ICPSR | INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

ICPSR 8475

ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File (1948-2012)

American National Election Studies

Stanford University

Codebook

Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:
http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/8475/terms

Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

ICPSR PROCESSING NOTES FOR #8475
ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File (1948-2012)

1) **Sequential Record Identifier:** ICPSR created a unique sequential record identifier variable named **CASEID**.

2) **Truncated Value Labels**: Several value labels are truncated throughout the data file. Please see the Variable Codebook and Appendices sections of the Original P.I. Documentation for complete labels, where available.

3) **Undocumented Codes:** The variables **VCF0907**, **VCF0908, VCF0142,** and **VCF0144** contain undocumented values which ICPSR has labeled "UNDOCUMENTED CODE." However, there are several other undocumented codes in many other variables throughout the dataset which ICPSR did not address, such as **VCF0129**. Users should refer to the Original P.I. Documentation as needed for confirmation.

4) **Value Discrepancies:**

   a) ICPSR did not add the value labels to the data files for the variables **VCF0012A** and **VCF0012B**. The value labels for these variable differ based on survey year. Please refer to the Variable Codebook section of the Original P.I. Documentation for a complete listing of value labels for these variables.

   b) There are many duplicate value labels present for variables such as **VCF0170B**, **VCF0170D**, and **VCF0375C**. No further information was provided.

   c) There are many duplicate values present throughout the Appendices section of the Original P.I. Documentation, such as for variable **VCF0376C**, code 21; is referenced twice, each with a different meaning. ICPSR has added labels to the data based on the first mention of a value and its corresponding label within the Original P.I. Documentation, therefore, users should refer to this documentation for any additional meaning, as needed.

5) **Documentation Discrepancies:**

   a) Users should note the dates and total unweighted cross-section case count statistics, found under the "General Introduction" section of the Original P.I. Documentation within the ICPSR Codebook, do not match the data. This appears to be an error in listing the current version of the data, however, this has not been confirmed.

b) A discrepancy exists in the Variable Codebook section of the Original P.I. Documentation between the variable labels and question text listed for variables **VCF0013**, **VCF0071B,** and **VCF0071D**. The variable labels list the suffix "Pre," whereas the question text list the suffix "Post." It appears the suffix should read as "Post" and ICPSR has changed the variable labels in the data.

c) A discrepancy exists in the Variable Codebook section of the Original P.I. Documentation between the variable label and question text listed for variable **VCF0014**. The variable label lists the suffix "Post," whereas the question text lists the suffix "Pre." It appears the suffix should read as "Pre" and ICPSR has changed the variable label in the data.

d) Users should note some variable names, such as **VCF0326** and **VCF0334,** that are referenced within the "Notes:" sections of the Variable Codebook found in the Original P.I. Documentation are not included in the data or listed in the Variable Codebook. No additional information was provided.

6) Additional Information:

a) Please refer to the Variable Codebook and Appendices sections of the Original P.I. Documentation for notes and coding schemes used throughout this collection.

b) Additional information on the American National Election Studies (ANES) Time Series Cumulative Data File, 1948-2012, including the collection's Errata and Study Page can be found by visiting the [American National Election Studies Web site](#).

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

TIME SERIES CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

1948-2012

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 anes_timeseries_cdf_codebook_int.txt)

>> CUMULATIVE DATA FILE - GENERAL INTRODUCTION

CODEBOOK   (file anes_timeseries_cdf_codebook_var.txt)

   Cumulative Data File variables

APPENDICES   (file anes_timeseries_cdf_codebook_app.txt)

>> WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE CUMULATIVE DATA FILE
>> 1992 ERRORS IN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ASSIGNMENTS
>> URBANISM NOTE
>> ETHNICITY
>> INCOME
>> CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES
  I. 1980 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES
  II. 1990 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES
>> CENSUS OCCUPATION 71 CATEGORIES
>> WORK STATUS
>> PRESTIGE SCORES
   I. DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE SCALES 1976-1982
   II. 1984 DUNCAN S.E.I.
   III. OCCUPATION S.E.S SCORES 1966-1974
>> RELIGION
   I. RELIGION 1960-1988,2002
   II. RELIGION 1990-LATER, EXC.2002
   III. 2002 RELIGION NOTE
>> STATE AND COUNTRY CODES (ICPSR)
>> COUNTY CODES
   I. 1956-1960 PSU-COUNTY CODES (VCF0170a)
   II. 1964-1976 SAMPLING-PSU COUNTY CODES (VCF0170b)

>> CUMULATIVE DATA FILE - GENERAL INTRODUCTION

    The Cumulative Data File consists of variables derived from the 1948-2004
series of biennial ("time-series") SRC/CPS National Election Studies.
[NOTE: No ANES study was conducted in 1950; 1954 was a minor study although
its data are included here.]

    To produce this dataset, cross-section cases from the time-series
election studies have been pooled; the total unweighted cross-section N is
46,226. (NOTE: non-cross-section cases from black supplements in 1964,
1968 and 1970 are not included in this file.)

    A variable in the dataset almost always represents a question which
has been asked in three or more (time-series) studies. This dataset
incorporates for specific questions data from all time-series studies in
which the question was asked in comparable fashion.

    When using variables from this dataset, the analyst should keep the
following in mind:
 1) Question wording has varied over the years. Where there are
   differences in question wording, we have tried to reference them
   in the documentation; completeness of this effort, however, cannot
   be guaranteed.
 2) Even if a question is worded identically in successive surveys, its
   placement in the survey instrument may be different, with unknown (and
   possibly large) effect.
 3) Variables have been recoded to be consistent over time. Questions are not
   necessarily coded the same way in this dataset as they are in the
   election study datasets from which they came.

       THE SAMPLE SIZES FOR ALL YEARS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

	Cross-section *	
	Weighted**	Unweighted
1948:	--	N=662
1952:	--	N=1899
1954:	--	N=1139
1956:	--	N=1762
1958:	N=1822	N=1450

```
           1960:      N=1954    N=1181
           1962:      --      N=1297
           1964:      --      N=1571
           1966:      --      N=1291
           1968:      --      N=1557
 type 0*   1970:      --      N=1507
 type 1*   1970:     N=835     N=758
 type 2*   1970:     N=817     N=749
           1972:      --      N=2705
           1974:    N=2523    N=1575
           1976:    N=2869.5  N=2248
           1978:      --      N=2304
           1980:      --      N=1614
           1982:      --      N=1418
           1984:      --      N=2257
           1986:      --      N=2176
           1988:      --      N=2040
           1990:      --      N=1980 ***
           1992:     ****     N=2485
           1994:     ****     N=1795
           1996:     ****     N=1714
           1998:     ****     N=1281
           2000:     ****     N=1807
           2002:     ****     N=1511
           2004:     ****     N=1212
           2008:     ****     N=2322
           2012:     ****     N=5914 *****
```

* note: the 1970 figures exclude 73 non-eligible Rs in the original dataset's
   cross-section N. The Cumulative File excludes all non-eligible respondents
   from its cross-section. For descriptions of type 0, type 1, and type 2
   variables in 1970, see weight vars VCF0009-VCF0011.
** note: the weighted cross-section Ns are represented in the Guide to Public
   Opinion and Electoral Behavior, which was produced using data from the
   Cumulative File. To reproduce the data appearing in the Sourcebook, it is
   necessary to use appropriate weights (see VCF0009-VCF0011).
***note: 20 cases have been deleted from the 1990 Study data due to belated
   discovery of interview fabrication and ineligible Rs.
****note: In 1992 and later studies there were multiple weights which can be
   used with the data; see Study documentation.
*****Combined sample (face-to-face and internet)

RELEASE VERSION: 20150514 (May 14, 2015)

===
VERSION

STUDY VARIABLE: Version Number Of Release

QUESTION:

Version of Cumulative Data File

NOTES:

This variable appears in the data as:
    ANES_cdf_VERSION:YYYY-mmm-DD
where mmm is standard 3-character month abbreviation
(Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec).

TYPE:

Character-1

===
VCF0004

STUDY VARIABLE: Year of Study

QUESTION:

Year of study (4-digit)

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0006

STUDY VARIABLE: Study Respondent Number: Year-level Case ID

QUESTION:

Case identification number

NOTES:

In Pre-Post studies, this is the Pre case ID.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480002
1952: 520002
1954: V540002
1956: 560002
1958: 580002
1960: 600002
1962: 620002
1964: 640002
1966: 660002
1968: 680002
1970: 700002
1972: 720002
1974: 742002
1976: 763002
1978: 780002
1980: 800004
1982: 820004
1984: 840004
1986: 860004
1988: 880004
1990: 900004
1992: 923004
1994: 940001
1996: 960001
1998: 980001
2000: 000001
2002: 020001
2004: 040001
2008: 080001
2012: caseid

===

VCF0006a

STUDY VARIABLE: Unique Respondent Number (Cross-year ID for panel cases)

QUESTION:

Unique identification number

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For non-panel cases this corresponds to 4-digit year of study followed
by 4-digit case id from the study as found in VCF0006.
For panel cases, this corresponds to 4-digit year of first year of
time-series participation followed by 4-digit case id from first
participation study . For example, 1958 ANES panel cases (first
interviewed in the 1956 anes) are numbered 1956xxxx where xxxx
corresponds to the case ID the respondent had been assigned previously
in the 1956 study; VCF0006, by contrast, includes the respondent's 1958
ANES case ID.
Studies including panel cases as part of the overall study cross-section

are flagged in VCF00016.
1958 NOTE:
In the 1958 anes time-series study, V580007 and V580008 flags whether
1958 respondents were previously interviewed in 1956. However, some
respondents flagged in these variables had been interviewed in 1956 not
as part of the 1956 anes study's cross-section sample, but as part of a
sample component intended for a separate 'panel' (non-cross-section)
file. Thus the actual count of cases from the 1958 study having 1956
unique IDs in VCF0006a (as 1956xxxx, where xxxx is the 1956 ANES
cross-section case ID) does not correspond with the count of cases
flagged in V580007 and V580008 for previous participation in 1956.
1960 NOTE:
see 1958 note; cases flagged in the 1960 ANES study for participation
prior to 1960 may have participated outside of the time-series cross-
section(s) in the year(s) of prior participation and may not correspond
to the count of cases found here for initial time-series participation.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0009x

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 FTF sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 FTF sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101

2008: V080101
2012: weight_ftf

===

VCF0009y

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 Web sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 Web sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_web

===

VCF0009z

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 full sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 full sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_full

==

VCF0010x

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 FTF sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 FTF sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V700012
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101

2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_ftf

===
VCF0010y

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 Web sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 Web sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V700012
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_web

===
VCF0010z

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 full sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 full sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE

CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V700012
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_full

==
VCF0011x

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 FTF sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 FTF sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V700013
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a

1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_ftf

==

VCF0011y

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 Web sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 Web sample

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix documentatin: "WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE
CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V700013
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_web

==

VCF0011z

STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 full sample

QUESTION:

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 full sample

NOTES:

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 4-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V580003
1960: V600003
1970: V70001
1974: V742003
1976: V763003
1992: V927000
1994: V940007a
1996: V960005a
1998: V980002
2000: V000002
2002: V020101
2004: V040101
2008: V080101
2012: weight_full

===

VCF0012

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Form Filter for Paper Questionnaires

QUESTION:

Form or interview type of paper questionnaire

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Type 1   (1970 N=758)
  /Form I (1972 N=1372)
  /Form A (1986 N=1086;1988 N=1006;1990 N=1007;1994 N=500)
2. Type 2   (1970 N=749)
  /Form II (1972 N=1333)
  /Form B (1986 N=1090;1988 N=1034;1990 N=993;1994 N=497

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. no form or type of IW; not a paper questionnaire

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See also VCF0012A, VCF0012B. This describes paper questionnaires

(1948-1994).
1972 NOTE 1:
57 Rs who were Pre Form I and 37 Rs who were Pre Form II were sent post
mail questionnaires that contained most, but not all, of Form I/ Form
II Post personal questions. Rs who were Form I in the Pre but
administered Post mail questionnaires were designated "FORM III" in the
Post, while Rs who were Form II in the Pre but who completed mail
questionnaires for the Post were Post "FORM IV".
1972 NOTE 2:
The same Form type was assigned in the Post as in the Pre.
1986 NOTE:
Form A questions were not asked of Form B respondents and vice versa,
with two exceptions: both were asked VCF0830, with varied wording.
1988 NOTE 1:
Unlike other years, in 1988 all questions were present in both Form A
and Form B, however some differed by form in wording or placement: e.g.
VCF0517-VCF0518, VCF0830, VCF9076, VCF9084, VCF9092.
1988 NOTE 2:
same as 1972 NOTE 2.
1994 NOTE:
In 1994, the study included a 'ballot card' experiment. Two ballot
cards were drafted with identical content but different layout.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0012a

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: CAI Question Selection - Pre

QUESTION:

CAI Question selection ('form') summary -- Pre

VALID_CODES:

1996:
 0. F1-F4 and H4-H8
 1. No F1-F4
 2. No H4-H8
 3. Neither F1-F4 nor H4-H8
2000:
 1. Both E and F6-F9, with Clinton traits and affects
 2. Both E and F6-F9, without Clinton traits and affects
 3. E, not F6-F9, with Clinton traits and affects
 4. E, not F6-F9, without Clinton traits and affects
 5. F6-F9, not E, with Clinton traits and affects
 6. F6-F9, not E, without Clinton traits and affects
 7. Neither E nor F6-F9, with Clinton traits and affects
 8. Neither E nor F6-F9, without Clinton traits and
    affects
2002:

1. K1 spending items
2. K2 spending items
2004:
1. Pre patriotism module
0. No Pre patriotism module (Post patriotism module)
2008:
1. OLD version assignment
2. NEW version assignment
2012:
1. Standard efficacy (Pre), 'about the same' federal spending
2. Standard efficacy (Pre), 'the same' federal
   spending
3. Revised efficacy (Pre), 'about the same' federal spending
4. Revised efficacy (Pre), 'the same' federal
   spending

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA (2002)
INAP. Inap. paper questionnaire (1948-1994); no assigned Pre
'forms'

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See also VCF0012.
CAPI administration (Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing) began in
1996. VCF0012A and VCF0012B describe CAPI handling of substantive
content according to original study design. Vars VCF0012/VCF0012A/
VCF0012B differ from VCF0015A/B in that shortened interviews described
in the latter are the result of problem, error, or late field-period
adjustments.
1996 NOTE:
Half-samples were randomly selected for each set of 1996 questions F1-
F4 and H4-H8: VCF0314-VCF0324 (from series F1-F4); VCF0522 (from H1-H4).
2000 NOTE:
Half-samples were randomly selected for section E and F6-F9;
respondents not selected for Pre administration of section E were
assigned to Post administration: VCF0880, VCF0881 (from E series);
VCF0875, VCF9012 (from F6-F9). Respondents were also randomly selected
to be administered Clinton traits and affects in either the Pre or the
Post: VCF0338, VCF0342-VCF0349.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to either K1 or K2 series of Federal
budget spending items: VCF0886, VCF0887, VCF0888, VCF0889, VCF0890,
VCF0892, VCF0894, VCF9047, VCF9049, and VCF9050.
2004 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to a battery of patriotism questions
in the Pre or the Post.
2008 NOTE:
The 2008 study included many splits according to variation in wording,
coding, and/or administration of questions. The principal split was
tagged "OLD" (standard) versus "NEW" (revised); the assignment applied
to multiple items in the Pre and Post interviews, including all 7-point

scales (and their alternatives). Assignment to OLD/NEW was the same
for both Pre and Post.
2012 NOTE:
In the Pre survey, respondents could be administered standard or
revised efficacy items (including variables corresponding to VCF0609,
VCF0613, VCF0614) and could have the either the phrase "kept the same"
or the phrase "kept about the same" used for the Pre questions on
levels of spending for federal programs (see VCF0886-VCF0894,VCF9046-
VCF9050). Respondents who were asked the standard efficacy items in
the Pre were asked the revised efficacy items in the Post; respondents
who were asked the revised efficacy items in the Pre were asked the
standard efficacy items in the Post.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 960035
2000: 000005a,000005b,000005c
2002: 022000
2004: 042001
2008: 082402
2012: randsplice_revisedstandard,randsplice_fedspendtxt

==

VCF0012b

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: CAI Question Selection - Post

QUESTION:

CAI Question selection ('form') summary -- Post

VALID_CODES:

1996:
 1. F1-F4, H1-H1b
 2. F1-F4 only (not administered H1-H1b)
 3. H1-H1b only (not administered F1-F4)
 4. Neither F1-F4 nor H1-H1b
2000:
 1. Section H , with Clinton traits and affects
 2. Section H, without Clinton traits and affects
 3. No section H, Clinton traits and affects
 4. No section H, no Clinton traits and affects
2002:
 1. L1-D3-K4
 2. L1-D3-K5
 3. L1-D4-K4
 4. L1-D4-K5
 5. L2-D3-K4

6. L2-D3-K5
 7. L2-D4-K4
 8. L2-D4-K5
2004:
 1. Post patriotism module
 2. No Post patriotism module (Pre patriotism module)
2012:
 1. Standard efficacy (Post)
 3. Revised efficacy (Post)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Post IW in study with Post-assigned 'forms'
INAP. Inap. paper questionnaire (1948-1994); no assigned Post
'forms'

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See VCF0012A.
1996 NOTE:
Half-samples were randomly selected for F1-F4 and H1-H1b: VCF0875,
VCF9012 (from F1-F4) and VCF0501 (from H1-H1b).
2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected for Clinton traits and affects in
either the Pre or Post: VCF0880-881, VCF0338, VCF0342-349. Rs not
administered section E in the Pre were administered the same questions
in section H of the Post.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to the following content (half-
samples): 1) either D3 or D4 Bush Traits questions; 2) either K4 or K5
social trust item; 3) either L1 series or L2 series Federal spending
items. Note that for the spending the alternate option had been
assigned to the Pre: VCF0338, VCF0342, VCF0343, VCF0344, VCF0345,
VCF0620, VCF0621, VCF0887, VCF0888, VCF0889, VCF0890, VCF0894, VCF9047.
2004 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to a battery of patriotism questions
in the Pre or the Post.
2008 NOTE:
The 2008 study included many splits according to variation in wording,
coding, and/or administration of questions. The principal split was
tagged "OLD" (standard) versus "NEW" (revised); the assignment applied
to multiple items in the Pre and Post interviews, including all 7-point scales (and their alternatives). Assignment to OLD/NEW was the same
for both Pre and Post.
2012 NOTE:
2012 NOTE:
Respondents who were asked the standard efficacy items in the Pre (see
VCF0012a) were asked the revised efficacy items in the Post; respondents
who were asked the revised efficacy items in the Pre were asked the
standard efficacy items in the Post.

TYPE:

Numeric   Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 960901
2000: 000005c,000127a
2002: 024000
2004: 044001
2008: 084402
2012: randsplice_revisedstandard

==
VCF0013

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Completion - Pre-election (flag)

QUESTION:

Post-election interview data present

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No Post-election interview data
1. Post-election interview data present

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This describes the presence of post-election data in ANES pre-post
time-series studies: studies conducted in years of presidential
elections and in 2002 were pre-post studies. In non-presidential years
except 1954 and 2002, ANES has conducted a Post-election interview only,
and all non-presidential years other than 1954 and 2002 have been coded
1.* 2002 is the only non-presidential-year study which is a Pre-Post
study.
The following list identifies for Pre-Post studies the start of Post
variable numbering:

Year	Post Vars begin:	Year	Post Vars begin:
1948	V480001	1980	V800738
1952	V520168	1984	V840722
1956	V560192	1988	V880564
1960	V600190	1992	V925001
1964	V640273	1996	V960900
1968	V680270	2000	V001201
1972	V720438	2002	V025001**
1976	V763524		

1948 NOTE:
All cases in the release datafile were interviewed in the Post.
1954 NOTE: *
The 1954 study was a minor study conducted in October of 1954 and is
coded 0. The 1954 study was comprised of only 27 variables and is
represented in the Cumulative Data File in: VCF0104-VCF0106, VCF0110,
VCF0112-VCF0114, VCF0127, VCF0128, VCF0140, VCF0301-VCF0305, VCF0701,

VCF9027.
1956 NOTE:
No cases without post-election re-interviews were included in the
final 1956 dataset.
1968 NOTE:
9 cases which were no-Post had some information about voting
behavior noted on their coversheets: although defined as "no-Post,"
these cases were nonetheless represented in (post) vote variables in
the original dataset, and such coversheet-derived vote information has
also been included in Cumulative Data File voting variables where
appropriate.
**ALL YEARS 2002-2008:
Post variable numbering begins Vxx5001, where xx is the 2-digit year
of the time-series study.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520003
1960: 600016
1964: 640276
1968: 680005
1972: 720438
1976: 763004
1980: 800003
1984: 840061
1988: 880048
1992: 923010
1996: 960010
2000: 000003
2002: 021002
2004: 041001
2008: 081001
2012: wave_completions

===
VCF0014

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Completion - Post-election (flag)

QUESTION:

Pre-election interview data present

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No Pre-election interview data present
1. Pre-election interview data present

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This describes the presence of pre-election data in ANES pre-post
time-series studies: studies conducted in years of presidential
elections and in 2002 were pre-post studies. Only in 1948, 1952 and
1960 cases were any cases conducted with a Post-election interview
but no Pre-election interview. In non-presidential years except 1954
and 2002, ANES conducted a Post-election interview only, and all
non-presidential years except 1954 and 2002 have been coded 0.*
1954**, 2002 and presidential years other than 1948, 1952 and 1960 have
been coded 1.
1948 NOTE:
1 case code 9 NA in the original survey data was examined
and identified as Post-only; this case has been coded 0.
1954 NOTE: *
The 1954 study was a minor study conducted in October of 1954 and is
coded 1. The 1954 study was comprised of only 27 variables and is
represented in the Cumulative Data File in: VCF0104-VCF0106, VCF0110,
VCF0112-VCF0114, VCF0127, VCF0128, VCF0140, VCF0301-VCF0305, VCF0701,
VCF9027.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480009
1952: 520003
1960: 600016

==
VCF0015a

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Abbreviated Interview - Pre

QUESTION:

Abbreviated interview form - Pre

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Pre IW not abbreviated [1992:'Long' form Pre]
1. Abbreviated pre IW
   [1980 N=44: CA29,TX03 ; 1992 short-form Pre N=150;
   1996 VQ date 09/25/96 or later N=1074; 2000 VQ date
   09/28/00 or later N=999]
2. Spanish Pre
   [1992 N=22; a translation of the 1992 Pre
   short form questionnaire except for demographic
   sections, which were slightly more complete in the
   Spanish Pre form]
INAP. Inap. post-election study; no pre IW (1948,1952,1960)

NOTES:

1980 NOTE:
Abbreviated Pre interviews were administered as replacements for
discovered 'fake' interviews.
1992 NOTE:
In addition to 'long-form' or full personal mode questionnaires, short-
form telephone questionnaires were prepared in both the Pre and Post
waves for out-of-range panel cases. Please see the full 1992 ANES
documentation for a complete description. Note that, contrary to
intentions, use of the short-form questionnaire was not limited to
telephone mode, nor was long-form use confined to personal mode. [In
a few cases the shorter interview was administered to 'fresh' cross-
section respondents-- 4 cases Pre, 4 cases Post].
1996 NOTE:
The Pre 'VQ file' or CAPI application was revised several times while
in the field. Beginning with the instrument with revision date 9/25/96,
some questions (most of the items related to 1996 candidate Ross Perot)
were dropped from the Pre.
2000 NOTE:
In the Pre, Buchanan traits and affects were dropped beginning with
the 09/28/00 VQ.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800048
1992: 923011
1996: 960018
2000: 000012

===

VCF0015b

INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Abbreviated Interview - Post

QUESTION:

Abbreviated interview form - Post

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Post IW is not abbreviated
   [1952: extended form B re-interview; 1984: personal
   IW; 1992: 'long' form Post incl. Spanish Post]
1. Abbreviated Post IW
   [1952 N=585: not the extended re-interview with
   29 additional questions; 1968 mail questionnaire N=36;
   1972 Form III mail quesionnaire N=57; 1984 telephone
   questionnaire N=966 ; 1992 short-form N=190 ; 1996

training VQ N=39]
2. Additional Abbreviated Post IWs
    [1972 Form IV mail questionnaire N=37; 1984
    abbreviated telephone questionnaire N=45]
INAP. Inap. no post IW

NOTES:

1952 NOTE:
In 1952 some respondents were sent an extended version of the post
questionnaire ("form B"); cases not administered this extended Post
re-interview are coded 1.
1968 NOTE:
In the 1968 post, some respondents were sent mail questionnaires which
contained fewer questions than in the full face-to-face questionnaire.
1972 NOTE:
In the 1972 post, some respondents were sent mail questionnaires which
contained fewer questions than in the full face-to-face questionnaire:
respondents who were Form I in the Pre (see VCF0012) and who were
interviewed in the Post using the mail questionnaire were designated
"Form III" in the Post; respondents who were Form II in the Pre and who
were interviewed in the Post using the mail questionnaire were
designated "Form IV" in the Post
1984 NOTE:
In addition to the 1984 telephone Post questionnaire, which was shorter
than the 1984 Post personal questionnaire, an abbreviated version of the
Post telephone questionnaire was also administered to 45 cases.
1992 NOTE:
In addition to 'long-form' or full personal mode questionnaires, short-
form telephone questionnaires were prepared in both the Pre and Post
waves for out-of-range panel cases. Please see the full 1992 ANES
documentation for a complete description. Note that, contrary to
intentions, use of the short-form questionnaire was not limited to
telephone mode, nor was long-form use confined to personal mode. [In
a few cases the shorter interview was administered to 'fresh' cross-
section respondents-- 4 cases Pre, 4 cases Post].
1996 NOTE:
The Post 'VQ file' or CAPI application was revised several times while
in the field. Some cases in the Post were mistakenly administered
using a pre-production (training) VQ file which lacked several
intended questions.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520003
1968: 680005
1972: 720003
1984: 840064
1992: 925002

1996: 960909

===

VCF0016

STUDY VARIABLE: Cross-section composition: fresh Cross or panel case

QUESTION:

Sample component: 'new' cross-section or panel case

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Fresh Cross case
1. Panel case (1958 N=866; 1960 N=939; 1974 N=1100;
        1976 N=925; 1992 N=1359; 1994 N=759;
        1996 N=1316; 2002 N=1187)

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Ns indicated below are unweighted. The combined sample of panel and
fresh-cross cases together constitute an overall representative cross-
section for the time-series study. Panel cases in 1958,1960,1974 and
1976 are not flagged in the data of the respective time-series studies;
for these years this variable has been coded from the 1956-1958-1960
and 1972-1974-1976 merged panel files.
1958 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1956 (note: the number
of panel cases in the 1958 time-series data file does not correspond with
the number of 1958 panel cases in the 1956-1958-1960 merged panel file)
1960 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1956 or 1958 (note: the
number of panel cases in the 1950 time-series data file does not
correspond with the number of 1950 panel cases in the 1956-1958-1960
merged panel file)
1974 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1972 (note: the number
of panel cases in the 1974 time-series data file does not correspond with
the number of 1974 panel cases in the 1972-1974-1976 merged panel file)
1976 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1972 or 1974 (note: the
number of panel cases in the 1975 time-series data file does not
correspond with the number of 1976 panel cases in the 1972-1974-1976
merged panel file)
1992 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1990.
1994 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1992, as 1992 new fresh
Cross-Section cases (no 1994 Panel cases had been interviewed in 1990).
1996 NOTE:
Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 1994, and a portion had
also been interviewed in 1992.
2002 NOTE:

Panel cases had previously been interviewed in 2000.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923005
1994: 940002
1996: 960002
2002: 021001

==

VCF0017

STUDY ADMIN: Mode of Interview

QUESTION:

Mode of interview

VALID_CODES:
----
0. All personal (pre-post studies: personal pre and post
        or personal pre and no post; post-only studies:
        personal post)
1. Telephone pre (personal post or no post)
2. Telephone post (personal pre)
3. All telephone (pre-post studies: pre and post [no post-only
        telephone studies in Time Series])
4. All internet (2012: pre and post)

NOTES:

1992 NOTE:
A shorter questionnaire was designed for telephone interviewing only,
where telephone administration was intended for selected Panel cases;
all long-form questionnaires were designed to be administered in
person. However, due to interviewer misunderstanding, 125 Pre
interviews and 284 Post interviews -- including both Panel and new
Cross-Section respondents --were administered over the telephone using
long-form questionnaires. Mode of interview here thus cannot be
identified with short or long questionnaire (VCF0015a,VCF0015b). [Note:
additionally, in 1 Pre case a Panel short-form interview was conducted
in person.]
1998 NOTE:
This is the beginning mode of the interview; in some cases, the
interview may have been suspended and completed in a different mode.
2000 NOTE:
Code 1 includes 5 cases which were personal in the Pre and intended to
be switched to phone mode in the Post, but which were again
administered face-to-face.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840004
1992: 923031,925003
1994: 940045
1996: 960031a
1998: 980024
2000: 000004,000126
2002: 022002,024002
2012: mode

===
VCF0018a

STUDY ADMIN: Language of Interview - Pre

QUESTION:

1980: Was this interview conducted in English? (IF NO:) In What language
was this interview conducted?
1984,1988,1992: Was this interview conducted entirely in English, or was
it necessary to translate some (or all) questions into another language?
What language?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. IW conducted entirely in English; 2008,2012: beginning language
1. Some or all of IW translated to Spanish
3. Some or all of IW translated to French
5. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language
    other than Spanish or French
7. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language
    but NA which language

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if English or other language
INAP. Inap. post-election study

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For studies prior to 1978 it is not entirely certain whether any full
or partial translations occurred, however none have been documented and
all cases prior to 1978 are coded 0. This was a question for the interviewer.
1988 NOTE:
A language variable appeared for the Pre but not the Post.
1992 NOTE:

In the Pre, a Spanish language version of the short questionnaire was administered to 22 cases; these 22 cases and 9 additional cases were coded in the language variable as including at least some translation.
2004 NOTE:
This was an admininstration (not interviewer) variable.
Spanish language versions of the Pre and Post questionnaires were administered to Spanish-speaking respondents: these cases are coded 1.
2008,2012 NOTE:
This was an admininstration (not interviewer) variable, representing language at start of interview (English coded 0, Spanish coded 1). (Interviewer could switch between English or Spanish language at any point later in the interview.)

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800734
1984: 840720,840721
1988: 880562,880563
1992: 923011,924212,924213
2008: 082011
2012: admin_pre_lang_start

===
VCF0018b

STUDY ADMIN: Language of Interview - Post

QUESTION:

1980: Was this interview conducted in English? (IF NO:) In What language was this interview conducted?
1984,1988,1992: Was this interview conducted entirely in English, or was it necessary to translate some (or all) questions into another language? What language?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. IW conducted entirely in English; 2008,2012: beginning language
1. Some or all of IW translated to Spanish
3. Some or all of IW translated to French
4. Some or all of IW conducted in either Spanish or French
5. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language
     other than Spanish or French
7. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language
     but NA which language

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if English or other language

INAP. Inap. no Post IW; abbrev. Post IW (1984)

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For studies prior to 1978 it is not entirely certain whether any full
or partial translations occurred, however none have been documented and
all cases prior to 1978 are coded 0. This was a question for the
interviewer (except 1994).
1978 NOTE:
Code 4 includes 1978 cases from code "Spanish, French".
1988 NOTE:
A language variable appeared for the Pre but not for the Post.
1992 NOTE:
For an unknown reason, this question was not answered by interviewers
in 826 cases.
1994 NOTE:
This was an admininstration (not interviewer) variable.
Spanish language versions of the Pre and Post questionnaires were
administered to Spanish-speaking respondentsl these cases are coded 1.
2004 NOTE:
This was an admininstration (not interviewer) variable.
Spanish language versions of the Pre and Post questionnaires were
administered to Spanish-speaking respondentsl these cases are coded 1.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780645
1980: 801192
1982: 820776
1984: 841117
1986: 860768,860769
1990: 900695,900696
1992: 926251,926252
1994: 940047
2008: 084011
2012: admin_post_lang_start

===
VCF0019

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: R Relationship to Head of HH 1952-1986

QUESTION:

R'S relationship to head

VALID_CODES:
----

1. R is head of household
2. R is spouse of head of household
3. R is neither head of household nor spouse of head

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. No Pre IW (1952,1960)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The concept of 'Head of Household' was used 1948-1986 (identification
of head was not coded 1948 or 1954).

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520009
1956: 560174
1958: 580173
1960: 600121
1964: 640185
1966: 660238
1968: 680265
1970: 700392
1972: 720426
1974: 742426
1976: 763514
1978: 780633
1980: 800723
1982: 820765
1984: 840710
1986: 860758

===
VCF0050a

IWR OBSERVATION: Respondent Level of Political Info - Pre

QUESTION:

PRE INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION:
Respondent's general level of information about politics and public
affairs seemed:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very high

2. Fairly high
3. Average
4. Fairly low
5. Very low

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680269
1972: 720429
1976: 763517
1980: 800726
1984: 840713
1988: 880555
1992: 924205
1996: 960070
2000: 001033
2002: 023155
2004: 043403
2008: 083303
2012: iwrobspre_levinfo

==

VCF0050b

IWR OBSERVATION: Respondent Level of Political Info - Post

QUESTION:

POST INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION:
Respondent's general level of information about politics and public
affairs seemed:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very high
2. Fairly high
3. Average
4. Fairly low
5. Very low

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. no Post IW; abbrev. Post IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1972 NOTE:
no Post version of this variable was available.
1976 NOTE:
same as 1972.
1988 NOTE:
same as 1972.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: 660242
1968: 680531
1970: 700396
1974: 742558
1978: 780636
1980: 801186
1982: 820768
1984: 841112
1986: 860761
1990: 900688
1992: 926250
1994: 941438
1996: 960940
1998: 980676
2000: 001745
2002: 025192
2004: 045303
2008: 085403
2012: iwrobspost_levinfo

===
VCF0070a

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Gender - Pre

QUESTION:

Pre interviewer gender

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Male
2. Female

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880037
1992: 923089
1996: 960090
2000: 000072
2002: 022025
2004: 042103
2008: 082252
2012: iwrdesc_pre_gender

==

VCF0070b

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Gender - Post

QUESTION:

Post interviewer gender

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Male
2. Female

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:

Post data are not available.
2000 NOTE:
Gender of post Interviewer assigned to R is coded for all cases,
including cases without post interview.
2004 NOTE:
same as 2000.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900049
1992: 925042
1994: 940101
1996: 960955
1998: 980058
2000: 000187
2002: 024025
2004: 044103
2008: 084252
2012: iwrdesc_post_gender

==
VCF0071a

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race Full - Pre

QUESTION:

Pre interviewer race - full

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White
2. Black
3. Native American
4. Asian
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For reasons of confidentiality, data are not available for the full set
of race codes after 2002 [see VCF0071c].

