

INSTRUCTION BOOKLET  
PRE-ELECTION SURVEY

Contents

- I. Background and Objectives of the Study
- II. Interview Procedures
  - A. Whom To Interview
  - B. Your Introduction
  - C. What To Do About Reinterviews
  - D. Non-Interviews
- III. Field Notes
  - A. Number of Calls
  - B. Review of Interviews
  - C. Thumbnail Sketch
  - D. Preparing Interviews for Mailing
  - E. Progress Reports
  - F. Study Deadline
- IV. Question-by-Question Objectives

I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

BACKGROUND

The political side of human behavior has long been of interest to social scientists, philosophers, and other students of human behavior. In this era of the Atom, of international tensions, and of competing political ideas, the study of man's political behavior, needless to say, takes on special importance.

As a field of study, it is a broad area, and includes many aspects. Thus, it would be possible to make studies of the behavior of public officials, legislators, party officials, or other segments of the population. None of these various aspects of political behavior has received greater attention from social scientists than the citizen himself. By "citizen" we mean the voters and non-voters, the people who do not hold political offices or party positions; i.e., the citizenry, some of which is very active politically, and some totally inactive. The part of the citizen in the political workings of society has interested philosophers since the time of Plato.

In recent years, there have been some attempts to use out-and-out research methods in the study of this part of the political picture, but these pioneering efforts have had to depend mainly on over-all, general information (for instance, the total vote, vote by states, etc.), and have been greatly handicapped by the lack of more detailed information about the individual citizen. The recent development of more effective research methods (for example, the sample survey) is making it possible for us to gather detailed information on political behavior which has not been available to political analysts in the past. Thus, in participating in this survey, you are taking part in the first broad-scale, national study of its kind; a study which is designed to produce much-needed information about the political behavior of the citizen.

# ABOUT THIS STUDY

The study of political behavior, like the study of economic behavior, has long been an important part of the Center's research program. In past years, the Center has conducted a number of surveys on citizens' ideas and involvement in international affairs, civil defense, and other public issues. In part, these surveys were designed to examine how the citizen gets information on these issues, the degree to which he sees himself involved in them, and the role he sees himself playing in their solution. A number of you have worked on several of these studies.

Some of the interviewing staff will also remember the small scale Survey of Public Reaction to the Election which we did immediately following the last presidential election in 1948. For this 1948 survey we reinterviewed the respondents we had talked with on an international affairs survey before the election (as part of the international affairs questionnaire we had asked respondents how they intended to vote). By combining the pre-election information with the post-election reinterview, we were able to investigate some of the factors that affected the vote in 1948 which might have led the newspaper polls to miscalculate the vote.

In the 1948 reinterview we obtained some valuable information on the characteristics of voters and non-voters, and the ways in which the various types of people saw the election issues and parties. We will now be able to compare the 1948 results on some of these topics with the 1952 results; this comparison will give us valuable findings which we wouldn't be able to have otherwise.

Having an interest in this area, and being encouraged by social scientists in various parts of the country who were familiar with the Center's work, the Center early in 1952 outlined a research proposal which became the basis for this study. The proposal was drawn up in consultation with the Social Science Research Council, and was submitted to the Carnegie Corporation, a private philanthropic foundation, which awarded the Center a research grant to finance the study.

In carrying out this project, the Center is working closely with a committee of the Social Science Research Council. This committee is composed of political and social scientists in various parts of the country who are particularly interested in the area of political behavior. This arrangement gives some indication of the widespread interest the survey is arousing in many quarters.

# STUDY OBJECTIVES

The general objective of this research is to expand our knowledge of political behavior, particularly voting behavior. The study has been designed to help us to fulfill the following six objectives:

1. To describe voters and non-voters, Republicans and Democrats, in terms of their personal data (age, sex, occupation, etc.), in terms of their ideas regarding the parties and candidates, and their opinions on certain political issues. The information from your interviews will make possible a rather full description of the characteristics of the supporters of the two parties, and how they differ from those of non-voters. The analysis of the non-voters should give information on an important question: why do people stay away from the polls?
2. To compare these groups to the corresponding groups in the 1948 presidential election. This comparison should throw some light on how different political climates affect the political behavior of the various groups of voters and non-voters; which groups (farmers, businessmen, etc.) increased or decreased their proportions of voters from one election to the next, etc.
3. To trace the presidential vote, with particular attention to the undecided and changing voters. This would concern mainly those people who do not have a commitment to one party or the other which determines their vote. Study of their movement from indecision to decision (or to non-voting) will point out factors affecting the final division of the vote. Study in this area will also answer such questions as: what effect do the groups a person sees himself belonging to have on his vote or his decision not to vote?
4. To study the nature of political party identification. It is pretty well accepted that the groups an individual sees himself belonging to very often exert an influence on his attitudes. However, there has been very little research done on the political side of this area. This objective deals with such questions as: if a person identifies strongly with a political party, what effect does this have on his political behavior? How does this compare with those persons who don't identify with any political party?
5. To learn more about the nature of citizen political participation. This, of course, is a basic objective of the study. Together with information on this topic from other surveys, we will study some of the ways the individual sees himself in relation to the government, his ideas of his opportunities and duties as a citizen, and his activities as a part of the political life of the nation.
6. To study the impact of the activities of the major parties on the population. This objective calls for a description of the activities of the parties as seen and reported by our sample respondents. Most of the material for this objective will be obtained on the post-election interview.

## DESIGN OF THE STUDY

As we were planning out the study objectives and the things we will have to do to fulfill them, it became apparent that we will need to interview both before and after the election. It is necessary to do this if we want to get a full story on voting activity. As plans for the reinterview survey stand now (September), all respondents on the pre-election study will be reinterviewed -- with the exception of a few Western sample points where the reinterview sample will be cut. (Will send special memos to those of you in the West who are involved.)

The plan calls for most of the information of the study to be obtained from the pre-election interview, and for a briefer interview with the same respondents immediately after the election. The purpose of the reinterview will be to catch last minute shifts, to determine what factors influence people's vote at the last minute, to determine how the undecided people finally voted, etc.

As you can see from the study objectives outlined above, these surveys will not concern themselves with a prediction of the presidential vote, which, although a matter of popular interest, is not in itself especially pertinent to the research objectives outlined above. The study will be very different from the presidential popularity polls. Although we ask each respondent how he is going to vote, we are not trying to predict the election, but merely to study what happens. There will not be any public release as to how our sample expects to vote. There will, of course, be a very elaborate analysis after the interviews are in of why some people vote one way and some the other.

