Version 01 Codebook

CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE
1985 PILOT STUDY
(1985.PN)

USER NOTE:
This file has been converted to electronic format via OCR scanning.
As as result, the user is advised that some errors in character
recognition may have resulted within the text.

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

1985 PILOT STUDY

(NOV. 11, 1985 - JAN. 15, 1986)

Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

int1985pil.txt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS   (file intpil85.cbk)

>> DESCRIPTION OF THE 1985 PILOT STUDY
>> CODEBOOK INFORMATION

CODEBOOK

     1985 variables
     1984 variables

APPENDICES   (file apppil85.cbk)

>> 1985 National Election Studies Working Papers Series
>> 1985 Benchmark Frequencies

>> 1984 FIPS STATE AND COUNTY NOTE
>> 1980 CENSUS DEFINITIONS
>> 1984 PARTY/CANDIDATE NOTE
>> 1984 NEWSPAPER CODE
>> 1984 ECONOMIC CONDITIONS CODE
>> 1984 COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY NOTE
>> 1984 RECODING IN THE EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION SECTIONS
>> OCCUPATION CODES, NES 1984 STUDY
>> 1980 CENSUS INDUSTRY CODES
>> 1984 NATIONALITY NOTE
>> 1984 STATE AND COUNTRY NOTE
>> 1984 CITIES NOTE
>> 1984 CANDIDATE MASTER CODE
>> 1984 PARTY DIFFERENCE NOTE
>> 1984 IMPORTANT PROBLEMS NOTE
>> 1984 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE DIMENSIONS

>> DESCRIPTION: NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES PILOT STUDY, 1985

Beginning in November of 1985 and ending in mid-January of 1986, the Center
for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan, conducted a small pilot study designed to test instrumentation for
the 1986 and 1988 National Election Studies. Planning for the study was done
throughout 1985 by a special Pilot Committee, composed of several members of
the Board of

Overseers including Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky, Morris P.
Fiorina, Harvard University, Donald R. Kinder, University of Michigan, Warren
E. Miller (ex officio), Arizona State University, Steven J. Rosenstone
(Chair), Yale University, and David Sears, University of California at Los
Angeles. Other persons contributing to the work of the committee included Pam
Conover, University of North Carolina, Ada Finifter, Michigan State
University, Shanto Iyengar, State University of New York, and John Zaller,
Princeton University. A sample of respondents from the American National
Election Study, 1984, was selected for the Pilot Study. Telephone interviews
were taken in November and December with 429 respondents; 345 of these
respondents were reinterviewed in December and January. Each wave of
interviewing employed two questionnaire forms administered to half-samples. A
brief description of the sampling and field procedures and the codebook layout
appears below. Special content areas emphasized in the pilot study are:
political knowledge, group membership, identification of elderly (60+), blacks
and women with these broader social groupings, attitudes toward racial issues,
and opinions on traditional moral values. The study also includes an
experiment in which one-half of the respondents were asked about
Reagan-Mondale issue placements immediately after their own placements were
elicited while the other half of the respondents were asked to place
Reagan-Mondale at the end of the interview, after an interval of several
minutes. Other Form A and Form B differences include experiments with response
alternatives to civic duty items, with question wording on two items relating
to affirmative action, and on an item relating to inflation.

A. SAMPLING

Respondents in the Pilot Study are a sample of persons who gave us both a Pre
and a Post Election personal interview in 1984, who had a known telephone
number and for whom there was no contraindication for a telephone interview
(such as deafness). Sampling was done from a list of eligible respondents
stratified by political interest ("follow public affairs"). From this list of
818 respondents, 15 replicates (mini-samples) were drawn. Replicates 1-10
consist of 46 or 47 cases, and represent the cross-section. Replicates 11-15
consist of 12 or 13 cases and are the oversample of elderly. (See below.)
Split-half form A and form B assignments were made randomly.

The study includes an oversample of the elderly, in order to insure a total of
at least 100 respondents over 60. Variable 857004 distinguishes between
cross-section respondents and those R's over 60 who are part of the
oversample. The cross section (380 R's in Wave I, 306 R's in Wave II) is
self-weighting.

To analyze the entire set of 429 respondents in Wave I (345 respondents in
Wave II) use of the weight variable 857011 is required, since all respondents
were not selected with equal probability. NOTE HOWEVER that the weight is
age-specific, so that use of the weight to analyse separately the group of 60+
respondents is not necessary.

B. FIELD WORK

Wave I field work began November 11 and ended December 13. Wave II field work began December 6 and ended January 16th. Although Wave II field work overlapped with Wave I, no Wave II recontact was attempted until at least 3 weeks had elapsed after the Wave I interview. Table I, below, gives study totals.

TABLE I: STUDY TOTALS

	Smple	No. of Intws	Refs	Othr Nonints	Resp Rate	Lngth	Form A	Form B	X-Sect	Over Samp.
Wave I	528	429	35	64	.816	28.5	218	211	380	49
Wave II	429	345	18	66	.804	38.5	171	174	306	39

C. ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENTATION/DATASET

1. Inclusion of 1984 Election study data. All respondents to the Pilot Study had been interviewed twice for the 1984 election study. A number of questions on the Pilot Study had also been asked in the 1984 Election Study also, so that it is possible to compare two or even three measurements for the same item. Additionally, variables from the 1984 study may be useful in the analysis of the 1985 data. In order to facilitate these uses of the 1984 Election Study data, we have merged that data into the Pilot Study datafile.

In fact, because the 1984 Election Study consisted of two lengthy interviews, the bulk of the Pilot Study codebook actually repeats the 1984 Election Study documentation, with some excisions, namely the questionnaires, notes and introductory materials. Users who wish to refer to these materials should consult the 1984 Election Study documentation itself, in either the study staff or the Consortium releases.

2. Organization of the data record. The study consists of 1533 variables. There are gaps in the variable numbering sequence. The data layout is as follows:

        1984 Pre-Post Election Study data   V840001-V840779
        Pilot Study Wave I Data   V857001-V857553
        Pilot Study Wave II Data   V858001-V858648

3. Missing data treatment. In a departure from previous NES practice, non-response on Wave II which is due to the fact that the R did not give us a Wave II interview at all is consistently coded as "9. NA," with the "0. INAP" category reserved for contingency patterns within the interview. Even when 9's on a previous question are padded to 0's on followups, the 9's due to "No Wave II" stay as 9's on the followups. This is done to make it easier to treat the '0. INAP' code as a substantive category when appropriate.

 >> CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The following example from the 1948 NES study provides the standard format for codebook variable documentation.

Note that NES studies which are not part of the Time-Series usually omit marginals and the descriptive content in lines 2-5 (except for

variable name).

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 numer 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 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
         "B1a.") 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 unweighted or weighted; check the Study codebook
introductory text to determine weight usage.