1988 NOTE:
Categories "Asian" and "Other" were not used.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880033
1992: 923085
1996: 960092
2000: 000074
2002: 022027

==
VCF0071b

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race Full - Pre

QUESTION:

Post interviewer race - full

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White
2. Black
3. Native American
4. Asian
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For some pre-post studies this also describes interviewers assigned to
post non-interviews. For reasons of confidentiality, data are not
available for the full set of race codes after 2002 [see VCF0071d].
1988 NOTE:
Post data are not available.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900044
1992: 925038
1994: 940103
1996: 960957
1998: 980060
2000: 000189
2002: 024027

==
VCF0071c

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race 2-category - Pre

QUESTION:

Pre interviewer race 2-category

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White
2. Nonwhite (2012: and other)
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For reasons of confidentiality, data are not available for the full set
of race codes after 2002. For years prior to 2004, this is built from
VCF0071a.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.
In 2012, all mentions other than white are combined in code 2. In
previous years, code 2 represented specific mentions of Black,
Asian, Native American, Asian, or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
and mentions outside of those specific categories were coded to 7.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880033

1992: 923085
1996: 960092
2000: 000074
2002: 022027
2004: 042105
2008: 082254
2012: iwrdesc_pre_race_white, iwrdesc_pre_race_black, iwrdesc_pre_race_other

===

VCF0071d

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race 2-category - Pre

QUESTION:

Post interviewer race 2-category

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White
2. Nonwhite (2012: and other)
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. No Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For some pre-post studies, this also describes interviewers assigned to
post non-interviews. For reasons of confidentiality, data are not
available for the full set of race codes after 2002. For years prior to
2004, this is built from VCF0071b.
1988 NOTE:
Post data are not available.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.
In 2012, all mentions other than white are combined in code 2. In
previous years, code 2 represented specific mentions of Black,
Asian, Native American, Asian, or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
and mentions outside of those specific categories were coded to 7.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900044
1992: 925038

1994: 940103
1996: 960957
1998: 980060
2000: 000189
2002: 024027
2004: 044105
2008: 084254
2012: iwrdesc_post_race_white, iwrdesc_post_race_black, iwrdesc_post_race_other

==
VCF0072a

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Ethnicity - Pre

QUESTION:

Pre interviewer ethnicity

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Non-Hispanic
2. Hispanic
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 7 Other not used until 1992.
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880034
1992: 923086
1996: 960093
2000: 000075
2002: 022027a
2008: 082255
2012: iwrdesc_pre_hisp

==
VCF0072b

IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Ethnicity - Post

QUESTION:

Post interviewer ethnicity

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Non-Hispanic
2. Hispanic
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 7 Other not used until 1992.
1988 NOTE:
Post data are not available
2012 NOTE:
This question applies only to the in-person (FTF) sample.

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900046
1992: 925039
1994: 940104
1996: 960958
1998: 980061
2000: 000190
2002: 024027a
2008: 084255
2012: iwrdesc_post_hisp

===

VCF0101

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Age

QUESTION:

1964-1976: What is your date of birth?
1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth?
1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

VALID_CODES:

17-96. Age as coded (1992: 91=91 or older; 2012: 90=90 or older)
97. 97 years old (1952, 1974, 1996 and later: or older)
98. 98 years old (1958-1962, 1966, 1968: or older)
99. 99 years old (1976-1990,1994,2002: or older)

MISSING_CODES:
----
00. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1964 this appeared as a coded staff summary (not as a survey
question).
Except for 1968, in Pre-Post studies this variable is pre-election.
Beginning in 1964, age variables in ANES Study datasets were created by
computing R's age from his/her given date of birth (beginning in 1988,
when birthdate was not available, age as given for household listing by
R/informant was used instead). The age calculation used in these
Study datasets determined age at date of interview in 1966, 1968,
1970, 1972 and 1980-1994; it represented age on November 1 of the year
of interview in 1976 and 1978. In 1974, age on election day of the
year of interview was calculated. For 1964, no documentation is extant
describing exact calculation made.
Prior to 1964, instead of age calculated using R's birthdate, age
as given by R/informant (this information may have come from the
coversheet) is represented.
1948 NOTE:
Age var was in the form of age groups and could not be included (see
VCF0102).
1954 NOTE:
same as 1948.
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated into the (pre) age var listed.
1992 NOTE:
Birthdate was not asked in short-form interviews: for panel 'short-
form' cases, 2 years were added to the age that appeared in the 1990
study; for short-form 'fresh' cross-section cases, age was pulled from
the coversheet.
2002 NOTE:
For panel cases, 2 years were added to the age (if determined) that
appeared in the 2000 study.
2008 NOTE:
Age was calculated from year of birth.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520142
1956: 560295
1958: 580174
1960: 600122
1962: 620009
1964: 640187
1966: 660192
1968: 680533
1970: 700398(type 0)
1972: 720294
1974: 742406
1976: 763369
1978: 780504
1980: 800408
1982: 820535
1984: 840429
1986: 860595
1988: 880417
1990: 900552
1992: 923903
1994: 941203
1996: 960605
1998: 980572
2000: 000908
2002: 023126x
2004: 043250
2008: 083215x
2012: dem_age_r_x

===
VCF0102

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Age Group

QUESTION:

1964-1976: What is your date of birth?
1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth?
1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 17 - 24
2. 25 - 34
3. 35 - 44
4. 45 - 54
5. 55 - 64

6. 65 - 74
7. 75 - 99 and over (except 1954)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENTERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0101 (except 1948,1954). See notes VCF0101.
1948 NOTE:
Code 6 from 1948 includes respondents 65 years and older (no code 7).
1954 NOTE:
same note as 1948

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480047
1952: 520142
1954: V540025
1956: 560295
1958: 580174
1960: 600122
1962: 620009
1964: 640187
1966: 660192
1968: 680533
1970: 700398(type 0)
1972: 720294
1974: 742406
1976: 763369
1978: 780504
1980: 800408
1982: 820535
1984: 840429
1986: 860595
1988: 880417
1990: 900552
1992: 923903
1994: 941203
1996: 960605
1998: 980572
2000: 000908
2002: 023126x

2004: 043250
2008: 083215x
2012: dem_age_r_x

==

VCF0103

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Cohort

QUESTION:

1964-1976: What is your date of birth?
1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth?
1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 1991 - present
2. 1975 - 1990
3. 1959 - 1974
4. 1943 - 1958
5. 1927 - 1942
6. 1911 - 1926
7. 1895 - 1910
8. Before 1895

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0101 (except 1954) or from birth year when available.
See notes VCF0101.
1948 NOTE:
The 1948 ANES age variable was present as age groups which do not allow
simple recoding. An estimate was made to fit those codes into the
cohort categories. The original age categories were:
   1948: 1.18-24; 2.25-34; 3.35-44; 4.45-54; 5.55-64; 6.65 and over.
The 1948 recode used was: 1=4, 2=5, 3-4=6, 5-6=7.
1954 NOTE:
The 1954 ANES age variable was present as age groups which do not allow
simple recoding. An estimate was made to fit those codes into the
cohort categories. The original age categories were:
   1954: 1.21-24; 2.25-34; 3.35-44; 4.45-54; 5.55-64; 6.over 65.
The 1954 recode used was: 1=4, 2-3=5, 4-5=6, 6=7.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480047
1952: 520142
1954: V540025
1956: 560295
1958: 580174
1960: 600122
1962: 620009
1964: 640187
1966: 660192
1968: 680533
1970: 700398(type 0)
1972: 720294
1974: 742406
1976: 763369
1978: 780504
1980: 800408
1982: 820535
1984: 840429
1986: 860595
1988: 880417
1990: 900552
1992: 923903
1994: 941203
1996: 960605
1998: 980572
2000: 000908
2002: 023126x
2004: 043249a
2008: 083215x
2012: dem_age_r_x

==
VCF0104

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Gender

QUESTION:

Respondent gender

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Male
2. Female

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For pre-post studies, when a gender variable was present in both the
pre and post, the pre variable is represented here. Coded by
interviewer.
1960 NOTE:
1960 pre variable 118 incorporated data from post gender variable
V600248 to establish the gender of 22 no-pre cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480045
1952: 520128
1954: V540026
1956: 560171
1958: 580170
1960: 600118
1962: 620098
1964: 640182
1966: 660236
1968: 680263
1970: 700390(type 0)
1972: 720424
1974: 742553
1976: 763512
1978: 780630
1980: 800720
1982: 820762
1984: 840707
1986: 860755
1988: 880413
1990: 900547
1992: 924201
1994: 941434
1996: 960066
1998: 980672
2000: 001029
2002: 023153
2004: 041109a
2008: 081101
2012: gender_respondent_x

===

VCF0105a

Race-ethnicity summary, 7 categories

QUESTION:

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.
1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you
        consider your main ethnic group or nationality
        group?
1978: Interviewer observation of Race.
     Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
     In addition to being American, is there another nationality or
     ethnic group that you feel you belong to?
     (IF YES:) What group is that?
1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race.
                  Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
                  In addition to being American, what do you
                  consider your main ethnic group or nationality
                  group?
1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your
        main ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you?
        [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR]
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your main
        ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories.
     FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider
                  yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or
                  African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native /
                  Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander /
                  Other.
                  Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White non-Hispanic (1948-2012)
2. Black non-Hispanic (1948-2012)
3. Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic (1966-2012)
4. American Indian or Alaska Native non-Hispanic (1966-2012)
5. Hispanic (1966-2012)
6. Other or multiple races, non-Hispanic (1968-2012)
7. Non-white and non-black (1948-1964)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Missing
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable corresponds to the race-ethnicity summary variable
proposed with full documentation in the January 28, 2015 ANES Memo
"Plan to update race & ethnicity variables on the ANES CDF".
Interviewer observation categories in 1948,1952,1956,1958,1960,1962,
1964 were: White; Negro; Other, including Mexicans, Puerto Ricans,
Asians (1948,1952: or Other); NA (EXC. 1960).
Interviewer observation categories for race in 1966,1968,1970,1972,
1974,1976 were: White; Negro ('Black' in 1974, 1976); Puerto Rican;
Mexican-American, Chicano ('Mexican' in '66, '68); Oriental; American
Indian; Other (EXC. 1966); NA
Interviewer observation categories fo race in 1978,1980,1982,1984,
1986,1988,1990,1992,1994,1996,1998 were: White; Black; American Indian
or Alaska Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Other (not all years; does
not include Hispanics); NA
Interviewer codes for race in instrument 2000,2002,2004,2008: Black;
Asian; Native American; Hispanic or Latino (Hispanic in 2004); White ;
Other
The question asking nationality or ethnic group 1972-2008 was open-ended
and coded to ICPSR State-Country codes (1972-1976) or to the closely
parallel ANES Ethnicity/Nationality codes (1978-2008).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: V480046
1952: V520129
1956: V560172
1958: V580171
1960: V600119
1962: V620097
1964: V640183
1966: V660237
1968: V680264
1970: V700391 (Type 0)
1972: V720406,V720425
1974: V742528,V742554
1976: V763489,V763513
1978: V780608,V780609,V780631,V780632
1980: V800695,V800696,V800721,V800722
1982: V820736,V820737,V820763,V820764
1984: V840689,V840690,V840708,V840709
1986: V860739,V860740,V860756,V860757
1988: V880412,V880534,V880535,V880540
1990: V900549,V900670,V900671,V900676

1992: V923011,V924116,V924117,V924122,V924202
1994: V941411,V941412,V941413,V941418,V941435
1996: V960067,V960703,V960704,V960708
1998: V980654,V980655,V980659,V980673
2000: V001006a,V001006b,V001006c,V001008,V001009,V001012
2002: V021001,V023150,V023151
2004: V043299,V043301a,V043301b,V043301c,V043305
2008: V083251a,V083251b,V083251c,V083251d,V083251e,V083252a,V083252b,V083252c,V083252d,V083256
2012:
dem_racecps_asian,dem_racecps_black,dem_racecps_native,dem_racecps_othrace,dem_racecps_pacif,dem_racecps_ra
cedkrf,dem_racecps_white

==
VCF0105b

Race-ethnicity summary, 4 categories

QUESTION:

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.
1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you
        consider your main ethnic group or nationality
        group?
1978: Interviewer observation of Race.
      Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
      In addition to being American, is there another nationality or
      ethnic group that you feel you belong to?
      (IF YES:) What group is that?
1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race.
                Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
                In addition to being American, what do you
                consider your main ethnic group or nationality
                group?
1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your
        main ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you?
        [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR]
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your main
        ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories.
      FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider
                yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or
                African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native /
                Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander /
                Other.
                Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. White non-Hispanic
2. Black non-Hispanic
3. Hispanic
4. Other or multiple races, non-Hispanic

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Missing, DK/REF/NA
0. Missing, pre-1966 data
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Collapsed from VCF0105a: 1=1,2=2,3=4,4=4,5=3,6=4,7=0,9=9.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: V480046
1952: V520129
1956: V560172
1958: V580171
1960: V600119
1962: V620097
1964: V640183
1966: V660237
1968: V680264
1970: V700391 (Type 0)
1972: V720406,V720425
1974: V742528,V742554
1976: V763489,V763513
1978: V780608,V780609,V780631,V780632
1980: V800695,V800696,V800721,V800722
1982: V820736,V820737,V820763,V820764
1984: V840689,V840690,V840708,V840709
1986: V860739,V860740,V860756,V860757
1988: V880412,V880534,V880535,V880540
1990: V900549,V900670,V900671,V900676
1992: V923011,V924116,V924117,V924122,V924202
1994: V941411,V941412,V941413,V941418,V941435
1996: V960067,V960703,V960704,V960708
1998: V980654,V980655,V980659,V980673
2000: V001006a,V001006b,V001006c,V001008,V001009,V001012
2002: V021001,V023150,V023151
2004: V043299,V043301a,V043301b,V043301c,V043305
2008: V083251a,V083251b,V083251c,V083251d,V083251e,V083252a,V083252b,V083252c,V083252d,V083256

2012:
dem_racecps_asian,dem_racecps_black,dem_racecps_native,dem_racecps_othrace,dem_racecps_pacif,dem_racecps_racedkrf,dem_racecps_white

==
VCF0106

Race summary, 3 categories

QUESTION:

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.
1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you
        consider your main ethnic group or nationality
        group?
1978: Interviewer observation of Race.
    Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
    In addition to being American, is there another nationality or
    ethnic group that you feel you belong to?
    (IF YES:) What group is that?
1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race.
                Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin.
                In addition to being American, what do you
                consider your main ethnic group or nationality
                group?
1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race.
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your
        main ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you?
        [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR]
        In addition to being American, what do you consider your main
        ethnic group or nationality group?
        [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish
        or Hispanic origin or descent?
2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories.
    FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider
                yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or
                African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native /
                Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander /
                Other.
                Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White non-Hispanic
2. Black non-Hispanic
3. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Missing, DK/REF/NA

0. Missing, pre-1966 data
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Collapsed from VCF0105a: 1=1,2=2,3=3,4=3,5=3,6=3,7=0,9=9.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: V480046
1952: V520129
1956: V560172
1958: V580171
1960: V600119
1962: V620097
1964: V640183
1966: V660237
1968: V680264
1970: V700391 (Type 0)
1972: V720406,V720425
1974: V742528,V742554
1976: V763489,V763513
1978: V780608,V780609,V780631,V780632
1980: V800695,V800696,V800721,V800722
1982: V820736,V820737,V820763,V820764
1984: V840689,V840690,V840708,V840709
1986: V860739,V860740,V860756,V860757
1988: V880412,V880534,V880535,V880540
1990: V900549,V900670,V900671,V900676
1992: V923011,V924116,V924117,V924122,V924202
1994: V941411,V941412,V941413,V941418,V941435
1996: V960067,V960703,V960704,V960708
1998: V980654,V980655,V980659,V980673
2000: V001006a,V001006b,V001006c,V001008,V001009,V001012
2002: V021001,V023150,V023151
2004: V043299,V043301a,V043301b,V043301c,V043305
2008: V083251a,V083251b,V083251c,V083251d,V083251e,V083252a,V083252b,V083252c,V083252d,V083256
2012:
dem_racecps_asian,dem_racecps_black,dem_racecps_native,dem_racecps_othrace,dem_racecps_pacif,dem_racecps_ra
cedkrf,dem_racecps_white

===

VCF0107

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Hispanic Origin Type

QUESTION:

1988 AND LATER: In addition to being American, what do you consider
your main ethnic group or nationality group? (IF NO HISPANIC GROUP
MENTIONED:) Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?
IF YES:) Please look at the booklet and tell me which category best
describes your Hispanic origin.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, Mexican-American, Chicano
2. Yes, Puerto Rican
3. Yes, other Hispanic
4. Yes, Hispanic but DK/NA type
7. No, not Hispanic

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK if Hispanic
9. NA if Hispanic
0. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

SEE ALSO VCF0108.
GENERAL NOTE:
RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R (exc. 2000 telephone and 2002:) .
Beginning in 1988, the respondent was asked within the series of
ethnicity questions [SEE VCF0109] whether s/he is Hispanic. Prior to
1988, information about Hispanic origin was determined only by
interviewer observation.
1978 NOTE:
A large number (171) of NAs appeared in the Study data.
1980 NOTE:
A Hispanic origin variable was present in both the pre and post. The
pre version is represented here.
1984 NOTE:
same as 1980
1992 NOTE:
This was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-form
panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
2002 NOTE:
For panel cases, 2000 data were incorporated.
2004 NOTE:
A question on Hispanic identity of household members was also
administered as part of the screener (household listing). Data for
the screener identification of Hispanic status are found separately
in the 2008 Time Series study data; screener Hispanic status was
used in the construction of the 2008 study weights.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780632
1980: 800722
1982: 820764
1984: 840709
1986: 860757
1988: 880540,880541
1990: 900676,900677
1992: 924122,924123
1994: 941418,941419
1996: 960708,960709
1998: 980659,980660
2000: 001012,001013
2002: 023152
2004: 043306
2008: 083255,083256,083256a

==
VCF0108

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Hispanic Origin

QUESTION:

1988 AND LATER: In addition to being American, what do you consider
your main ethnic group or nationality group? (IF NO HISPANIC GROUP
MENTIONED:) Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?
IF YES:) Please look at the booklet and tell me which category best
describes your Hispanic origin.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, R is Hispanic
2. No, R is not Hispanic

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Collapsed from VCF0107.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780632
1980: 800722
1982: 820764
1984: 840709
1986: 860757
1988: 880540,880541
1990: 900676,900677
1992: 924122,924123
1994: 941418,941419
1996: 960708,960709
1998: 980659,980660
2000: 001012,001013
2002: 023151
2004: 043305,043306
2008: 083255,083256,083256a

===

VCF0109

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Ethnicity

QUESTION:

In addition to being an American what do you consider your main
ethnic group or nationality group?
(IF MORE THAN 1 GROUP MENTIONED:) With which of these groups do you
most closely identify?

VALID_CODES:

010-874. Ethnicity as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
877. 'American'; 'Just American'; none; neither
    (response to 'choice' question); NA
888. DK
000. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See ethnicicty codes- Appendix "ETHNICITY"
GENERAL NOTE:
This represents the single mention of respondents who indicated only
1 ethnic group and the 'most close' group (followup question) of
respondents who indicated more than 1 ethnic group.
There is no code to single out Rs who volunteered to assert their
'American' identity. This is because in most years these Rs were
combined with NA and/or 'none' (no ethnic identity).
1978 NOTE:
A version of this question which included a (filter) lead-in was used:
'In addition to being an American, is there another nationality group
or ethnic group that you feel you belong to?   [IF YES] What...'
Because of this format, the 1978 distributions varied dramatically from
other years, and 1978 data have not been included.
1992 NOTE:
This was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-form
panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
1996 NOTE:
In a few cases R identified 2 or more nationality/ethnicity groups but
the interviewer did not ask the 'choice' followup (due to incorrect
completion of the IWR checkpoint); since R's chosen nationality/
ethnicity remained undetermined, these cases (30) were considered
missing data (code 99 here).
2004 NOTE:
For respondents who gave multiple mentions but did not choose one
ethnic group as closest, 1st mention is coded.
2008 NOTE:
For respondents who gave multiple mentions but did not choose one
ethnic group as closest, 1st mention is coded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720406
1974: 742528
1976: 763489
1980: 800695,800696,800697
1982: 820739
1984: 840692
1986: 860742
1988: 880537
1990: 900673
1992: 924116,924119
1994: 941415

1996: 960706
1998: 980657
2000: 001008
2004: 043303x
2008: 083254x

===

VCF0110

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 4-category

QUESTION:

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?
1974,1976: What is highest grade of school or year of college
you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high
school equivalency test? Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What
degree is that?
1978-1984: What is highest grade of school or year of college
you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high
school equivalency test? Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What
is the highest degree that you have earned?
1986-2008: What is highest grade of school or year of college
you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high
school equivalency test? What is the highest degree that you have
earned?
2012: What is the highest level of school you have completed or the
highest degree you have received?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Grade school or less (0-8 grades)
2. High school (12 grades or fewer, incl. non-college
     training if applicable)
3. Some college (13 grades or more but no degree;
     1948 ONLY: college, no identification of degree
     status)
4. College or advanced degree (no cases 1948)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0140.
GENERAL NOTE:
Code 4 includes 1 case in 1968, 2 cases in 1976 and 4 cases in 1974
which were designated by respondents as 'honorary degrees.'
1948 NOTE 1:
Question wording is undocumented.
1948 NOTE 2:

No distinction was made between Rs holding college degrees and those who attended college but did not receive a degree. All cases coded 'college' in 1948 are coded 3 -- there are no cases coded 4 for 1948.
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these forms were incorporated.
1992 NOTE:
This was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
2002 NOTE:
For panel cases, 2000 data were incorporated.
2004 NOTE:
1 respondent who did not indicate highest grade, but who indicated no high school diploma, has been coded 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480048
1952: 520131
1954: V540020
1956: 560181
1958: 580180
1960: 600128
1962: 620078
1964: 640196
1966: 660197
1968: 680156
1970: 700269(type 0)
1972: 720300
1974: 742418
1976: 763389
1978: 780513
1980: 800436
1982: 820542
1984: 840438
1986: 860602
1988: 880422
1990: 900557
1992: 923905,923908
1994: 941206,941209
1996: 960607,960610
1998: 980577
2000: 000913
2002: 023131

2004: 043254
2008: 083218x
2012: dem_edu

===

VCF0111

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Urbanism

QUESTION:

Urbanism

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Central cities
2. Suburban areas
3. Rural, small towns, outlying and adjacent areas

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone (RDD) sample (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See "URBANISM NOTE" appendix.
This represents R's sampling address. Data are not available after
2000.
1948 NOTE:
Urbanism variable was not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520007
1954: V540003
1956: 560004
1958: 580005
1960: 600006
1962: 620003
1964: 640006
1966: 660006
1968: 680008
1970: 700027(type 0)
1972: 720012

1974: 742017
1976: 763018
1978: 780026
1980: 800021
1982: 820025
1984: 840019
1986: 860031
1988: 880022
1990: 900023
1992: 923067
1994: 940059
1996: 960118
1998: 980099
2000: 000093

===

VCF0112

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Census Region

QUESTION:

Region - U.S. Census

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Northeast (CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)
2. North Central (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND,
     OH, SD, WI)
3. South (AL, AR, DE, D.C., FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC
     OK, SC,TN, TX, VA, WV)
4. West (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA,
     WY)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA (1948)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable represents the region codes of the U.S. Census.
1952 NOTE:
No state variable was present, however this was recoded from sampling
location information.
1962 NOTE:
same as 1952.
1954 NOTE:
No state variable was present and no other location information was
available; this has been coded from a non-Census version region
variable comprised of categories containing unspecified states:
1. Northeast; 2. Midwest 3. South; 4. Far West.
1994 NOTE:

For panel respondents who moved between study years, region corresponds
to the place where R was intereviewed for the latest study.
1996 NOTE:
same as 1994

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520005
1954: V540019
1956: 560007
1958: 580009
1960: 600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012
1966: 660010
1968: 680014
1970: 700018(type 0)
1972: 720004
1974: 742005
1976: 763005
1978: 780012
1980: 800023
1982: 820014
1984: 840009
1986: 860025
1988: 880008
1990: 900008
1992: 923014
1994: 940011
1996: 960115
1998: 980098
2000: 000092
2002: 021203
2004: 041204a
2008: 081204
2012: sample_region

===

VCF0113

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Political South/Nonsouth

QUESTION:

Region - political south

VALID_CODES:
----
1. South
2. Nonsouth

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This var identifies the 11 secession states: Alabama, Arkansas,
Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. These states cannot be
identified for 1954.
This identification of 'south' does NOT conform to the definition
used in VCF0112 (Census-defined region).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520005
1956: 560007
1958: 580009
1960: 600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012
1966: 660010
1968: 680013
1970: 700019(type 0)
1972: 720005
1974: 742006
1976: 763006
1978: 780014
1980: 800023
1982: 820014
1984: 840009
1986: 860025
1988: 880008
1990: 900008
1992: 923014
1994: 940011
1996: 960108
1998: 980086
2000: 000092
2002: 021201
2004: 041204a
2008: 081201b

==

VCF0114

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Income Group

QUESTION:

1952,1956-1960:
About what do you think your total income will be this year for yourself
and your immediate family?
1962:
Would you tell me how much income you and your family will be making
during this calendar year, 1962. I mean, before taxes.
1964,1968:
About what do you think your total income will be this year for yourself
and your immediate family. Just give me the number/ letter) of the
right income category.
1966,1970:
Many people don't know their exact (1966/1970) income yet; but would you
tell me as best you can what you expect your (1966/1970) income to be--
before taxes? You may just tell me the letter of the group on this card
into which your family income will probably fall.
1972-1990, 1992 LONG-FORM,1994-2008 EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE:
Please look at this card/page (2000 FTF: the booklet) and tell me the
letter of the income group that includes the income of all members of
your family living here in [previous year] before taxes. This figure
should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all
other income. (IF UNCERTAIN:) What would be your best guess?
1992 SHORT FORM:
Can you give us an estimate of your total family income in 1991 before
taxes? This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends,
interest and all other income for every member of your family living in
your house in 1991. First could you tell me if that was above or below
$24,999? (IF UNCERTAIN: what would be your best guess?) (IF ABOVE/BELOW
$24,999:) I will read you some income categories, could you please stop
me when I reach the category that corresponds to your family situation?
2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a list of income categories. Please tell me which
category best describes the.total income of all members of your family
living in your house in 1999 before taxes. This figure should include
salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all other income.
Please stop me when I get to your family's income.
2012:
Information about income is very important to understand how people are
doing financially these days. Your answers are confidential. Would you
please give your best guess?
The next question is about [the total income of all the members of your
family living here / your total income] in 2011, before taxes.
This figure should include income from all sources, including salaries,
wages, pensions, Social Security, dividends, interest, and all other
income. What was [the total income in 2011 of all your family members
living here / your total income in 2011]?

(IF DK/RF:) Was it $40,000 or more, or less than that?
(IF LESS THAN 40,000:) Was it $20,000 or more, or less than that?
(IF LESS THAN 40,000 AND LESS THAN 20,000:) Please mark the answer that
includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011
before taxes.
(IF LESS THAN 40,000 BUT MORE THAN 20,000:) Please mark the answer
that includes the income of all members of your family living here
in 2011 before taxes.
(IF MORE THAN 40,000:) Was it $70,000 or more, or less than that?
(IF MORE THAN 40,000 BUT LESS THAN 70,000:) Please mark the answer
that includes the income of all members of your family living here
in 2011 before taxes.
(IF MORE THAN 40,000 AND MORE THAN 70,000:) Was it $100,000 or more,
or less than that?
(IF MORE THAN 40,000, MORE THAN 70,000, BUT LESS THAN 100,000:)
Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members
of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.
(IF MORE THAN 40,000, MORE THAN 70,000 AND MORE THAN 100,000:)
Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members
of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 0 to 16 percentile
2. 17 to 33 percentile
3. 34 to 67 percentile
4. 68 to 95 percentile
5. 96 to 100 percentile

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "INCOME" for income ranges corresponding to these
percentiles.
Study coding of income was approximated as closely as possible to fit
within this version. Prior to 1972, this was an estimate of CURRENT
year's income; since 1972, PREVIOUS year's income. Note that in all
years beginning 1976 this question was not actually asked if R was the
only household member age 14 or over: in such cases, data from the
question asking R's own income was duplicated. (Prior to 1976 R's
own income was not determined.)
Beginning in 1964, R was shown a respondent card or booklet.
1948 NOTE:
Question wording was undocumented.
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from
these forms were incorporated.
1996 NOTE:
For 14 cases, interviewers entered responses where individual income

was higher than family income. In some of these cases, the responses for family income and R income may have been provided.entered in incorrect order.

1998 NOTE:

Some interviewers coded lowest income category when the respondent stated that he or she did not know what the household income was. Study staff has reviewed all interviewer comment material available to identify cases coded in the lowest category where comment notes clearly indicate Don't Know; such cases have been recoded to DK. However, it is not known whether there are additional DK cases (without recorded comments) for which lowest category had been incorrectly coded.

2002 NOTE:

Income categories were too broad for approximation here.

2012 NOTE:

Income range was included in the public release. Percentile group represents full (combined) 2012 sample, including both in-person (FTF) and Web respondents.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480049
1952: 520160
1954: V540023
1956: 560190
1958: 580203
1960: 600189
1962: 620075
1964: 640269
1966: 660235
1968: 680261
1970: 700388(type 0)
1972: 720420
1974: 742549
1976: 763507
1978: 780598
1980: 800686
1982: 820725
1984: 840680
1986: 860733
1988: 880520
1990: 900663
1992: 924104
1994: 941404
1996: 960701
1998: 980652
2000: 000994

2004: 043293x
2008: 083248x
2012: incgroup_prepost_x

===
VCF0115

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation Group 6-category

QUESTION:

1952-1964:
What is your occupation. I mean, what kind of work do you do? (IF NOT
CLEAR OR OBVIOUS [1958,1960,1964 only]:) What exactly do you do on your
job? (IF NOT ASCERTAINED:) What kind of business is that? (IF R IS
UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work do you usually do? (IF R IS RETIRED:)
What kind of work did you do before you retired?
1968-1970:
(IF EMPLOYED OR ON STRIKE:) What kind of work do you do? [What exactly
do you do on your job?] (IF UNEMPLOYED OR RETIRED:) What kind of work
did you do when you were employed? [What exactly did you do on your job?]
1972-1982:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main
occupation [What sort of work do you do? Tell me a little more about
what you do.] (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work did you do on
your last regular job [What was your occupation?]   (IF R IS RETIRED OR
DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do when you worked [What was your
main occupation?]
1984 AND LATER:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main
occupation [What sort of work do you do?] What are your most important
activities or duties? (IF R IS RETIRED/UNEMPLOYED /DISABLED:) What kind
of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?]
What were your most important activities or duties?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Professional and managerial
2. Clerical and sales workers
3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers
4. Laborers, except farm
5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen;
     forestry and fishermen
6. Homemakers (1972-1992: 7 IN VCF0116, 4 in VCF0118;
     1952-1970: 4 in VCF0118)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; member of armed forces; no occupation and not a
     homemaker; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix OCCUPATION notes.
GENERAL NOTE:
This represents current employment of respondents defined as 'working now', and represents past employment of respondents defined as retired, unemployed, or disabled; respondents defined as homemakers are coded 6, and respondents defined as students are coded 0.
Exclusion: in studies 1966-later, additional occupation data were available for Rs considered "students" and "housewives" (either nonworking [past/recent employment] or currently working some hours [1966-1970: any number of hours; 1972 and later: less than 20 hours per week], but corresponding occupation data were not available at all in the 1952,1956,1958,1960 or 1964 studies, and VCF0115 excludes the occupation of this additional set of (1966-later) respondents: VCF0151 includes such additional data.
2002 NOTE:
Respondent occupation was not determined.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Occuption has not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520132,520134
1956: 560120,560123
1958: 580181,580184
1960: 600129,600132
1964: 640202,640205
1968: 680161
1970: 700275,700276(type 0)
1972: 720306,720309
1974: 742443,742446
1976: 763409,763412
1978: 780531,780534
1980: 800454,800455,800471,800486
1982: 820556,820557,820572
1984: 840456,840504,840516
1986: 860614,860664
1988: 880428,880466
1990: 900565,900603
1992: 923914,923955
1994: 941215,941216

1996: 960615,960676
1998: 980579,980639
2000: 000919,000980
2004: 043262p

==
VCF0116

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 7-category

QUESTION:

1972-1978:
(1972: We'd like to know if you are looking for work, working now) (1974-
1978: We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,)
retired, (a housewife) a (student), or what? (IF HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT)
Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (IF R IS HOMEMAKER
OR STUDENT AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work
on your job in the average week?
1980 AND LATER EXC. 2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are
you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a
student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for
pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you
doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND
LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR
HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average
week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do
you work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R
ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do
you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R
VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work
on your job in the average week?
2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,
retired, a homemaker, (a student), or what? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Working now
2. Temporarily laid off
4. Unemployed
5. Retired
6. Permanently disabled
7. Homemaker
8. Student

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See appendix note "WORK STATUS".
See also VCF0118,VCF0150.
GENERAL NOTE:
For all years except 2002, this is occupation status after the
respondent has first self-identified in one or more occupation
categories and then answered other employment questions related to work
history, number of work hours etc.; for these years, it may be that
coding here differs from R's initial self-identification(s).
2002 NOTE:
2000 data have been incorporated for panel cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720306
1974: 742443
1976: 763409
1978: 780531
1980: 800515
1982: 820610
1984: 840457
1986: 860615
1988: 880429
1990: 900566
1992: 923915
1994: 941216
1996: 960676
1998: 980579a
2000: 000920
2002: 023132x
2004: 043260b
2008: 083222a
2012: dem_empstatus_1digitfin_x

===
VCF0117

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Work Status 7-category 1948-1986

QUESTION:

1948: What is [head's] occupation, I mean, what kind of work does
head) do?
1972-1978:
We'd also like to know about the head of the family. Is (he/she) working
now, looking for work, retired,(a housewife), (a student), or what?

(HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT, AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?
1980-1986:
We'd like to know if he/she is working now, temporarily laid off, or is he/she unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours does he/she work on his/her job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week does he/she work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Working now
2. Temporarily laid off
4. Unemployed (1972 adds "looking for work.")
5. Retired
6. Permanently disabled
7. Housewife (not working at least 20 hrs. per wk.)
8. Student (not working at least 20 hrs. per wk.)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See appendix note "WORK STATUS".
GENERAL NOTE:
After 1986, the concept of 'Head of Household' was discontinued.
1948 NOTE:
Constructed from the variable for occupation of Head.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480029
1972: 720329
1974: 742466

1976: 763431
1978: 780553
1980: 800592
1982: 820666
1984: 840531
1986: 860676

===

VCF0118

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 5-category

QUESTION:

1968-1970:
Are you presently employed, or are you unemployed, or retired, (a
housewife), (a student), or what?
1972-1978:
(1972: We'd like to know if you are looking for work, working now) (1974-
1978: We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,)
retired, (a housewife) a (student), or what? (IF HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT)
Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (IF R IS HOMEMAKER
OR STUDENT AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work
on your job in the average week?
1980 AND LATER EXC. 2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are
you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a
student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for
pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you
doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND
LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR
HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average
week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do
you work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R
ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do
you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R
VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work
on your job in the average week?
2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,
retired, a homemaker, (a student), or what? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Employed
2. Not employed: laid off, unemployed, on strike,
    permanently disabled, other (Exc.: retired,
    student, housewife)
3. Retired
4. Homemaker (since 1972: not working 20 or more hrs/wk;
    1968-1970: if identifies self as "housewife;" 1956-
    1964: not working at all; 1952: not working full
    time)
5. Student (since 1972: not working 20 or more hrs/wk;

1970:if identifies self as "student;" 1968: if
identifies self as student--unless working full
time days [coded 'employed']; 1956-1964: full or
part time day student, working or not;
1952: not employed full time)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See appendix note "WORK STATUS".
See also VCF0116,VCF0150.
GENERAL NOTE:
No direct question asking R about his/her work status was used prior
to 1968. Instead, R was asked what his/her occupation was, and codes
for "student," "retired," "housewife," "unemployed" etc. appeared
within the occupation codes from which this variable has been
recoded. For years prior to 1972, this is respondent self-
identification (exceptions described in the appendix for cases where R
described self as working student or homemaker).
For years 1972 and later except 2002 fresh cross, this is occupation
status after the respondent has first self-identified in one or more
occupation categories and then has answered other employment questions
related to work history, number of work hours etc.; for these years,
it may be that coding here differs from R's initial self-
identification(s).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520132
1956: 560120
1958: 580181
1960: 600129
1964: 640202
1968: 680160
1970: 700275(type 0)
1972: 720306
1974: 742443
1976: 763409
1978: 780531
1980: 800515
1982: 820610

1984: 840457
1986: 860615
1988: 880429
1990: 900565
1992: 923915
1994: 941216
1996: 960616
1998: 980579a
2000: 000920
2002: 023132x
2004: 043260b
2008: 083222x
2012: dem_empstatus_1digitfin_x

==

VCF0119

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Work Status 5-category 1952-1986

QUESTION:

1968,1970:
Is (the head) presently employed, or is (he/she) unemployed, retired, (a
hosuewife), (a student), or what?
1972-1978:
We'd also like to know about the head of the family. Is (he/she) working
now, looking for work, retired,(a housewife), (a student), or what?
(HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present
time? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT, AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many
hours do you work on your job in the average week?
1980-1986:
We'd like to know if he/she is working now, temporarily laid off, or is
he/she unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a
student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Is he/she doing any work for
pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982) Is he/she doing any work
for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982) Is he/she doing any work
for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many
hours does he/she work on his/her job in the average week? (RETIRED AND
ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week does he/she work 20
or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING
FOR PAY 1982:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the
average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY
1984,1986:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the
average week?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Employed
2. Not employed: laid off, unemployed, on strike,
    permanently disabled and other except for retired,
    student or housewife
3. Retired (1966 adds "over 65")
4. Homemaker (see VCF0118)
5. Student (see VCF0118)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0118.
GENERAL NOTE:
After 1986, the concept of 'Head of Household' was discontinued.
GENERAL NOTE:
No direct question asking R about head's work status was used prior
to 1968. Instead, R was asked what head's occupation was, and codes
for "student," "retired," "housewife," "unemployed" etc. appeared
within the occupation codes from which this variable has been
recoded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520135
1956: 560125
1958: 580188
1960: 600136
1964: 640209
1966: 660199
1968: 680168
1970: 700298(type 0)
1972: 720329
1974: 742466
1976: 763431
1978: 780553
1980: 800592
1982: 820666
1984: 840531
1986: 860676

===

VCF0120

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score S.E.I. Rank 1976-1984

QUESTION:

Duncan S.E.I. score for R

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. R is member of armed forces or former member
000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)--
      all years; R is nonworking student or housewife--
      all years; R is housewife or student working less
      than 20 hrs per week (1976,1978)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
1976-1982 NOTE 1:
Score (3-digit code, see APPENDIX "DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE
SCALES 1976-1982") based on 1970 U.S. Census occupation codes.
1976-1982 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point, i.e., code 578 represents a score
of 57.8.
1984 NOTE 1:
Score (4-digit code, see APPENDIX "1984 DUNCAN S.E.I.") is based on
1980 U.S. Census occupation codes; distributions are not comparable to
earlier years (based on 1970 Census).
1984 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763413,763425
1978: 780535,780547
1980: 800504,800517
1982: 820558,820573,820586,820600
1984: 841136

===
VCF0121

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score S.E.I. Rank 1976-1984

QUESTION:

Duncan S.E.I. score for Head

MISSING_CODES:
----

998. Head is member of armed forces or former member
999. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's
      occupation NA
000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)-
      all years; R is nonworking student or housewife-
      all years; R is housewife or student working less
      than 20 hrs per week (1976,1978)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
1976-1982 NOTE 1:
Score (3-digit code, see APPENDIX "DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE
SCALES 1976-1982") based on 1970 U.S. Census occupation codes.
1976-1982 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point, i.e., code 578 represents a score
of 57.8.
1984 NOTE 1:
Score (4-digit code, see APPENDIX "1984 DUNCAN S.E.I.") is based on
1980 U.S. Census occupation codes; distributions are not comparable
to earlier years (based on 1970 Census).
1984 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763435,763446
1978: 780557,780569
1980: 800581,800594
1982: 820614,820629,820642,820656
1984: 841138

===
VCF0122

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score NORC Rank 1976-1982

QUESTION:

NORC Prestige score for R

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. R is member of armed forces or former member; R's

occupation has no NORC code (2 categories:
carpenter's helpers, or fishermen and oystermen)
000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)--
all years; R is nonworking student or housewife--
all years; R is housewife or student working less
than 20 hrs per week (1976,1978)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
1976-1982 NOTE 1:
Score (3-digit code, see APPENDIX "DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE
SCALES 1976-1982") based on 1970 U.S. Census occupation codes.
1976-1982 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point, i.e., code 578 represents a
score of 57.8.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763414,763426
1978: 780536,780548
1980: 800505,800518
1982: 820559,820574,820587,820601

==

VCF0123

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score NORC Rank 1976-1982

QUESTION:

NORC Prestige score for Head

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. Head is member of armed forces or former member;
Head's occupation has no NORC code (2 categories:
carpenter's helpers, and fishermen and oystermen)
999. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's
occupation NA
000. Head has never worked (unemployed or
disabled)--all years; Head is nonworking student
or housewife--all years; Head is housewife or
student working less than 20 hours per week

(1976,1978); identity of head of household not
established (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
1976-1982 NOTE 1:
Score (3-digit code, see APPENDIX "DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE
SCALES 1976-1982") based on 1970 U.S. Census occupation codes.
1976-1982 NOTE 2:
Scores have 1 implied decimal point, i.e., code 578 represents a
score of 57.8.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763436,763447
1978: 780558,780570
1980: 800582,800595
1982: 820615,820630,820643,820657

===
VCF0124

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score S.E.S. Rank 1968-1974

QUESTION:

Duncan S.E.S. score for R

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. R is member of armed forces or former member; R's
    occupation has no S.E.S. code (tobacco
    manufacturers)
99. NA if R is working now/ has ever worked; R's
    occupation is NA
00. R is housewife, student (or student with job),
    unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, or
    "handles own investments only" (1966-1968); R is
    nonworking housewife,nonworking student,
    permanently disabled, "handles own investments
    only"(1970); R is nonworking housewife/student
    who has not worked in past 12 months, or is working
    housewife/student but working less than 20 hours

per week, or R has never worked unemployed or
disabled) or "handles own investments only" (1972,
1974)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
GENERAL NOTE:
These ratings were based on 1960 U.S. Census Occupation codes. This
2-digit code has no implied decimal points.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680163
1970: 700278,700290(type 0)
1972: 720310,720322
1974: 742447,742459

===
VCF0125

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score S.E.S. Rank 1968-1974

QUESTION:

Duncan S.E.S. score for Head

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. Head is member of armed forces or former member;
    Head's occupation has no S.E.S. code (tobacco
    manufacturers)
99. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's
    occupation is NA
00. Head is housewife, student (or student with
    job), unemployed, retired, permanently disabled,
    or "handles own investments only"(1966-1968); Head
    is nonworking housewife, nonworking student,
    permanently disabled, "handles own investments
    only" (1970); Head is nonworking housewife/student
    who has not worked in past 12 months, or is
    working housewife/ student but working less than
    20 hrs per week, or Head has never
    worked (unemployed or disabled) or "handles own

investimentos only"(1972, 1974)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See PRESTIGE SCORE appendices.
GENERAL NOTE:
These ratings were based on 1960 U.S. Census Occupation codes. This
2-digit code has no implied decimal points.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: 660204
1968: 680171
1970: 700301,700313(type 0)
1972: 720333,720345
1974: 742470,742482

==

VCF0126

DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation 5-category 1952-1996

QUESTION:

What kind of work did your father (SINCE 1978: [or father surrogate])
do for a living while you were growing up?
(SINCE 1984: What was his main occupation?)
(SINCE 1986: What were his most important activities or duties?)
(SINCE 1984: What kind of business or industry was that?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Professional and managerial
2. Clerical and sales workers
3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers
4. Laborers, except farm
5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; father wasn't living/not raised by father/no
    information for parental surrogate; member of armed
    forces; father not in labor force; no Pre IW;
    short-form or Spanish language (1992)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Since 1984, this variable has been a recode taken from 1980 U.S.
Census Occupation codes [recoded here from collapsed-code Census
variables appearing in ANES datasets].
Prior to 1984, this variable was a recode from the following:
1976-1982: 1970 U.S. Census Occupation codes
1968-1974: CPS Political Behavior Occupation codes
1964: 1960 U.S. Census Occupation codes
1956-1960: 1950 U.S. Dept. of Commerce Census of occupations
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520141
1956: 560298
1958: 580257
1960: 600180
1964: 640259
1966: 660228
1968: 680252
1970: 700370(type 0)
1972: 720413
1974: 742534
1976: 763495
1978: 780618
1980: 800705
1982: 820747
1984: 840694
1986: 860744
1988: 880542
1992: 924126
1996: 960710

===

VCF0126a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent Occupation 8-category 1970-1976

QUESTION:

What kind of work did your father (SINCE 1978: [or father surrogate])
do for a living while you were growing up?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers
2. Managers, officials and proprietors exc. farm
3. Clerical and kindred workers, sales workers
4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers and
   authoritative) protective service workers
5. Operative and kindred workers
6. Service workers, including private household
   workers and (exec. authoritative) protective
   service workers
7. Laborers, except farm
8. Farm laborers and foremen; farmers; owners,
   managers, tenant farmers and sharecroppers

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Occupation not reported (NA); members of armed
   forces; not in labor force
0. Father wasn't living; not raised by father; no
   parallel information for parental surrogate
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700370
1972: 720413
1974: 742534
1976: 763495

===

VCF0126b

DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation Group 1978-1982,1996

QUESTION:

What kind of work did your father or father surrogate do for a
living while you were growing up?

VALID_CODES:

----
01. Professional, technical and kindred workers
02. Managers and administrators, except farm
03. Sales workers
04. Clerical and kindred workers
05. Craftsmen and kindred workers
06. Operatives, except transport
07. Transport equipment operatives
08. Laborers, except farm
09. Farmers (owners and tenants), farm managers,
    farmer -- NA type
10. Farm foreman, farm laborer (wage-worker)
11. Service workers, except private household and
    government protective services
12. Government protective services: firemen; police;
    marshals and constables
13. Private household workers
14. Member of armed forces
15. Not in labor force

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
00. Father wasn't living; not raised by father; no
    parallel information for parental surrogate
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1996 NOTE:
No code corresponding to 15 in Study data.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780618
1980: 800705
1982: 820747
1996: 960710

==

VCF0126c

DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation Group 1984-1988,1992

QUESTION:

What kind of work did your father or father surrogate do for a
living while you were growing up? What was his main occupation?
(SINCE 1986:) What were his most important activities or duties?
What kind of business or industry was that?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. Executive, administrative and managerial
02. Professional speciality occupations
03. Technicians and related support occupations
04. Sales occupation
05. Administrative support, including clerical
06. Private household
07. Protective service
08. Service exc. protective and household
09. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations
10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations
11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors
12. Transportation and material, moving occupations
13. Handler, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers
14. Member of armed forces
15. Not in labor force

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
00. Father wasn't living; not raised by father;
     no parallel information for parental surrogate;
     short form or Spanish language questionnaire (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840694
1986: 860744
1988: 880542
1992: 924126

===

VCF0127

DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Union Membership

QUESTION:

1948:
Does [head] belong to a labor union?
1952,1954:
Do either you or the head of your household belong to a labor union?
Who is it that belongs?
1956 AND LATER:
(1956-1984,2002: Does anyone) (1986-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988:
does] anyone else) in this household belong to a labor union?
(IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, someone (1948: head) in household belongs to a
    labor union
2. No, no one in household belongs to a labor union

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross
    Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1948 NOTE:
"Yes" acknowledged only head's union affiliation.
1952 NOTE:
"Yes" acknowledged only R's or the head of household's union
affiliation.
1954 NOTE:
same as 1952
1992 NOTE:
This was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-form
panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
2002 DATA:
Asked only of 'fresh' cross-section cases; for panel cases 2000 data
have been included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480030
1952: 520139
1954: V540024

1956: 560130
1958: 580205
1960: 600150
1964: 640228
1966: 660215
1968: 680201
1970: 700347(type 0)
1972: 720378
1974: 742515
1976: 763476
1978: 780595
1980: 800683
1982: 820722
1984: 840676
1986: 860729
1988: 880517
1990: 900660
1992: 924101
1994: 941401
1996: 960698
1998: 980649
2000: 000990
2002: 023133,023133a
2004: 043290
2008: 083246
2012: dem_unionhh

==

VCF0127a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Who Belongs to Union 8-category

QUESTION:

(1988-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988: does] anyone else; 2002: Does
anyone) in this household belong to a labor union?
(IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

VALID_CODES:
----
00. No one
11. Respondent only
12. Spouse only
13. Other household member only
21. R and spouse
22. R and other household member
23. Spouse and other household member
31. R, spouse and other household member

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. DK; NA; DK/NA if anyone in union; short-form 'new'
Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0127.
2002 NOTE:
Asked only of 'fresh' cross-section cases; for panel cases 2000 data
have been included.
Maximum of 2 mentions for 2002 Fresh cross-section cases; for panel
cases 2000 data have been included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880517,880518
1990: 900660,900661
1992: 924101,924102
1994: 941401,941402
1996: 960698,960699
1998: 980649,980650
2000: 000990,000991c
2002: 023134,023134a
2004: 043290,043291
2008: 083246,083246a
2012: dem_unionhh,dem_unionwho_r,dem_unionwho_spouse,dem_unionwho_personoth

===
VCF0127b

DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Who Belongs to Union 4-category

QUESTION:

1952:
Do either you or the head of your household belong to a labor union?
Who is it that belongs?
1956 AND LATER:
(1956-1984,2002: Does anyone) (1986-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988:
does] anyone else) in this household belong to a labor union?
(IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No one
1. R only
2. Someone other than R only
3. R and someone other than R

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross
    Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
'Someone other than R' can designate 1 or more persons.
1948,1954 NOTE:
In 1948 and 1954 it was not possible to distinguish when R was head,
and 1948 and 1954 are not included.
1952 NOTE:
Only R's or the head of household's union affiliation was coded; for
1952, codes 2 and 3 only include persons other than R if they were
designated head of household.
1992 NOTE:
This was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-form
panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
2002 NOTE:
Asked only of 'fresh' cross-section cases; for panel cases 2000 data
have been included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520009,520139
1956: 560130,560174
1958: 580205,580173
1960: 600150,600121
1964: 640228,640185
1966: 660215,660238
1968: 680201,680265
1970: 700347,700348,700392(type 0)
1972: 720378,720379,720426
1974: 742515,742516,742426
1976: 763392,763476,763477
1978: 780595,780596
1980: 800683,800684
1982: 820722,820723
1984: 840676,840678
1986: 860729,860731
1988: 880517,880518
1990: 900660,900661

1992: 924101,924102
1994: 941401,941402
1996: 960698,960699
1998: 980649,980650
2000: 000990,000991a,000991b,000991c
2002: 023134,023134a
2004: 043290,043291
2008: 083246,083246a
2012: dem_unionhh,dem_unionwho_r,dem_unionwho_spouse,dem_unionwho_personoth

==

VCF0128

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Major Group

QUESTION:

1952-1964: Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant,
Catholic or Jewish?
1966-1968: Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish?
1970-1988,2002: Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic,
Jewish, or something else?
1990 AND LATER, exc. 2002: (IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you
mostly attend a place of worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic,
Jewish or what? (IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:)
Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services do you
ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or
denomination? (IF YES:) Do you consider yourself Protestant, Roman
Catholic, Jewish or what?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Protestant
2. Catholic [Roman Catholic]
3. Jewish
4. Other and none (also includes DK preference)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;
    short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0129 and VCF0152.
GENERAL NOTE:
In all Pre-Post studies except 1960 this was a Pre var.
This has been collapsed from the Study variable summarizing R's
religious self-identification, constructed from the complete set of
questions asked, usually including questions additional to those
documented here (see questions per VCF0128b,VCF0129).
1990-later (exc. 2002) NOTE:
Questions about religious affiliation were preceded by the filter

question, 'Lots of things come up that keep people from attending
religious services even if they want to.
Thinking about your life these days, do you ever attend religious
services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?'
(SEE VCF0130), which had some effect on distributions.
1948 NOTE:
Question wording was undocumented.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
2002 NOTE:
For panel cases, 2000 data were incorporated.
2012:
In 2012, cases categorized as 'undifferentiated Christian' in the
major-group summary are coded 4.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480050
1952: 520158
1954: V540021
1956: 560132
1958: 580210
1960: 600252
1962: 620093
1964: 640235
1966: 660221
1968: 680213
1970: 700360(type 0)
1972: 720422
1974: 742551
1976: 763510
1978: 780605
1980: 800693
1982: 820734
1984: 840687
1986: 860737
1988: 880527
1990: 900525,900546
1992: 923827,923850
1994: 941102,941105,941122
1996: 960602
1998: 980542,980569
2000: 000878,000904

2002: 023138
2004: 043247
2008: 083185b
2012: relig_7cat_x

===
VCF0128a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion 7-category 1960-1988

QUESTION:

1960,1964:
Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant, Catholic or
Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1966-1968:
Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is
that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1970:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something
else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1972-1988:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something
else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church or denomination is that?
(IF BAPTIST:) Is that Southern Baptist or something else?
2002:
Is your religious preference PROTESTANT, ROMAN CATHOLIC, JEWISH, or
something else? (IF PROTESTANT OR OTHER:) What church or denomination
is that?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Mainline Protestant
2. Evangelical Protestant
3. Catholic [Roman Catholic]
4. Jewish
5. Non-traditional orthodox
6. Non-Christian/Non-Jewish
7. Atheist, agnostic, none

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;
    short-from 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Collapsed from VCF0129.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600252
1964: 640235
1966: 660221
1968: 680213
1970: 700360(type 0)
1972: 720422
1974: 742551
1976: 763510
1978: 780605
1980: 800693
1982: 820734
1984: 840687
1986: 860737
1988: 880527

==
VCF0128b

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion 8-category 1990-1996

QUESTION:

(IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you mostly attend a place of
worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?
(IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Regardless of whether you
now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as
part of a particular church or denomination? (IF YES:) Do you
consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?
ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF PROTESTANT:
(IF BAPTIST:) With which Baptist group is your church associated? Is
it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Churches in
the USA, the American Baptist Association, [1992-LATER: the National
Baptist Convention U.S.A.,]an independent Baptist church or some other
Baptist group? (IF INDEPENDENT BAPTIST:) Are you affiliated with any
larger Baptist group or is this strictly a local church?
(IF LUTHERAN:) Is this church part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church
in America, the Missouri Synod, or some other Lutheran group?
(IF METHODIST:) Is your church part of the United Methodist Church,
African Methodist Episcopal, or some other Methodist group?
(IF PRESBYTERIAN:) Is this the Presbyterian Church in the USA or some
other Presbyterian group?
(IF REFORMED:) Is this the Christian Reformed Church, the Reformed
Church in America, or some other Reformed group?
(IF BRETHREN:) Is this the Church of the Brethren, the Plymouth
Brethren, or what?
(IF CHRISTIAN OR JUST CHRISTIAN:) When you say "Christian" does that
mean the denomination called the "Christian Church (Disciples of

Christ)," or some other Christian denomination, or do you mean to say
"I am just a Christian?"
(IF CHURCH OR CHURCHES OF CHRIST:) Is this the Church of Christ or
United Church of Christ?
(IF CHURCH OF GOD:) Is this the Church of God of Anderson Indiana, the
Church of God of Cleveland Tennessee, the Church of God in Christ, or
some other Church of God?
(IF HOLINESS OR PENTECOSTAL:) What kind of church is that? What is it
called exactly? Is that part of a larger church or denomination? What
is that church called?
ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF OTHER:
What is it called exactly? Is that church part of a denomination? Is
that group Christian?
ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF JEWISH:
Do you usually attend a synagogue or temple that is Orthodox,
Conservative, Reform or what? / Do you consider yourself Orthodox,
Conservative, Reform or what?
ALL CHRISTIANS:
Which one of these words BEST describes your kind of Christianity:
Fundamentalist, Evangelical, Charismatic or Spirit-Filled, Moderate to
Liberal? Would you call yourself a born-again Christian, that is, have
you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Mainline Protestant
1. Evangelical Protestant
2. Black Protestant Church
3. Catholic [roman catholic]
4. Jewish
5. Non-traditional orthodox
6. Non-Christian/Non-Jewish
7. Atheist, agnostic, none

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;
    short-from 'new' Cross Section (1992); 'new' Cross
    Section (1994)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0152, respondent race, respondent categorization of type
of Christianity, church attendance, and Christian born-again status.
1994 NOTE:
Applies only to panel cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0129

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Full Code 1960-1988,2002

QUESTION:

1960,1964:
Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant, Catholic or
Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1966-1968:
Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is
that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1970:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something
else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?
1972-1988:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something
else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church or denomination is that?
(IF BAPTIST:) Is that Southern Baptist or something else?
2002:
Is your religious preference PROTESTANT, ROMAN CATHOLIC, JEWISH, or
something else? (IF PROTESTANT OR OTHER:) What church or denomination
is that?

VALID_CODES:

100-800. Religion as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
996. Refused
998. DK; none; no preference
999. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "2002 RELIGION NOTE".
See also VCF0152.
GENERAL NOTE:
These questions follow up questions in VCF0128.
The addition in 1972 of "Is that Southern Baptist or something else?"

significantly changed distributions of Protestant Baptists beginning in
that year.
Beginning in 1990 (except 2002), the full set of religion codes was
expanded considerably, adding codes for different affiliations within
the major mainline Protestant denominations and reworking almost
entirely the Pentecostal, Holiness, fundamentalist, and evangelical
Protestant denominations. VCF0152 gives the 'new' set of full
codes.
2002 NOTE:
2000 data were included in the 2002 study religion summary variable by
recoding from the 2000 study variable, which differed somewhat in
coding from that used for 2002 fresh cross-section cases. A
description of the recode from the 2002 summary variable is provided in
the Appendix.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600252
1964: 640235
1966: 660221
1968: 680213
1970: 700361(type 0)
1972: 720422
1974: 742551
1976: 763510
1978: 780605
1980: 800693
1982: 820734
1984: 840687
1986: 860737
1988: 880527
2002: 023138a

===

VCF0130

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1970-

QUESTION:

1970-1988: (IF ANY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE) Would you say you/do you go
to (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a
month, a few times a year, or never?
1990 AND LATER: Lots of things come up that keep people from
attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about

your life these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart
from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals? (IF YES:) Do you go
to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a
month, a few times a year, or never?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Every week (Except 1970: almost every week)
2. Almost every week (no cases in 1970)
3. Once or twice a month
4. A few times a year
5. Never (1990 and later: 'No' in filter)
7. No religious preference (1970-1988)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK how often/DK if attend
9. NA/RF how often/NA/RF if attend
INAP. 0. INAP religion (1970-1988); atheists and agnostics are
    INAP (1972,1986 only); short-form 'new' Cross
    Section (1992)

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Beginning in 1990, question flow was reversed so that the religious
attendance question preceded religious affiliation questions, whereas
in previous studies religious attendance followed. Beginning in 1990,
frequency of religious attendance was preceded by a general attendance
filter (yes/no); a "no" response to the filter 1990 and later has been
coded 5 here.
1970 NOTE:
Only codes corresponding to VCF0130 codes 2-5 were used (no code for
"every week"). "Almost every week" from 1970 has been recoded to 1,
with no 1970 cases appearing in code 2.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For Panel respondents,1992 data have been included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700362(type 0)
1972: 720423

1974: 742552
1976: 763511
1978: 780606
1980: 800694
1982: 820735
1984: 840688
1986: 860738
1988: 880530
1990: 900526
1992: 923828
1994: 941103
1996: 960578
1998: 980543
2000: 000877,000879
2002: 023085
2004: 043223,043224
2008: 083186,083186a
2012: relig_church,relig_churchoft

==
VCF0130a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1990-

QUESTION:

Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious
services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these
days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional
weddings, baptisms or funerals? (IF YES:) Do you go to religious
services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a
few times a year, or never?
(IF R SAYS HE/SHE GOES TO RELIGIOUS SERVICES EVERY WEEK:)
Would you say you go to religious services once a week or more often
than once a week?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Every week - more than once a week
1. Every week - once a week or NA if once a week/more
     than once a week
2. Almost every week
3. Once or twice a month
4. A few times a year
5. Never ('No' in filter)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK how often/DK if attend
9. NA how often/NA if attend; short-form 'new'
    Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For 1994 panel respondents, 1992 data have been included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900526,900527
1992: 923828,923829
1994: 941103,941104
1996: 960578,960579
1998: 980543,980544
2000: 000877,000879,000880
2002: 023085,023086
2004: 043223,043224
2008: 083186,083186a,083186b
2012: relig_church,relig_churchoft,relig_churchwk

===
VCF0131

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1952-1968

QUESTION:

Would you say you go to church regularly, often, seldom or never?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Regularly
2. Often
4. Seldom
5. Never
7. No religious preference (1960-1968)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
0. Religion refused/NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all Pre-Post studies except 1960, this was a Pre var.
This question was asked only of Rs who gave a religious identification
(see VCF0128).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520159
1956: 560133
1958: 580211
1960: 600253
1962: 620094
1964: 640236
1966: 660222
1968: 680214

==

VCF0132

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: State 1968-

QUESTION:

Where was it that you grew up? (IF UNITED STATES:) Which state or
states?

VALID_CODES:

101-997. State/country as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK
999. NA; RF; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES".
See also VCF0133.
GENERAL NOTE:
If R grew up in more than one state or country, the place(s) where R
lived the longest between the ages of 6 and 18 was coded. If it was
not clear which place(s) R lived longest, the code which best
reflected all mentioned places was used.

1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680257
1970: 700379(type 0)
1972: 720416
1974: 742538
1976: 763499
1978: 780622
1980: 800709
1982: 820751
1984: 840698
1986: 860748
1988: 880546
1990: 900679
1992: 924125
1994: 941421
1996: 960711
2000: 001014
2008: 083264

==

VCF0133

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: State 1952-1966

QUESTION:

What part of the United States did you grow up in?

VALID_CODES:

101-997. State/country as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK
999. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES".
See also VCF0132.
GENERAL NOTE:
Note that in studies 1952-1966 coding by ANES of foreign-born Rs was
inconsistent. Some cases were coded MD in these years (recoded to 999
here), while others were assigned a foreign country code.
1958 NOTE:
To reconcile the original 1958 Study data, Rs who did not grow up in
the U.S. (and who were not asked this question) were coded into
generalized foreign codes, e.g., 'Central America,' 'Eastern Europe,'
etc., based upon parents' foreign origins according to information
obtained in questions about places of mother's and father's birth
(VCF0144,VCF0145).
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520144
1956: 560188
1958: 580226
1960: 600182
1964: 640261
1966: 660230

===

VCF0134

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Farm 1952-1994,2000

QUESTION:

1952: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a small town, or
in a large city?
1956-1970: Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small
city, or in a large city?
1972-1976: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a
small city, or in a large city?
1978-1982: Looking at this list, please tell me, were you brought up
mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?
1984-LATER: Looking at this list, please tell me, where were you
mostly brought up?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Farm/country (including "in the country, not on a
    farm" in 1978-1992)
2. Not farm/country

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0135-VCF0137.
GENERAL NOTE:
From 1978 on, this question was administered with a "show card" that
contained categories (corresponding to codes in VCF0137) from which the
respondent could choose. Prior to 1978, the choices available to the
respondent were those present in the question text.
Code 1 includes 'in the country' 1952,1972-1976, 'on a farm' 1956-1970,
and both 'farm' and 'in the country, not on a farm' 1978-1992.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520145
1956: 560189
1958: 580228
1960: 600184
1964: 640263
1966: 660232
1968: 680259
1970: 700381(type 0)
1972: 720418
1974: 742540
1976: 763500
1978: 780623
1980: 800710
1982: 820752

1984: 840699
1986: 860749
1988: 880547
1990: 900680
1992: 924129
1994: 941422
2000: 001019

==
VCF0135

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Large City 1952-1994,2000

QUESTION:

Type community where R grew up (2)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. In a large city (in 1978-1992 this includes
     categories 5 and 7 from VCF0137)
2. Not in a large city (in 1978-1992 this includes all
     categories exc. 5 and 7 from VCF0137)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and wording VCF0134.
See also VCF136,VCF0137.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560189
1958: 580228
1960: 600184
1964: 640263
1966: 660232
1968: 680259
1970: 700381(type 0)
1972: 720418

1974: 740254
1976: 763500
1978: 780623
1980: 800710
1982: 820752
1984: 840699
1986: 860749
1988: 880547
1990: 900680
1992: 924129
1994: 941422
2000: 001019

===

VCF0136

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Urbanism 1956-1976

QUESTION:

Type community where R grew up (3)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Farm, rural, 'country'
2. Town, 'small town'
3. City, not a large city
4. Large city
5. Other; mixture of communities; 'suburb'

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and wording VCF0134.
See also VCF0135,VCF0137.
GENERAL NOTE:
In 1956-1964, the named community was coded according to its
approximate population at the time R was growing up. A community may
thus have been coded for the study into a size category different from
the size description chosen by R in his/her answer. "City" categories
by population during these years were (in general): under 10,000;
10,000-50,000; 100,000-250,000; 250,000+. For the codes here, the
250,000+ category was placed into "large city", while lesser-
population cities were included in code 3.
In 1966-1976, R's own perception of size of community was used.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560189
1958: 580228
1960: 600184
1964: 640263
1966: 660232
1968: 680259
1970: 700381(type 0)
1972: 720418
1974: 742540
1976: 763500

==
VCF0137

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Urbanism 1978-2000

QUESTION:

Type community where R grew up (4)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. On a farm
2. In the country, not on a farm
3. In a small city or town (under 50,000)
4. In a medium-sized city (50,000-100,000)
5. In a large city (100,000-500,000)
6. In a suburb of a large city
7. In a very large city (over 500,000)
8. In a suburb of a very large city

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and wording VCF0134.
See also VCF0135,VCF0136.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0138

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number of Children

QUESTION:

1958: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family?
1960: How many children under 18 years old are there in this family?
1962: How many children under 18 are there in your family?
1964: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family?
1966: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family
(household)?
1968: Are there any children under 18 years old in this family? (How
many?)
2008: How many children age 10 or younger live in this household? How
many children age 11 to 17 live in this household?
2012: How many children age 10 or younger live in this household? How
many children ages 11 to 17 live in this household [IF R 17 YEARS OLD:]
including you?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three or more

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Pre IW; Panel (1992,1996,2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Data 1978-2004 are from the household listing. For years 1958-1968
and 2008, these data are from questions in the demographic section
of the interview. It is unknown how 1956 data were obtained.

1970 NOTE:
The respondent was not asked how many children were in the household
if R had no children of his/her own (or MD if had any). 1970 data are
therefore not included.
1994 NOTE:
R was asked if he/she had any children of his/her own; number of
children in the household was not established. 1994 data are therefore
not included.
2000 NOTE:
same as 1994.
2002 NOTE:
These data are available only for 2002 fresh cross-section cases.
2008 NOTE:
A count of children was obtained in the household listing as well as
in the demographic section of the Pre-election interview.
2012 NOTE:
Beginning in 2012, number of children was topcoded at 3 in the release.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560178
1958: 580177
1960: 600125
1962: 620088
1964: 640189
1966: 660194
1968: 680147
1978: 780039,780040,780041,780042
1980: 800044,800045,800046,800047
1982: 820054,820055,820056,820057
1984: 840071,840072,840073,840074
1986: 860015,860016,860017,860018
1988: 880092,880093,880094,880095
1990: 900030,900031,900032,900033
1992: 923079,923080,923081,923082
1996: 960048,960049,960050,960051
1998: 980041
2002: 021107
2004: 041103
2008: 083265a,083265b
2012: dem2_numchild

==

VCF0138a

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Under Age 6

QUESTION:

Number of children age 5 or younger old in household

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2002 NOTE:
These data are available only for 2002 fresh cross-section cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780039
1980: 800044
1982: 820054
1984: 840071
1986: 860015
1988: 880092
1990: 900030
1992: 923079
1996: 960048
1998: 980037
2002: 021107a,021107b,021107c,021107d,021107e,021107f
2004: 041105

===

VCF0138b

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 6-9

QUESTION:

Number of children 6-9 years old in household

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2002 NOTE:
These data are available only for 2002 fresh cross-section cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780040
1980: 800045
1982: 820055
1984: 840072
1986: 860016
1988: 880093
1990: 900031
1992: 923080
1996: 960049
1998: 980038
2002: 021107a,021107b,021107c,021107d,021107e,021107f
2004: 041106

==

VCF0138c

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 10-13

QUESTION:

Number of children 10-13 years old in household

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2002 NOTE:
These data are available only for 2002 fresh cross-section cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780041
1980: 800046
1982: 820056
1984: 840073
1986: 860017
1988: 880094
1990: 900032
1992: 923081
1996: 960050
1998: 980039
2002: 021107a,021107b,021107c,021107d,021107e,021107f
2004: 041107

===
VCF0138d

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 14-17

QUESTION:

Number of children 14-17 years old in household

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2002 NOTE:
These data are available only for 2002 fresh cross-section cases.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780042
1980: 800047
1982: 820057
1984: 840074
1986: 860018
1988: 880095
1990: 900033
1992: 923082
1996: 960051
1998: 980040
2002: 021107a,021107b,021107c,021107d,021107e,021107f
2004: 041108

===

VCF0138e

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Age Youngest Child

QUESTION:

Age of youngest child in family

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 1 - 1/2 years or less
2. Over 1 - 1/2 years up to and including 2 -1/2 years
3. Over 2 - 1/2 years up to and including 3 - 1/2 years
4. Over 3 - 1/2 years up to and including 4 - 1/2 years
5. Over 4 - 1/2 years up to and including 5 - 1/2 years
6. Over 5 - 1/2 years up to and including 10 - 1/2 years
7. Over 10 - 1/2 years up to and including 14- 1/2 years
8. Over 14 - 1/2 years up to 18 years

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no children; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560179
1958: 580178
1960: 600126
1962: 620089
1964: 640190
1966: 660195
1968: 680149

===

VCF0139

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - How Many Children Does R Have

QUESTION:

1970,1974,1976,1980: Do you have any children? (IF YES:) How many?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight or more

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Ages of children not limited to those under 18 years old.
1970 NOTE:
Single Rs were not asked this question and are represented in code 0.
1992 NOTE:
Study data represented only number of children under the age of 18
and are not represented here.
1994:
Questions were not comparable.
1998 NOTE:
same as 1992
2000 NOTE:
same as 1994

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700265(type 0)
1974: 742409
1976: 763372
1980: 800411

==

VCF0140

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 6-category

QUESTION:

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?
1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college
you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high
school equivalency test?
1974,1976: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?
1978-1984: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest
degree that you have earned?
1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that you have earned?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')
2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency
3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency
4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic
     training
5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college
     level degree (AA degree)
6. BA level degrees; advanced degrees incl. LLB

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0110.
GENERAL NOTE:
Code 6 includes 1 cases in 1968, 2 cases in 1976 and 4 cases in 1974
which were designated by respondents as 'honorary degrees.'
In 1986 and later, the equivalent to code 4 was not used.
1952 NOTE:
The category recoded to code 6 only mentioned "has a degree" or
"completed college," without specifying Bachelor's degree or 4-year
college. Another code present specified "some college" and has been
recoded to 5.
1956 NOTE:
same as 1952
1958 NOTE:
same as 1952
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
2002 NOTE:

For panel cases, 2000 data were incorporated.
2004 NOTE:
Code 1 includes 1 cases with number of grades NA without high school
diploma or equivalency.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520131
1954: V540020
1956: 560181
1958: 580180
1960: 600128
1962: 620078
1964: 640196
1966: 660197
1968: 680156
1970: 700269(type 0)
1972: 720300
1974: 742423
1976: 763389
1978: 780513
1980: 800436
1982: 820542
1984: 840438
1986: 860602
1988: 880422
1990: 900557
1992: 923908
1994: 941209
1996: 960610
1998: 980577
2000: 000913
2002: 023131
2004: 043254
2008: 083218x
2012: dem_edu

==

VCF0140a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 7-category

QUESTION:

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?

1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test?
1974,1976: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?
1978-1984: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that you have earned?
1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that you have earned?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')
2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency
3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency
4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic
     training
5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college
     level degree (AA degree)
6. BA level degrees
7. Advanced degrees incl. LLB

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0140.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520131
1956: 560181
1958: 580180
1960: 600128
1962: 620078
1964: 640196
1966: 660197
1968: 680156
1970: 700269(type 0)
1972: 720300
1974: 742423
1976: 763389
1978: 780513

1980: 800436
1982: 820542
1984: 840438
1986: 860602
1988: 880422
1990: 900557
1992: 923908
1994: 941209
1996: 960610
1998: 980577
2000: 000913
2002: 023131
2004: 043254
2008: 083218x
2012: dem_edu

===

VCF0141

DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Education 6-category 1962-1986

QUESTION:

1952-1972: How many grades of school did (head) finish?
1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college
(head) has completed? Did (head) get a high school diploma or pass a
high school equivalency test?
1974,1976: Does (head) have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is
that? 1978-1984: Does (head) have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is
the highest degree that (head) has earned?
1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that (head) has earned?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')
2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency
3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency
4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic
     training
5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college
     level degree (AA degree)
6. BA level degrees; advanced degrees incl. LLB

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; head of family not determined (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0140.
GENERAL NOTE:
After 1986, the concept of 'Head of Household' was discontinued.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1962: 620076
1964: 640197
1968: 680157
1970: 700271(type 0)
1972: 720302
1974: 742432
1976: 763398
1978: 780522
1980: 800445
1982: 820549
1984: 840447
1986: 860607

===

VCF0142

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Place of Birth

QUESTION:

Where were you born? (IF UNITED STATES:) Which state?