A word on the analysis: because of the importance of the subject, special attention will be given to the analysis of your interviews on these two surveys. We expect to devote at least a year and a half to this phase of the project.

## II. INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

### WHOM TO INTERVIEW

Since this study requires that we talk with a cross section of adult (voting age, which in all states except Georgia will be 21) citizens within households in the population, we will use the procedure described under "Sampling With Selection Tables" in your Interview Notebook, pages 28-31, inclusive. If you have not had much practice in using the selection table procedure, it will be especially important for you to read carefully this section of the Interviewer Notebook. The accuracy of the sample will depend, in large part, on the accuracy with which you carry out the sampling procedure.

### Determining Who Is To Be Interviewed

In order to locate the proper respondents to be interviewed, it will be necessary for you to do two things:

1. Locate all Dwelling Units in the sample.
2. At each Dwelling Unit use the selection table on the Face Sheet to determine who is to be the respondent.

Each Dwelling Unit in the sample must have a Face Sheet filled out, regardless of the outcome of your contact with the occupants. We have prepared almost all of the Face Sheets for you in advance (in doing this, we used the Listing Sheets from your sample point). However, there will be a few cases where you'll need to fill in the Face Sheet address yourself: as in the case where there is an "extra" Dwelling Unit other than the one specified at the top of the Face Sheet, and also when you find a Dwelling Unit between the sample address and the next listed address. (See instruction on Face Sheet)

After locating a specific Dwelling Unit, you will need to list in the chart on the left side of the Face Sheet all persons in the Dwelling Unit who are 21 years of age and over (except in the state of Georgia where the interviewer should list persons 18 years and over). Then use the Selection Table on that particular Face Sheet to select the respondent.

# We Don't Interview Non-Citizens

IN THIS STUDY, WE DON'T WANT TO INTERVIEW PEOPLE WHO ARE NON-CITIZENS. In order to eliminate non-citizens, we have included the following two questions on the Face Sheet:

- c. Was R born in the U.S.?
- d. (IF NO) Is he (she) a U.S. citizen?

These questions should be asked after you have filled out the chart on the Face Sheet and selected the respondent. You do not need to ask the questions of the respondent himself; they can be asked of the person who provides the information on the Dwelling Unit composition.

If you find that the person who was selected is not a citizen of the U.S., you should cross his name off the Dwelling Unit composition chart, and select a new respondent. In doing this, you will need to find out whether there are any other non-citizens, and if so, cross their names off the chart. After you have done this, re-number the remaining persons in the usual way, and select the new respondent. Unfortunately, this is a rather complicated procedure; however, only 2 to 3% of the U.S. population are non-citizens, and you will not run into this problem very often.

In determining who is to be interviewed, be sure that all voting age citizens at the Dwelling Unit are listed on the Face Sheet, even though they may not be registered to vote, haven't paid their poll tax, etc.

## YOUR INTRODUCTION

The introduction you use for this study should pose no special problems. The subject of the interview, i.e., the election, has, of course, been given prominence in the paper, on the radio and television, as well as in the movies, and it is a subject your respondents are certainly aware of -- even though some of them will not have a great deal of information or ideas on it.

You won't be sure when someone opens the door that this is the person you are actually to interview. Because you will first have to find out how many adults live in the Dwelling Unit and which one is to be interviewed, it will probably be easier to give a fairly general introduction. You might want to use something like the following:

"I'm \_\_\_\_\_ from the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. We're doing a survey -- talking with people here and all over the country to find out something on how they feel about the election and important questions of the day. Like many of the surveys you read about, we get a number of people from the whole country, and more or less talk over the questions we have with them. I believe we sent a letter about the survey to this address. We want to be sure, though, that we

## YOUR INTRODUCTION (Continued)

"talk with the right number of men, women, young people, and so forth; so we have a special way that picks the person we're to talk with in each household, once we know something about how many people live there. Can you tell me how many adults live here?"

Although your introduction to the person who comes to the door will probably not be as detailed as it is in the case of the respondent himself, you will probably need to handle this situation as diplomatically as you would handle the introductory situation with the actual respondent, since non-interviews sometimes come about not because of the actual respondent's refusal, but because the person who came to the door refused to cooperate.

## What To Tell the Respondent

After you have determined who the respondent is, and have made contact with him, you will have to give another introduction (if he wasn't present), this time getting more specific. If the respondent turns out to be the person who answered the door, it will be merely a case of continuing your introduction and getting more specific. In any case, there are several points that should be gotten over to the respondent himself sometime during the interview:

1. Explain the auspices of the survey. You should introduce yourself as an employee of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, a non-profit organization which does nation-wide surveys on topics of national importance.
2. Explain how the respondent happened to be chosen, and the anonymity of the interview. You may say something like this: "You see, in trying to find out what the people think, we don't talk with everyone, but we try to talk to men and women of different ages, in all walks of life. We use a map of the city and take certain blocks from it at different places all over the city," or "We use a map of the country-side, and take certain sections from all over the country. In each block (or open country segment) we stop at every so manyth house. We're not interested in knowing people's names at all."
3. Explain the importance of the survey, and give the respondent some idea of how it will be used. For some people, merely saying that the Center is interested in knowing how the public feels about issues of the day, is not very satisfactory. For such people, you will need to pick out things to say which, in the light of what little you know about the respondent, you think will appeal to him. If necessary, explain that the findings of the study will be published for the general good, and will be made available to everyone interested in public opinion on the election, including universities, social scientists, and the general public (respondents too!). In particular,

### YOUR INTRODUCTION (Continued)

social scientists will use the findings to learn more about people's political behavior and ideas, and how democracy works. A point you may want to add is that the study will doubtless be quoted in the newspapers and over the radio after the election.

You will have to adapt your introductory remarks to the particular respondent, to the type of language he uses, to the kinds of things he seems to want to know about, etc. With some respondents you may feel the need to go into some detail; with others, you can get an interview with only a basic explanation of the above-mentioned points. Whenever additional explanation is necessary, the only thing to watch is that you don't give out specific information or express opinions that will be called for later in the interview.

### Answering Respondents' Questions

In many cases, you'll no doubt find that the letter sent to respondents before the survey will be of some help; the "Why Ask Me?" folder will also be an aid. You'll have extra copies of these documents to carry with you in case they are needed (in some cases we didn't have enough information about the address to mail the letter). In this regard, the "Staff Letter," the little newsletter which we have sent you from time to time, may be of help in giving you a background of knowledge about the Center's work from which you can draw to answer any questions your respondents may ask you.

