2759

>> IV. SPECIAL DATA NOTES

Special Data Notes

1. The 1992 California interviews have been duplicated in this dataset, to cover the unique situation of California's two Senate races in 1992. For 1992 California cases with case I.D. in the range of 20,000 - 29,999, the Senate race referred to was the Boxer-Herschensohn race. The 1992 California cases with I.D.'s in the range of 30,000 - 39,999 are the same respondents as above, but are referring instead to the Feinstein-Seymour Senate race.
2. In Louisiana's second congressional district (VST0006=4502) two Democrats ran for the House seat in 1990. Both the Democrat and the Republican House Candidate Variables (VST0018 and VST0019) are coded as 31 (Democrat in open race). The House race type (VST0024) is coded 57 (Democrat retiring with Democrat and Other running). Question wording (where applicable) referred to both candidates as Democrats.
3. In Vermont's House race (1990), we substituted Bernard Sanders (an Independent) for the Democratic candidate since he was the higher profile challenger to the Republican incumbent. The Democrat House Candidate variable (VST0018) is coded 30. The House race type (VST0024) is coded 29 (Republican incumbent facing Democratic and Other challenger). Question wording (where applicable) referred to Sanders as an Independent.
4. In Hawaii's second congressional district (1990), we treated the House race as an open race (VST0024=55) since the seat had only been filled since late September, 1990.
5. In Minnesota's 1990 Gubernatorial race, the Republican challenger Jon Grunseth dropped out on October 28 and was replaced by Arne Carlson as the Republican. All relevant questions referred to Arne Carlson as the Republican.
6. Both the 1990 Connecticut and 1990 Alaska Gubernatorial races were contested by three high profile candidates. Lowell Weicker ran as an independent in Connecticut while Walter Hickel ran as an independent in Alaska. The vote questions specifically referred to both of these independent candidates as well as the major party candidates. The Gubernatorial Race Type variable (VST0026) is coded 59 (Democrat retiring, Democrat, Republican and other candidates running) for both states.
7. In 1990, four states had uncontested Senate races, two with Democratic incumbents running unopposed (Arkansas and Georgia) and two with Republican incumbents running unopposed (Mississippi and Virginia)

8. Unhappily, Senator Jacob Hecht of Nevada was erroneously referred to throughout the 1988 interview as a Democrat instead of a Republican. The subsequent data problems are obvious enough in places where the party was read to the respondent along with the Senator's name, in, for example, the likes and dislikes questions, and the Senate vote choice question, but the error may well have contaminated responses to all subsequent questions about Hecht, even where the party is not specifically mentioned, as in the contact batteries. (Of course, the problem also affects his opponent, Richard Bryan, who was mislabeled as a Republican.)

The problem with the vote choice variable should be specifically mentioned, since the responses to it are particularly confusing. When asked for whom he/she voted, a respondent could answer either "the Democrat" or Senator Hecht. In either case, the respondent would have been coded as voting for Senator Hecht, when in the first instance, the respondent may have been trying to convey a vote for his opponent. Or, the respondent may have known that he voted for a Democrat, and responded with "Hecht" when presented with the cue that Hecht was a Democrat. In short, we would recommend strongly against the use of the Senate vote choice variable for Nevada.

Questions asked prior to the misidentification (i.e., recall, recognition and thermometer) have been corrected for this release so that, for example, v86 now holds data referring to Bryan. These corrections have been made in both the original survey variables and the recoded variables.

Also, all variables in the original survey and recode sections of the dataset relating to Senator Hecht and his opponent which were asked after the misidentification by party (i.e., starting with the Likes/Dislikes series) have been set to missing data.

>> V. HOW TO ORDER (AND TAPE FORM)

>> VI. USER DOCUMENTATION

#### CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The following example from the 1948 NES study provides the standard format for codebook. Note that NES studies that are not part of the Time-Series usually omit marginals and

Line

```
1 =====
2 VAR 480026    NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
3              COLUMNS 61    - 61
```

```

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

```

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lines 11-16

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

Lines 11-16

Marginals are usually provided for discrete variables. The

counts may be un-weighted or weighted; check the Study codebook introductory text to determine weight usage.