VALID_CODES:

101-997. State/Country as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK
999. NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES"
1960 NOTE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:

For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520143
1956: 560182
1958: 580220
1960: 600175
1964: 640252
1966: 660223
1968: 680243
1970: 700363(type 0)
1972: 720407
1974: 742537
1976: 763498
1978: 780621
1980: 800708
1982: 820750
1984: 840697
1986: 860747
1988: 880545
1990: 900678
1992: 924124
1994: 941420

===
VCF0143

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Parents - Native Born

QUESTION:

Were both your parents born in this country?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section
(1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1960,1964,1966,1968,1970, this question was not asked of black
Rs or foreign-born Rs.
1960 N0TE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-
form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520146
1960: 600176
1964: 640253
1966: 660224
1968: 680244
1970: 700364(type 0)
1972: 720408
1974: 742529
1976: 763490
1978: 780612
1980: 800699
1982: 820741
1984: 840693
1986: 860743
1988: 880538
1990: 900674
1992: 924120
1994: 941416
1996: 960707
2000: 001007
2004: 043300
2008: 083257
2012: dem_parents

==

VCF0144

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Father - Where Born

QUESTION:

(IF BOTH PARENTS NOT BORN IN THE U.S.:) What country was your father
born in?

VALID_CODES:
----
199. U.S.
182,183,186,201-997. Country as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK
999. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES".
GENERAL NOTE:
All codes within United States have been recoded to 199.
This question was a follow-up to VCF0143. If R responded "yes" to
VCF0143, then VCF0144 and VCF0145 have been coded 199.
Black Rs were not asked this question in 1960, 1964, 1966, 1968 or
1970 and for these years have been recoded to code 199, United States.
Parents of foreign-born Rs were also present in missing data during
these years in the study datasets, but for this variable parental
birthplaces have been imputed from R's own birth-place, as a
generalized category e.g., "British Isles" if R were born in England).
1960 N0TE:
Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases: data from these
forms were incorporated.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520151
1960: 600177
1964: 640254
1966: 660225
1968: 680245
1970: 700365(type 0)
1972: 720409
1974: 742530
1976: 763491

1978: 780613
1980: 800700
1982: 820742

==

VCF0145

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Mother - Where Born

QUESTION:

(IF BOTH PARENTS NOT BORN IN THE U.S.:) What country was your mother
born in?

VALID_CODES:
----
199. U.S.
182,183,186,201-997. Country as coded

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK
999. NA; no Pre I
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0144.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520152
1960: 600178
1964: 640255
1966: 660226
1968: 680246
1970: 700366(type 0)
1972: 720410
1974: 742531
1976: 763492
1978: 780614
1980: 800701
1982: 820743

==

VCF0146

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Home Ownership

QUESTION:

(Do you/ Does your family) own your own home, pay rent or what?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, own
2. No, not owned

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520156
1964: 640271
1968: 680262
1970: 700389(type 0)
1972: 720421
1974: 742550
1976: 763509
1978: 780629
1980: 800719
1982: 820761
1984: 840706
1986: 860754
1988: 880552
1990: 900685
1992: 924135
1994: 941427
1996: 960714
1998: 980663
2000: 001022
2002: 023141
2004: 043312
2008: 083281

===

VCF0147

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Marital Status

QUESTION:

1952: Are you married?
1956-2004: Are you married now and living with your husband/
wife (2002: spouse)-- or are you widowed, divorced, separated, or
have you never married?
2008: Are you married now and living with your husband/wife-- or
are you widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never married? /
Are you married, divorced, separated, widowed, or have you never
been married?
2012: Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never
married? Are you currently living with a partner, or not?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Married
2. Never married
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed
7. Partners; not married (VOLUNTEERED [exc.1986,2012])

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. R not married/partnered, refused to say whether never
    married, divorced, separated or widowed (1992
    only); DK
9. NA; no Pre IW; unmarried at time of IW (1952 only);
    short-form 'new' Cross-Section (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Common law partners first appeared as a volunteered code in 1964.
Interviewer instruction 1990 and later: 'If spouse is in a nursing
home or works in another city, or the family is in the process of
moving and is temporarily holding 2 residences, code 1 is used.'
1952 NOTE:
Rs who were not married have been recoded to NA because their specific
status as divorced, widowed, never married etc. was not determined. Rs
married at the time of the 1952 interview have all been coded 1 in
VCF0147, with no 1952 cases appearing in codes 2-7.
1960 NOTE:
1960 pre variable was used except for 22 no-pre cases, for which post
marital status was used.
1986 NOTE:
Unmarried Rs were also asked if they were living with a partner.
1992 NOTE:
This question was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire; for short-

form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated, except in cases where additional information current to 1992 [as determined by the interviewer] contradicted the marital status of 1990. In the latter instances, the 1992 marital status variable was coded to reflect the most complete and up-to-date information known by the interviewer.
2002 NOTE:
For panel cases, 2000 data were included.
2008 NOTE:
This question was asked in 2 versions; data are combined in this variable.
2012 NOTE:
Unmarried Rs were asked if they were living with a partner.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520114
1956: 560177
1958: 580176
1960: 600124
1962: 620791
1964: 640188
1966: 660193
1968: 680146
1970: 700263(type 0)
1972: 720295
1974: 742407
1976: 763370
1978: 780505
1980: 800409
1982: 820536
1984: 840430
1986: 860598
1988: 880418
1990: 900553
1992: 923904
1994: 941204
1996: 960606
1998: 980573
2000: 000909
2002: 023127,023127a
2004: 043251
2008: 083216a,083216b
2012: dem_marital,dem_partner

==

VCF0148

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Social Class 8-category

QUESTION:

There's been some talk these days about different social classes.
Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working
class.
Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes?
(IF YES:) Which one? /
(IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself
middle class or working class? Would you say that you are about
average middle/working class or that you are in the upper part of the
middle/working class?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Lower class (VOLUNTEERED)
1. Average working
2. Working--NA average or upper
3. Upper working
4. Average middle
5. Middle class--NA average or upper
6. Upper middle
7. Upper class (VOLUNTEERED)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; other (incl. "refused to accept idea of
    class")
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1958 NOTE:
If R did not know whether R thought of self as a member of the working
or middle class, then R was not probed with "If you had to make a
choice..."; only Rs who answered 'no' were probed (in all other years,
Rs answering DK to the lead-in were also probed with the If you had to
make a choice..." question).
1992 NOTE:
This set of questions was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire;
for short-form panel cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated
in the summary.
2008 NOTE:
Respondents were coded 9 (other) if they initially indicated middle or
working class but subsequently answered (volunteered) 'lower' or 'lower
middle' or 'lower working' class in response to the followup which asked
whether R was average or upper middle/working class.
2012 NOTE:
84 respondents (both modes) volunteered "lower" middle or working class.
These have been coded 9.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560224
1958: 580219
1966: 660219
1968: 680209
1970: 700356(type 0)
1972: 720400
1974: 742525
1976: 763486
1978: 780603
1980: 800691
1982: 820732
1984: 840685
1988: 880525
1990: 900668
1992: 924114
1994: 941409
2000: 001005
2004: 043298
2008: 083250,083250a,083250b,083250c
2012: dem_class,dem_whichclass,dem_chclass,dem_avgclass

==
VCF0148a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Average or Upper Middle/Working Class

QUESTION:

There's been some talk these days about different social classes.
Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working
class.
Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes?
IF YES:) Which one? /
(IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself
middle class or working class? Would you say that you are about
average middle/working class or that you are in the upper part of the
middle/working class?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Average working
2. Working--NA average or upper
3. Upper working

4. Average middle
5. Middle class--NA average or upper
6. Upper middle

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; other (incl. "refused to accept idea of
   class")
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable is the same as VCF0148 except for years 1960,1964 and
1986. For these 3 years, data from VCF0149 have been incorporated in
the following manner: if VCF0149 is coded 1 or 2, this variable is
coded 5; if VCF0149 is coded 3 or 4, this variable is coded 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560224
1958: 580219
1960: 600155
1964: 640231
1966: 660219
1968: 680209
1970: 700356(type 0)
1972: 720400
1974: 742525
1976: 763486
1978: 780603
1980: 800691
1982: 820732
1984: 840685
1986: 860736
1988: 880525
1990: 900668
1992: 924114
1994: 941409
2000: 001005
2004: V043298
2008: 083250,083250a,083250b,083250c
2012: dem_class,dem_whichclass,dem_chclass,dem_avgclass

==

VCF0149

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Think of Self as Member of Social Class

QUESTION:

There's been some talk these days about different social classes.
Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working
class.
Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes?
(IF YES:) Which one? /
(IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself
middle class or working class?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, think of self as member of class and that class is
   middle class
2. No, don't think of self as member of class, but if had
   to choose middle or working, would choose middle
3. Yes, think of self as member of class and that class is
   working class
4. No, don't think of self as member of class, but if
   had to choose middle or working, would choose
   working
5. Refuses to accept idea of class (except 1964, 1966,
   1968)
6. Other (in 1964, 1966 and 1968, also includes "refuses
   to accept idea of class.")

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1958 NOTE:
If R did not know whether R thought of self as a member of the working
or middle class, then R was not probed with "If you had to make a
choice..."; only Rs who answered 'no' were probed (in all other years,
Rs answering DK to the lead-in were also probed with the If you had to
make a choice..." question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560224
1958: 580219
1960: 600155
1964: 640231
1966: 660219
1968: 680209
1970: 700356(type 0)
1972: 720402
1974: 742523
1976: 763484
1978: 780601
1980: 800689
1982: 820730
1984: 840683
1986: 860736
1988: 880525
1990: 900665,900666
1992: 924111,924112
1994: 941406,941407
2000: 000999,001000
2004: 043295,043296,043297
2008: 083250,083250a,083250b,083250c
2012: dem_class,dem_whichclass,dem_chclass

==

VCF0150

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 16-category

QUESTION:

We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are
you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a
student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for
pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you
doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND
LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR
HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average
week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do
you work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R
ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do
you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R
VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work
on your job in the average week?

VALID_CODES:
----
10. Working now
15. Working now and retired--20 or more hrs/wk
16. Working now and permanently disabled--20 or more
     hrs/wk
17. Working now and homemaker--20 or more hrs/wk
18. Working now and student--20 or more hrs/wk

20. Temporarily laid off
40. Unemployed
50. Retired, no current occupation
51. Retired and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk
60. Permanently disabled, no current occupation
61. Permanently disabled and working--less than 20 hrs/wk
70. Homemaker, no other occupation
71. Homemaker and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk
75. Homemaker and student, no other occupation
80. Student, no current occupation
81. Student and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0116,VCF0118.
GENERAL NOTE:
In 1980, those who were "permanently disabled" when the occupation
questions began but who subsequently replied that they were also
currently working were not administered the "permanently disabled"
series (past employment, if any) but instead were administered the
"working now" set of questions (present employment), regardless of
number of hours working [code 10]. Code 60 only represents nonworking
disabled (during all years since 1980).
2002 NOTE:
Number of hours working was not determined; no 2002 data.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800515
1982: 820610
1984: 840457
1986: 860615
1988: 880429
1990: 900565
1992: 923915
1994: 941216
1996: 960615
1998: 980579
2000: 000919
2004: 043260a

2008: 083222x
2012: dem_empstatus_2digitfin_x

==
VCF0151

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation Group 5-Category

QUESTION:

1952-1964:
What is your occupation. I mean, what kind of work do you do? (IF NOT
CLEAR OR OBVIOUS [1958,1960,1964 only]:) What exactly do you do on your
job? (IF NOT ASCERTAINED:) What kind of business is that? (IF R IS
UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work do you usually do? (IF R IS RETIRED:)
What kind of work did you do before you retired?
1968-1970:
(IF EMPLOYED OR ON STRIKE:) What kind of work do you do? [What exactly
do you do on your job?] (IF UNEMPLOYED OR RETIRED:) What kind of work
did you do when you were employed? [What exactly did you do on your job?]
1972-1982:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main
occupation [What sort of work do you do? Tell me a little more about
what you do.] (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work did you do on
your last regular job [What was your occupation?]   (IF R IS RETIRED OR
DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do when you worked [What was your
main occupation?]
1984 AND LATER:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main
occupation [What sort of work do you do?] What are your most important
activities or duties? (IF R IS RETIRED/UNEMPLOYED /DISABLED:) What kind
of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?]
What were your most important activities or duties?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Professional and managerial
2. Clerical and sales workers
3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers
4. Laborers, except farm
5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen;
     forestry and fishermen
6. Homemakers (1980-later: no other occupation (any
     number of hours) and have not worked in past 6/12
     mos.; 1972-1978: not working at least 20 hrs/wk.;
     1956-1970: no other occupation, full or part time;
     1952: no other full-time occupation)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; member of armed forces; no occupation and not a
    homemaker; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0115.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Occuption has not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520132,520134
1956: 560120,560123
1958: 580181,580184
1960: 600129,600132
1964: 640202,640205
1968: 680161,680176
1970: 700275,700276,700288(type 0)
1972: 720306,720309,720321
1974: 742443,742446,742458
1976: 763409,763412,763424
1978: 780531,780534,780546
1980: 800454,800455,800471,880486,800503
1982: 820556,820557,820572,820585,820599
1984: 840456,840504,840516,840585
1986: 860614,860655,860664
1988: 880428,880458,880466
1990: 900565,900595,900603
1992: 923914,923922,923955
1994: 941215,941223,941256
1996: 960676,960615,960653,960665
1998: 980619,980628,980639
2000: 000919,000980
2004: 043260a,043262p,043268f

===

VCF0152

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Full Code 1990-

QUESTION:

(IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you mostly attend a place of

worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?
IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Regardless of whether you
now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as
part of a particular church or denomination? (IF YES:) Do you
consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?
PROTESTANTS:
(IF BAPTIST:) With which Baptist group is your church associated? Is
it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Churches in
the USA, the American Baptist Association, [1992-LATER: the National
Baptist Convention U.S.A.,]an independent Baptist church or some other
Baptist group? (IF INDEPENDENT BAPTIST:) Are you affiliated with any
larger Baptist group or is this strictly a local church?
(IF LUTHERAN:) Is this church part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church
in America, the Missouri Synod, or some other Lutheran group?
(IF METHODIST:) Is your church part of the United Methodist Church,
African Methodist Episcopal, or some other Methodist group?
(IF PRESBYTERIAN:) Is this the Presbyterian Church in the USA or some
other Presbyterian group?
(IF REFORMED:) Is this the Christian Reformed Church, the Reformed
Church in America, or some other Reformed group?
(IF BRETHREN:) Is this the Church of the Brethren, the Plymouth
Brethren, or what?
(IF CHRISTIAN OR JUST CHRISTIAN:) When you say "Christian" does that
mean the denomination called the "Christian Church (Disciples of
Christ)," or some other Christian denomination, or do you mean to say
"I am just a Christian?"
(IF CHURCH OR CHURCHES OF CHRIST:) Is this the Church of Christ or
United Church of Christ?
(IF CHURCH OF GOD:) Is this the Church of God of Anderson Indiana, the
Church of God of Cleveland Tennessee, the Church of God in Christ, or
some other Church of God?
(IF HOLINESS OR PENTECOSTAL:) What kind of church is that? What is it
called exactly? Is that part of a larger church or denomination? What
is that church called?
(IF OTHER:) What is it called exactly? Is that church part of a
denomination? Is that group Christian?
(IF JEWISH:) (IF R ATTENDS JEWISH RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you usually
attend a synagogue or temple that is Orthodox, Conservative, Reform
or what? (IF R DOES NOT ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES BUT CONSIDERS SELF
JEWISH:) Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or
what?

VALID_CODES:

10-790. Religion as coded
800.   Agnostics
801.   Atheists
997.   Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. None; no preference; don't know preference; DK;
      refused
999. NA; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "RELIGION 1990 AND LATER (EXC.2002)"
GENERAL NOTE:
Questions about religious affiliation were preceded by the filter
question, 'Lots of things come up that keep people from attending
Religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life
these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from
occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?' Respondents who do
not think of themselves as affiliated with any church or denomination
are not asked these questions.
1992 NOTE 1:
This set of questions was not part of the 'short-form' questionnaire;
for short-form panel cases 1990 study data were incorporated.
1992 NOTE 2:
Codes 127 and 133 were combined into code 127 [no 1992 code 133]; code
102 was moved to become code 306 [no 1992 code 102]; and codes 267 and
261 were added (new).
1994 NOTE 1:
For panel cases, 1992 data were incorporated.
1994 NOTE 2:
The following codes were added: 111,186,234,262.
1996 NOTE:
Code 240 was added.
1998 NOTE:
Codes 263,264,524,725,726,727 were added.
2000 NOTE:
Codes 750,795 were added.
2002 NOTE:
Religion questions were not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900546
1992: 923850
1994: 941122
1996: 960602
1998: 980569
2000: 000904
2004: 043248
2008: 083185x
2012: relig_mastersummary

===

VCF0153a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation 8-category 1970-1976

QUESTION:

1972-1976: Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or
mother substitute) have a job while you were growing up?
1970-1976: IF YES:) What kind of work did she do?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers
2. Managers, officials and proprietors exc. farm
3. Clerical and kindred workers, sales workers
4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers and
      (authoritative) protective service workers
5. Operative and kindred workers
6. Service workers, including private household
      workers and (exec. authoritative) protective
      service workers
7. Laborers, except farm
8. Farm laborers and foremen; farmers; owners,
      managers, tenant farmers and sharecroppers

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Occupation not reported (NA); members of armed
      forces; not in labor force; NA if mother had
      occupation
0. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother; no
      parallel information for parental surrogate
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700374
1972: 720414,720415
1974: 742535,742536
1976: 763496,763497

===

VCF0153b

DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation Group 1978-1982

QUESTION:

Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or mother
substitute) have a job while you were growing up?
(IF YES:) What kind of work did she do?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. Professional, technical and kindred workers
02. Managers and administrators, except farm
03. Sales workers
04. Clerical and kindred workers
05. Craftsmen and kindred workers
06. Operatives, except transport
07. Transport equipment operatives
08. Laborers, except farm
09. Farmers (owners and tenants), farm managers,
       farmer -- NA type
10. Farm foreman, farm laborer (wage-worker)
11. Service workers, except private household and
       government protective services
12. Government protective services: firemen; police;
       marshals and constables
13. Private household workers
14. Member of armed forces
15. Not in labor force

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
00. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother; no
     parallel information for parental surrogate
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Character-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780619,780620
1980: 800706,800707
1982: 820748,820749

==

VCF0153c

DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation Group 1984-1988

QUESTION:

Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or mother
substitute) have a job while you were growing up?
(IF YES:) What kind of work did she do while you were growing up?
(What was her main occupation?)
(1986,1988,1992: What were her most important activities or duties?
What kind of (business/industry was that?)

VALID_CODES:
----
01. Executive, administrative and managerial
02. Professional speciality occupations
03. Technicians and related support occupations
04. Sales occupation
05. Administrative support, including clerical
06. Private household
07. Protective service
08. Service exc. protective and household
09. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations
10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations
11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors
12. Transportation and material moving occupations
13. Handler, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers
14. Member of armed forces
15. Not in labor force

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
00. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother;
     no parallel information for parental surrogate;
     short form or Spanish language questionnaire
     (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840695,840696
1986: 860745,860746
1988: 880543,880544

===

VCF0154a

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation 71-category

QUESTION:

What is/was your main occupation? (What sort of work do/did
you do?) (1984-1986:IF NOT CLEAR: tell me a little more about
what you do/did.) (1986 AND LATER: What are/were your most important
activities or duties?)

MISSING_CODES:
----
00.   DK; NA; honworking homemaker/student; R has never
worked for pay
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "CENSUS OCCUPATION 71 CATEGORIES".
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable combines employment data for all Rs except nonworking
homemakers and students (i.e., their data for employment in the past 6
months are omitted). The disabled and homemakers or students who are
also currently working have their current occupation coded here.
Retirees who are also currently working have past occupation coded
rather than current occupation. If R is disabled and not working but
has worked in the past, or if R is unemployed, then past employment is
represented here.
The original 3-digit U.S. Census Occupation variable has been recoded
into 71 subgroups, in order to protect Respondents' anonymity.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Occuption has not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840515

1986: 860663
1988: 880465
1990: 900602
1992: 923954
1994: 941255
1996: 960675
1998: 980638
2000: 000979
2004: 043262n

===

VCF0154b

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation 14-category

QUESTION:

What is/was your main occupation? (What sort of work do/did you do?)
(1984-1986:IF NOT CLEAR: tell me a little more about what you do/did.)
(1986 AND LATER: What are/were your most important activities or duties?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Executive, administrative and managerial
2. Professional specialty occupations
3. Technicians and related support occupations
4. Sales occupation
5. Administrative support, including clerical
6. Private household
7. Protective service
8. Service except protective and household
9. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations
10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations
11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors
12. Transportation and material moving occupations
13. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers
14. Member of armed forces

MISSING_CODES:
----
00. DK; NA; honworking homemaker/student; R has never
worked for pay
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable combines employment data for all Rs except nonworking
homemakers and students (i.e., their data for employment in the past 6
months are omitted). The disabled and homemakers or students who are
also currently working have their current occupation coded here.
Retirees who are also currently working have past occupation coded
rather than current occupation. If R is disabled and not working but
has worked in the past, or if R is unemployed, then past employment is

represented here.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Occuption has not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840516
1986: 860664
1988: 880466
1990: 900603
1992: 923955
1994: 941256
1996: 960676
1998: 980639
2000: 000980
2004: 043262p

===
VCF0155

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Worried about Find/Losing Job

QUESTION:

How worried are you about losing your job/finding a job in the near future: a lot, somewhat, or not much at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. A lot
3. Somewhat
5. Not much at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK; refused
9. NA
0. R is nonworking homemaker or student; R is
    unemployed/disabled and has never worked for pay, or
    R is working and retired (1984-1986); R is

unemployed/disabled and has never worked for pay, or
R is working and retired/disabled (1988-1994); R is
unemployed/disabled and has never worked for pay
(1996-1998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Note that homemakers or students without current outside employment
were not asked this question. Other respondents excluded from question
administration has varied slightly.
1992 NOTE:
A large number of NA cases appear in the data without documentation for
reason.
2000 NOTE:
If Rs were unemployed, nonworking retired or nonworking disabled, they
were not asked this question unless they said they were looking for
work. 2000 data are not included.
2012 NOTE:
Code categories changed in 2012 and are not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840525
1986: 860671
1988: 880471
1990: 900608
1992: 923960
1994: 941262
1996: 960682
1998: 980645
2004: 043262j
2008: 083244k,083233b,083240

==
VCF0156

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Working R Laid off Last 6 Months

QUESTION:

Were you out of work or laid off at any time during the last six
months?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. R is not currently working
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Respondents without current employment (including Rs temporarily
laid off) were not asked this question.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840474
1986: 860632
1988: 880444
1990: 900581
1992: 923931
1994: 941232
1996: 960673
1998: 980636
2000: 000977
2004: 043285
2008: 083241
2012: dem_offwork

===
VCF0157

DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Working R Hours Reduced/Cut in Pay

QUESTION:

During the last six months, have you had a reduction in your
work hours or had to take a cut in pay at any time for reasons
other than illness or personal choice?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. R is not currently working
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Respondents without current employment (including Rs temporarily
laid off) were not asked this question.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840475
1986: 860633
1988: 880445
1990: 900582
1992: 923932
1994: 941233
1996: 960674
1998: 980637
2000: 000978
2004: 043286
2008: 083242
2012: dem_hrsreduce

===

VCF0170a

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1956-1960

QUESTION:

County code 1956-1960

NOTES:

See Appendix "COUNTY CODE" (part I).
Coded 0011-1071 and:

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560003
1958: 580004
1960: 600004

==
VCF0170b

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1964-1976

QUESTION:

Sampling PSU-county code 1964-1976

NOTES:

See Appendix "COUNTY CODE" (part II).
Coded 001-993 and:

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640004
1966: 660003
1968: 680017
1970: 700021
1972: 720008
1974: 742009
1976: 763009

==
VCF0170c

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1968-1982

QUESTION:

ICPSR county code 1968-1982

NOTES:

See Appendix "COUNTY CODE"(part III).
Coded 01001-73037 and:

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680016
1970: 700020
1972: 720007
1974: 742008
1976: 763008
1978: 780013
1980: 800010
1982: 820017

==
VCF0170d

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1970,1978-1998

QUESTION:

FIPS state-county code 1970,1978-1998

NOTES:

See Appendix "COUNTY CODE" (part IV).
GENERAL NOTE:
Note: county code information restricted beginning 2000.
The 1st 2 digits of code correspond to FIPS state code.
Coded 01033-56013 and:

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700401,700402
1978: 780016
1980: 800011
1982: 820018
1984: 840012
1986: 860026
1988: 880011
1990: 900011
1992: 923061
1994: 940021
1996: 960110
1998: 980093

==

GROUP THERMOMETER INTRO

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the
American people to see things more their way. We would like to get
your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on
which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a
"feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards
groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group
or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should
place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm
feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it
a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how
warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you
don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are
some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere
between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.
1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that
try to get the government or the American people to see things more
their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate
your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also
like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using
the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates;
1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just
tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)
1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American
society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with
what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100
degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings
between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the
group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't
feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50
degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me

and we'll move on to the next one.
1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the
following.)
1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE FOR ALL GROUP THERMOMETERS:
Card or respondent booklet shown to R exc. 2000 telephone and 2002
(telephone study).
Code distinction between "don't know" and non-recognition of name
begin in 1978; data are combined in the DK category here.
In all Pre-Post study years except 1968 and 1976, group thermometers
followed (within the same wave, if not immediately) the series of
thermometers for specific political figures, so that R was asked to
recall the "explanation" of the thermometer. In 1968 and 1976 only,
group thermometers appeared in a separate wave.
1964 NOTE:
"Don't knows" were coded 50 on thermometers; groups about which the
respondent "didn't know much" were also placed at 50 degrees
1966 NOTE:
same as 1964.
1968 NOTE:
same as 1964.
1970 NOTE:
The order in which group thermometers were asked varied by form.
1970-1976 NOTE:
The respondent was not asked to give thermometer ratings for groups
about which R "didn't know much" or "didn't know too much." However,
it is unclear whether such cases were coded DK or NA.
1996 NOTE:
Group thermometers were administered in random order.
1998 NOTE:
same as 1996.
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996.
2002 NOTE:
Group thermometers were randomly assigned to one of two possible
orderings.
2004 note:
same as 1996.
2008 note:
same as 1996.-1

==

VCF0201

GROUP THERMOMETER: Democrats

QUESTION:

Democrats -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding this variable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640242
1966: 660124
1968: 680230
1970: 700248(type 0)
1972: 720719
1974: 7402364
1976: 763833
1980: 800871
1982: 820146

===
VCF0202

GROUP THERMOMETER: Republicans

QUESTION:

Republicans -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)

99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640247
1966: 660129
1968: 680237
1970: 700250(type 0)
1972: 720721
1974: 742366
1976: 763835
1980: 800873
1982: 820147

==

VCF0203

GROUP THERMOMETER: Protestants

QUESTION:

Protestants -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640249
1966: 660123
1968: 680239
1972: 720715
1976: 763844
2000: 001325
2002: 025070

===
VCF0204

GROUP THERMOMETER: Catholics

QUESTION:

Catholics -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640240
1966: 660121

1968: 680227
1972: 720712
1976: 763826
1984: 840774
1988: 880611
1992: 925321
2000: 001323
2002: 025068
2004: 045058
2008: 085064c
2012: ftgr_catholics

===
VCF0205

GROUP THERMOMETER: Jews

QUESTION:

Jews -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640244
1966: 660126
1968: 680232
1972: 720716
1976: 763842
1988: 880626
1992: 925334

2000: 001324
2002: 025069
2004: 045061
2008: 085064f

===

VCF0206

GROUP THERMOMETER: Blacks

QUESTION:

Blacks -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640250
1966: 660130
1968: 680240
1970: 700249(type 0)
1972: 720720
1974: 742365
1976: 763832
1980: 800870
1982: 820145
1984: 840763
1986: 860149
1988: 880613
1990: 900155
1992: 925323

1994: 940305
1996: 961029
1998: 980262
2000: 001308
2002: 025055
2004: 045077
2008: 085064y
2012: ftcasi_black

===

VCF0207

GROUP THERMOMETER: Whites

QUESTION:

Whites -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640245
1966: 660128
1968: 680233
1970: 700247(type 0)
1972: 720718
1974: 742363
1976: 763846
1980: 800884
1982: 820144
1984: 840769

1988: 880625
1992: 925333
1994: 940313
1996: 961030
1998: 980270
2000: 001309
2002: 025056
2004: 045086
2008: 085065c
2012: ftcasi_white

==

VCF0208

GROUP THERMOMETER: Southerners

QUESTION:

Southerners -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640239
1968: 680226
1972: 720710
1976: 763824
1980: 800862
1992: 925332
2004: 045078
2008: 085064z

===
VCF0209

GROUP THERMOMETER: Big Business

QUESTION:

Big business -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640241
1966: 660119
1968: 680224
1972: 720707
1974: 742356
1976: 763821
1980: 800859
1984: 840773
1988: 880612
1992: 925322
1994: 940314
1996: 961034
2000: 001313
2002: 025060
2004: 045067
2008: 085064n
2012: ftgr_bigbus

===
VCF0210

GROUP THERMOMETER: Labor Unions

QUESTION:

Labor unions -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640246
1966: 660127
1968: 680235
1972: 720722
1974: 742367
1976: 763836
1980: 800874
1984: 840767
1986: 860151
1988: 880604
1990: 900157
1992: 925316
1994: 940307
1996: 961033
1998: 980266
2000: 001312
2002: 025059
2004: 045064
2008: 085064j

==

VCF0211

GROUP THERMOMETER: Liberals

QUESTION:

Liberals -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640238
1966: 660120
1968: 680225
1970: 700252(type 0)
1972: 720709
1974: 742358
1976: 763823
1980: 800861
1982: 820142
1984: 840770
1986: 860153
1988: 880616
1990: 900161
1992: 925326
1994: 940311
1996: 961032
1998: 980267

2000: 001311
2002: 025058
2004: 045062
2008: 085064g
2012: ftgr_liberals

==

VCF0212

GROUP THERMOMETER: Conservatives

QUESTION:

Conservatives -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640251
1966: 660131
1968: 680241
1970: 700242(type 0)
1972: 720724
1974: 742369
1976: 763838
1980: 800877
1982: 820143
1984: 840764
1986: 860150
1988: 880609
1990: 900156

1992: 925319
1994: 940306
1996: 961031
1998: 980264
2000: 001310
2002: 025057
2004: 045069
2008: 085064q
2012: ftgr_cons

===

VCF0213

GROUP THERMOMETER: Military

QUESTION:

Military -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640243
1968: 680231
1970: 700246(type0)
1972: 720717
1974: 742362
1976: 763831
1980: 800869
1984: 840781
1988: 880618

1992: 925328
1996: 961027
2000: 001306
2002: 025053
2004: 045066
2008: 085064m
2012: ftgr_military

===
VCF0214

GROUP THERMOMETER: Policemen

QUESTION:

Policemen (1992: the police) -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see VCF0201 note)
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: 660125
1968: 680228
1970: 700240(type 0)
1972: 720714
1974: 742360
1976: 763828
1992: 925340

===
VCF0215

GROUP THERMOMETER: Black Militants

QUESTION:

Black militants -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700255(type 0)
1972: 720727
1974: 742372
1976: 763841
1980: 800880
1984: 840775
1986: 860155

===
VCF0216

GROUP THERMOMETER: Civil Rights Leaders

QUESTION:

Civil rights leaders -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700239(type 0)
1972: 720729
1974: 742373
1976: 763843
1980: 800875
1984: 840779
1988: 880606

==
VCF0217

GROUP THERMOMETER: Chicanos/Hispanics

QUESTION:

1976:Chicanos-- feeling thermometer
1980,1984,1988: Hispanics-- feeling thermometer
1992: Hispanic-Americans-- feeling thermometer
1994: Hispanics or Latinos-- feeling thermometer
1996-later: Hispanics (Hispanic-Americans)-- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763825
1980: 800863
1984: 840765
1988: 880617
1992: 925327
1994: 940304
1996: 961037
2000: 001316
2002: 025063
2004: 045056
2008: 085064s
2012: ftcasi_hisp

===
VCF0218

GROUP THERMOMETER: Democratic Party

QUESTION:

The Democratic Party -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
1984 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the pre and the post. The pre version
is included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780155
1980: 800168
1982: 820138
1984: 840305
1986: 860146
1988: 880164
1990: 900151
1992: 923317
1994: 940301
1996: 960292
1998: 980260
2000: 000369
2004: 043049
2008: 083044a
2012: ft_dem

==
VCF0219

GROUP THERMOMETER: Middle Class People

QUESTION:

Middle class people -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720734
1974: 742376
1976: 763848
1980: 800886
1984: 840766
2004: 045063
2008: 085064h
2012: ftgr_middle

==
VCF0220

GROUP THERMOMETER: People on Welfare

QUESTION:

People on welfare -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763834
1980: 800872

1984: 840777
1986: 860154
1988: 880607
1990: 900159
1992: 925318
1994: 940309
1996: 961036
2000: 001315
2002: 025062
2004: 045068
2008: 085064p
2012: ftgr_welfare

===

VCF0221

GROUP THERMOMETER: Political Independents

QUESTION:

People who call themselves political independents - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
1984 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the pre and the post. The pre version
is included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800170
1982: 820140
1984: 840307

===

VCF0222

GROUP THERMOMETER: Political Parties

QUESTION:

Political parties, in general -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
1984 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the pre and the post. The pre version
is included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800171
1982: 820141
1984: 840308
1986: 860148
1990: 900153
1994: 940303
1996: 960294
2000: 000372

===

VCF0223

GROUP THERMOMETER: Poor People

QUESTION:

Poor people -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720708
1974: 742357
1976: 763822
1980: 800860
1984: 840768
1986: 860156
1988: 880610
1990: 900162
1992: 925320
1994: 940312
1996: 961035
1998: 980268
2000: 001314
2002: 025061
2004: 045065
2008: 085064k
2012: ftgr_poor

==
VCF0224

GROUP THERMOMETER: Republican Party

QUESTION:

TheRepublican Party -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
1984 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the pre and the post. The pre version
is included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780156
1980: 800169
1982: 820139
1984: 840306
1986: 860147
1988: 880165
1990: 900152
1992: 923318
1994: 940302
1996: 960293
1998: 980261
2000: 000370
2004: 043050
2008: V083044b
2012: ft_rep

===
VCF0225

GROUP THERMOMETER: Womens Libbers

QUESTION:

1970-1976,1980,1984: the women's liberation movement--feeling thermometer
1986,1990,1992,1996: the women's movement--feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
For "feminists" (1988 and 1992) see VCF0253 and VCF0254.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700254(type 0)
1972: 720725
1974: 742370
1976: 763839
1980: 800878
1984: 840782
1986: 860152
1990: 900158
1992: 925324
1994: 940308
1996: 961039
2000: 001318

===
VCF0226

GROUP THERMOMETER: Young People

QUESTION:

Young people -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720723
1974: 742368
1976: 763837
1980: 800876
2004: 045080

==
VCF0227

GROUP THERMOMETER: Asian-Americans

QUESTION:

Asian-Americans -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 925339
2000: 001327
2002: 025072
2004: 045075
2008: 085064v
2012: ftcasi_asian

===
VCF0228

GROUP THERMOMETER: Congress

QUESTION:

1998: U.S. Congress -- thermometer
1980,1988,1992,2000-later: Congress (1980,1992: that is, the U.S.
Senate and the House of Representatives)-- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800882
1988: 880628
1992: 925337
1996: 961026
1998: 980273
2000: 001305
2002: 025052
2004: 045076
2008: 085064w
2012: ftgr_congress

==
VCF0229

GROUP THERMOMETER: Environmentalists

QUESTION:

1980,1988,1990: people seeking to protect the environment --thermometer
1994-later: environmentalists -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800867
1988: 880620
1990: 900160
1992: 925329
1994: 940310

1996: 961041
2000: 001320
2002: 025066
2004: 045072
2008: 085064s

===

VCF0230

GROUP THERMOMETER: Anti-Abortionists

QUESTION:

1984: Anti-abortionists -- thermometer
1988,1990: Opponents of abortion -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. Post IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840780
1988: 880624
1990: 900163

===

VCF0231

GROUP THERMOMETER: Federal Government

QUESTION:

The federal government in Washington -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800868
1988: 880615
1992: 925325
1996: 961028
2000: 001307
2002: 025054
2004: 045060
2008: 085064e
2012: ftgr_fedgov

===
VCF0232

GROUP THERMOMETER: Gays and Lesbians

QUESTION:

Gay men and lesbians (that is), homosexuals -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize

99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840778
1988: 880627
1992: 925335
1994: 940318
1996: 961042
1998: 980265
2000: 001321
2002: 025067
2004: 045074
2008: 085064u
2012: ftgr_gay

===
VCF0233

GROUP THERMOMETER: Illegal Aliens

QUESTION:

Illegal aliens (2004: illegal immigrants) -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880622
1992: 925331
1994: 940317
2004: 045081
2008: 085065a
2012: ftcasi_illegal

===

VCF0234

GROUP THERMOMETER: Christian Fundamentalists

QUESTION:

Christian fundamentalists -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880629

1992: 925338
1994: 940315
1996: 961038
2000: 001317
2002: 025064
2004: 045057
2008: 085064b
2012: ftgr_xfund

==

VCF0235

GROUP THERMOMETER: Radical Students

QUESTION:

Radical students -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700253
1972: 720713
1974: 742359
1976: 763827
1980: 800864

==

VCF0236

GROUP THERMOMETER: Farmers

QUESTION:

Farmers -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720732
1974: 742375
1980: 800883

===
VCF0253

GROUP THERMOMETER: Feminists

QUESTION:

Feminists -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
For "women's movement" see VCF0225.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880605
1992: 925317
2000: 001326
2002: 025071
2004: 045059
2008: 085064d
2012: ftgr_feminists

===
VCF0290

PARTIES: Major Party Thermometer Avg

QUESTION:

Thermometers --both major parties

VALID_CODES:

0-97 Degrees.