Sometimes in a survey of this sort, people respond to the introduction by saying that they haven't had much education, or that they don't know about "issues of the day." In this type of case, it is important to put the respondent at ease immediately by assuring him that education makes no difference at all, that we are doing a survey of public opinion and there are no right or wrong answers, and that we are interested in everyone's feelings about it. If we wanted expert or technical information, we would go to experts. A modest statement like, "I don't know much about such things, either," may help.

Try to make it clear that the respondent is kept anonymous in a national study like this one. Tell him how his answers go in with two thousand others, and how no names are used. Emphasize the importance of his ideas in the way they represent the ideas of many other people. ("We study the ideas of a cross section of the people, and put these together to know something about the whole country.") Thus, the emphasis on "survey" serves to reassure the respondent as to his anonymity, and helps to keep him from feeling that he alone has been selected to answer the questions. You may, of course, explain as much about our sampling as the respondents wish. We believe our procedures to be the best so far devised, and the more our respondents know about it, the more they will realize this. Their cooperation depends, in part, on their confidence in us, which is always increased by frankness and honesty. This includes saying you don't know about something when this is true. We will give you any additional information you want, for yourself or for respondents.

### Sponsorship of the Survey

As far as the sponsorship of the survey is concerned, the Survey Research Center is the sponsor. As a means of financing the study, the Center was awarded a Research Grant by the Carnegie Corporation, a private philanthropic foundation which is interested in financing various types of research which is in the public interest. Under a Research Grant arrangement, the Center is allowed complete freedom in planning and carrying out the study. Thus, for all practical purposes, the Center is the sponsor, and you will probably not want to complicate your introduction too much by explaining this arrangement (although, feel free to do so if it will aid rapport). However, you might want to mention the fact that a special committee of political and social scientists of the Social Science Research Council is working closely with the Center in the planning of the survey and the analysis of the results. In any case, it goes without saying that the Center, as a research agency, is impartial and neutral in regard to the election; the role of the Center and its staff is that of an objective collector of facts about where the public stands.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER  
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

DIVISION OF THE  
INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

September, 1952

Dear Sir:

Every few months the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan carries out a nation-wide survey of the American people. We are interested in their ideas and opinions on important questions of the day.

Within the next few weeks we will be interviewing men and women all over the country in our fall survey. We have selected 2,000 addresses, chosen by scientific methods of sampling, for our interviewers to visit. Your address has turned up as one of these 2,000.

At each address we want to interview one person, sometimes the man of the house, sometimes the housewife, sometimes a grown son or daughter living at home. We do not know anyone's name and will not ask for it. All interviews are entirely confidential. I am enclosing a folder that tells about our research.

An interviewer, carrying proper identification as an employee of the University of Michigan, will call at your home sometime within the next three or four weeks. I feel sure that you, or the member of the household selected, will find this visit interesting and worthwhile. Our interviewer will be glad to answer any questions you have about the Center or the purpose of our surveys.

Sincerely yours,

  
Angus Campbell  
Director

AC:jls  
Encl.

(Note to interviewers: This is a copy of the letter sent to respondents. You will have some extra copies for your own use. Notice that the letter does not indicate that the interview is concerned with the election, but is simply a general introduction. Our experience in 1948 and in pretesting this year indicates that the election will be a very popular subject of conversation for respondents.)

-11-

WHAT TO DO ABOUT REINTERVIEWS

The fact that we will reinterview should cause you no special concern, as it is a procedure that is frequently followed by survey organizations. Some organizations, in fact, go back again and again to the same respondents in an effort to follow changes in respondent opinion over a considerable period of time. This repeated reinterview procedure is sometimes called a "Panel Study." Although the Center hasn't done this type of study, some of you may have worked on a Panel Study for other organizations. However, as far as a single reinterview is concerned, in past years we have done several reinterview studies (some of you may have worked on these), and no special problems were indicated. The most recent of these was a reinterview study in May and June in the Detroit area where we contacted 300 respondents from a former survey.

Although posing no real problems, a reinterview study, however, does require that:

1. we be able accurately to re-locate the respondent, and
2. pay special attention to respondent rapport.

On that first point, we have found that it is sometimes difficult to re-locate the respondent for the reinterview, both in urban and rural areas. To help you re-locate respondents in open country areas, we are sending to those of you with rural interviews an "Open Country Reinterview Sheet" on which you can record the location of each of your rural interviews (instructions for the use of this sheet will be printed on it). You will be able to use this sheet during the reinterview study in re-locating open country respondents. For city and town reinterviews, we will record on the reinterview survey Face Sheets, information about the respondent and his address which will aid you. In this regard, when you make your pre-election contact with the respondent, write on the Face Sheet any information which will help you or another interviewer re-locate the respondent for the reinterview. We will be sure to include your notes on the reinterview survey Face Sheet before we sent it to the field in November. If you are in a sample point with several interviewers, remember that some other interviewer may be called upon to take some of these reinterviews, and extra information will be of aid to him.

On the second point, that of respondent rapport, since we want the respondent's cooperation in November, we will need to maintain a high level of rapport in the original interview. The respondent needs to be sold on the importance of the interview, and when you leave him, he should have a good feeling toward the interview, and toward you as a sympathetic listener -- even if this means that you have to stay and chat with him a little.

Do not tell your respondents that you expect to be back again after the election. It is essential that no indication of the second interview be given, since we feel sure that if people know you are planning to come back, they will begin to study the newspapers in order to have "right answers" ready for you when you return.

NON-INTERVIEWS

We are especially anxious that we get a very high rate of return on the sample. We have paid special attention to several factors in order to accomplish this goal. The respondent letters and "Why Ask Me?" folder should be of help in this regard. We are also asking that you make call-backs to get interviews at at least 90% of your addresses (see section on Number of Calls). There is no doubt that some people will refuse and some people will be too sick to interview, and some will be away from home. But we are especially anxious to get every respondent who is available. In 1948 we succeeded in getting interviews from over 90% of the addresses which made up the sample. We want to equal that record this time and, if possible, do even better.

In those cases where you do get a non-interview, we will need to get some information about each non-interview, and we are using the back side of the Face Sheet for this purpose. When you get a non-interview, be sure to fill in the callback information on the front of the Face Sheet, and the non-interview information on the back of the Face Sheet. The non-interview information is of four types:

1. Check off the reason for non-interview.
2. If the non-interview is a refusal, check off the sex, race, estimated age, education and income of the would-be respondent wherever possible.
3. Give a detailed account of the story behind the refusal (or "other" reason for non-interview), and of the situation in which it occurred. Put this on the lower half of the back of the Face Sheet. In the case of a refusal, this writeup should include information on such items as: a description of how he refused; why you think he refused; the possibility of getting an interview at this address after the election; any other information which will be of aid in case we decide to contact this address again.
4. In the case of some non-interviews you may have some information which is pertinent to the questionnaire questions; if so, put this information in the writeup of the non-interview. For example, a potential respondent may refuse to be interviewed but may remark to you that he is a Democrat, or that he wants to vote for Eisenhower. Be sure to write up afterwards such statements as these.

It is important that you include the information on non-interviews for two reasons: the information will be of much value in the analysis; it is always important to assess the characteristics of the people we missed. This information will also aid us and yourself in case it is decided that we need to revisit non-interview addresses during the re-interview survey.

## III. FIELD NOTES

NUMBER OF CALLS

As usual, we would like to have a total of four calls made at all urban addresses (i.e., three call backs after the initial one). In open country segments, two call backs or a total of three calls should be made before an address is ready to be called a non-interview.

After all the required calls have been completed, we would like to have you compute the response percentage. This is done by: 1) adding the number of Vacancies, Addresses Not Dwellings, No Such Numbers, and cases of no citizen over 21 living there; 2) subtracting that total from the total number of addresses to be accounted for; and 3) dividing the number of interviews taken by the figure obtained in Step 2. If, after doing this, you find that you have less than 90% response, additional calls should be made at all of your NAHs, RAs, etc. This should be continued until at least 90% has been reached. If it appears, for any reason, that you will be unable to reach 90%, please notify the office immediately.

Notice that we have raised the response percentage from the usual 85% to 90%. We are doing this because on this study it will be especially important to keep the number of non-interviews low. Also, at least one call on NAHs (not-at-home) and RAs (respondent absent) should be made in the evening. Keep a record of each call with its result on the form at the bottom of the Face Sheet.

As is customary on studies where Sampling with selection tables is used, some attempt has been made to cluster certain selection tables within blocks in order to improve the efficiency of your calls (see Page 31, Note 2 in your Interviewer's Notebook). Late afternoon or evening calls will probably be most successful on those blocks which have Face Sheets with Selection Tables designated A, B, or C. On the other hand, morning and afternoon calls will probably be successful for blocks having D, E, and F Selection Tables.

REVIEW OF INTERVIEWS

As soon after September 15 as possible, please take one or two interviews and send them to the office by Air Mail so that we can review them as early in the field operation as possible. We are following this procedure in lieu of practice interviews. After reviewing your first interviews, if there seem to be any problems with them, we will get a letter off to you immediately.

#### THUMBNAIL SKETCH

In those cases where you have information about the respondent, aside from what's on the questionnaire, which you think will aid us in understanding him and his answers, please include a Thumbnail Sketch with the interview. In particular, include in the Sketch anything that was unusual about the respondent, or anything that made the interview an unusual interviewing situation.

For example, on the way out to the door the respondent might give you additional information which he hadn't mentioned during the interview; or he might have had a foreign language difficulty in answering your questions; he might have a close relative who is very active in local politics, etc. Information such as this will make possible increased understanding of the interview, the respondent and his political behavior. In addition, if you have any information which you think will be helpful in approaching the respondent for the reinterview, please include that also.

#### PREPARING INTERVIEWS FOR MAILING

You will notice that we are using a write-in type of questionnaire for this survey in an effort to complete the job as efficiently and as economically as possible. Many of the questions can be answered by a single word or a short phrase. It is very likely, however, that some of your respondents will get wound up and deliver extensive speeches on some of these questions. We have tried to leave space which, according to the pretesting, should take care of any ordinary answers. But if you feel that the respondent is giving relevant information, take it down on the back of the page, in the margin, or on an extra sheet (make a note wherever you have done this so we will be sure to catch all of the information you have gotten for us).

Any system you have found that works best for you in conserving writeup time and energy will be all right with us. We would like to emphasize, though, that the use of the write-in form does not mean that we want summaries of the respondents' answers, or that we can afford to have relevant material omitted. There will be many interviews that you can send in without having to rewrite. This is advantageous, of course, because it reduces the cost of interviewing. In a few cases you will probably find it impossible to take a legible record during the interview, and these will have to be rewritten. The general rule is to rewrite only those answers which are illegible. In any case, you will need to give each interview a brief final checking to see that it is complete.

In order that the interviews from the field may keep up with the coding here in the office, we would like you to mail your interviews promptly. Please do not let more than three interviews pile up before mailing them.

#### PROGRESS REPORT

As the interviewing proceeds, we will send out forms for you to report the progress of your interviewing. This will give us a picture of how all the counties are getting along. Will you please return these forms to us promptly. In case any special difficulties come up, such as interruptions in interviewing, circumstances that may interfere with your finishing on time, etc., we must depend on you to write, phone or wire us immediately.

#### STUDY DEADLINE

The time schedule for this study provides one month for the interviewing. That is, with the exception of those few respondents who are temporarily unavailable, the interviewing should be completed by October 12. The period from October 12-24 should be used only to pick up respondents who have been out of town or who were otherwise unavailable. We are allowing this extra time to be sure that we will get at least a 90% response rate. The final day for mailing interviews to the office is October 24.

It is absolutely imperative that the interviewing be completed on time because we will be reinterviewing the respondents immediately after the election, and will need all your pre-election interviews in the office at least a week and a half before that time in order to prepare the materials for the reinterview. If you are able to finish your interviewing well ahead of schedule, that will be all the better for it will give us more time to carry out the big job we have to do in preparing for the reinterview survey.

### III. QUESTION-BY-QUESTION OBJECTIVES

The process we went through in putting together this questionnaire was roughly as follows: first, we wrote out several pages of detailed objectives enumerating every piece of information we wanted to get. Then, questions were constructed which were designed to elicit these items of information from the respondents; the questions were then put together in a conversational, respondent-centered sequence, and the questionnaire was put through pretest interviewing in various parts of the country. The questionnaire was then revised on the basis of the pretest experiences. This process was repeated several times until we arrived at the present form.

You will see from the questionnaire that there are several main areas of information that we will want to cover. Before taking up each question in detail below, let us sketch in the various sections to give you an overall view of the questionnaire and interview. After the beginning questions, which should make possible an easy entrance to the interview, we launch into a comparison of the two parties (3-9). Then, there follows a comparison of the two candidates (10-17). After two or three questions on personal interest in the election and the campaign (18-20), there follows a series of questions on national issues which will be important in the campaign (21-27). This brings us to a rather long and detailed section on what we call "party identification" (28, series, 29). Next there is a series of questions on the respondent's voting history, how he expects to vote, and how he thinks other people will vote in the election (30-46). Finally, there is a series of statements intended to measure the respondent's sense of obligation to vote, and his feeling that he, as a voter, has some real influence on politics (47-49). The personal data sheet is unusually long, but there should be no difficulty with the items included in it.