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK in VCF0218 or VCF0224
999. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0218 and VCF0224 as: (VCF0218+VCF0224)/2. Fractional
results are rounded to the next highest integer.
Cases DK in either thermometer are coded DK; cases which are NA in one
thermometer are coded NA unless the other thermometer is DK (in which
case this var is coded DK).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780155,780156
1980: 800168,800169
1982: 820138,820139
1984: 840305,840306
1986: 860146,860147
1988: 880164,880165
1990: 900151,900152
1992: 923317,923318
1994: 940301,940302
1996: 960292,960293
1998: 980260,980261
2000: 000369,000370
2004: 043049,043050
2008: 083044a,083044b

===
VCF0291

PARTIES: Major Party Thermometer Index

QUESTION:

Major party thermometer index

VALID_CODES:
----
2.   Most Republican

.

50.   Neutral

.

99.   Most Democratic

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK in VCF0218 or VCF0224
999. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:

Built from VCF0218 and VCF0224 as: (VCF0218-VCF0224 +100)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.
Cases DK in either thermometer are coded DK; cases which are NA in one
thermometer are coded NA unless the other thermometer is DK (in which
cases this var is coded DK).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0301

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- 7-point Scale

QUESTION:

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican,
a Democrat, an Independent, or what? (IF REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT)
Would you call yourself a strong (REP/DEM) or a not very strong
(REP/DEM)? (IF INDEPENDENT, OTHER [1966 AND LATER: OR NO PREFERENCE;
2008: OR DK)
Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Strong Democrat
2. Weak Democrat
3. Independent - Democrat
4. Independent - Independent
5. Independent - Republican
6. Weak Republican
7. Strong Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA/RF initial party identification; Democrat or
    Republican initial party identification but DK/NA/RF
    strength; initial party identification independent/
    no preference/other/DK and followup is DK/NA/RF/other;
    no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable has been revised in accordance with the ANES memo on
construction of the Party Identification Summary (available from the
ANES Web site).
For all years, this variable has been reconstructed in the following

consistent manner:
Code 1: initial mention Democrat; followup: strong.
Code 2: initial mention Democrat; followup: not strong.
Code 3: initial preference independent,no preference, other, DK ;
       followup: Democrat
Code 4: initial preference independent,no preference, other, DK ;
       followup: neither
Code 5: initial preference independent,no preference, other, DK ;
       followup: Republican
Code 6: initial mention Republican; followup: not strong.
Code 7: initial mention Republican; followup: strong
2008 NOTE:
The order of the parties in the initial question was randomized.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520237
1954: V540012
1956: 560088
1958: 580062
1960: 600091
1962: 620035
1964: 640146
1966: 660082
1968: 680120
1970: 700184(type 0)
1972: 720140
1974: 742204
1976: 763174
1978: 780433
1980: 800266
1982: 820291
1984: 840318
1986: 860300
1988: 880274
1990: 900320
1992: 923634
1994: 940655
1996: 960420
1998: 980339
2000: 000523
2002: 023038x
2004: 043116
2008: 083098x
2012: pid_x

===
VCF0302

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Initial Party ID Response

QUESTION:

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican,
a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Republican
2. Independent
3. No preference; none; neither
4. Other
5. Democrat

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; refused
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable corresponds to R's initial response, before follow-up
questions determine strength or leaning.
1952-66,1970 study data were coded as a summary already including
information from strength and closeness, and are not included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680119
1972: 720141
1974: 742201
1976: 763168
1978: 780426
1980: 800225
1982: 820287
1984: 840315
1986: 860297
1988: 880271

1990: 900317
1992: 923631
1994: 940652
1996: 960417
1998: 980336
2000: 000519
2002: 023036
2004: 043114
2008: 083097
2012: pid_self

==

VCF0303

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Summary 3-Category

QUESTION:

Party ID - 3 categories

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats (including leaners)
2. Independents
3. Republicans (including leaners)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; other; refused to answer; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from VCF0301, 1-3=1, 4=2, 5-7=3

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520237
1954: V540012
1956: 560088
1958: 580062
1960: 600091
1962: 620035
1964: 640146

1966: 660082
1968: 680120
1970: 700184(type 0)
1972: 720140
1974: 742204
1976: 763174
1978: 780433
1980: 800266
1982: 820291
1984: 840318
1986: 860300
1988: 880274
1990: 900320
1992: 923634
1994: 940655
1996: 960420
1998: 980339
2000: 000523
2002: 023038x
2004: 043116
2008: 083098x
2012: pid_x

===

VCF0305

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Strength of Partisanship

QUESTION:

Party ID - strength of partisanship

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Independent
2. Leaning Independent
3. Weak Partisan
4. Strong Partisan

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; other; refused to answer; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from VCF0301, 1=4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1, 5=2, 6=3, 7=4, 9=1

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520237
1954: V540012
1956: 560088
1958: 580062
1960: 600091
1962: 620035
1964: 640146
1966: 660082
1968: 680120
1970: 700184(type 0)
1972: 720140
1974: 742204
1976: 763174
1978: 780433
1980: 800266
1982: 820291
1984: 840318
1986: 860300
1988: 880274
1990: 900320
1992: 923634
1994: 940655
1996: 960420
1998: 980339
2000: 000523
2002: 023038x
2004: 043116
2008: 083098x

==

VCF0306

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent's Father

QUESTION:

(1970,1988,1990: When you were growing up) Did he/your father
(1988,1992: or stepfather) think of himself mostly as a Democrat, as a
Republican, or what?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Independent (some years also: shifted around)
3. Republican
4. Other; minor party; apolitical; never voted, didn't
    get into politics; parents refused to say; DK (1988
    only); father not a U.S. citizen

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK (exc. 1988)
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; R had no
   father/father substitute; DK/NA father's interest
   in politics (1972 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1972, code 2 was a volunteered code only.
1972 NOTE:
If R's response to the question corresponding to VCF0308 (father's
interest in politics) was DK or NA, then this question was not asked.
1988 NOTE:
DK was combined with "other" codes (code 4).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520068
1958: 580069
1964: 640151
1968: 680124
1970: 700192(type 0)
1972: 720153
1976: 763202
1978: 780439
1980: 800355
1988: 881115
1992: 926243

===

VCF0307

PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent's Mother

QUESTION:

(1970,1988,1990: When you were growing up) Did she/your mother
(1988,1992: or stepmother) think of himself mostly as a Democrat, as a
Republican, or what?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Democrat
2. Independent
3. Republican
4. Other; minor party; apolitical; never voted, didn't
   get into politics; parents refused to say; DK (1988
   only); mother not a U.S. citizen; no women's suffrage
   (prior to 1972 only)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK (exc. 1988)
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; R had no
   mother/mother substitute; DK/NA mother's interest in
   politics (1972 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1972, code 2 was a volunteered code only.
1972 NOTE:
If R's response to the question corresponding to VCF0309 (mother's
interest in politics) was DK or NA, then this question was not asked.
1988 ONLY:
DK was combined with "other" codes (code 4).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520069
1958: 580071
1964: 640153
1968: 680126
1970: 700193(type 0)
1972: 720155
1976: 763204
1978: 780440
1980: 800356
1988: 881116
1992: 926244

==

VCF0308

PARTISANSHIP: Political Interest of Respondent's Father

QUESTION:

Do you remember when you were growing up whether your father was very
much interested in politics, somewhat interested, or didn't he pay
much attention to it?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Didn't pay much attention
2. Somewhat interested
3. Very much interested

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK
0. NA; R had no father/father substitute
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580068
1964: 640150
1968: 680123
1972: 720152
1976: 763201

===
VCF0309

PARTISANSHIP: Political Interest of Respondent's Mother

QUESTION:

Now how about your mother? When you were growing up was she very much
interested in politics, somewhat interested, or didn't she pay much
attention to it?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Didn't pay much attention
2. Somewhat interested
3. Very much interested

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. DK
0. NA; R had no mother/mother substitute
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580070
1964: 640152
1968: 680125
1972: 720154
1976: 763203

==
VCF0310

POLITICAL INTEREST: Interest in the Elections

QUESTION:

Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How
about you, would you say that you have been/were very much interested,
somewhat interested, or not much interested in (1952-1998: following)
the political campaigns (so far) this year?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Very much interested
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; split versions: not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:
This question was present in both the pre and post. The pre version is
represented here.
1992 NOTE:
same as 1988
2002 NOTE:

same as 1988
2004 NOTE:
same as 1988
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "OLD"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "NEW").
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.
This question was present in both the pre and post. The pre version is
represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520044
1956: 560097
1958: 580075
1960: 600098
1962: 620039
1964: 640157
1966: 660087
1968: 680130
1970: 700201(type 0)
1972: 720163
1976: 763031
1978: 780043
1980: 800053
1982: 820058
1984: 840075
1986: 860059
1988: 880097
1990: 900062
1992: 923101
1994: 940124
1996: 960201
1998: 980201
2000: 000301
2002: 023001
2004: 043001
2008: 083001a
2012: interest_following

===
VCF0311

POLITICAL INTEREST: Does Respondent Care Which Party Wins Presidential Election

QUESTION:

Generally speaking, would you say that you personally care a good deal
which party (1992 and later: who) wins the presidential election this
fall, or that you don't care very much which party (1992 and later: who)
wins?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Don't care very much or DK, pro-con, depends, and
    other
2. Care a good deal

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The 1992 change in wording from 'which party wins' to 'who wins'
produced a significant change in distributions.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520041
1956: 560014
1960: 600019
1964: 640020
1968: 680027
1972: 720029
1976: 763030
1980: 800061
1984: 840080
1988: 880102
1992: 923106
1996: 960202
2000: 000302
2004: 043092
2008: 083072
2012: preswin_care

```
================================================================================
```

VCF0312

POLITICAL INTEREST: Does Respondent Care Which Party Wins Congressional Election

QUESTION:

POST ADMINISTRATION:
As you know, representatives to Congress in Washington are being chosen
in this election from congressional districts all around the country.
How much would you say that you personally cared about the way the
elections (1996 AND LATER: election) to the U.S. House of
Representatives (1966,1970,1974: to Congress) came out:
Did you care very much, pretty much, not very much or not at all?
PRE ADMINISTRATION:
As you know, representatives to Congress in Washington are being chosen
in this election from congressional districts all around the country.
How much would you say that you personally care about the way the
elections (1996 AND LATER: election) to the U.S. House of
Representatives (1970,1974: to Congress) come(s) out:
Do you care very much, pretty much, not very much or not at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not very much, not at all, DK, pro-con, depends, other
2. Very much, pretty much

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2002 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the Pre and Post; the Pre is
represented here.
2008 NOTE:
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
with response options in reverse order.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: 660063
1970: 700164(type 0)

1974: 742026
1978: 780114
1980: 800822
1982: 820097
1986: 860102
1990: 900106
1992: 925108
1994: 940209
1996: 960256
1998: 980222
2000: 000342
2002: 023007
2008: 083034

===

VCF0313

POLITICAL INTEREST: Interest in Public Affairs

QUESTION:

1964 AND LATER:
Some people seem to follow (1964: think about) what's going on in
government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an
election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say
you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the
time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?
1960, 1962:
We'd also like to know how much attention you pay to what's going on in
politics generally. I mean from day to day, when there isn't any big
election campaign going on, would you say you follow politics very
closely, fairly closely, or not much at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Hardly at all (1960,1962: not much at all)
2. Only now and then
3. Some of the time (1960,1962: fairly closely)
4. Most of the time (1960,1962: very closely)
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972); abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); split versions: not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1960 NOTE:
Only three response categories were available, corresponding to codes
1, 3, and 4.
1962 NOTE:
same as 1960.

1962 NOTE 2:
The DK category was not present
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "OLD"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "NEW").
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.
This question was present in both the pre and post. The pre version is
represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600225
1962: 620040
1964: 640324
1966: 660064
1968: 680430
1972: 720476
1974: 742027
1976: 763599
1978: 780310
1980: 800974
1982: 820294
1984: 840988
1986: 860301
1988: 880812
1990: 900321
1992: 925721
1994: 940701
1996: 961134
1998: 980340
2000: 001367
2002: 025084
2004: 045095
2008: 085072

===

VCF0314

PARTIES: Democratic Party: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic

party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four positive mentions (likes)
5. Five positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
   (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
   sample [See VCF012A] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form or wave. Rs
who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that you
like about the Democratic party?" have been coded here as 0
mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response have also been coded
here as 0 mentions. In addition, Rs who responded "yes" BUT
who provided no mentions (DK or NA in first mention) have been
coded 0.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996
2004 NOTE:
same as 1996
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2012 NOTE:
Party-candidate codes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018
1956: 560015
1958: 580015
1960: 600020
1964: 640021
1968: 680028
1972: 7200031
1976: 763088,763089,763090,763091,763092
1978: 780091,780092,780093,780094,780095
1980: 800173,800174,800175,800176,800177
1982: 820074,820075,820076,820077,820078
1984: 840267,840268,840269,840270,840271
1986: 860073,860074,860075,860076,860077
1988: 880183,880184,880185,880186,880187
1990: 900074,900075,900076,900077,900078,900079
1992: 923402,923403,923404,923405,923406
1994: 940132,940133,940134,940135,940136
1996: 960326,960327,960328,960329,960330
2000: 000374,000375,000376,000377,000378
2004: 043053

==

VCF0315

PARTIES: Democratic Party: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the
Democratic party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)
5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form (1972,1990,1996)
or within a wave (1952,1960). Rs who responded "no" to "Is there
anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?" have been coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in
response to the same question have also been coded here as 0
mentions. In addition, Rs who responded "yes" BUT who provided
no mentions (DK or NA in first mention) have been coded 0.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996
2004 NOTE:
same as 1996
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party-candidate codes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019
1956: 560016
1958: 580016
1960: 600021
1964: 640022
1968: 680029
1972: 720033
1976: 763094,763095,763096,763097,763098
1978: 780097,780098,780099,780100,780101
1980: 800179,800180,800181,800182,800183
1982: 820081,820082,820083,820084
1984: 840273,840274,840275,840276,840277
1986: 860079,860080,860081,860082,860083
1988: 880189,880190,880191,880192,880193

1990: 900081,900082,900083,900084,900085
1992: 923408,923409,923410,923411,923412
1994: 940138,940139,940140,940141,940142
1996: 960332,960333,960334,960335,960336
2000: 000380,000381,000382,000383,000384
2004: 043055

==

VCF0316

PARTIES: Democratic Party: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Democratic Party

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic party 'likes' minus the number of
Democratic party 'dislikes' (VCF0314-VCF0315).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0317

PARTIES: Democratic Party: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Democratic Party

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.

.
10. Ten mentions

MISSING_CODES:

```
-------------
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used
```

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic party 'likes' plus the number of
Democratic party dislikes (VCF0314+VCF0315)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0318

PARTIES: Republican Party: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four positive mentions (likes)
5. Five positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form (1972,1990,1996)
or within a wave (1952,1960). Rs who responded "no" to "Is there

anything in particular that you like about the Republican party?"
have been coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response
to the same question have also been coded here as 0 mentions. In
addition, Rs who responded "yes" BUT who provided no mentions (DK
or NA in first mention) have been coded 0 here.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party-candidate codes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020
1956: 560017
1958: 580017
1960: 600022
1964: 640023
1968: 680030
1972: 720035
1976: 763100,763101,763102,763103,763104
1978: 780103,780104,780105,780106,780107
1980: 800185,800186,800186,800187,800188,800189
1982: 820086,820087,820088,820089,820090
1984: 840279,840280,840281,840282,840283
1986: 860085,860086,860087,860088,860089
1988: 880195,880196,880197,880198,880199
1990: 900086,900087,900088,900089,900090,900091
1992: 923414,923415,923416,923417,923418
1994: 940144,940145,940146,940147,940148
1996: 960314,960315,960316,960317,960318
2000: 000386,000387,000388,000389,000390
2004: 043057

===

VCF0319

PARTIES: Republican Party: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the
Republican party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)
5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012A] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form (1972,1990,1996)
or within a wave (1952,1960). Rs who responded "no" to "Is there
anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?" have been coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in
response to the same question have also been coded here as 0
mentions. In addition, Rs who responded "yes" BUT who provided
no mentions (DK or NA in first mention) have been coded 0.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996
2004 NOTE:
same as 1996
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party-candidate codes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021
1956: 560018
1958: 580018
1960: 600023
1964: 640024
1968: 680031
1972: 720037
1976: 763106,763107,763108,763109,763110
1978: 780109,780110,780111,780112,780113
1980: 800191,800192,800193,800194,800195
1982: 820092,820093,820094,820095,820096,820096
1984: 840285,840286,840287,840288,840289
1986: 860091,860092,860093,860094,860095
1988: 880201,880202,880203,880204,880205
1990: 900092,900093,900094,900095,900096,900097
1992: 923420,923421,923422,923423,923424
1994: 940150,940151,940152,940153,940154
1996: 960320,960321,960322,960323,960324
2000: 000392,000393,000394,000395,000396
2004: 043059

==
VCF0320

PARTIES: Republican Party: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Republican Party

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican party 'likes' minus the number of
Republican party 'dislikes' (VCF0318-VCF0319).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0321

PARTIES: Republican Party: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Republican Party

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
10. Ten mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican party 'likes' plus the number of
Republican party 'dislikes' (VCF0318+VCF0319)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0322

PARTIES: Major Parties: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Net affect toward major parties

MISSING_CODES:
----

999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
   (1990); questions not administered in assigned half
   sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The net affect toward parties is the difference between two sums:
the sum of Democratic party 'likes' and Republican party 'dislikes'
MINUS the sum of Democratic party 'dislikes' and Republican party
'likes:'   [VCF0314+VCF0319] - [VCF0315+VCF0318]
which is the same as: VCF0316 - VCF0320

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0323

PARTIES: Major Parties: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Major party salience

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Zero mentions
.
.
20. Twenty mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned
    half-sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Party salience is the sum of all 'likes' and 'dislikes' about both
the Democratic and Republican parties:
[VCF0314 + VCF0315 + VCF0318 + VCF0319]
which is the same as: VCF0317 + VCF0321

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0324

PARTIES: Major Parties: Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Relative salience of major parties

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); questions not administered in assigned half-
    sample [See VCF012a] (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Relative salience of parties is the sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes'
about the Democratic party MINUS the sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes'
about the Republican party: [VCF0314+VCF0315] - [VCF0318+VCF0319]
which is the same as: VCF0317 - VCF0321

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

POLITICAL FIGURE TRAITS - GENERAL TEXT

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to
describe political figures...
Think about [NAME].
The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT]
describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at
all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:

Presidential trait vars appeared in both the pre and post; the pre is
represented here.
1988 NOTE:
Form A respondents were asked in the Pre, and Form B respondents were
asked in the Post.
1996 NOTE:
Traits were administered in random order; order of Presidential
candidates (including the President) was also in random order.
1998 NOTE:
Order of traits was randomized.
2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered Clinton traits in
either the pre or the post. The order of traits was randomized.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered one of two sets
of traits. In the first set traits included VCF342 and VCF343; in the
second set, VCF338, VCF344, and VCF345. Each set of traits was
randomly assigned to one of two possible orders.
2004 NOTE:
same as 1996.
2008 NOTE:
2008 NOTE:
Traits were administered in 2 versions; version "J" corresponds
to the version here; the remaining respondents were administered
alternative version "K".
Traits were administered in random order; order of Presidential
candidates (including the President) was also in random order.
A half-sample of respondents were administered the traits questions
with response options in reverse order.
2012 NOTE:
Not coded comparably in 2012.-1

==

POLITICAL FIGURE AFFECTS - GENERAL TEXT

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward
[NAME].
Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of
something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

NOTES:

1980 NOTE:
"Don't know" was combined with "no" (code 2).
1982 NOTE:
same as 1980.
1984 NOTE 1:
Reagan affect variables appeared in both the pre and post: the pre
is represented.
1984 NOTE 2:
"Don't know" was combined with NA (code 9).
1988 NOTE:

Form A respondents were asked affects in the Pre, and Form B
respondents were asked in the Post.
1996 NOTE:
Affects were administered in random order; order of Presidential
candidates (including the President) was also in random order.
1998:
Affects were administered in random order.
2000 NOTE 1:
Respondents were randomly assigned to be administered affects in either
the pre or the post.
2000 NOTE 2:
The order of affects was randomized.
2004 NOTE:
same as 1996.
2008 NOTE:
same as 1996.-1

===

VCF0338

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Intelligent

QUESTION:

President trait - intelligent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post
   administration and no Post IW (2000); R not selected
   for this trait (2002); no Post IW; split versions:
   not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840323
1986: 860550
1988: 881014
1992: 923635
1996: 960421
2000: 001642a
2002: 025082
2004: 043121
2008: 083178e

==

VCF0339

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Compassionate

QUESTION:

President trait - compassionate

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840321
1986: 860551
1988: 881015
1992: 923636
1996: 960422

==

VCF0340

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Decent

QUESTION:

President trait - decent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840320
1986: 860555
1988: 881019

===

VCF0341

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Inspiring

QUESTION:

President trait- inspiring

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800397
1982: 820382
1984: 840326
1986: 860553

1988: 881017
1992: 923638
1996: 960425

===

VCF0342

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Knowledgeable

QUESTION:

President trait - knowledgeable

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post
   administration and no Post IW (2000); R not selected
   for this trait (2002); no Post IW; split versions:
   not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800395
1982: 820380
1984: 840327
1986: 860557

1988: 881021
1992: 923641
1994: 940923
1996: 960428
1998: 980432
2000: 001639a
2002: 025078
2004: 043120
2008: 083178d

===

VCF0343

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Moral

QUESTION:

President trait - moral

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post
   administration and no Post IW (2000); R not selected
   for this trait (2002); no Post IW; split versions:
   not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800392
1982: 820377
1984: 840324
1986: 860552
1988: 881016
1992: 923637
1994: 940920
1996: 960423
1998: 980430
2000: 001637a
2002: 025076
2004: 043117
2008: 083178a

==
VCF0344

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Leadership

QUESTION:

President trait - provides strong leadership

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post
   administration and no Post IW (2000); R not selected
   for this trait (2002); no Post IW; split versions:
   not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800399
1982: 820384
1984: 840330
1986: 860554
1988: 881018
1992: 923639
1994: 940921
1996: 960426
1998: 980434
2000: 001640a
2002: 025079
2004: 043118
2008: 083178b

===

VCF0345

CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Cares

QUESTION:

President trait - really cares about people like you

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000); R not selected
    for this trait (2002); no Post IW; split versions:
    not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:

Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840329
1986: 860556
1988: 881020
1992: 923640
1994: 940922
1996: 960427
1998: 980431
2000: 001638a
2002: 025080
2004: 043119
2008: 083178c

===
VCF0346

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Angry

QUESTION:

President affect: angry

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for affects preceding VCF0334.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:

Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800127
1982: 820386
1984: 840212
1986: 860542
1988: 881023
1992: 923501
1994: 940835
1996: 960341
1998: 980389
2000: 001629a
2004: 043069
2008: 083174
2012: candaff_angdpc

==

VCF0347

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Afraid

QUESTION:

President affect: afraid (of him)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for affects preceding VCF0334.
GENERAL NOTE:

Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800129
1982: 820388
1984: 840214
1986: 860544
1988: 881025
1992: 923503
1994: 940837
1996: 960345
1998: 980393
2000: 001633a
2004: 043073
2008: 083176
2012: candaff_afrdpc

===
VCF0348

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Hopeful

QUESTION:

President affect: hopeful

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for affects preceding VCF0334.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800128
1982: 820387
1984: 840213
1986: 860543
1988: 881024
1992: 923502
1994: 940836
1996: 960343
1998: 980391
2000: 001631a
2004: 043071
2008: 083175
2012: candaff_hpdpc

===
VCF0349

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Proud

QUESTION:

President affect: proud

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for affects preceding VCF0334.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of presidents since 1980 includes:
Carter 1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986, 1988; George Bush Sr.
1992; Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004,2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800130
1982: 820389
1984: 840215
1986: 860545
1988: 881026
1992: 923504
1994: 940838
1996: 960347
1998: 980395
2000: 001635a
2004: 043075
2008: 083177
2012: candaff_prddpc

==
VCF0350

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Intelligent

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - intelligent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA

INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840339
1988: 880284
1992: 923644
1996: 960421
2000: 000529
2004: 043128
2008: 083099e

===
VCF0351

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Compassionate

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - compassionate

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:

----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840337
1988: 880285
1992: 923645
1996: 960422

===

VCF0352

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Decent

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - decent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;

Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840336
1988: 880289

==

VCF0353

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Inspiring

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - inspiring

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800397
1984: 840342
1988: 880287
1992: 923647
1996: 960425

==
VCF0354

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Knowledgeable

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - knowledgeable

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800395
1984: 840343
1988: 880291
1992: 923650
1996: 960428
2000: 000526
2004: 043127
2008: 083099d

===

VCF0355

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Moral

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - moral

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800392

1984: 840340
1988: 880286
1992: 923646
1996: 960423
2000: 000524
2004: 043124
2008: 083099a

===

VCF0356

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Leadership

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - provides strong leadership

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800399
1984: 840346
1988: 880288

1992: 923648
1996: 960426
2000: 000527
2004: 043125
2008: 083099b

===

VCF0357

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Cares

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate trait - really cares about people
like you

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004; Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840345
1988: 880290
1992: 923649
1996: 960427

2000: 000525
2004: 043126
2008: 083099c

===

VCF0358

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Angry

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate affect: angry

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004, Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800127
1984: 840219
1988: 880218
1992: 923505
1996: 960341
2000: 000407
2004: 043077
2008: 083061
2012: candaff_angdpc

===

VCF0359

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Afraid

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate affect: afraid (of him)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004, Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800129
1984: 840221
1988: 880220
1992: 923507
1996: 960345
2000: 000411
2004: 043081
2008: 083063
2012: candaff_afrdpc

===

VCF0360

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Hopeful

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate affect: hopeful

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004, Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800128
1984: 840220
1988: 880219
1992: 923506
1996: 960343
2000: 000409
2004: 043079
2008: 083062
2012: candaff_hpdpc

===

VCF0361

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Proud

QUESTION:

Democratic Presidential candidate affect: proud

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Democratic presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Jimmy Carter in 1980; Walter Mondale 1984;
Michael Dukakis 1988; Bill Clinton 1992,1996; Al Gore 2000;
John Kerry 2004, Barack Obama 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800130
1984: 840222
1988: 880221
1992: 923508
1996: 960347
2000: 000413
2004: 043083
2008: 083064
2012: candaff_prddpc

===

VCF0362

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Intelligent

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - intelligent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840323
1988: 880275
1992: 923635
2000: 000536
2004: 043121
2008: 083101e

===
VCF0363

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Compassionate

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - compassionate

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well

3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840321
1988: 880276
1992: 923636

==
VCF0364

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Decent

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - decent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840320
1988: 880280

==
VCF0365

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Inspiring

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - inspiring

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800379
1984: 840326
1988: 880278
1992: 923638
1996: 960434

==

VCF0366

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Knowledgeable

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - knowledgeable

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800377
1984: 840327
1988: 880282
1992: 923641
1996: 960437
2000: 000533
2004: 043120
2008: 083101d

===
VCF0367

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Moral

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - moral

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800374
1984: 840324
1988: 880277
1992: 923637
1996: 960432
2000: 000531
2004: 043117
2008: 083101a

==

VCF0368

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Leadership

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - provides strong leadership

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800381
1984: 840330
1988: 880279
1992: 923639
1996: 960435
2000: 000534
2004: 043118
2008: 083101b

==

VCF0369

CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Cares

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate trait - really cares about people
like you

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely well
2. Quite well
3. Not too well
4. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. 0. INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840329
1988: 880281

1992: 923640
1996: 960436
2000: 000532
2004: 043119
2008: 083101c

==

VCF0370

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Angry

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate affect: angry

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800113
1984: 840212
1988: 880214
1992: 923501
1996: 960349
2000: 000415
2004: 043069
2008: 083065

2012: candaff_angrpc

==
VCF0371

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Afraid

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate affect: afraid (of him)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800115
1984: 840214
1988: 880216
1992: 923503
1996: 960353
2000: 000419
2004: 043073
2008: 083067
2012: candaff_afrrpc

==

VCF0372

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Hopeful

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate affect: hopeful

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800114
1984: 840213
1988: 880215
1992: 923502
1996: 960351
2000: 000417
2004: 043071
2008: 083066
2012: candaff_hprpc

===

VCF0373

CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Proud

QUESTION:

Republican Presidential candidate affect: proud

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, have felt
2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)
9. NA (1984 only: DK)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See general question text and notes for traits preceding VCF0326.
GENERAL NOTE:
Different traits have been asked in indvidual studies since
1980. A list of Republican presidential candidates since
1980 includes: Ronald Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush 1988,1992;
Bob Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004; John McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800116
1984: 840215
1988: 880217
1992: 923504
1996: 960355
2000: 000421
2004: 043075
2008: 083068
2012: candaff_prdrpc

==
VCF0374

PARTIES: Likes Anything about Democratic party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. RF; NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A
    (1990); question not administered in assigned half
    sample [See VCF012A] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720030
1976: 763087
1978: 780090
1980: 800172
1982: 820073
1984: 840266
1986: 860072
1988: 880182
1990: 900074
1992: 923401
1994: 940131
1996: 960325
2000: 000373
2004: 043052
2008: 083045
2012: ptylik_likdp

===

VCF0375a

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0374; form II (1972); form B
     (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
     in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0314, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031a
1976: 763088
1978: 780091
1980: 800173
1982: 820074
1984: 840267
1986: 860073

1988: 880183
1990: 900075
1992: 923402
1994: 940132
1996: 960326
2000: 000374
2004: 043053a

==
VCF0375b

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0374; form II (1972); form B
      (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
      in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0375a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031a
1976: 763088
1978: 780091
1980: 800173
1982: 820074
1984: 840267
1986: 860073
1988: 880183
1990: 900075
1992: 923402
1994: 940132
1996: 960326
2000: 000374
2004: 043053a

==
VCF0375c

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980

MISSING_CODES:

9987. DK much about party
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

```
-----
Numeric  Dec 0-1
```

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018a
1956: 560015a
1958: 580015a
1960: 600020a
1964: 640021a
1968: 680028a

===

VCF0375d

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0375c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018a
1956: 560015a
1958: 580015a
1960: 600020a
1964: 640021a
1968: 680028a

==

VCF0376a

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0314, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031b
1976: 763089
1978: 780092
1980: 800174
1982: 820075
1984: 840268
1986: 860074
1988: 880184
1990: 900076
1992: 923403
1994: 940133
1996: 960327
2000: 000375
2004: 043053b

==
VCF0376b

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0376a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031b
1976: 763089
1978: 780092
1980: 800174
1982: 820075
1984: 840268
1986: 860074
1988: 880184
1990: 900076
1992: 923403
1994: 940133
1996: 960327
2000: 000375
2004: 043053b

===

VCF0376c

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018b
1956: 560015b
1958: 580015b
1960: 600020b
1964: 640021b
1968: 680028b

==
VCF0376d

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0376c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018b
1956: 560015b
1958: 580015b
1960: 600020b
1964: 640021b
1968: 680028b

===
VCF0377a

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0314, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031c
1976: 763090
1978: 780093
1980: 800175
1982: 820076
1984: 840269
1986: 860075
1988: 880185
1990: 900077
1992: 923404
1994: 940134
1996: 960328
2000: 000376
2004: 043053c

==

VCF0377b

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0377a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720031c
1976: 763090
1978: 780093
1980: 800175
1982: 820076
1984: 840269
1986: 860075
1988: 880185
1990: 900077
1992: 923404
1994: 940134
1996: 960328
2000: 000376
2004: 043053c

==
VCF0377c

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018c
1956: 560015c
1958: 580015c
1960: 600020c
1964: 640021c
1968: 680028c

==

VCF0377d

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0377c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018c
1956: 560015c
1958: 580015c
1960: 600020c
1964: 640021c
1968: 680028c

==

VCF0378a

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0314, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763091
1978: 780094
1980: 800176
1982: 820077
1984: 840270
1986: 860076
1988: 880186
1990: 900078
1992: 923405
1994: 940135
1996: 960329
2000: 000377
2004: 043053d

===

VCF0378b

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0378a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763091
1978: 780094
1980: 800176
1982: 820077
1984: 840270
1986: 860076
1988: 880186
1990: 900078
1992: 923405
1994: 940135
1996: 960329
2000: 000377
2004: 043053d

==
VCF0378c

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018d
1956: 560015d
1958: 580015d
1960: 600020d
1964: 640021d
1968: 680028d

===

VCF0378d

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0378c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018d
1956: 560015d

1958: 580015d
1960: 600020d
1964: 640021d
1968: 680028d

==
VCF0379a

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0314, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763092
1978: 780095
1980: 800177
1982: 820078
1984: 840271
1986: 860077
1988: 880187
1990: 900079
1992: 923406
1994: 940136
1996: 960330
2000: 000378
2004: 043053e

==

VCF0379b

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0379a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763092
1978: 780095
1980: 800177
1982: 820078
1984: 840271
1986: 860077
1988: 880187
1990: 900079
1992: 923406
1994: 940136
1996: 960330
2000: 000378
2004: 043053e

==
VCF0379c

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0314.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018e
1956: 560015e
1958: 580015e
1960: 600020e
1964: 640021e
1968: 680028e