**Questions 1 and 2.** These first two questions are aimed at getting R's expectations about the presidential race. We are interested in finding out who R thinks will win the election, and how close he thinks the contest will be. Because of the electoral college system, we ask about the presidential race in R's state as well as the contest in the nation as a whole.

There are a couple of things to watch out for in the responses to these two questions. We are interested in how R thinks the election will go, not how he hopes it will go. We are also interested in how much R thinks one candidate will win by. This is clearly asked for in Question 1a with regard to the race in the nation as a whole, but is not as clearly called for in Question 2. If R's answer to Question 2 does not indicate how close he thinks the race in his state will be, you might use the same probe for the state race as was used in 1a. (For example, if the response to Question 2 is "More people will vote for Eisenhower," ask "Do you think it will be a close race here in (your state) or do you think Eisenhower will win by quite a bit?")

We are not interested in R's reasons for expecting one candidate or the other to win, or why he thinks the race will or will not be close. Write down reasons that are volunteered, but do not probe for them.

### 1952 Election Study (R400)

#### Interviewer Instructions: Pre-election Questionnaire

**Questions 1 and 2.** These first two questions are aimed at getting R's expectations about the presidential race. We are interested in finding out who R thinks will win the election, and how close he thinks the contest will be. Because of the electoral college system, we ask about the presidential race in R's state as well as the contest in the nation as a whole.

There are a couple of things to watch out for in the responses to these two questions. We are interested in how R thinks the election will go, not how he hopes it will go. We are also interested in how much R thinks one candidate will win by. This is clearly asked for in Question 1a with regard to the race in the nation as a whole, but is not as clearly called for in Question 2. If R's answer to Question 2 does not indicate how close he thinks the race in his state will be, you might use the same probe for the state race as was used in 1a. (For example, if the response to Question 2 is "More people will vote for Eisenhower," ask "Do you think it will be a close race here in (your state) or do you think Eisenhower will win by quite a bit?")

We are not interested in R's reasons for expecting one candidate or the other to win, or why he thinks the race will or will not be close. Write down reasons that are volunteered, but do not probe for them.

**Question 3.** In this question, we are only interested in whether or not R thinks there are important differences between the two parties. We are not interested in why he thinks the parties are or are not different, or what the differences consist of. We feel we will get that information in the questions that follow, particularly Questions 4-8. Write down information that is volunteered, but do not probe for it.

**Questions 4 through 7.** In this series of questions we ask the R about the things he likes and doesn't like about the two parties. 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, after the first response to each question (4 through 7), use such probes as "any other things you like (don't like) about the Democratic (Republican) party?", "anything else?", etc.

We need to get responses that are as specific as possible. Thus, if R says he agrees with a party's stand on issues, probe for examples of such issues; if he says it's a "better" party, probe for why it's better; if he talks in terms of a party catering to "special interest groups," probe for the particular groups he has in mind; if he says he doesn't like a party's "economy" program, probe as to why he doesn't like it, etc.

We'd also like you to probe a little behind some of the standard adjectives, clichés and slogans that are used. When R gives such responses as "the \_\_\_\_\_ party is more progressive," "conservative," "socialistic," "time

---

\*R refers to respondent.

for a change," "party of the working man," "better for the country," 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.

In probing on these questions, we're interested in getting at material that is meaningful to the respondents. We don't want to probe to the extent that the respondents will just start grabbing wildly for answers; we also don't want to probe so much that it causes irritation and hurts rapport. For example, if R talks in very general terms and has difficulty being more specific, don't probe too hard for specificity. We do want to give him the opportunity to be specific so that we can say whether or not he is able to think in such terms, but we don't want to force him to give us specific examples. In general, in Questions 4-7, use your judgment as to just how much meaningful material the respondent has to give on these questions.

There's one thing you might watch out for in this series. We used the term "in particular" in these questions to get at things which R considers important about the parties. However, there might be some danger that R will answer "nothing in particular" because there are a number of things he likes or dislikes about the parties, none of which stand out particularly. Therefore, when you get such a response and feel that R actually might have some for or against feelings about the parties, repeat the question without using the phrase "in particular."

Question 8. This question is asked to find out whether R thinks the election outcome will or will not have much effect on what will happen in the country. This is asked in addition to Questions 5-7 because it's possible for a person to see the two parties as very different, and to have a strong preference for one party, even though he doesn't think it will really make much difference which party wins.

Question 8a. is to be asked if R thinks that it will make a difference which party wins. Under Question 8a, we'd like to get the specific ways in which R thinks the election result will affect what happens in the country; that is, we'd like to get his ideas of the specific results of one party or the other winning the election ("Business will be better if the Republicans win," or "If the Democrats get in we're more likely to have peace," etc.) Responses such as "Things will be better if the Republicans win," or "The Democratic foreign policy is better," etc., are too vague and should be probed (for example, "In what way will things be better if the Republicans win?" or "How would you feel the Democratic foreign policy is better?" or general probes like "How do you mean?" or "What do you have in mind there?"). In any event, be sure to find out which party he's talking about. The response "It will mean the difference between war and peace" is too vague because he doesn't mention which party he has in mind.

In the pre-tests, Rs frequently indicated by their responses to 8a whether they thought a Republican or Democratic victory would be better for the country. In some cases, however, respondents stated that something would happen following a Democratic or Republican victory -- however, it wasn't clear whether they thought this would be good or bad for the country; in such cases a probe should be used. ("Do you think this would be good or bad for the country, or what?")

Question 9. In this question we are interested in finding out whether R sees the election result as having consequences for his own personal financial interest, not for the country as a whole. In those cases where financial consequences of the election are mentioned in response to Question 9, but it is not clear whether these are seen as good or bad for R personally, 9a should be asked as a probe.

Questions 10 through 13. These questions get at R's likes and dislikes about both candidates. Notice that this series parallels the 4-7 series, with emphasis here on candidates rather than parties. Here, too, we are interested in getting a fairly complete picture, so that the same instructions and problems mentioned under 4-7 are pertinent here. Phrases such as "he's a good man," and "he's a good leader," etc., should be probed for more specific feelings.

Notice that these questions are phrased in terms of characteristics that "would make you want to vote for (or against) him." This wording might cause a problem in that R might have strong favorable feelings toward a candidate but not indicate them on these questions because he doesn't intend to vote for the candidate. Therefore, if R answers Question 10 by saying something like "I'm not voting for Stevenson," you might rephrase the question and ask, "Well, is there anything you like about Stevenson?" Here's the kind of interview conversation you might have on Question 10 or 12:

"I think he'd do a lot more for the country." ("How do you mean there?")

"I mean financially." ("In what way?") "Oh, I think he'd stop the government from spending so much money."

Question 14. In this question we are interested in having R attempt to divorce the candidates from their parties and indicate a preference for one candidate or the other. In many cases, the answers to this question will be obvious from the responses to Questions 10-13 preceding it. However, in cases where Rs have indicated positive feelings toward both candidates, or have spoken of the candidates only as party representatives, the response to Question 14 will give us new information.

In Question 14 we are not interested in getting R's reasons for preferring one candidate over the other. In most cases we feel this would only repeat material obtained in the responses to Questions 10-13. Write down reasons that are volunteered, but do not probe for them.

Questions 15 and 16. In these questions we are interested in finding out whether people see Eisenhower as different from what they consider to be a "real Republican." We are assuming that many people who have some unfavorable feelings toward the Republican Party will support Eisenhower only if they see him as somehow different from their idea of a "typical" Republican. Also, some old line Republicans may withdraw support from Eisenhower because they do not think he is a dependable Republican.

Eisenhower can be thought of as different from "real Republicans" in a number of ways. Some people may talk of him as different because he's not a party man, others may talk of him as different because he's "above politics," others may think of him as different in his ideas and the things he stands for (e.g., he's an internationalist whereas the "real Republican"

is an "isolationist," he's more "liberal" in his domestic policies, etc.).

To catch all these possible ways of thinking of Eisenhower as similar to (or different from) a "real Republican," Question 15 is phrased in a fairly open-ended way. However, we are particularly interested in whether respondents see Eisenhower as similar to (or different from) most Republicans in his ideas and the things he stands for, and what differences or similarities they see. Therefore, if Question 15 is not answered in terms of Eisenhower's ideas and the things he stands for, Question 16 should be asked. In Question 16 we are not only interested in whether R sees Eisenhower as different from (or similar to) most Republicans in his ideas, but in what ways he is seen as similar or different. That is, what ideas? What issues? Etc.

Some respondents may have trouble with Question 15. If they ask what we mean by a "real Republican" get them to try to think in terms of their own definition -- don't define it for them. If they find the question too vague to answer, don't attempt to force an answer, but go on to Question 16.

Question 16. Our primary objective is to determine whether Ike is seen as inheriting the past policies of the Republican party. Of course, this question will be most useful if specific information about particular issues or problems is mentioned. If the R can only give indications of a vague feeling that Ike is not the same as other Republicans, we still don't know whether this is merely lack of information, "rationalization" for an attitude other than on his policies, or an accurate picture of how Ike's policies are seen as related to Republican policies. The more specific the information can be, the better we will know what the answer means.

Question 17. Here, again, R's ability to name the Veep candidates is important. It is a crude indication of his information about them. Other than finding out if the respondent knows who the candidates are, we want to find those people who have opinions about the candidates which might affect their voting decision. Consequently, it is important to know whether a strong opinion or feeling about either candidate is a favorable or an unfavorable feeling; is the respondent attracted or repelled by the candidate he mentions? Neutral probes may be needed in some cases.

Questions 18 and 19. Here we want only the direct information called for by the questions. Do not probe for reasons why these elections are or are not important. Using your own judgment, try to make sure that the respondent answers in terms of how much he cares, how important it is to him, and not in terms of how important it is to the country, as in Question 8. One problem on these questions might be that some respondents feel embarrassed in saying they don't care who wins. Try to make such people feel at ease so they can give you their real feeling.

Question 20. Try to pin the respondent down to one of the three categories offered in the question. Again, we are not interested here in "why" his interest or lack of interest, but we do want to be able to put him in one of the three categories of interest (very much, somewhat, or not much interested).

Question 21. This is intended to get at basic attitudes toward government activity in social welfare. In general, does R favor government activity

in areas like these, or does he tend to dislike the idea? There may be a tendency for respondents to pick out one of the specific items mentioned and talk at length on the single problem area. This is all right if it is done by the respondent to give you an example of how he feels more generally. However, where needed, repeat the question or use an additional summarizing probe to make sure that R is thinking in general terms. You could probe by re-asking the last sentence in the question, or by asking "In general, do you think it's a good idea that the government does this type of thing, or not?"

Questions 21a (and 21a). From each of these questions, we would like to get enough information to allow us to say: 1) R sees (or does not see) a real difference between the parties, and 2) where differences are seen, R thinks the Democrats feel there should be more (or less) of this kind of government activity and the Republicans feel there should be less (or more) or whatever the case may be.

In other words, we want a clear comparison between the parties. This means that if R says, "Oh, the Democrats would do more," further probing would be necessary to find out whether he means they would do more than the Republicans would do, or whether he means they would do more than is now being done. An answer such as "The Democrats don't think the government has done enough, but the Republicans think the government has done too much already" would give us all the needed information. Another good response would be, "The Republicans think way too much has been done, and I think the Democrats themselves would like to cut down on it a little." Where only one party is mentioned in the response, probe to find out what the other party thinks.

Question 22. Here our primary objective is to get attitudes of support or opposition for government action on something like FEPC. Does the R favor government action on this problem or not? In addition to this primary objective, we would like to have a relatively complete picture of the respondent's thinking about various approaches to the race problem. The additional probes are intended to explore various types of governmental action, and whether R favors state action or federal government action. In Question 22, if R feels the government should stay out of the problem, ask Question 22d. If he says that the government should take an interest in the problem, ask Question 22a, and follow it with either 22b or 22c.

Question 23. This is a repeat of a question used in the 1948 election study. At that time a large portion of the respondents knew nothing about the Taft-Hartley Law. The initial question here is intended to screen these people out for us; the probes which follow will provide information about those people who do know about the Taft-Hartley Law.

In 1948 only a fraction of one per cent of the people wanted the Taft-Hartley Law changed in favor of management. This number may be larger now, or it may have completely disappeared. Any respondent comments which indicate the way he'd like to see the Law changed (for example, more pro-labor or pro-management) should be noted together with his specific response on how much change he wants.

Question 24. This question is used to get at R's basic attitudes toward American foreign policy. The question is a slightly altered version of a question which we have used in many other studies. Does the R think

the United States is paying too much attention to problems in other parts of the world, or not? Notice that the question is followed by the same probe as follows Question 21. The objective of the probe remains the same.