===

VCF0379d

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0374; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0379c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520018e
1956: 560015e
1958: 580015e
1960: 600020e
1964: 640021e
1968: 680028e

===
VCF0380

PARTIES: Dislikes Anything about Democratic party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. RF; NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    question not administered in assigned half sample [See
    VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720032
1976: 763093
1978: 780096
1980: 800178
1982: 820079
1984: 840272
1986: 860078
1988: 880188
1990: 900080
1992: 923407
1994: 940137
1996: 960331
2000: 000379

2004: 043054
2008: 083047
2012: ptylik_disldp

===

VCF0381a

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0380; form II (1972); form B
    (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
    in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0315, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033a
1976: 763094
1978: 780097
1980: 800179
1982: 820080
1984: 840273
1986: 860079
1988: 880189
1990: 900081
1992: 923408
1994: 940138
1996: 960332
2000: 000380
2004: 043055a

==
VCF0381b

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0380; form II (1972); form B
    (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
    in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0381a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033a
1976: 763094
1978: 780097
1980: 800179
1982: 820080
1984: 840273
1986: 860079
1988: 880189
1990: 900081
1992: 923408
1994: 940138
1996: 960332
2000: 000380
2004: 043055a

===

VCF0381c

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980

MISSING_CODES:

9987. DK much about party
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019a
1956: 560016a
1958: 580016a
1960: 600021a
1964: 640022a
1968: 680029a

==
VCF0381d

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0381c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019a
1956: 560016a
1958: 580016a
1960: 600021a
1964: 640022a
1968: 680029a

==

VCF0382a

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0315, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:

Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033b
1976: 763095
1978: 780098
1980: 800180
1982: 820081
1984: 840274
1986: 860080
1988: 880190
1990: 900082
1992: 923409
1994: 940139
1996: 960333
2000: 000381
2004: 043055b

===
VCF0382b

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)

33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0382a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033b
1976: 763095
1978: 780098
1980: 800180
1982: 820081
1984: 840274
1986: 860080
1988: 880190
1990: 900082
1992: 923409
1994: 940139
1996: 960333
2000: 000381
2004: 043055b

===
VCF0382c

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019b
1956: 560016b
1958: 580016b
1960: 600021b
1964: 640022b
1968: 680029b

===
VCF0382d

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

Collapsed from full code VCF0382c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019b
1956: 560016b
1958: 580016b
1960: 600021b
1964: 640022b
1968: 680029b

==

VCF0383a

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0315, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will

integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033c
1976: 763096
1978: 780099
1980: 800181
1982: 820082
1984: 840275
1986: 860081
1988: 880191
1990: 900083
1992: 923410
1994: 940140
1996: 960334
2000: 000382
2004: 043055e

===

VCF0383b

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)

40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0383a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720033c
1976: 763096
1978: 780099
1980: 800181
1982: 820082
1984: 840275
1986: 860081
1988: 880191
1990: 900083
1992: 923410
1994: 940140
1996: 960334
2000: 000382
2004: 043055e

===

VCF0383c

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019c
1956: 560016c
1958: 580016c
1960: 600021c
1964: 640022c
1968: 680029c

==
VCF0383d

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0383c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019c
1956: 560016c
1958: 580016c
1960: 600021c
1964: 640022c
1968: 680029c

==

VCF0384a

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0315, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763097
1978: 780100
1980: 800182
1982: 820083
1984: 840276
1986: 860082
1988: 880192
1990: 900084
1992: 923411
1994: 940141
1996: 960335
2000: 000383
2004: 043055d

===
VCF0384b

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);

questions not administered in assigned half sample
[See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0384a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763097
1978: 780100
1980: 800182
1982: 820083
1984: 840276
1986: 860082
1988: 880192
1990: 900084
1992: 923411
1994: 940141
1996: 960335
2000: 000383
2004: 043055d

==
VCF0384c

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019d
1956: 560016d
1958: 580016d
1960: 600021d
1964: 640022d
1968: 680029d

==
VCF0384d

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0384c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0385a

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0315.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0315, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763098
1978: 780101
1980: 800183
1982: 820084
1984: 840277
1986: 860083
1988: 880193
1990: 900085
1992: 923412
1994: 940142
1996: 960336
2000: 000384
2004: 043055e

===
VCF0385b

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0385a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763098
1978: 780101
1980: 800183
1982: 820084
1984: 840277
1986: 860083
1988: 880193
1990: 900085
1992: 923412
1994: 940142
1996: 960336
2000: 000384
2004: 043055e

===
VCF0385c

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019e
1956: 560016e
1958: 580016e
1960: 600021e
1964: 640022e
1968: 680029e

==

VCF0385d

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0380; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0385c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520019e
1956: 560016e
1958: 580016e
1960: 600021e
1964: 640022e
1968: 680029e

==

VCF0386

PARTIES: Likes Anything about Republican party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. RF; NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    question not administered in assigned half sample [See
    VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0318.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020
1956: 560017
1958: 580017
1960: 600022
1964: 640023
1968: 680030
1972: 720034

1976: 763099
1978: 780102
1980: 800184
1982: 820085
1984: 840278
1986: 860084
1988: 880194
1990: 900086
1992: 923413
1994: 940143
1996: 960313
2000: 000385
2004: 043056
2008: 083049
2012: ptylik_likrp

==
VCF0387a

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0386; form II (1972); form B
    (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
    in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0318.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0318, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series

Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035a
1976: 763100
1978: 780103
1980: 800185
1982: 820092
1984: 840279
1986: 860085
1988: 880195
1990: 900087
1992: 923414
1994: 940144
1996: 960314
2000: 000392
2004: 043057a

===

VCF0387b

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)

35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0386; form II (1972); form B
    (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
    in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0387a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035a
1976: 763100
1978: 780103
1980: 800185
1982: 820092
1984: 840279
1986: 860085
1988: 880195
1990: 900087
1992: 923414
1994: 940144
1996: 960314
2000: 000392
2004: 043057a

===
VCF0387c

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980

MISSING_CODES:

9987. DK much about party
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020a
1956: 560017a
1958: 580017a
1960: 600022a
1964: 640023a
1968: 680030a

===

VCF0387d

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy

07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0387c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020a
1956: 560017a
1958: 580017a
1960: 600022a
1964: 640023a
1968: 680030a

==

VCF0388a

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0318.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0318, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035b
1976: 763101
1978: 780104
1980: 800186
1982: 820086
1984: 840280
1986: 860086
1988: 880196
1990: 900088
1992: 923415
1994: 940145
1996: 960315
2000: 000387
2004: 043057b

==

VCF0388b

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?

What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0388a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035b
1976: 763101
1978: 780104
1980: 800186
1982: 820086
1984: 840280
1986: 860086
1988: 880196
1990: 900088
1992: 923415
1994: 940145
1996: 960315
2000: 000387
2004: 043057b

==

VCF0388c

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020b
1956: 560017b
1958: 580017b
1960: 600022b
1964: 640023b
1968: 680030b

==

VCF0388d

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy

04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0388c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020b
1956: 560017b
1958: 580017b
1960: 600022b
1964: 640023b
1968: 680030b

==
VCF0389a

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
      form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
      questions not administered in assigned half sample
      [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

See notes VCF0318.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0318, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035c
1976: 763102
1978: 780105
1980: 800187
1982: 820088
1984: 840281
1986: 860087
1988: 881097
1990: 900089
1992: 923416
1994: 940146
1996: 960316
2000: 000388
2004: 043057c

===

VCF0389b

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0389a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720035c
1976: 763102
1978: 780105
1980: 800187
1982: 820088
1984: 840281
1986: 860087
1988: 881097
1990: 900089
1992: 923416
1994: 940146
1996: 960316
2000: 000388
2004: 043057c

==

VCF0389c

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020c
1956: 560017c
1958: 580017c
1960: 600022c
1964: 640023c
1968: 680030c

===

VCF0389d

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy

07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0389c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020c
1956: 560017c
1958: 580017c
1960: 600022c
1964: 640023c
1968: 680030c

===
VCF0390a

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0318.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:

Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0318, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763103
1978: 780106
1980: 800188
1982: 820089
1984: 840282
1986: 860088
1988: 880198
1990: 900090
1992: 923417
1994: 940147
1996: 960317
2000: 000389
2004: 043057d

==

VCF0390b

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)

22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0390a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763103
1978: 780106
1980: 800188
1982: 820089
1984: 840282
1986: 860088
1988: 880198
1990: 900090
1992: 923417
1994: 940147
1996: 960317
2000: 000389
2004: 043057d

===
VCF0390c

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?

What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020d
1956: 560017d
1958: 580017d
1960: 600022d
1964: 640023d
1968: 680030d

==
VCF0390d

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0390c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020d
1956: 560017d
1958: 580017d
1960: 600022d
1964: 640023d
1968: 680030d

===

VCF0391a

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0318.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0318, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.

2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763104
1978: 780107
1980: 800189
1982: 820090
1984: 840283
1986: 860089
1988: 880199
1990: 900091
1992: 923418
1994: 940148
1996: 960318
2000: 000390
2004: 043057e

===
VCF0391b

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)

33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0391a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763104
1978: 780107
1980: 800189
1982: 820090
1984: 840283
1986: 860089
1988: 880199
1990: 900091
1992: 923418
1994: 940148
1996: 960318
2000: 000390
2004: 043057e

==

VCF0391c

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980

INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020e
1956: 560017e
1958: 580017e
1960: 600022e
1964: 640023e
1968: 680030e

==

VCF0391d

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0386; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0391c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520020e
1956: 560017e
1958: 580017e
1960: 600022e
1964: 640023e
1968: 680030e

==
VCF0392

PARTIES: Dislikes Anything about Republican party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. RF; NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    question not administered in assigned half sample [See
    VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720036
1976: 763105
1978: 780108
1980: 800190
1982: 820091
1984: 840284
1986: 860090
1988: 880200
1990: 900092
1992: 923419
1994: 940149
1996: 960319
2000: 000391
2004: 043058
2008: 083051
2012: ptylik_dislrp

===
VCF0393a

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0392; form II (1972); form B
      (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
      in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0319, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded

tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037a
1976: 763106
1978: 780109
1980: 800191
1982: 820092
1984: 840285
1986: 860091
1988: 880201
1990: 900093
1992: 923420
1994: 940150
1996: 960320
2000: 000392
2004: 043059a

==

VCF0393b

PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)

23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0392; form II (1972); form B
    (1986); form A (1990); questions not administered
    in assigned half sample [See VCF0012a] (1996);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0393a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037a
1976: 763106
1978: 780109
1980: 800191
1982: 820092
1984: 840285
1986: 860091
1988: 880201
1990: 900093
1992: 923420
1994: 940150
1996: 960320
2000: 000392
2004: 043059a

===

VCF0393c

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980

MISSING_CODES:

9987. DK much about party
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021a
1956: 560018a
1958: 580018a
1960: 600023a
1964: 640024a
1968: 680031a

==
VCF0393d

PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----

01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0393c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021a
1956: 560018a
1958: 580018a
1960: 600023a
1964: 640024a
1968: 680031a

===

VCF0394a

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
 form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
 questions not administered in assigned half sample
 [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0319, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037b
1976: 763107
1978: 780110
1980: 800192
1982: 820093
1984: 840286
1986: 860092
1988: 880202
1990: 900094
1992: 923421
1994: 940151
1996: 960321
2000: 000393
2004: 043059b

===

VCF0394b

PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0394a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037b
1976: 763107
1978: 780110
1980: 800192
1982: 820093
1984: 840286
1986: 860092
1988: 880202
1990: 900094
1992: 923421

1994: 940151
1996: 960321
2000: 000393
2004: 043059b

===

VCF0394c

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021b
1956: 560018b
1958: 580018b
1960: 600023b
1964: 640024b
1968: 680031b

===

VCF0394d

PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0394c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021b
1956: 560018b
1958: 580018b
1960: 600023b
1964: 640024b
1968: 680031b

==

VCF0395a

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);

questions not administered in assigned half sample
[See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0319, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037c
1976: 763108
1978: 780111
1980: 800193
1982: 820094
1984: 840287
1986: 860093
1988: 880203
1990: 900095
1992: 923422
1994: 940152
1996: 960322
2000: 000394
2004: 043059c

==

VCF0395b

PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
     form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
     questions not administered in assigned half sample
     [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0395a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720037c
1976: 763108
1978: 780111
1980: 800193
1982: 820094
1984: 840287
1986: 860093
1988: 880203
1990: 900095
1992: 923422
1994: 940152
1996: 960322
2000: 000394

===

VCF0395c

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021c
1956: 560018c
1958: 580018c
1960: 600023c
1964: 640024c
1968: 680031c

===

VCF0395d

PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----

01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0395c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021c
1956: 560018c
1958: 580018c
1960: 600023c
1964: 640024c
1968: 680031c

===

VCF0396a

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0319, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763109
1978: 780112
1980: 800194
1982: 820095
1984: 840288
1986: 860094
1988: 880204
1990: 900096
1992: 923423
1994: 940153
1996: 960323
2000: 000395
2004: 043059d

==

VCF0396b

PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0396a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763109
1978: 780112
1980: 800194
1982: 820095
1984: 840288
1986: 860094
1988: 880204
1990: 900096
1992: 923423
1994: 940153
1996: 960323
2000: 000395
2004: 043059d

==

VCF0396c

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021d
1956: 560018d
1958: 580018d
1960: 600023d
1964: 640024d
1968: 680031d

==
VCF0396d

PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other

06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0396c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021d
1956: 560018d
1958: 580018d
1960: 600023d
1964: 640024d
1968: 680031d

==
VCF0397a

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0319.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972 AND LATER" master code.

1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0319, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763110
1978: 780113
1980: 800195
1982: 820096
1984: 840289
1986: 860095
1988: 880205
1990: 900097
1992: 923424
1994: 940154
1996: 960324
2000: 000396
2004: 043059e

===

VCF0397b

PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)

21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392;
    form II (1972); form B (1986); form A (1990);
    questions not administered in assigned half sample
    [See VCF0012a] (1996); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0397a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763110
1978: 780113
1980: 800195
1982: 820096
1984: 840289
1986: 860095
1988: 880205
1990: 900097
1992: 923424
1994: 940154
1996: 960324
2000: 000396
2004: 043059e

==

VCF0397c

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican

party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:

0011-9980
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021e
1956: 560018e
1958: 580018e
1960: 600023e
1964: 640024e
1968: 680031e

===

VCF0397d

PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican
party?
What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. People within party
02. Government management
03. Government activity, government philosophy
04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic
05. Domestic policies, other
06. Foreign policy
07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
09. General party attitudes/responses
10. Other

INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0392; no Pre IW

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0397c.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520021e
1956: 560018e
1958: 580018e
1960: 600023e
1964: 640024e
1968: 680031e

===

VCF0401

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Now I'd like to ask you about the good and bad points of the two
(1996 and later: "the major") candidates for President.
Is there anything in particular about [Democratic presidential
candidate] that might make you want to vote for him? What is that?
Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four positive mentions (likes)
5. Five positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form or wave. Rs
who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that you
like about [Democratic Presidential candidate]?" have been coded
here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response have also been
coded here as 0 mentions. In addition, Rs who responded "yes"
BUT who provided no mentions (DK or NA in first mention) have
been coded 0. Democratic Presidential Candidates: Stevenson 1952,
1956; Kennedy 1960; Johnson 1964; Humphrey 1968; McGovern 1972;
Carter 1976,1980; Mondale 1984; Dukakis 1988; Clinton 1992, 1996;
Gore 2000; Kerry 2004.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party likes-dislikes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027
1956: 560019
1960: 600024
1964: 640025
1968: 680032
1972: 720039
1976: 763112,763113,763114,763115,763116
1980: 800102,800103,800104,800105,800106
1984: 840094,840095,840096,840097,840098
1988: 880116,880117,880118,880119,880120
1992: 923122,923123,923124,923125,923126
1996: 960206,960207,960208,960209,960210
2000: 000306,000307,000308,000309,000310

==

VCF0402

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about [Democratic presidential
candidate] that might make you want to vote against him?
What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)
5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form or wave.
Rs who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that
you don't like about [Democratic Presidential candidate]?" have
been coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response
have also been coded here as 0 mentions. In addition, Rs who
responded "yes" BUT who provided no mentions (DK or NA in first
mention) have been coded 0. Democratic Presidential Candidates:
Stevenson 1952,1956; Kennedy 1960; Johnson 1964; Humphrey 1968;
McGovern 1972; Carter 1976,1980; Mondale 1984; Dukakis 1988;
Clinton 1992, 1996; Gore 2000.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series

Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party likes-dislikes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028
1956: 560020
1960: 600025
1964: 640026
1968: 680033
1972: 720041
1976: 763118,763119,763120,763121,763122
1980: 800108,800109,800110,800111,800112
1984: 840100,840101,840102,840103,840104
1988: 880122,880123,880124,880125,880126
1992: 923128,923129,923130,923131,923132
1996: 960212,960213,960214,960215,960216
2000: 000312,000313,000314,000315,000316
2004: 043013

==

VCF0403

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Democratic Presidential candidate

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic presidential candidate 'likes'
minus the number of Democratic presidential candidate 'dislikes'
(VCF0401-VCF0402).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0404

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Democratic Presidential candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
10. Ten mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
     (1980: see VCF0015a)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic presidential candidate 'likes' plus
the number of Democratic presidential candidate 'dislikes'
(VCF0401+VCF0402)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0405

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Now I'd like to ask you about the good and bad points of the two (1996
and later: the major) candidates for President.
Is there anything in particular about [Republican presidential

candidate] that might make you want to vote for him? What is that?
Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four positive mentions (likes)
5. Five positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form or wave.
Rs who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that
you like about [Republican Presidential candidate]?" have been
coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response have
also been coded here as 0 mentions. In addition, Rs who
responded "yes" BUT who provided no mentions (DK or NA in first
mention) have been coded 0. Republican Presidential Candidates:
Eisenhower 1952,1956; Nixon 1960, 1968, 1972; Goldwater 1964;
Ford 1976; Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush Sr. 1988,1992; Dole
1996; George W. Bush 2000,2004.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party likes-dislikes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029
1956: 560021
1960: 600026
1964: 640027
1968: 680034
1972: 720043
1976: 763124,763125,763126,763127,763128
1980: 800078,800079,800080,800081,800082
1984: 840082,840083,840084,840085,840086
1988: 880104,880105,880106,880107,880108
1992: 923110,923111,923112,923113,923114
1996: 960218,960219,960220,960221,960222
2000: 000318,000319,000320,000321,000322
2004: 043007

==

VCF0406

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about [Republican presidential
candidate] that might make you want to vote against him?
What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)
5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Five possible mentions were coded in all original ANES datasets.
MD category 9 comprises cases of systematic question exclusion,
i.e., when a question was not present within a form or wave. Rs
who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that you

don't like about [Republican Presidential candidate]?" have been
coded here as 0 mentions; Rs coded DK or NA in response have also
been coded here as 0 mentions. In addition, Rs who responded
"yes" BUT who provided no mentions (DK or NA in first mention)
have been coded 0. Republican Presidential Candidates: Eisenhower
1952,1956; Nixon 1960, 1968, 1972; Goldwater 1964; Ford 1976;
Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush Sr. 1988,1992; Dole 1996; George
W. Bush 2000,2004.
1996 NOTE:
The order in which the set of likes/dislikes questions was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized ('likes' always preceding
dislikes).
2000 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Party likes-dislikes have not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030
1956: 560022
1960: 600027
1964: 640028
1968: 680035
1972: 720045
1976: 763130,763131,763132,763133,763134
1980: 800084,800085,800086,800087,800088
1984: 840088,840089,840090,840091,840092
1988: 880110,880111,880112,880113,880114
1992: 923116,923117,923118,923119,923120
1996: 960224,960225,960226,960027,960228
2000: 000324,000325,000326,000327,000328
2004: 043009

==

VCF0407

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Republican Presidential candidate

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican presidential candidate 'likes' minus
the number of Republican presidential candidate 'dislikes'
(VCF0405-VCF0406).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0408

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Republican Presidential candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
10. Ten mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican presidential candidate 'likes'
plus the number of Republican presidential candidate 'dislikes'
(VCF0405+VCF0406).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0409

CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Net affect toward Major party Presidential candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. No Pre IW; form II (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The net affect toward major party presidential candidates is the
difference between two sums: the sum of Democratic presidential
candidate 'likes' and Republican presidential candidate 'dislikes'
MINUS the sum of Democratic presidential candidate 'dislikes' and
Republican presidential candidate 'likes:'
[VCF0401+VCF0406] - [VCF0402+VCF0405],
which is the same as: VCF0403-VCF0407.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0410

CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Major party Presidential candidate salience

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions

.
.
20. Twenty mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Major party presidential candidate salience is the sum of all 'likes'
and 'dislikes' about both the Democratic and Republican presidential
candidates: [VCF0401+VCF0402 + VCF0405+VCF0406]
which is the same as: VCF0404+VCF0408.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0411

CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Major party relative salience of Presidential candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Relative salience of major party presidential candidates is the sum of
'likes' and 'dislikes' about the Democratic presidential candidate
MINUS the sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes' about the Republican
presidential candidate: [VCF0401+VCF0402] - [VCF0405+VCF0406]
which is the same as: VCF0404-VCF0408

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0412

CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Avg

QUESTION:

Thermometers -- both Major party Presidential candidates

VALID_CODES:

0-97 Degrees.

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK/don't recognize in VCF0424 or VCF0426
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0424 and VCF0426 as: (VCF0424+VCF0426)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0413

CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Index

QUESTION:

Major party Presidential candidate thermometer index

VALID_CODES:
----
2. Most Republican
.
50. Neutral
.
99. Most Democratic

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK/don't recognize in VCF0424 or VCF0426
999. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0424 and VCF0426 as: (VCF0424-VCF0426 +100)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0414

CANDIDATES: Vice-Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Avg

QUESTION:

Thermometers -- both Major party vice-Presidential candidates

VALID_CODES:

0-97 Degrees.

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK/don't recognize in VCF0425 or VCF0427
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0425 and VCF0427 as: (VCF0425+VCF0427)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0415

CANDIDATES: Vice-Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Index

QUESTION:

Major party vice-Presidential candidate thermometer index

VALID_CODES:
----
2.   Most Republican
.
50. Neutral
.
99. Most Democratic

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK/don't recognize in VCF0425 or VCF0427
999. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0425 and VCF0427 as: (VCF0425-VCF0427 +100)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER INTRO

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year
as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the
political parties.)
(1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible
candidates for President in 1972.)
(1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these
people.)
(1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political
leaders and other people who are in the news these days.)
I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a
thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures
your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we

used something like this in our earlier interview with you.)
Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward
a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at
the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel
favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50
degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your
feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel
very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too
much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50
degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell
me and we'll go on to the next name.
1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates
for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like
to get your feelings toward some of these people.
I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person
with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100
degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings
between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the
person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't
feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50
degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me
and we'll move on to the next one.
1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and
other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the
news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that
person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer.
Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel
favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees
mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't
care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person
at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward
the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you
don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the
next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel
particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the
person at the 50 degree mark.)

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For study years where the same thermometer appeared in both the Pre and
Post, the Pre data are used.
1968 NOTE:
"Don't know"s were coded 50 on thermometers; groups about which the
respondent "didn't know much" were also placed at 50 degrees. The 50
degree mark was labeled "50 degrees; no feeling".
1970 NOTE:
The order of names read varied by form.
1996 NOTE:
The order of thermometers for all individuals except Presidential
candidates was randomized.
1998 NOTE:

The order of thermometers for all individuals except the President
(first thermometer) was randomized.
2000 NOTE:
same as 1998
2002 NOTE:
Individual thermometers were administered in one of two possible
orders, following President (first thermometer).
2004 NOTE:
The order of thermometers for all individuals except the president
(first thermometer) and Ronald Reagan, in retrospect (as the last/
14th thermometer) was randomized. Overall randomization was devised
as a set of consecutive subrandomizations; major presidental candidates
thermometers other than then incumbent president were randomly
administered as the 2nd-3rd names, follwed by other political figures
as the 4th-11th randomized thermometers. Thermometers for the major
parties were randomly administered in the 12th-13th positions.-1

==
VCF0424

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic Presidential Candidate

QUESTION:

Democratic presidential candidate -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding this question.
GENERAL NOTE:
Democratic Presidential Candidates: Stevenson 1952,1956; Kennedy 1960;
Johnson 1964; Humphrey 1968; McGovern 1972; Carter 1976,1980; Mondale
1984; Dukakis 1988; Clinton 1992, 1996; Gore 2000; Kerry 2004; Obama
2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680479
1972: 720254
1976: 763298
1980: 800154
1984: 840301
1988: 880155
1992: 923306
1996: 960272
2000: 000360
2004: 043039
2008: 083037a
2012: ft_dpc

===
VCF0425

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic Vice-presidential Candidate

QUESTION:

Democratic vice-presidential candidate thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW; ; interview conducted before VP
     candidate selection (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.
GENERAL NOTE:
Democratic Vice-Presidential candidates: Muskie 1968; Shriver 1972;
Mondale 1976,1980; Ferraro 1984; Bentsen 1988; Gore 1992,1996;
Lieberman 2000; Edwards 2004; Biden 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680487
1972: 720266
1976: 763308
1980: 800161
1984: 840304
1988: 880159
1992: 923309
1996: 960275
2000: 000366
2004: 043042
2008: 083039a
2012: ft_dvpc

==
VCF0426

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican Presidential Candidate

QUESTION:

Republican presidential candidate thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.
GENERAL NOTE:
Republican Presidential candidates: Nixon 1968,1972; Ford 1976; Reagan
1980,1984; George Bush Sr. 1988,1992; Dole 1996; George W. Bush
2000,2004; McCain 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680480
1972: 720255
1976: 763299
1980: 800155
1984: 840290
1988: 880154
1992: 923305
1996: 960273
2000: 000361
2004: 043038
2008: 083037b
2012: ft_rpc

==

VCF0427

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican Vice-presidential Candidate

QUESTION:

Republican vice-presidential candidate thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW; interview conducted before VP
     candidate selection (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.
GENERAL NOTE:
Republican Vice-Presidential candidates: Agnew 1968,1972; Dole 1976;
George Bush Sr. 1980,1984; Quayle 1988,1992; Kemp 1996; Cheney
2000,2004; Palin 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680488

1972: 720265
1976: 763312
1980: 800162
1984: 840292
1988: 880160
1992: 923308
1996: 960276
2000: 000367
2004: 043041
2008: 083039b
2012: ft_rvpc

===
VCF0428

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: U.S. President

QUESTION:

President thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.
GENERAL NOTE:
Presidents: Johnson 1968; Nixon 1970,1972; Ford 1974,1976; Carter 1978,
1980; Reagan 1982,1984,1986,1988; George Bush Sr. 1990,1992; Clinton
1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680484
1970: 700231
1972: 720255

1974: 742339
1976: 763299
1978: 780137
1980: 800154
1982: 820123
1984: 840290
1986: 860130
1988: 880158
1990: 900134
1992: 923305
1994: 940223
1996: 960272
1998: 980238
2000: 000359
2002: 023010
2004: 043038
2008: 083036
2012: ft_dpc

===
VCF0429

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Vice-president

QUESTION:

Vice-president thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.
GENERAL NOTE:
Vice-Presidents: Humphrey 1968; Agnew 1970,1972; Rockefeller 1974,1976;
Mondale 1978,1980; George Bush Sr. 1982,1984,1986,1988; Quayle 1990,
1992; Gore 1994,1996,1998,2000; Cheney 2002,2004.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680479
1970: 700237
1972: 720265
1974: 742342
1976: 763304
1978: 780143
1980: 800161
1982: 820135
1984: 840292
1986: 860144
1988: 880154
1990: 900137
1992: 923308
1994: 940227
1996: 960275
1998: 980243
2000: 000360
2002: 023011
2004: 043041
2012: ft_dvpc

==

VCF0432

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Hubert Humphrey

QUESTION:

Hubert Humphrey -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

```
-----
Numeric  Dec 0-1
```

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680479
1970: 700230(type 0)
1972: 720264
1974: 742352
1976: 763300

==
VCF0433

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ted Kennedy

QUESTION:

Ted Kennedy -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700235(type 0)
1972: 720258
1974: 742347
1976: 763302
1978: 780140
1980: 800156
1982: 820124

==

VCF0434

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Eugene McCarthy

QUESTION:

Eugene Mccarthy -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680481
1970: 700238(type 0)
1976: 763311

==

VCF0435

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George McGovern

QUESTION:

George Mcgovern -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded

97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700236(type 0)
1972: 720254
1976: 763309
1980: 800165
1984: 840300

==
VCF0436

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Walter Mondale

QUESTION:

Walter Mondale -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742353
1976: 763308
1978: 780143
1980: 800161
1982: 820136
1984: 840301

==
VCF0437

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Edmund Muskie

QUESTION:

Edmund Muskie -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680487
1970: 700234(type 0)

1972: 720257

===

VCF0438

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George Bush Sr.

QUESTION:

George Bush Sr. -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800162
1982: 820135
1984: 840292
1986: 860144
1988: 880154
1990: 900134
1992: 923305
2000: 001297

===

VCF0439

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George Wallace

QUESTION:

George Wallace -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680478
1970: 700229(type 0)
1972: 720253
1974: 742338
1976: 763297
1978: 780136
1980: 800166

==

VCF0440

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Spiro Agnew

QUESTION:

Spiro Agnew -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680488
1970: 700237(type 0)
1972: 720265

===
VCF0441

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Gerald Ford

QUESTION:

Gerald Ford -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742339
1976: 763299
1978: 780138
1980: 800158
1984: 840295

===

VCF0442

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Richard Nixon

QUESTION:

Richard Nixon -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680480
1970: 700231(type 0)
1972: 720255
1974: 742354
1976: 763307
1978: 780142
1980: 800167
1982: 820137
1984: 840302

===

VCF0443

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ronald Reagan

QUESTION:

(2004: And finally, in retrospect,) Ronald Reagan -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680482
1970: 700233(type 0)
1976: 763301
1978: 780139
1980: 800155
1982: 820123
1984: 840290
1986: 860130
1988: 880158
1990: 900138
2004: 043051

==
VCF0444

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Nelson Rockefeller

QUESTION:

Nelson Rockefeller -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc.1968)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680483
1974: 742342
1976: 763304

==

VCF0445

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Robert Dole

QUESTION:

Robert Dole -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1986,1988,1994,1996)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763312
1984: 840294
1986: 860140
1988: 880152
1994: 940225
1996: 960273

===
VCF0446

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Jimmy Carter

QUESTION:

Jimmy Carter -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763298

1978: 780137
1980: 800154
1982: 820122
1984: 840293
1988: 880595

==

VCF0447

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Bill Clinton

QUESTION:

Bill Clinton -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923306
1994: 940223
1996: 960272
1998: 980238
2000: 000359
2002: 023015
2004: 043045
2008: 083041

==

VCF0448

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Al Gore

QUESTION:

Al Gore -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923309
1994: 940227
1996: 960275
1998: 980243
2000: 000360
2002: 023012

==
VCF0449

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ross Perot

QUESTION:

Ross Perot -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----

98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923307
1994: 940224
1996: 960274

===
VCF0450

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve of President Performance

QUESTION:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that [the president] is
handling his job as President?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve
2. Disapprove
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; form II (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
This var appeared in both the pre and post; Pre data are included.
1988 NOTE:
same as 1984

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720046
1974: 742157
1976: 763135
1978: 780441
1980: 800062
1982: 820065
1984: 840258
1986: 860096
1988: 880140
1990: 900098
1992: 923319
1994: 940201
1996: 960295
1998: 980216
2000: 000339
2002: 023005
2004: 043024
2008: 083028
2012: presapp_job

===
VCF0451

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Strength Approve/Disapprove President Performance

QUESTION:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that [the president] is
handling his job as President?
Do you (approve/disapprove) {of the president's performance} strongly
or not strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve, strongly
2. Approve, not strongly
3. Disapprove, not strongly
4. Disapprove, strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; form II (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
This var appeared in both the pre and post; Pre data are included.
1988 NOTE:
same as 1984

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800063
1982: 820066
1984: 840259
1986: 860097
1988: 880141
1990: 900099
1992: 923320
1994: 940202
1996: 960296
1998: 980217
2000: 000341
2002: 023006x
2004: 043025
2008: 083028a
2012: presapp_job_x

==
VCF0471

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Hillary Clinton

QUESTION:

Hillary Clinton -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923313
1994: 940229
1996: 960281
1998: 980259
2000: 000368
2002: 023020
2004: 043044
2008: 083040
2012: ft_hclinton

===
VCF0472

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Pat Buchanan

QUESTION:

Pat Buchanan -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923315
1996: 960282
1998: 980249
2000: 000362

===
VCF0473

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Dan Quayle

QUESTION:

Dan Quayle -- thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96. Degrees as coded
97. 97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0424.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880160
1990: 900137
1992: 923308
1994: 940226
1998: 980246

===
VCF0475

CANDIDATES: Likes Anything about Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about the candidate.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will integrate with this file.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720038
1976: 763111
1980: 800101
1984: 840093
1988: 880115
1992: 923121
1996: 960205
2000: 000305
2004: 043010
2008: 083008
2012: candlik_likdpc

==

VCF0476a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0401, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039a

1976: 763112
1980: 800102
1984: 840094
1988: 880116
1992: 923122
1996: 960206
2000: 000306
2004: 043011a

===
VCF0476b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0476a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039a
1976: 763112
1980: 800102
1984: 840094
1988: 880116
1992: 923122
1996: 960206
2000: 000306
2004: 043011a

==

VCF0476c

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

MISSING_CODES:

9987. Don't know much about candidate
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0475; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027a
1956: 560019a
1960: 600024a
1964: 640025a

==

VCF0476d

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0475; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0476c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027a
1956: 560019a
1960: 600024a
1964: 640025a

1968: 680032a

==
VCF0477a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0401, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039b
1976: 763113
1980: 800103
1984: 840095

1988: 880117
1992: 923123
1996: 960213
2000: 000307
2004: 043011b

==
VCF0477b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0477a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039b
1976: 763113

1980: 800103
1984: 840095
1988: 880117
1992: 923123
1996: 960213
2000: 000307
2004: 043011b

===
VCF0477c

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027b
1956: 560019b
1960: 600024b
1964: 640025b
1968: 680032b

===
VCF0477d

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0477c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027b
1956: 560019b
1960: 600024b
1964: 640025b
1968: 680032b

==

VCF0478a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II

(1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0401, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039c
1976: 763114
1980: 800104
1984: 840096
1988: 880118
1992: 923124
1996: 960208
2000: 000308
2004: 043011c

===
VCF0478b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
      (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0478a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720039c
1976: 763114
1980: 800104
1984: 840096
1988: 880118
1992: 923124
1996: 960208
2000: 000308
2004: 043011c

===

VCF0478c

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?