Question 21a. See Question 21a.

Question 25. This issue is, of course, being hotly debated. Our pre-test experience indicates that many respondents will have rather strong feelings on it, one way or the other. A few respondents will not know much about this area, and will tell you so; however, even if they have only slight leanings one way or the other on the question, we'd like to get some indication of that. Thus, in many cases you will need to encourage them to give their opinion, even if they feel it isn't worth much.

Question 26. You will recognize this as another question which is an issue in the presidential campaign. Notice that the question does not refer to what we should do at present in Korea; it refers, rather, to whether or not we did the right thing two years ago in getting into the fighting there. If R volunteers any of his ideas about what should be done at present, take these down, but don't probe for them. We don't need an extended discussion on this question; but in any case we do need his idea of whether we should have gotten into Korea or not.

Question 27. In Question 26 we ask whether we did the right thing in the first place in Korea. Question 27 asks what R thinks we should do now in Korea, aside from the rightness or wrongness of what we did in the past. We are providing you with a card to use for this question; the procedure is to ask the question first, and then show the R the card, letting him pick one of the alternatives. If you have any reason to believe R cannot read, be sure to read to him the full question at least once. If in deciding on an alternative, R makes any comments pertinent to the question or qualifying his choice, write these down in the lines provided.

Questions 21 through 27. NOTE: In using the questions on issues (21-27) you will, of course, run into a few respondents who feel they don't know enough about the issues to answer the questions. However, R's knowledge about the issues is not the point behind these questions; Questions 21-27 are not meant to measure R's information on these topics, as such. The questions are, instead, meant to determine which side of the argument R tends to take. Therefore, your problem will be to make sure that all Rs with opinions on these issues will feel free to give these opinions, regardless of the amount of specific knowledge they have. If you sense that R feels a little awkward, reassure him by saying something like: "Some of these questions are '64-dollar' questions, and it is pretty hard to know all the facts, so we're just trying to get people's rough idea on it." etc. If it's obvious that R has no opinion on a topic, don't push him too hard; however, make sure he does have no idea of which side of the argument he'd take.

Question 28. Here we are attempting to measure the respondent's "party identification." By party identification we mean a person's feeling of attachment or belonging to a party. It is something over and above his merely supporting the party because he approves of its policies or its stand on issues.

The question is intended to pin down the respondent's "usual" or customary sense of party affiliation, not particularly how he intends to vote in this election. This means that a response such as "Oh, I have been a Democrat off and on, but I really don't know about this year" classifies the respondent as a Democrat (probably, in 28a, a not very strong Democrat), and not as an Independent. The people who are deviating from a usual party will be identified by later questions, but at this point we want to know if they have a "usual" party.

On the pretests, a few respondents shied away from the question with responses such as "I am an American." Such evasions should be probed further with something such as "Well, a lot of us who feel that we are good Americans also think of ourselves as Democrats, Republicans and so forth. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself . . . ."

A one-word answer may be perfectly adequate for 28. A line is available, however, for the comments of respondents who qualify their answers. For Rs who say "Republican" or "Democrat," ask Questions 28a through 28d.

Question 28a. Again, the question refers to his customary or usual feelings about strength of party attachment. If R mentions a change in his feelings toward a party, be sure to record that information. In asking the question, use "Republican" or "Democrat" (parentheses in question) depending upon R's statement in Question 28.

Question 28b. This question, of course, is to determine whether R ever thought of himself as identified with the opposite party. This information is necessary since we're trying to get a rather full history of his party identification. In using the question, if he has said that he's a Republican, ask him if he ever thought of himself as a Democrat; if he has said that he's a Democrat, ask him if he ever thought of himself as a Republican.

Question 28c. This is another question on the history of his party identification. Here we are interested in getting exact and accurate dates, but we will settle for more general information as to the period when the changes occurred, such as "right after the Hoover depression" or "after Dewey got beat the first time." If they talk in terms of a man who was active in more than one campaign, such as Hoover, Dewey, Roosevelt, etc., try to get the particular term or campaign they are thinking of. If "when Hoover ran," try to pin down the date, was it 1928 or 1932?

Question 28d. This question gives us a rough idea of the strength of his party identification. The respondent may be reluctant to choose one of the three alternatives without qualifying them in some manner. Write in the margin any comments he makes, but emphasize that we want the one which comes closest, and try to force a choice. If alternative 3 is chosen, Question 28e becomes very important because it gives a "party identifier" who wants to be a reasonable and intelligent citizen (and vote for the best man) a chance to tell us if he feels any conflict or has any qualms about voting against his party. We are providing you with a card to use on this question. Read the full question to R and show him the card. If the R mentioned something other than "Republican" or "Democrat" in Question 28, ask questions 28f and 28g, which are designed to catch "Independents" and others.

Question 28f. The "time" reference of this question is still his "usual" or customary feelings toward the parties. If the R is usually independent in his feelings, we, of course, want to know that (in this case, the party he feels closest to right now will be indicated elsewhere in the interview).

Question 28g. We included this question to determine whether Independents and others at any time in the past thought of themselves as Republican or Democratic. If the answer to this is "Yes" or equivalent, ask questions 28h and 28i.

Question 28i. This question is similar to 28c in that we're trying to get a clear idea of when R made his change.

Question 29. The party preferences of one's parents are likely to exert an influence on one's own party identification, and it is for this reason that we are asking this question. Some Rs may say there's a difference between their parents. In that case, note the difference.

Question 30. This is the first of four questions which we ask about R's voting behavior in past presidential elections. If R has ever voted for president, ask Questions 31-33; if he has never voted for president, skip to Question 34. Questions 30-34 should cause you no problems.

Question 32. In this question we ask the R whether he remembers who he voted for the first time he voted for president. If he remembers, write his response on the line for Question 32 and go ahead and ask him Questions 32a and 32b. If he has trouble answering these questions (32a, 32b), first write down his response, and then show him the list of dates and candidates provided you. Then write down his response, including the candidate or party and the year he mentions.

If however, when you first ask him Question 32, he doesn't remember who he voted for, write his response on the line for Question 32, show him the list of dates and candidates, and then ask Questions 32a and 32b, writing down his response to these on the lines provided. Do not show the list of dates and candidates to the R unless he doesn't remember under Question 32, or unless he has trouble with 32a and 32b. Under each question (32, 32a, 32b) please indicate all cases in which R saw the list. Do this by writing on the lines for each question the words "list used."

Question 34. Special instructions for interviewers in Texas and Arkansas: Since there is no registration in either Texas or Arkansas, always use the alternate wording ("Do you know if you are eligible to vote...?") Since non-citizens and legal minors are not being interviewed, this should mean to most of your respondents: "Do you have your poll tax receipt?" However, do not make a direct reference to poll tax yourself.

Special instructions for interviewers in Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin: Registration requirements vary in your states. In some places there will be no registration; in other places, registration will be a voting requirement which must be met. Inquire from your City Clerk or County Clerk about the requirements in the areas where your

interviews fall. Use whichever alternate phrasing of Question 34 is appropriate to each area.

Question 35. This is a rather straightforward question, and should cause no problems. If R says "Yes" to Question 35, ask Questions 36-37. If R says "No" to Question 35, or if he says he doesn't know, skip to Question 40.

Question 36. When asked "how" he thinks he will vote for president, the terms in which an R answers may be significant. That is, does he answer by giving a candidate's name, by indicating a political party, or what? For this reason, it will be important that you use his own words in asking Question 36a (see parentheses in the question).

Questions 37-39. In many cases respondents won't know who they are going to vote for. Responses such as "I don't know yet" or "I don't remember his name" should be probed with "Which party do you think it will be?" or "What party does he belong to?" We don't want to force answers, but we do want to get the party intention where the name of the particular candidate is not known to the R. (Incidentally, we are interested in knowing whether or not the R knows the candidates' names; thus, if he asks for their names, note that down. Try to avoid giving him specific information on this yourself.)

Also, in Questions 37-39, try to get down the R's exact words. That is, we want to know if he answers by giving candidate or party name. In those cases where the R names a particular candidate, write on the interview schedule in parentheses whether this candidate is a Democrat or a Republican. We need this information for coding the answers.

Question 37. Special instructions to interviewers in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Kentucky, South Dakota, Kansas, Iowa, Idaho, Colorado, Oregon and Illinois: There are no races for United States Senator in your states. Omit this question.

Special instructions to interviewers in Connecticut: Since two Senators will be elected in Connecticut, get voting intentions for two candidates.

Question 38. Special instructions to interviewers in Connecticut, New Mexico, and Ohio: In your states there is one Congressman-at-Large to be elected by all voters, in addition to the regular Congressmen elected one to a district. Consequently, you should get two statements of preference for Congressman.

Question 39. Special instructions to interviewers in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, California, Idaho, Colorado, Oregon and Baltimore, Maryland: There is no race for the governorship of your states, omit this question.

Question 40. This is intended as a summary question. We do not want detailed responses, single word answers will be quite satisfactory. However, it is important to get the exact answer of the respondent. Particularly, we want to know if R gives his voting intention in terms of a party or in terms of a candidate.

Question 41. The main objective of this question is to get R's opinion on this interesting topic; that is, the degree to which a voter should go along with his party on candidates other than for president. Notice the discussion probe 41a.

Question 43. There has been some talk about using the same method for the entire nation which is now used in the State of Oregon. This would give all of the people a chance to select their party's nominee, rather than having the selection made at a convention of politicians. Some of the political scientists working on this study would like to know how many respondents have heard of this proposal, and how those who have heard of it react to it. Notice that this is done without suggesting any particular change.

Question 44. In question 44 and 44a we are primarily interested in seeing to what extent R sees different groups in American society as lined up politically -- for example, does he see certain economic and religious groups as supporting the Democrats, other economic and religious groups as supporting the Republicans, etc."

Although 44 and 44a are phrased in terms of how these groups will vote in this election, we would be interested in any indication R gives that he sees the allegiance of a group changing in this election from its traditional pattern-- for example, record such remarks as "farmers have gone Republican in the past but this time they'll go Democratic," "Working class people have gone Democratic but I don't know how they'll go this time," etc. Also record any other kinds of qualifying statements R may make (for example, "Southern Negroes will vote Republican but Northern Negroes will vote Democratic.")

In 44b we would like to get some idea of the reasons R sees groups as having for voting Republican or Democratic. For every group that R saw as going Republican or Democratic in response to 44 and 44a, go back and ask why he thinks that group will vote that way. (Record the answers in the lines provided for each group.) Do not ask this about groups which R saw as split or of which he said that he did not know how they would vote.

Although we can't afford to spend too much time on this question, two types of responses to 44b should be probed further: 1) If R answers the question in terms of the basis of his information (e.g., "I think that will vote Democratic because I read in the papers yesterday that that's how they would vote,") repeat the question, pointing out that we want to know what reasons he thinks the people in that group have for voting that way; 2) If R says a group will vote for a party because "they support its policies" or "agree with it on issues," probe for some specific examples of what R means.

Question 44b could be very time-consuming and difficult for R to answer. If R seems to show some resistance, don't press the probes to 44b too much.

Question 48. Some Rs may have difficulty answering this question, may want to know what we mean by "classes," or may deny that there are classes in America, etc. Record these remarks, but try to get R to place himself in one of the class groupings presented in the question.

Question 49. In this question, we're interested in getting some indication of R's feelings about opportunity in America today. This question shouldn't cause any difficulties.

Personal Data Questions. Although the Personal Data information is rather long because we need to classify respondents according to the various characteristics which are pertinent to this kind of study (age, sex, income, schooling, parents' place of birth, etc.), you should have no problems with it. If you need to, explain to the R that we need this information in order to tell whether men feel differently than women, whether older people answer the questions differently than younger people, people of higher income differently than people with lower income, etc.

Questions 5 and 6 (occupation): Be sure to get the kind of work done. For example, if R answers by saying he works at such-and-such a factory, get the kind of work he does.

Question 8: We are interested here in getting the "occupational environment" which R grew up in. Consequently, if R's father died, if R was raised by Mother, Relatives or Friends, or if he grew up in an institution, record this information. The question of parental occupation shouldn't be skipped unless R grew up in an institution. In all other cases, make the appropriate change in wording, such as: "What kind of work did your (uncle, mother, grandfather, etc.) do for a living while you were growing up?"

Our primary objective is to get the occupation of the person acting as parent or guardian while R was growing up. If information is volunteered about someone other than R's father being breadwinner when he was growing up, that should be recorded, too.

Question 15: The phrase "face sheet designation" should be interpreted as follows: In urban areas, the name of the town or city should be used. For rural areas, use whatever town or city is most appropriate -- use the County name only if no other designation fits the case.

Question 20 (income): If R feels awkward because other people are present, or if he says he'd rather not answer, show him the categories on your schedule, and get him to check one.