What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027c
1956: 560019c
1960: 600024c
1964: 640025c
1968: 680032c

===

VCF0478d

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0478c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027c
1956: 560019c
1960: 600024c
1964: 640025c
1968: 680032c

===

VCF0479a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0401, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series

Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763115
1980: 800105
1984: 840097
1988: 880119
1992: 923125
1996: 960209
2000: 000309
2004: 043011d

==

VCF0479b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0479a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763115
1980: 800105
1984: 840097
1988: 880119
1992: 923125
1996: 960209
2000: 000309
2004: 043011d

==
VCF0479c

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

```
------------

1952: 520027d
1956: 560019d
1960: 600024d
1964: 640025d
1968: 680032d
```

==
VCF0479d

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0479c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027d
1956: 560019d
1960: 600024d

1964: 640025d
1968: 680032d

==

VCF0480a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0401, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763116
1980: 800106
1984: 840098

1988: 880120
1992: 923126
1996: 960210
2000: 000310
2004: 043011e

===

VCF0480b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475; form II
      (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0480a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763116
1980: 800106

1984: 840098
1988: 880120
1992: 923126
1996: 960210
2000: 000310
2004: 043011e

===

VCF0480c

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0401.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027e
1956: 560019e
1960: 600024e
1964: 640025e
1968: 680032e

===

VCF0480d

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0475;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0480c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520027e
1956: 560019e
1960: 600024e
1964: 640025e
1968: 680032e

==

VCF0481

CANDIDATES: Dislikes Anything about Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:

----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720040
1976: 763117
1980: 800107
1984: 840099
1988: 880121
1992: 923127
1996: 960211
2000: 000311
2004: 043012
2008: 083010
2012: candlik_disldpc

==

VCF0482a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0402, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041a
1976: 763118
1980: 800108
1984: 840100
1988: 880122
1992: 923128
1996: 960212
2000: 000312
2004: 043013a

==

VCF0482b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0482a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041a
1976: 763118
1980: 800108
1984: 840100
1988: 880122
1992: 923128
1996: 960212
2000: 000312

===

VCF0482c

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

MISSING_CODES:

9987. Don't know much about candidate
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0481; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028a
1956: 560020a
1960: 600025a
1964: 640026a
1968: 680033a

===

VCF0482d

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0481; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0482c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028a
1956: 560020a
1960: 600025a
1964: 640026a
1968: 680033a

===

VCF0483a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0402, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041b
1976: 763119
1980: 800109
1984: 840101
1988: 880123
1992: 923129
1996: 960213
2000: 000313
2004: 043013b

==
VCF0483b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0483a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041b
1976: 763119
1980: 800109
1984: 840101
1988: 880123
1992: 923129
1996: 960213
2000: 000313
2004: 043013b

===

VCF0483c

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028b
1956: 560020b
1960: 600025b
1964: 640026b
1968: 680033b

===

VCF0483d

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other

INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0483c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028b
1956: 560020b
1960: 600025b
1964: 640026b
1968: 680033b

===

VCF0484a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0402, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3

released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041c
1976: 763120
1980: 800110
1984: 840102
1988: 880124
1992: 923130
1996: 960214
2000: 000314
2004: 043013c

==

VCF0484b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)

40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0484a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720041c
1976: 763120
1980: 800110
1984: 840102
1988: 880124
1992: 923130
1996: 960214
2000: 000314
2004: 043013c

==

VCF0484c

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028c
1956: 560020c
1960: 600025c
1964: 640026c
1968: 680033c

==

VCF0484d

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0484c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028c
1956: 560020c
1960: 600025c
1964: 640026c
1968: 680033c

==

VCF0485a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0402, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763121
1980: 800111
1984: 840103
1988: 880125
1992: 923131
1996: 960215
2000: 000315
2004: 043013d

==
VCF0485b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
      (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0485a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763121
1980: 800111
1984: 840103
1988: 880125
1992: 923131
1996: 960215
2000: 000315
2004: 043013d

===

VCF0485c

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028d
1956: 560020d
1960: 600025d
1964: 640026d
1968: 680033d

===

VCF0485d

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0485c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028d
1956: 560020d
1960: 600025d
1964: 640026d
1968: 680033d

==

VCF0486a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0402, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763122
1980: 800112
1984: 840104
1988: 880126
1992: 923132
1996: 960216
2000: 000316
2004: 043013c

==
VCF0486b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481; form II
      (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0486a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763122
1980: 800112
1984: 840104
1988: 880126
1992: 923132
1996: 960216
2000: 000316
2004: 043013c

==

VCF0486c

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0402.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028e
1956: 560020e
1960: 600025e
1964: 640026e
1968: 680033e

===
VCF0486d

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0481;

no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0486c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520028e
1956: 560020e
1960: 600025e
1964: 640026e
1968: 680033e

==

VCF0487

CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.

2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720042
1976: 763123
1980: 800077
1984: 840081
1988: 880103
1992: 923109
1996: 960217
2000: 000317
2004: 043006
2008: 083012
2012: candlik_likrpc

==

VCF0488a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0405, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043a
1976: 763124
1980: 800078
1984: 840082
1988: 880104
1992: 923110
1996: 960218
2000: 000318
2004: 043007a

==
VCF0488b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)

23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0488a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043a
1976: 763124
1980: 800078
1984: 840082
1988: 880104
1992: 923110
1996: 960218
2000: 000318
2004: 043007a

===
VCF0488c

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

MISSING_CODES:

9987. Don't know much about candidate
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0487; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029a
1956: 560021a
1960: 600026a
1964: 640027a
1968: 680034a

===
VCF0488d

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
     politics
89. DK ;RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0487; no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0488c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029a
1956: 560021a
1960: 600026a
1964: 640027a
1968: 680034a

===
VCF0489a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:

Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0405, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043b
1976: 763125
1980: 800079
1984: 840083
1988: 880105
1992: 923111
1996: 960219
2000: 000319
2004: 043007b

===
VCF0489b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)

32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0489a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043b
1976: 763125
1980: 800079
1984: 840083
1988: 880105
1992: 923111
1996: 960219
2000: 000319
2004: 043007b

===
VCF0489c

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029b
1956: 560021b
1960: 600026b
1964: 640027b
1968: 680034b

==

VCF0489d

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0489c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029b
1956: 560021b
1960: 600026b
1964: 640027b
1968: 680034b

==

VCF0490a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0405, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043c
1976: 763126
1980: 800080
1984: 840084
1988: 880106
1992: 923112
1996: 960220
2000: 000320
2004: 043007c

==
VCF0490b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0490a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720043c
1976: 763126
1980: 800080
1984: 840084
1988: 880106
1992: 923112
1996: 960220
2000: 000320
2004: 043007c

==
VCF0490c

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029c
1956: 560021c
1960: 600026c
1964: 640027c
1968: 680034c

===

VCF0490d

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0490c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029c
1956: 560021c
1960: 600026c
1964: 640027c
1968: 680034c

===

VCF0491a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0405, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763127
1980: 800081
1984: 840085
1988: 880107
1992: 923113
1996: 960221
2000: 000320
2004: 043007d

===

VCF0491b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
      (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
      question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0491a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763127
1980: 800081
1984: 840085
1988: 880107
1992: 923113
1996: 960221
2000: 000320
2004: 043007d

==

VCF0491c

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029d
1956: 560021d
1960: 600026d
1964: 640027d
1968: 680034d

==

VCF0491d

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies

26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0491c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029d
1956: 560021d
1960: 600026d
1964: 640027d
1968: 680034d

===

VCF0492a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0405, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763128
1980: 800082
1984: 840086
1988: 880108
1992: 923126
1996: 960222
2000: 000322
2004: 043007c

===

VCF0492b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)

32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0492a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763128
1980: 800082
1984: 840086
1988: 880108
1992: 923126
1996: 960222
2000: 000322
2004: 043007c

===

VCF0492c

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0405.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029e
1956: 560021e
1960: 600026e
1964: 640027e
1968: 680034e

==
VCF0492d

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0487;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0492c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520029e
1956: 560021e
1960: 600026e
1964: 640027e
1968: 680034e

===
VCF0493

CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. no Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.
This question was not present as a separate variable until 1972.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720044
1976: 763129
1980: 800083
1984: 840087
1988: 880109
1992: 923115
1996: 960223
2000: 000323
2004: 043008
2008: 083014
2012: candlik_dislrpc

==

VCF0494a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
   (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0406, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.

2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045a
1976: 763130
1980: 800078
1984: 840088
1988: 880110
1992: 923116
1996: 960224
2000: 000324
2004: 043009a

===

VCF0494b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)

89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form
    (1980: see VCF0015a); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0494a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045a
1976: 763130
1980: 800078
1984: 840088
1988: 880110
1992: 923116
1996: 960224
2000: 000324
2004: 043009a

===
VCF0494c

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

MISSING_CODES:

9987. Don't know much about candidate
9988. DK (mention 1 only)
9989. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0493;no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030a
1956: 560022a
1960: 600027a
1964: 640028a
1968: 680035a

===

VCF0494d

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in
    politics
89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,8,9 in VCF0493;no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0494c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030a
1956: 560022a
1960: 600027a
1964: 640028a
1968: 680035a

==

VCF0495a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0406, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045b
1976: 763131
1980: 800085
1984: 840089
1988: 880111
1992: 923117
1996: 960225
2000: 000325
2004: 043009b

==
VCF0495b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

Collapsed from full code VCF0495a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045b
1976: 763131
1980: 800085
1984: 840089
1988: 880111
1992: 923117
1996: 960225
2000: 000325
2004: 043009b

==
VCF0495c

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030b

1956: 560022b
1960: 600027b
1964: 640028b
1968: 680035b

===
VCF0495d

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0495c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030b
1956: 560022b
1960: 600027b
1964: 640028b
1968: 680035b

==
VCF0496a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0406, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045c
1976: 763132
1980: 800086
1984: 840090
1988: 880112
1992: 923118

1996: 960226
2000: 000326
2004: 043009c

===
VCF0496b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0496a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720045c
1976: 763132
1980: 800086
1984: 840090

1988: 880112
1992: 923118
1996: 960226
2000: 000326
2004: 043009c

===

VCF0496c

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030c
1956: 560022c
1960: 600027c
1964: 640028c
1968: 680035c

===

VCF0496d

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0496c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030c
1956: 560022c
1960: 600027c
1964: 640028c
1968: 680035c

===
VCF0497a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0406, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763133
1980: 800087
1984: 840091
1988: 880113
1992: 923119
1996: 960227
2000: 000327
2004: 043009d

===
VCF0497b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)

12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0497a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763133
1980: 800087
1984: 840091
1988: 880113
1992: 923119
1996: 960227
2000: 000327
2004: 043009d

===

VCF0497c

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030d
1956: 560022d
1960: 600027d
1964: 640028d
1968: 680035d

===
VCF0497d

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0497c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030d
1956: 560022d
1960: 600027d
1964: 640028d
1968: 680035d

==

VCF0498a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
    (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
    question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1972 SPECIAL NOTE:
Only 3 mentions were included in the 1972 ANES dataset release.
Note that VCF0406, which was created in the 1970s, was originally coded
tallying a count of all 1972 mentions, including those (not extant)
which were not part of the 1972 ANES release file. However, only the 3
released mentions are represented in this file.
2008 SPECIAL NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and
are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series
Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will
integrate with this file.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763134
1980: 800088
1984: 840092
1988: 880114
1992: 923120
1996: 960228
2000: 000328
2004: 043009e

==
VCF0498b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493; form II
     (1972); abbrev. IW form (1980: see VCF0015a);
     question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

Collapsed from full code VCF0498a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763134
1980: 800088
1984: 840092
1988: 880114
1992: 923120
1996: 960228
2000: 000328
2004: 043009e

==
VCF0498c

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
    no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0406.
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1952-1968" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030e
1956: 560022e

1960: 600027e
1964: 640028e
1968: 680035e

==

VCF0498d

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
21. Experience and abilities
22. Character and background
23. Personal attraction
24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign
25. Stand on domestic policies
26. Stand on foreign affairs
27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest
28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest
29. Candidate as party representative*
30. Other
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,8,9 in VCF0493;
     no Pre IW; question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF0498c.
*Includes: "Wallace and political parties"

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520030e
1956: 560022e
1960: 600027e
1964: 640028e
1968: 680035e

==

VCF0501

PARTIES: Difference Between Major Parties

QUESTION:

Do you think there are any important differences in what the
Republicans and Democrats stand for?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No difference
2. Yes, a difference
9. DK; yes, a difference but don't know what (1964,1966);
    depends (1972)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; form II,III,IV
    (1972); telephone IW (1984); form B (1986); form A
    (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1952 NOTE:
176 respondents have been coded 2 from category "minor differences
(not important); some differences, don't know what."

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520017
1960: 600229
1964: 640298,640299
1966: 660081
1968: 680346
1972: 720498
1976: 763184
1980: 800776
1984: 840867
1986: 860541
1988: 880797
1990: 900336
1992: 925901
1994: 840708

1996: 961182
1998: 980370
2000: 001435
2004: 045159
2008: 085118
2012: ptydiff_diff

==

VCF0502

PARTIES: Which Major Party is More Conservative 3-Category

QUESTION:

1960-1976:
Would you say that one of the parties (1972: either party) is more
conservative or more liberal than the other (1970-1976: at the national
level)?
(IF YES:) Which party is more conservative?
(IF NO 1960,1968:) Do you think that people generally consider the
Democrats or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't you want to
guess about that?
(IF NO OR DK 1964,1970,1972,1976:) Do you think that people generally
consider the Democrats or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't
you want to guess about that?
1984 AND LATER:
Would you say that either one of the parties is more conservative than
the other at the national level? (IF YES:) Which party is more
conservative?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, Democrats more conservative
2. Yes, Republicans more conservative
9. No, both the same; DK; no guess (1970-1976); other
   (1968,1970,1972)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form
   II,III,IV (1972); form A (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
After 1976, respondents answering no/DK to the initial question were
not prompted further.
1960 NOTE:
"No" or "DK" responses to the stem question were combined with cases
coded DK in the single study variable released.
1964 NOTE:
same as 1960.
1968 NOTE:

same as 1960.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600232
1964: 640302
1968: 680361
1970: 700177(type 0)
1972: 720500
1976: 763194
1984: 840874,840875
1988: 880810,880811
1990: 900349,900350
1992: 925914,925915
2004: 045160,045160a
2008: 085119,085119a
2012: ptycons_cons,ptycons_ptyconswh

==

VCF0502a

PARTIES: Which Major Party is More Conservative 4-Category

QUESTION:

1970-1976:
Would you say that one of the parties (1972: either party) is more
conservative or more liberal than the other at the national level?
(IF YES:) Which party is more conservative?
(IF NO OR DK:) Do you think that people generally consider the Democrats
or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't you want to guess about
that?
1984 AND LATER:
Would you say that either one of the parties is more conservative than
the other at the national level? (IF YES:) Which party is more
conservative?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, Democrats more conservative
2. Yes, Republicans more conservative
5. No, both the same
9. DK whether one more conservative; yes, one more
    conservative but DK which party

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA whether one more conservative; yes, one more
    conservative but NA which party; no Post IW;
    telephone IW (1984); form II,III,IV (1972); form
    A (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
After 1976, respondents answering no/DK to the initial question were
not prompted further.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700177(type 0)
1972: 720500
1976: 763194
1984: 840874,840875
1988: 880810,880811
1990: 900349,900350
1992: 925914,925915
2004: 045160,045160a
2008: 085119,085119a
2012: ptycons_cons,ptycons_ptyconswh

==
VCF0503

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
I'm going to show you (1996 AND LATER: Here is) a seven-point scale
on which the political views that people might hold are arranged
from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}?
(7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal

3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate, middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA self-placement (1984-1996);
   refused to choose self-placement (1996); no
   Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
1972-1982: If self-placement was "DK," NA or "haven't thought much"
R was not asked for party placements on this scale.
1984-1996: If R responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much about
it" to self-placement AND if R responded "DK" or NA (1996: or 'refused
to choose') to the self-placement follow-up ("If you had to choose
would you consider yourself a liberal or a conservative?" [VCF0849]),
then R was not asked for party placements on this scale.
In 1996 and later, ordering of placements for the 2 major parties was
randomized.
1980 NOTE:
This var was present in both the pre and post; pre data are represented
here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720656
1974: 742309
1976: 763289
1978: 780401
1980: 800279
1982: 820405
1984: 840373
1986: 860393
1988: 880235
1990: 900413
1992: 923518
1994: 940847
1996: 960379

===

VCF0504

PARTIES: Republican Party- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on liberal/conservative scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate, middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA self-placement (1984-1996);
   refused to choose self-placement (1996); no
   Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0503

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720657
1974: 742310
1976: 763290
1978: 780402
1980: 800278
1982: 820404

1984: 840374
1986: 860394
1988: 880234
1990: 900414
1992: 923517
1994: 940848
1996: 960380
1998: 980412
2000: 001383
2004: 043091
2008: 083071b
2012: libcpre_ptyr

==

VCF0507

PARTIES: Which Favors Government Help With Medical Care

QUESTION:

1960, 1962:
Which party do you think is more likely to see to it that people get
doctors and hospital care at low cost, the Democrats or the Republicans,
or wouldn't there be any difference?
1964, 1968:
Which party do you think is more likely to want the government to help
in getting doctor and hospital care at low cost, the Democrats, the
Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them on this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats
2. No difference
3. Republicans

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK which party
9. NA party placement
0. NA; no opinion for R's opinion on this
   issue; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0508-VCF0511.
GENERAL NOTE:
If R's own opinion on this issue was "no opinion," "DK" or NA, then
R was not asked this question.
1986 NOTE:
Code 2 includes 6 cases where George Wallace/American Independent Party
was mentioned.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600068
1962: 620060
1964: 640077
1968: 680065

===
VCF0508

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and
hospital costs.
Some (1988,1994: people) feel there should be a government insurance
plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1988,1994:
for everyone).
Others feel that (1988,1994: all) medical expenses should be paid by
individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross (1988,
1994: or other company paid plans).
Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale [1988 ONLY:
or haven't you thought much about this]? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK self-placement(1972,
    1976,1978,1994); haven't thought much about self-
    placement (1970,1972,1976,1978,1994); NA self-
    placement (all years exc. 1970); form II (1972);
    haven't thought much about party placement
    (1988 ONLY)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0507.
GENERAL NOTE:
1972-1978: If self-placement was "DK," NA or "haven't thought much",
then R was not asked for party placements on this scale.
1970 NOTE:
If R responded "haven't thought much" for self-placement then party
placements were not asked; however, if R responded DK or NA for self-
placement party placements were asked.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700135(type 0)
1972: 720212
1976: 763276
1978: 780383
1988: 880322
1994: 940954
2012: inspre_dem

===
VCF0509

PARTIES: Republican Party- Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on govt health insurance scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK self-placement (1972,
    1976,1978,1994); haven't thought much about self-

placement (1970,1972,1976,1978,1994); NA self-
placement (all years exc. 1970); form II (1972);
haven't thought much about party placement
(1988 ONLY)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0508.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700136(type 0)
1972: 720213
1976: 763277
1978: 780384
1988: 880321
1994: 940955
2012: inspre_rep

==

VCF0512

PARTIES: Which Favors Guaranteed Jobs and Standard of Living

QUESTION:

1960:
Which party do you think is more likely to see to it that everybody who
wants to work can find a job, the Democrats, the Republicans, or
wouldn't there be any difference between them?
1964,1968:
Which party do you think is more likely to favor the government seeing
to it that each person has a job and a good standard of living (1964
only: the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any
difference between them on this)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats
2. No difference
3. Republicans

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK which party
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/no opinion for self-
   placement; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0513-VCF0514.
GENERAL NOTE:
If R's own opinion on this issue was "no opinion," "DK" or NA, then
R was not asked this question.
1968 NOTE:
Code 2 includes 6 cases where George Wallace/American Independent Party
was mentioned.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600055
1964: 640080
1968: 680067

==

VCF0513

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Guaranteed Jobs-Living Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it
that every person has a job and a good standard of living. (1972-
1978: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point
1). Others think the government should just let each person get ahead
on his/her own. (1972-1978: Suppose these people are at the other
end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.)
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.

6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on his own

8. DK party placement
9. NA party placement
0. DK/NA/haven't thought much about self-
   placement; form III,IV (1972); form II and no Post IW
   (1972); no Post IW; short form or Spanish language
   (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0512.
GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 2000, Rs with self-placement "DK," NA or "haven't thought
much about it" were not asked for party placements on this scale.
1972 NOTE:
Form I respondents were asked this question in the Pre, form II
respondents in the Post
2000 NOTE 1:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series and telephone data
are not included.
2000 NOTE 2:
The order in which Democratic and Republican party placements
were administered was randomized.
2004 NOTE:
The order in which Democratic and Republican party placements
were administered was randomized.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720176,720617
1974: 742269
1976: 763244
1978: 780359
1980: 801122
1982: 820427
1984: 840417
1988: 880329
1992: 923722
1994: 940934
2000: 000631

2012: guarpr_dem

==
VCF0514

PARTIES: Republican Party- Guaranteed Jobs-Living Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on jobs/std of living scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on his own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
9. NA party placement
0. DK/NA/haven't thought much about self-
    placement; form III,IV (1972); form II and no Post IW
    (1972); no Post IW; short form or Spanish language
    (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0513.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720177,720618
1974: 742270
1976: 763245
1978: 780360
1980: 801121
1982: 820428
1984: 840418
1988: 880328

1992: 923721
1994: 940935
2000: 000636
2012: guarpr_rep

==
VCF0517

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER: Some people feel that the government in
Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social
and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government
should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should
help themselves.
1970-1984, 1988 FORM B: Some people feel that the government in
Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups
(1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others
feel that the government should not make any special effort to help
minorities because they should help themselves (1970: but they should
be expected to help themselves).
ALL YEARS: Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this
scale} (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help minority groups
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Minority groups should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
9. NA party placement
0. DK self-placement (1972-1984,1990,1994); NA
    self-placement (1972-1990,1994); haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1970-1984,1990,1994); no Post
    IW; form III,IV (1972); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Note that form B in 1988 and all cases in previous years specified
"blacks and other minorities" in this question, while form A in 1988
and all cases in 1990 specified only "blacks." To filter for form A/B
responses in 1988, use variable VCF0012.

Rs with self-placement "haven't thought much about it" in 1970 or with
self-placements "haven't thought much about it" or DK in 1972,1984,
1990,1994 were not asked for party placements on this scale (if R's
self-placement was DK or NA in 1970, R was asked for party placements.)
If R's self-placement was NA in 1972-1984,1990,1994 then R was not
asked for party placements.
2000 NOTE 1:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series and telephone data
are not included.
2000 NOTE 2:
The order in which Democratic and Republican party placements
were administered was randomized.
2004 NOTE:
The order in which Democratic and Republican party placements
were administered was randomized.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700107(type 0)
1972: 720633
1974: 742300
1976: 763267
1978: 780375
1980: 801074
1982: 820417
1984: 840385
1988: 880338,880346
1990: 900449
1994: 940938
2000: 000661
2004: 043162

===

VCF0518

PARTIES: Republican Party- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on aid to blacks/minorities
scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help minority groups

2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Minority groups should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
9. NA party placement
0. DK self-placement (1972-1984,1990,1994); NA
    self-placement (1972-1990,1994); haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1970-1984,1990,1994); no Post
    IW; form III,IV (1972); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0517

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700108(type 0)
1972: 720634
1974: 742301
1976: 763268
1978: 780376
1980: 801073
1982: 820418
1984: 840386
1988: 880337,880345
1990: 900450
1994: 940939
2000: 000666
2004: 043163

==

VCF0521

PARTIES: Which Favors Stronger Government

QUESTION:

Which party do you think is more likely to favor a stronger [1978,1980,

1984: more powerful; 1988,1992: a powerful] government in Washington --
the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference
between them on this?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Democrats
2. No difference
3. Republicans
8. DK which party

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. Filter response is that R has no opinion/interest for
   topic or DK whether has own opinion on topic (all
   years); R says s/he has own opinion but gives opinion
   as DK (1964,1968,1972,1976,1988,1992); R says s/he
   has own opinion but gives opinion as NA (all years);
   R's own opinion is: thinks govt not getting too
   strong but DK/NA if it should become more
   powerful (1988,1992 ONLY); R's own opinion is that
   govt is not too strong AND should stay as it is
   (1988,1992 ONLY); R's own opinion is "other/ depends"
   (1988 ONLY); NA which party; no Post IW; form I
   (1972); telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1964-1988,1992,2000, if the following answers were given when R was
asked if R had an opinion on the question of whether the government is
getting too powerful, then R was not asked this question:
"no" (opinion) (1964,1976-1992,2000); "no interest" (1968,1972); NA
(all years); "DK" (all years).
Additionally, in 1964,1968,1972,1976,1988,1992,2000 if R replied "yes,"
that R did have an interest/opinion BUT responded "DK" or NA when
asked for that opinion, then R was not asked this question.
In 1988,1992,2000, among Rs who indicated that they had an opinion on
this issue, Respondents who were asked this question were limited to
Rs having their own opinions as one of the following: 1) The government
is too powerful; OR 2) The government is not getting too strong AND
(followup) the government should become more powerful.
1992 NOTE:
46 cases were not asked this question due to an error in skip
instructions.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640073
1968: 680063
1972: 720058
1976: 763226
1978: 780456
1980: 801131
1984: 841062
1988: 880851
1992: 926018
2000: 001512,001515

===
VCF0521a

PARTIES: Which Favors Stronger Government w/ No Opinion

QUESTION:

Which party do you think is more likely to favor a stronger
[1978,1980, 1984: more powerful; 1988,1992: a powerful] government in
Washington -- the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any
difference between them on this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats
2. No difference
3. Republicans
9. DK which party; no opinion

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. R's own opinion is: thinks govt. not getting too
    strong but DK/NA if it should become more powerful
    (1988,1992 ONLY); R's own opinion is that govt. is not
    too strong AND should stay as it is (1988,1992 ONLY);
    R's own opinion is "other/depends" (1988 ONLY); NA
    which party; no Post IW; form I (1972);
    telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0521.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640073
1968: 680063
1972: 720058
1976: 763226
1978: 780456
1980: 801131
1984: 841062
1988: 880851
1992: 926018
2000: 001515

==
VCF0522

PARTIES: Which Will Best Avoid War/Bigger War

QUESTION:

Looking ahead, do you think the problem of keeping out of
war (1966-1972: a bigger war) would be handled better in the next four
years (1966-1970: two years) by the Republicans, by the Democrats, or
about the same by both?
[2000: IF 'DK' OR 'NEITHER PARTY' IS VOLUNTEERED, DO NOT PROBE]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Better by Democrats
2. Same by both
3. Better by Republicans
9. DK; depends (1972); neither (2000)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; Form II (1972); no Pre IW; question not
    administered in assigned half-sample [See VCF0012a]
    (1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1996 NOTE:
The order of parties read in the question text was randomized.

2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560086
1960: 600087
1964: 640141
1966: 660040
1968: 680117
1970: 700046(type 1)
1972: 720052
1980: 800196
1982: 820308
1984: 840249
1986: 860524
1988: 880253
1992: 923602
1996: 960408
2000: 000506
2004: 043111

===

VCF0523

PARTIES: Which Favors Military Spending Cut

QUESTION:

Which political party do you think is more in favor of cutting
military spending - the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there
be much difference between them?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats
2. Not much difference
3. Republicans

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA; no Post IW; form II,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720589
1976: 763359

==

VCF0524

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Rights of Accused Scale

QUESTION:

Some people are primarily concerned with doing everything possible to
protect the legal rights of those accused of committing crimes.
Others feel that it is more important to stop criminal activity even
at the risk of reducing the rights of the accused.
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Protect rights of accused
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; NA/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (all years); DK/NA self-
    placement (1972-1978); no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Rs who responded "haven't thought much about it" for self-placement
were not asked for party placements on this scale.
In 1972-1978, Rs who responded "DK" for self-placement were not
asked for party placements on this scale.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700121(type 0)
1972: 720625
1974: 742284
1976: 763251
1978: 780367

===
VCF0525

PARTIES: Republican Party- Rights of Accused Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on rights of accused scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Protect rights of accused
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; NA/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (all years); DK/NA self-
    placement (1972-1978); no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0524.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0528

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Urban Unrest Scale

QUESTION:

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with the problem
of urban unrest and rioting.
Some say it is more important to use all available force to maintain
law and order - no matter what results.
Others say it is more important to correct the problems of poverty and
unemployment that give rise to the disturbances.
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Use all available force

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1972,1976); no Post IW; form
    I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1972-1976, Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much about
it" for self-placement were not asked for party placements on this
scale.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700086(type 0)
1972: 720674
1974: 742277
1976: 763770

==
VCF0529

PARTIES: Republican Party- Urban Unrest Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on urban unrest scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Use all available force

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1972,1976); no Post IW;
    form I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0528.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700087(type 0)
1972: 720675
1974: 742278
1976: 763771

===

VCF0533

PARTIES: Democratic Party- School Busing Scale

QUESTION:

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with racial
problems.
Some people think achieving racial integration of schools is so
important that it justifies busing children to schools out of their
own neighborhoods.
Others think letting children go to their neighborhood schools is so
important that they oppose busing.
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Bus to achieve integration
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Keep children in neighborhood schools

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much about
     self-placement
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much about it" for self-
placement were not asked for party placements on this scale.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0534

PARTIES: Republican Party- School Busing Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on school busing scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Bus to achieve integration
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Keep children in neighborhood schools

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much about
    self-placement
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0533.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720207
1974: 742293
1976: 763261

===

VCF0537

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights.
Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in
running business, industry, and government.
Others feel that women's place is in the home.
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought
   much about self-placement (1972-1988); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1998, Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much
about it" for self- placement were not asked for party placements on
this scale.
1998 NOTE:
The order in which this rating was administered for the 2 major parties
was randomized.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720236
1976: 763790
1978: 780391

1980: 801106
1982: 820437
1988: 880391
1998: 980453

==
VCF0538

PARTIES: Republican Party- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on equal role for women scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought
    much about self-placement (1972-1988); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0537.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720237
1976: 763791
1978: 780392
1980: 801105
1982: 820438
1988: 880390
1998: 980454

==
VCF0541

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending.
(1996 AND LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at
point 1). Other people feel that it is important for the government
to provide many more services even if it means an increase in
spending.
(1996: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And,
of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2,3,4,5 or 6.)
Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce
   spending a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government should provide many more services: increase
   spending a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1982,1984,1990,1994); NA self-
    placement (exc. 1986); short form or Spanish language
    (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1982-1984,1990,1994,1996, Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't
thought much about it" for self-placement were not asked for party
placements on this scale.
1996 AND LATER NOTE: the order in which this rating was administered
for the 2 major parties was randomized.
1988 NOTE:
If R's self-placement was NA , then R was not asked for party
placements.
1992 NOTE:
same as 1988.
1980 NOTE:

The 1980 version of this question was not comparable.
2000 NOTE 1:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series, and 2000 telephone
data are not included.
2000 NOTE 2:
The order in which Democratic and Republican party placements were
administered was randomized.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: 820445
1984: 840378
1986: 860455
1988: 880308
1990: 900456
1992: 923705
1994: 940944
1996: 960461
1998: 980468
2000: 000569
2012: spsrvpr_ssdem

===
VCF0542

PARTIES: Republican Party- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on government services scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce
   spending a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government should provide many more services: increase
   spending a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1982,1984,1990,1994); NA self-
    placement (exc. 1986); short form or Spanish language
    (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0541

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: 820446
1984: 840379
1986: 860456
1988: 880307
1990: 900457
1992: 923704
1994: 940945
1996: 960462
1998: 980469
2000: 000575
2004: 043141
2012: spsrvpr_ssrep

==

VCF0545

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along
with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get
along with Russia.
1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale?
(7-PT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Cooperate more/get along with Russia
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher/big mistake

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much
   about self-placement; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much about it" for self-
placement were not asked for party placements on this scale.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 801090
1984: 840411
1988: 880374

==

VCF0546

PARTIES: Republican Party- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on cooperate with Russia scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Cooperate more/get along with Russia
2.
3.
4.
5.

6.
7. Get much tougher/big mistake

==

VCF0549

PARTIES: Democratic Party- Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
(1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point
1.) Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
(1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.
And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between
at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.)
Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale? (7-POINT
SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending.

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much
    about self-placement (1980,1984,1990); NA self-
    placement (exc. 1986); short form or Spanish language
    (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1980-1984,1990, Rs who responded "DK," NA or "haven't thought much
about it" for self-placement were not asked for party placements on
this scale.
1988 NOTE:
If R's self-placement was NA then R was not asked for party placements.
1992 NOTE:
same as 1988.
1996 (and later) NOTE:
The order in which this rating was administered for the 2 major parties
was randomized.
2000 NOTE 1:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series, and 2000 telephone
data are not included.
2004 NOTE:
see 1996 note.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800287
1982: 820409
1984: 840398
1986: 860412
1988: 880316
1990: 900443
1992: 923711
1996: 960477
2000: 000598
2004: 043146
2012: defsppr_dem

===

VCF0550

PARTIES: Republican Party- Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Republican Party - R's rating of party on defense spending

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending.

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK party placement
0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much
   about self-placement (1980,1984,1990); NA self-
   placement (exc. 1986) short form or Spanish language
   (1992); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0549.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800286
1982: 820410
1984: 840399
1986: 860413
1988: 880315
1990: 900444
1992: 923710
1996: 960478
2000: 000603
2004: 043147
2012: defsppr_rep

==

VCF0601

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Participation in Protests

QUESTION:

There are many possible ways for people to show their disapproval or
disagreement with governmental policies and actions. I am going to
describe three such ways. We would like to know which ones you
approve of as ways of showing dissatisfaction with the government and
which ones you disapprove of.
How about taking part in protest meetings or marches that are
permitted by the local authorities? Would you approve of taking part,
disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Disapprove
2. Pro-con, depends, don't know
3. Approve

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680472
1970: 700141(type 1)
1972: 720275
1974: 742238

==
VCF0602

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Civil Disobedience

QUESTION:

How about refusing to obey a law which one thinks is unjust, if the
person feels so strongly about it that he is willing to go to jail
rather than obey the law? Would you approve of a person doing that,
Disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Disapprove
2. Pro-con, depends, don't know
3. Approve

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See introductory text VCF0601.
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680474
1970: 700142(type 1)
1972: 720276
1974: 742239

==

VCF0603

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Demonstrations

QUESTION:

Suppose all other methods have failed and the person decides to try to

stop the government from going about its usual activities with sit-
ins, mass meetings, demonstrations, and things like that? Would you
approve of that, disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Disapprove
2. Pro-con, depends, don't know
3. Approve

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See introductory text VCF0601.
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680476
1970: 700143(type 1)
1972: 720277
1974: 742240
1976: 763909

==

VCF0604

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Trust the Federal Government To Do What is Right

QUESTION:

People have (1958,1964: I'd like to talk about some of the) different
ideas about the government in Washington. These ideas don't refer to
Democrats or Republicans in particular, but just to government in
general. We want to see how you feel about these ideas. (1996 and
later: For example:)

How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in
Washington to do what is right -- just about always, most of the time
(not 1966: or) only some of the time (1996: or almost never)?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. None of the time/never (VOLUNTEERED); almost never
   (1966 only)
2. Some of the time
3. Most of the time
4. Just about always
9. DK; depends

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. NA; no Post IW; split versions: not asked (2008);
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See VCF0015b)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0604-VCF0608 appeared may have varied.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "OLD"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "NEW").
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.
2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580157
1964: 640403
1966: 660173
1968: 680504
1970: 700151(type 0)
1972: 720571
1974: 742230
1976: 763163

1978: 780347
1980: 800402
1982: 820529
1984: 841064
1986: 860548
1988: 880955
1990: 900504
1992: 926120
1994: 941033
1996: 961251
1998: 980528
2000: 001534
2002: 025174
2004: 045197
2008: 085147a
2012: trustgov_trustgstd

==

VCF0605

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Federal Government Run by Few Interests or for the Benefit of All

QUESTION:

Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests
looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all
the people?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Few big interests
2. Benefit of all
9. DK; pro-con; depends; other; refused to choose; both

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See
    VCF0015b)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0604-VCF0608 appeared may have varied.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640405
1966: 660176
1968: 680505
1970: 700152(type 0)
1972: 720572
1974: 742231
1976: 763164
1978: 780348
1980: 800403
1982: 820530
1984: 841065
1988: 880957
1990: 900506
1992: 926122
1994: 941035
1996: 961253
1998: 980529
2000: 001536
2002: 025176
2004: 045198
2008: 085148
2012: trustgov_bigintrst

===

VCF0606

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Does the Federal Government Waste Tax Money

QUESTION:

Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay
in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. A lot
2. Some
3. Not very much
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See
    VCF0015b)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0604-VCF0608 appeared may have varied.

1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
2008 NOTE:.
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580156
1964: 640402
1968: 680503
1970: 700150(type 0)
1972: 720570
1974: 742229
1976: 763162
1978: 780346
1980: 800401
1982: 820528
1984: 841063
1988: 880956
1990: 900505
1992: 926121
1994: 941034
1996: 961252
1998: 980527
2000: 001535
2002: 025175
2004: 045198
2008: 085149
2012: trustgov_waste

==

VCF0607

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Many Government Officials Are Smart

QUESTION:

Do you feel that almost all of the people running the government are
smart people (1958-1972: who usually know what they are doing), or do
you think that quite a few (1970: quite a lot) of them don't seem to
know what they are doing?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Don't know what they're doing
2. Know what they're doing
9. DK; pro-con; depends; other; refused to choose; both

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. MD; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0604-VCF0608 appeared may have varied.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580159
1964: 640404
1968: 680506
1970: 700153(type 0)
1972: 720573
1974: 742232
1976: 763165
1978: 780349
1980: 800404

==

VCF0608

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Many Government Officials Are Crooked

QUESTION:

Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are
(1958-1972: a little) crooked, not very many are, or do you think
hardly any of them are crooked (1958-1972: at all)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Quite a few; quite a lot (1958-1972)
2. Not many
3. Hardly any
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See
    VCF015)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0604-VCF0608 appeared may have varied.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
2008 NOTE:.
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.
2012 NOTE:
This question was not asked comparably in 2012

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580155
1964: 640401
1968: 680507
1970: 700154(type 0)
1972: 720574
1974: 742233
1976: 763166
1978: 780350
1980: 800405
1984: 841066
1988: 880958
1990: 900507
1992: 926123
1994: 941036
1996: 961254
1998: 980526
2000: 001537
2002: 025177
2004: 045200
2008: 085150

==

VCF0609

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Officials Care What People Like Respondent Think

QUESTION:

1952-1980,1982,1992: Now I'd like to read some of the kinds of things
people tell us when we interview them. Please tell me whether (1992: and
ask you whether) (1966,1988,1990,1994-LATER: how much) you agree or
disagree with these statements (1992: with them) (2002: about the
government.) (1988,1990: You can just give me the number of your
choice.) (1992: I'll read them one at a time and you just tell me
whether you agree or disagree) (1996 and later: The first is:)
1952-1988,1992:
'I don't think public officials care much what people like me think."
1990,1994-LATER:
'Public officials don't care much what people like me think.'
2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this
statement?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)
9. DK; not sure; it depends; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; split versions: not asked
    (2008); form B (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1988, response options were read to R. In 1988 and later
(except 2000 telephone and 2002), response options were in the
Respondent Booklet.
Code 1 includes: 'strongly agree' and 'agree' from the 1966 data;
'agree strongly' and 'agree somewhat' from 1988 and later data (exc.
2002). Code 2 includes: 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' from
the 1966 data; 'disagree somewhat' and 'disagree strongly' from 1988
and later data (exc. 2002).
1952 NOTE:
The order of items appearing in VCF0609-VCF0618 was varied.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "C"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "D").
2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520118
1956: 560115
1960: 600114
1964: 640177
1966: 660118
1968: 680520
1970: 700147(type 0)
1972: 720272
1974: 742225
1976: 763818
1978: 780354
1980: 801033
1982: 820532
1984: 840313
1986: 860549
1988: 880938
1990: 900508
1992: 926103
1994: 941037
1996: 961244
1998: 980524
2000: 001527
2002: 025172
2004: 045201
2008: 085151c
2012: effic_carestd

==
VCF0610

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Congressmen Lose Touch with Constituents

QUESTION:

'Generally speaking, those we elect to Congress in Washington lose
touch with the people pretty quickly.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK; it depends; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680521
1970: 700148(type 0)
1972: 720273
1974: 742226
1976: 763819
1978: 780355
1980: 801034

===
VCF0611

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Parties Only Interested in Votes

QUESTION:

'Parties are only interested in people's votes but not in their
opinions.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK; it depends; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680523
1970: 700149(type 0)
1972: 720274
1974: 742227
1976: 763820
1978: 780356
1980: 801035

==

VCF0612

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Voting is the Only Way to Have a Say in Government

QUESTION:

'Voting is the only way that people like me can have any (1956-1964:
a) say about how the government runs things.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say;
    neither agree nor disagree (1988)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.
1966 NOTE:
This question was asked as a Likert Scale (i.e., strongly agree/ agree/
disagree/ strongly disagree), collapsed here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520120
1956: 560109
1960: 600108
1964: 640175
1966: 660116
1968: 680518
1970: 700145(type 0)
1972: 720270
1974: 742223
1976: 763816
1978: 780352
1980: 801031

==

VCF0613

SYSTEM SUPPORT: People like Respondent Have Any Say in What the Government Does

QUESTION:

'People like me don't have any say about what the government does.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; split versions: not asked
    (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.
Prior to 1988, response options were read to R. In 1988 and later
(except 2000 telephone and 2002), response options were shown to R in
the Respondent Booklet.

Code 1 includes: 'strongly agree' and 'agree' from the 1966 data
'agree strongly' and 'agree somewhat' from 1988 and later data (exc.
2002). Code 2 includes: 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' from
the 1966 data; 'disagree somewhat' and 'disagree strongly' from 1988
and later data (exc. 2002).
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
1996 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are included
here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "C"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "D").
2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520123
1956: 560108
1960: 600107
1964: 640174
1966: 660115
1968: 680517
1970: 70144(type 0)
1972: 720269
1974: 742222
1976: 763815
1978: 780351
1980: 801030
1982: 820531
1984: 840312
1988: 880937
1990: 900509
1992: 926102
1994: 941038
1996: 960568
1998: 980525
2000: 001528
2002: 025173
2004: 045202
2008: 085151d
2012: effic_saystd

===

VCF0614

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Politics and Government Seem Too Complicated

QUESTION:

'Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person
like me can't really understand what's going on.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; split versions: not asked
    (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.
Prior to 1988, response options were read to R. In 1988 and later
(except 2000 telephone and 2002), response options were shown to R in
the Respondent Booklet.
Code 1 includes: 'strongly agree' and 'agree' from the 1966 data
'agree strongly' and 'agree somewhat' from 1988 and later data (exc.
2002). Code 2 includes: 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' from
the 1966 data; 'disagree somewhat' and 'disagree strongly' from 1988
and later data (exc. 2002).
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.
1996 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are included
here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "C"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "D").
2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520125
1956: 560112
1960: 600111
1964: 640176
1966: 660117
1968: 680519
1970: 700146(type 0)
1972: 720271
1974: 742224
1976: 763817
1978: 780353
1980: 801032
1984: 840314
1988: 880939
1990: 900510
1992: 926104
1994: 941039
1996: 961246
1998: 980523
2000: 001529
2008: 085151a
2012: effic_complicstd

==
VCF0615

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Matter Whether Respondent Votes or Not

QUESTION:

2002: Now I'd like to read you a few statements about public life. I'll
read them one at a time. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree
with each of them.
ALL YEARS:
'So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't
matter much to me whether I vote or not.'
2000:
Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree,
disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)
2002:
Do you AGREE, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, or DISAGREE with this
statement?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree (2000: agree strongly/somewhat)
2. Disagree (2000: disagree strongly/somewhat)

3. Neither agree nor disagree (2000, 2002 only)
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; IW conducted prior to addition
   of question (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.
2000 NOTE 1:
Response options changed.
2000 NOTE 2:
This variable was added to the 2000 Post questionnaire after it had
already been in the field several days.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520122
1956: 560111
1960: 600110
1972: 720288
1976: 763349
1978: 780423
1980: 800144
2000: 001520
2002: 025171

==
VCF0616

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Should Those Who Don't Care About Election Outcome Vote

QUESTION:

'If a person doesn't (1988: if people don't) care how an election
comes out he (1980,1984: then that person; 1988,1992: they) shouldn't
vote in it.'

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988, 1990, 1992 only)
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.
Prior to 1988, response options were read to R. In 1988 and later,
response options were shown to R in the Respondent Booklet.
Code 1 includes: 'agree strongly' and 'agree somewhat' from 1988 and
later data. Code 2 includes: 'disagree somewhat' and 'disagree
strongly' from 1988 and later data.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520124
1956: 560113
1960: 600112
1972: 720289
1976: 763350
1978: 780424
1980: 800145
1984: 840311
1988: 880936
1992: 926101

===

VCF0617

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Should Someone Vote If Their Party Can't Win

QUESTION:

'It isn't so important to vote when you know your party doesn't have
any chance to win.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520117
1956: 560110
1960: 600109
1972: 720287
1976: 763348
1978: 780422
1980: 800143

===
VCF0618

SYSTEM SUPPORT: A Good Many Local Elections Unimportant

QUESTION:

'A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree
2. Disagree
9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0609.
GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which questions VCF0609-VCF0618 appeared may have varied
by study.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520121
1956: 560114
1960: 600113
1972: 720290
1976: 763351
1978: 780425
1980: 800146

===
VCF0619

SOCIAL TRUST: Most People Can Be Trusted OR: Can't Be Too Careful With People

QUESTION:

1968:
Now here is something different. We have questions on other things
besides politics.
ALL YEARS:
Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or
that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Can't be too careful
2. Most people can be trusted
9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972); split versions:
    not asked (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1996 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are used
here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
(verion "G"); the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version of the question (version "H").
2012:
This question was not asked comparably in 2012.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640398
1966: 660136
1968: 680500
1972: 750581
1974: 742400
1976: 763745
1992: 926139
1996: 960567
1998: 980532
2000: 001475
2002: 025101
2004: 045186
2008: 083092a

===
VCF0620

SOCIAL TRUST: People Are Helpful OR: People Look Out for Themselves

QUESTION:

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that
they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Just look out for themselves
2. Try to be helpful
9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1968 NOTE:
See intro VCF0619.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to either VCF0620 or VCF0621.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640399
1966: 660137
1968: 680501
1972: 720582
1974: 742401
1976: 763746
1992: 926140
2000: 001477
2002: 025103
2004: 045188

==

VCF0621

SOCIAL TRUST: People Will Take Advantage of Others OR: People Will Try to be Fair

QUESTION:

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they
got a chance, or would they try to be fair?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Would take advantage
2. Would try to be fair
9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1968 NOTE:
See intro VCF0619.
1996 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are used
here.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to either VCF0620 or VCF0621.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640400
1968: 680502
1972: 720583
1974: 742402
1976: 763747
1996: 960569
1998: 980531
2000: 001476
2002: 025102
2004: 045187

===
VCF0622

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Government Pays Attention to What People Think

QUESTION:

Over the years, how much attention do you feel the government pays to
what the people think when it decides what to do -- a good deal, some,
or not much?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much
2. Some
3. A good deal
9. DK; other; depends; can't say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640390
1968: 680490
1970: 700155(type 1)
1972: 720575
1974: 742234
1976: 763741
1978: 780416
1980: 800888
1982: 820527
1984: 840310
1988: 880960
1992: 926125
1996: 961256
1998: 980521
2000: 001539

===

VCF0623

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Parties Make Government Pay Attention to People

QUESTION:

How much do you feel that political parties help to make the
government pay attention to what the people think, a good deal, some
or not much?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much
2. Some
3. A good deal

9. DK; other; depends; can't say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV 1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640391
1968: 680491
1970: 700156(type 1)
1972: 720576
1974: 742235
1976: 763742
1978: 780417
1980: 800889

==
VCF0624

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Elections Make Government Pay Attention to People

QUESTION:

(And) How much do you feel that having elections makes the government
pay attention to what the people think, a good deal, some or not much?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much
2. Some
3. A good deal
9. DK; other; depends; can't say

MISSING_CODES:

----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
2008 NOTE:.
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640392
1966: 660177
1968: 680492
1970: 700157(type 1)
1972: 720577
1974: 742236
1976: 763743
1978: 780418
1980: 800890
1984: 840309
1988: 880959
1992: 926124
1996: 961255
1998: 980522
2000: 001538
2002: 025178
2004: 045204
2008: 085154
2012: respons_elections

===

VCF0625

SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Attention Congressmen Pay to Constituents

QUESTION:

How much attention do you think most Congressmen pay to the people who
elect them when they decide what to do in Congress, a good deal, some,
or not much?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much
2. Some
3. A good deal
9. DK; other; depends; can't say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form 2 whites (1970); form
   III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640393
1968: 680493
1970: 700158(type 1)
1972: 720578
1974: 742237
1976: 763744
1978: 780419
1980: 800891

==

VCF0626

PERSONAL EFFICACY: Respondent Usually Able to Carry Out Plans as Expected

QUESTION:

1958,1960,1964:

Now here is something a little different. It helps use know what kinds
of people we have talked to if we can find out how they feel about
things besides politics. For example..
1968-1972:
Now here is something different. We have questions on other things
besides politics.
1976:
Now we have a few questions on other things besides politics.
ALL YEARS:
When you do make plans ahead, do you usually get to carry out things
the way you expected, or do things usually come up to make you change
your plans?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Have to change plans
2. Things work out as expected
9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both other; refused to choose

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580164
1960: 600240
1964: 640362
1968: 680496
1970: 700160(type 0)
1972: 720279
1974: 742397
1976: 763737

===

VCF0627

PERSONAL EFFICACY: Better to Plan Life a Good Way Ahead

QUESTION:

Do you think it's better to plan your life a good way ahead, or would
you say life is too much a matter of luck to plan ahead very far?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Too much luck to plan
2. Plan ahead
9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to
    choose

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0626.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680495
1970: 700159(type 0)
1972: 720278
1974: 742396
1976: 763736

===

VCF0628

PERSONAL EFFICACY: Sure Life Would Work out as Expected

QUESTION:

Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way you
want it to, or have there been times when you haven't been (1958:
very) sure about it?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Haven't been sure
2. Pretty sure
9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to
    choose

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0626.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580160
1960: 600238
1964: 640360
1968: 680497
1970: 700161(type 0)
1972: 720280
1974: 742398
1976: 763738

===

VCF0629

PERSONAL EFFICACY: Can Run Life as Wanted

QUESTION:

Some people feel they can run their lives pretty much the way they
want to; others feel the problems of life are sometimes too big for
them. Which one are you most like?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Problems of life too big
2. Can run own life
9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to
    choose

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See introductory text VCF0626.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680498
1970: 700162(type 0)
1972: 720281
1974: 742399
1976: 763739

==
VCF0630

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Level Respondent Has Most Faith in

QUESTION:

We find that people differ in how much faith and confidence they have
in various levels of government in this country.
In your case, do you have more faith and confidence in the national
government, the government of this state, or in the local government
around here?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. National government
2. State government
3. Local government
9. DK; none; all; other; depends; refuses to choose;
    combination of two

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680508

1972: 720453
1974: 742244
1976: 763593
1996: 961203

==

VCF0631

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Level Respondent Has Least Faith in

QUESTION:

Which level (1996: of government) do you have the least faith and
confidence in -- the national government, the government of this
state, or the local government around here?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. National government
2. State government
3. Local government
9. DK; none; all; other; depends; refuses to choose;
    combination of two

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680510
1972: 720454
1974: 742247
1976: 763596
1996: 961204

==

VCF0632

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts Most

QUESTION:

Which part of the government on the list do you most often trust to do

what's right: Congress, the Supreme Court, the President, or
political parties? (LIST SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Congress
2. Supreme Court
3. President
4. Political parties
9. DK; all; none

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720450
1974: 742241
1976: 763590

==

VCF0633

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts 2nd Most

QUESTION:

Which of the others do you next often trust to do what's right
{Congress, Supreme Court, President or political parties}?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Congress
2. Supreme Court
3. President
4. Political parties
9. DK; all; none

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972); answered
   all, none, DK or NA in VCF0632
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0632.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720451
1974: 742242
1976: 763591

===
VCF0634

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts Least

QUESTION:

Which {part of the government} do you least often trust to do what's
right {Congress, Supreme Court, President or political parties}?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Congress
2. Supreme Court
3. President
4. Political parties
9. DK; all; none

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972); answered
    all, none, DK or NA in VCF0632
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0632.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0640

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Handling of Most Important Problem mentioned by Respondent

QUESTION:

(IF R HAS MENTIONED A 'MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM' IN THE NATION:)
How good (of) a job is the government doing in dealing with this problem:
a good job, only fair, or a poor job?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Good job
3. Only fair
5. Poor job
8. Don't know

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; R not selected (1996,2000); no Post IW;
    abbrev. Post IW (1984); short form questionnaire
    (1992)
0. R has not identified any problem
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This represents the follow-up question to VCF0875/VCF0875a/VCF0875b.
1996 NOTE:
A half-sample of respondents was randomly selected to be administered
questions about the "most important problem".
2000 NOTE:
same as 1996.
2004 NOTE:
The CSES version of this question, included in the 2004 study, is not
comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0648

SYSTEM SUPPORT: External Efficacy Index

QUESTION:

External efficacy index, 100-pt scale

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Least efficacious

.

100. Most efficacious

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. Not scored in both VCF0609 and VCF0613
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0609 AND VCF0613.
Component vars are first recoded as follows: VCF0609,VCF0613:
1=0,2=100,3=50. The recoded values are then totaled and divided by
the number of valid responses. The result is then rounded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

1966: 660115,660118

==

VCF0649

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Responsiveness Index

QUESTION:

Government responsiveness index, 100-pt scale

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Least responsive
.
100. Most responsive

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. Not scored in both VCF0622 and VCF0624
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0609 AND VCF0613.
Component vars are first recoded as follows: VCF0622,VCF0624:
1=0,2=50,3=100. The recoded values are then totaled and divided by the
number of valid responses. The result is then rounded.
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0650

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Federal Government Performance Rating

QUESTION:

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of
our government are doing.
As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a

job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a
whole.
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.
6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
    no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742251
1976: 763548
1980: 800762

==
VCF0651

SYSTEM SUPPORT: State Government Performance Rating

QUESTION:

State governments, in general

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.

6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
    no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0650.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742252
1976: 763549
1980: 800763

==

VCF0652

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Local Government Performance Rating

QUESTION:

Local governments, in general

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.
6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
    no Post IW

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0650.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742253
1976: 763550
1980: 800764

==

VCF0653

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Presidency Performance Rating

QUESTION:

The presidency

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.
6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
    no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0650.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742254
1976: 763551
1980: 800765

==
VCF0654

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Congress Performance Rating

QUESTION:

Congress, that is the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.
6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
    no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0650.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742255
1976: 763552
1980: 800766

==
VCF0655

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Supreme Court Performance Rating

QUESTION:

The U.S. Supreme Court

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Very poor job
1.
2. Poor job
3.
4. Fair job
5.
6. Good job
7.
8. Very good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;
   no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0650.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: 742256
1976: 763553
1980: 800767

==
VCF0656

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Trust in Government Index

QUESTION:

Trust in government index, 100 pt scale

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Least trusting
.
100. Most trusting

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. Not scored in all of: VCF0604, VCF0605, VCF0606,
      VCF0608.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0604, VCF0605, VCF0606, VCF0608.
Component vars are first recoded as follows:
VCF0604: 1=0,2=33,3=67,4=100; VCF0605: 1=0, 2=100;
VCF0606,VCF0608: 1=0,2=50,3=100.
The recoded values are then totaled and divided by the number of valid
responses. The result is then rounded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0675

MEDIA: How Much of the Time Does Respondent Trust the Media to Report Fairly

QUESTION:

How much of the time do you think you can trust the media to report
the news fairly? Just about always, most of the time, only some of
the time, or almost never?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Just about always
2. Most of the time
3. Only some of the time
4. Almost never
5. None of the time [VOL]

8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2008 NOTE:.
A half-sample of respondents were administered this question with
response options in reverse order.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 961339
1998: 980474
2000: 001429
2004: 045007
2008: 085024

==

VCF0700

ELECTION: Who Will Be Elected President in November

QUESTION:

Who do you think will be elected President in November?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democratic candidate
2. Republican candidate
7. Other candidate
8. DK; depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520013
1956: 560012
1960: 600017
1964: 640018
1968: 680025
1972: 720025
1976: 763026
1980: 800054
1984: 840076
1988: 880098
1992: 923102
1996: 960381
2000: 000485
2004: 043093
2008: V083073

==

VCF0701

ELECTION: Registered to Vote Pre-Election

QUESTION:

Now how about the election this November. (1952-1964: Do you know if
you are; 1968-1980: Are you) registered/eligible so that you could
vote in the November election if you wanted to?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; form II (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This is a pre-election var.
See VCF0737 for post-election registration question.
GENERAL NOTE:
Code 2 includes cases coded "yes, qualified, I think so" from 1956,
1960 and 1964. From 1980, code 0 includes 1 response that voters were
not required to register in respondent's state (this case was coded 1
in VCF0703).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520077
1954: V540015
1956: 560098
1960: 600099
1964: 640158
1968: 680131
1972: 720164
1976: 763032
1980: 800134

===

VCF0702

ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote in the National Elections

QUESTION:

1948:
In the election, about half the people voted and about half of
them didn't. Did you vote?
1962:
One of the things we need to know is whether or not people really did
get to vote this fall. In talking to people about the election we find
that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't
registered or they were sick or something else came up at the last
minute. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in the
November election?
1952-1960,1964-1998, 2002 VERSION 1, and 2004 VERSION 1:
In talking to people about the election we (1972 AND LATER: often) find
that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't
registered or they were sick or they just didn't have time. (1956-1960:
How about you, did you vote this time?) (1964-1970: How about you, did
you vote this time, or did something keep you from voting) (1972-1976:
How about you, did you vote in the elections this fall?) (1978 and
later: How about you, did you vote in the elections this November?)
2000, 2002 VERSION2, and 2004 VERSION 1: In talking to people about
elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote
because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't
have time. Which of the following statements best describes you:
One, I did not vote (in the election this November);
Two, I thought about voting this time - but didn't;
Three, I usually vote, but didn't this time; or

Four, I am sure I voted?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, did not vote
2. Yes, voted

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; refused to say if voted;
   Washington D.C. (presidential years only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 2 includes 8 respondents from 1958, 8 respondents from 1962 and
14 respondents from 1968, who replied "yes, I think so."
1956 NOTE:
Code 2 includes 3 cases from: "Nonvoter, NA preference; voted, but not
for president".
1982 NOTE:
For congressional districts GA04 and GA05, an additional question
appeared: How about the special US Congressional elections held
November 30th. Did you vote in that election? From 1982, code 2
includes all GA04, GA05 respondents who voted in either the November 2
general election or the November 30 special election, or both.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to either version 1 or version 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480018
1952: 520178
1956: 560203
1958: 580077
1960: 600201
1962: 620041
1964: 640286
1966: 660102
1968: 680310
1970: 700209(type 0)
1972: 720477
1974: 742319
1976: 763655
1978: 780470

1980: 800988
1982: 820501
1984: 840783
1986: 860261
1988: 880756
1990: 900279
1992: 925601
1994: 940601
1996: 961074
1998: 980303
2000: 001241
2002: 025016
2004: 045018X
2008: 085036x
2012: rvote2012_x

===

VCF0703

ELECTION: Register and Turnout SUMMARY

QUESTION:

Summary: did R register and vote

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not registered, and did not vote
2. Registered, but did not vote
3. Voted (registered)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA if voted; DK/NA whether registered (includes
    1960 nonvoter cases without pre IWs and 1972 form II
    nonvoters); no Post IW; refused to say if
    voted; Washington D.C. (presidential years only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Derived from: vote variable VCF0702 and registration variable
VCF0701/VCF0737 (VCF0701 pre-election data for 1952-1976,1980; VCF0737
post-election data for 1978, 1982-later; for 1952 cases without pre-
election interviews, post-election data from VCF0737).
All respondents who reported voting have been coded 3, regardless of
whether they actually reported being registered.
No registration variable at all was present in 1958,1962,1966,1970 or
1974.
In some years a few respondents have declared that registration was not
required in their state; these cases have been included with
'registered'.
2004 NOTE:

This is a summary variable of vote and registration status.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520077,520178
1956: 560098,560203
1960: 600099,600201
1964: 640158,640286
1968: 680131,680310
1972: 720164,720477
1976: 763032,763655
1978: 780484,780470
1980: 800134,800988
1982: 820519,820501
1984: 840783,840802
1986: 860261,860276
1988: 880756,880757
1990: 900279,900280
1992: 925601,925602
1994: 940601,940602
1996: 961074,961075
1998: 980303,980304
2000: 001241,001242
2002: 025016,025017
2004: 045018x
2008: 085039a
2012: rvote2012_x,prevote_regist_addr,prevote_regist_noaddr,postvote_regist_addr,postvote_regist_noaddr

===
VCF0704

ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Candidates

QUESTION:

1948:
(IF R VOTED:) Whom did you vote for?
1952-1964:
(IF R VOTED:) Who did you vote for President?
1968-1976:
(IF R VOTED:) Who did you vote for in the election for President?
1980-LATER:
(IF R VOTED:) How about the election for President? Did
you vote for a candidate for President? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Major third party candidate (Wallace 1968/Anderson
   1980/Perot 1992,1996)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if
   voted; voted, but not for president (1980-1992);
   DK/NA if voted for president; DK/NA who voted for
   (1980-1992); refused to say who voted for; "other"
   vote; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480018
1952: 520178
1956: 560203
1960: 600201
1964: 640286
1968: 680316
1972: 720478
1976: 763665
1980: 800994
1984: 840788
1988: 880763
1992: 925609
1996: 961082
2000: 001249
2004: 045026
2008: 085044a
2012: presvote2012_x

===
VCF0704a

ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Parties

QUESTION:

Major party presidential vote (2 party)

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Democrat
2. Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if
   voted; voted, but not for president (1980-1992);
   DK/NA if voted for president; DK/NA who voted for
   (1980-1992); refused to say who voted for; "other"
   vote; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0704.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480018
1952: 520178
1956: 560203
1960: 600201
1964: 640286
1968: 680316
1972: 720478
1976: 763665
1980: 800994
1984: 840788
1988: 880763
1992: 925609
1996: 961082
2000: 001249
2004: 045026
2008: 085044a
2012: presvote2012_x

==

VCF0705

ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Parties and Other

QUESTION:

Presidential vote (major parties and all "other")

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Other (incl. 3d/minor party candidates and write-ins)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if
   voted; voted, but not for president (1980-1992);
   DK/NA if voted for president (1980-1992); DK/NA who
   voted for; refused to say who voted for; no
   Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0704.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480018
1952: 520178
1956: 560203
1960: 600201
1964: 640286
1968: 680316
1972: 720478
1976: 763665
1980: 800994
1984: 840788
1988: 880763
1992: 925609
1996: 961082
2000: 001249
2004: 045026
2008: 085044a
2012: presvote2012_x

==

VCF0706

ELECTION: Vote and Nonvote- President

QUESTION:

Presidential vote and nonvote

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Major third party candidate (Wallace 1968/Anderson
    1980/Perot 1992,1996)
4. Other (incl. 3d/minor party candidates and write-ins)
7. Did not vote or voted but not for president (exc.1972)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA if voted; refused to say if voted; DK/NA if
    voted for president (1980 and later); voted but not
    for president (1972 Only); DK/NA who voted for;
    refused to say who voted for; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0704.
1972 NOTE:
Rs who voted but not for president were combined with NA.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480018
1952: 520178
1956: 560203
1960: 600201
1964: 640286
1968: 680316
1972: 720478
1976: 763665
1980: 800994
1984: 840788
1988: 880763
1992: 925609
1996: 961082
2000: 001249
2004: 045026
2008: 085044a
2012: presvote2012_x,rvote2012_x,prevote_presvt,postvote_presvt

===

VCF0707

ELECTION: Vote for Congressman

QUESTION:

1952-1970:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the vote for Congressman. Did you vote for a candidate for
Congress? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?
1972:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for Congressman-- that is, for the House of
Representatives in Washington? Which party's candidate did you vote for
for Congressman?
1974,1976:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED: [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for Congressman-- that is, for the House of
Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for
Congress? Whom did you vote for? Which party was that?
1978:
ALL CASES [BALLOT CARD]:
Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How
about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did
you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF
YES:) Who did you vote for?
I. 1980-LATER - REGISTERED IN IW COUNTY:
....
1980-1982,1984 PERSONAL,1986-1996,1998 PERSONAL,2000 PERSONAL
[BALLOT CARD]:
Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How
about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did
you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF
YES:) Who did you vote for?
1984 TELEPHONE [NO BALLOT CARD]:
I am going to read a list of candidates for the major races in your
district. In the election for the House of Representatives, the ballot
listed: [Names and party affiliations of all House candidates on the
Ballot Card]. Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of
Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?
1998 TELEPHONE [BALLOT CARD]:
Please take out the (color) sheet of paper that was folded inside your
booklet. There you see a list of candidates for the major race(s) in
this district. How about the election for the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of
Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?
2000 TELEPHONE,2002 [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington.
Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? Did
you vote for (the Democrat, [NAME], or) (the Republican, [NAME]) (IF
IND/3RD PARTY CANDIDATE: or the [PARTY] candidate, [NAME])?
II. 1980-LATER - REGISTERED OUTSIDE IW COUNTY:
....
1980-1996,1998 PERSONAL,2000,2002 [NO BALLOT CARD]:

How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington?
Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF
YES:) Who did you vote for? (2000: Which party was that?)
1998 TELEPHONE [NO BALLOT CARD]:
[TELL RESPONDENT, IF NECESSARY, "We won't need to use the ballot card in
your booklet since you are in a different city/town/county)."] How
about the election for the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES in Washington? Did
you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF
YES:) Who did you vote for?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; R did not vote; R refused to say if
    voted; DK/NA if voted; refused to say who voted for;
    'other' (third party, independent vote) name given by
    R not on candidate list (1978-1988); Washington D.C.;
    no Post IW; voted but not for House of
    Representatives; DK/NA if voted for House of
    Representatives; forms III and IV (1972); special
    districts with no House race in 1978
    (LA03,LA07,FL08,FL10); special districts with no
    House race in 1980 (LA03, LA07); special districts,
    with no House race in 1982 (LA05, LA07); special
    district with no House race in 1986 (LA04)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0735,VCF0736,VCF1011-VCF1013
GENERAL NOTE:
The Ballot Card was introduced in 1978.
Note that VCF0707 and VCF0736 differ slightly from VCF1011-VCF1013 for
years prior to 1978: see VCF1011.
1952-1968: When an 'incorrect' name--i.e., not on the list of
candidates which the interviewer had for R's congressional district--
was given with a party association, the party given was coded and is
represented here. When a 'correct' name was given with an incorrect
party, however, the actual party associated with the named candidate
was coded in Study data: "Smith, a Democrat" was coded as a Republican
if, in fact Smith was a Republican. [In 1952-1968, party was asked for
only if R did not know the candidate name or gave an 'incorrect' name.
If R correctly named a candidate for his/her district without
volunteering party association, party was not asked for, and factual
party of candidate was coded.] In 1958 ONLY, if the respondent gave
the correct name of a candidate from another race in R's district, then
R was informed of the named candidate's actual race and the question
for R's House vote was repeated.
In 1952, 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1964 this question was coded as a
multiple response allowing, when applicable, for candidate-at-large

mentions (2nd response) as well as district choice of candidates (1st response). Second responses were excluded in coding VCF0707.
1970-1976: R's perception of candidate's party was coded. If not volunteered, party of candidate was always asked for. If party associated by R was not the actual party of a correctly named candidate, party as mentioned was still coded. Even if an 'incorrect' name (i.e., name not on the interviewer's list of candidate names--see VCF1006 for description of lists) was given, party associated by R was coded.
Ballot card 1978-1982, 1984 personal, 1986 and later: when R gave a name not on the ballot card, the party of actual vote remained undeterminable (0 in VCF0707), unless R voted outside district of interview and R's major party vote from 'outside' district could be established (if a recognizable name was given).
No ballot card 1980-later: Respondents who had voted outside the Congressional District of their sample selection location could not use the Ballot Card, and question wording was altered somewhat. 1980 was the first year that cases of 'outside' Congressional District voting were identified.
1984 NOTE:
In Post telephone interviews, If the interviewer had the correct Ballot Card at hand, then he or she attempted to read the names and party affiliations of the House candidates [see question wording above].
1992 NOTE:
In telephone interviews, names were not read by the interviewer, but attempt was made, in many cases, to leave ballot cards with respondents if a telephone appointment was made.
1994 NOTE:
A 'ballot card' experiment was conducted; see VCF0012.
1996 NOTE:
same as 1992
2000 NOTE:
For respondents registered in county of interview, the order of candidate names was randomized on the Ballot Card/as read by interviewers.
2002 NOTE:
For respondents registered in county of interview, the order of candidate names was randomized as read by interviewers.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520187
1956: 560212
1958: 580081
1960: 600211

1962: 620042
1964: 640290
1966: 660112
1968: 680323
1970: 700215(type 0)
1972: 720485
1974: 742322
1976: 763673
1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507
1984: 840792
1986: 860266
1988: 880768
1990: 900289
1992: 925623
1994: 940614
1996: 961089
1998: 980313
2000: 001262
2002: 025028b
2004: 045031x,045032x
2008: 085049x
2012: prevote_votehs postvote_votehs prevote_hsvtbc postvote_hsvtbc

===

VCF0708

ELECTION: Vote for Senator

QUESTION:

1952-1976:
How about the vote for United States Senator? Did you vote for a
candidate for Senator? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was
that?
1978-1998,2000 PERSONAL,2000 TELEPHONE IF VOTED OUTSIDE COUNTY OF IW,
2002 VOTED OUTSIDE COUNTY OF IW:
(IF BALLOT CARD [1978-1998,2000 PERSONAL]: Still looking at the list of
candidates:) How about the election for the United States Senate?   Did
you vote for a candidate for the U.S./United States Senate? (IF YES:)
Who did you vote for?
2000 TELEPHONE IF VOTED IN COUNTY OF IW [NO BALLOT CARD], 2002 VOTED
IN COUNTY OF IW [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for the United States Senate?   Did you vote for
a candidate for the U.S./United States Senate? (IF YES:)Did you vote
for (the Democrat, [NAME], or) (the Republican, [NAME]) (IF IND/3RD
PARTY CANDIDATE: or the [PARTY] candidate, [NAME])?
1992 CALIFORNIA:
We had two Senate races in California. Which candidate did you vote for?
1996 KANSAS:
How about the two elections for the United States Senate? Did you vote
for candidates for the U.S. Senate?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; R did not vote; refused to say if voted;
   DK/NA if voted; refused to say who voted for; "other"
   (minor/3rd party) vote; name given by R not on
   candidate list (1978-1988); no race in state; no Post
   IW; voted but not for Senate; forms III and IV
   (1972); Washington D.C.; did not vote in regular
   Senate election (California, 1992 ONLY)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

SEE VCF0707 (Senate data coded in same manner as House data).
GENERAL NOTE:
1980-later cases administered without Ballot Card presentation include
respondents who had voted outside the state of their sample selection
location. 1980 was the first year that 'outside' voting was identified.
In California in 1992, in Tennessee in 1994, and in Kansas in 1996 the
regular Senate election and a second "special" Senate election were
held. This variable codes data for the respondent's vote in the
regular Senate election only. [Note special question wording was not
used for Tennessee in 1994].
2002 NOTE:
For respondents registered in county of interview, the order of
candidate names was randomized in text read by telephone interviewers.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520186
1956: 560211
1958: 580086
1960: 600210
1964: 640289
1966: 660110
1968: 680320
1970: 700211(type 0)
1972: 720482
1974: 742325
1976: 763670

1978: 780478
1980: 801001,801002
1982: 820509,820510,820511
1984: 840796,840797,840798
1986: 860269,860270,860271
1988: 880773
1990: 900294
1992: 925628
1994: 940618
1996: 961093
1998: 980317
2000: 001275
2002: 025034x
2004: 045038x
2008: 085056a
2012: senvote2012_x

==

VCF0709

ELECTION: Vote Ticket-splitting- President/House

QUESTION:

Ticket splitting Presidential vs. Congressional vote

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Dem. Pres. - Dem. Congressional
2. Dem. Pres. - Rep. Congressional
3. Rep. Pres. - Dem. Congressional
4. Rep. Pres. - Rep. Congressional

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA who voted for in presidential or congressional
   race; did not vote; refused to say if voted; DK/NA if
   voted; refused to say who voted for; "other"
   (independent/3rd party) vote; name given by R not on
   candidate list (1978-1988); Washington D.C.; no
   Post IW; voted, but not for president (1980 and
   later); voted, but not for House of Representatives
   (1978 and later); forms III and IV (1972); special
   districts with no House race in 1978 (LA03, LA07,
   FL08, FL10); special districts with no House race in
   1980 (LA03, LA07); special districts with no House
   race in 1982 (LA05, LA07)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0704 and VCF0707.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0710

ELECTION: Vote Ticket-splitting- President/Senate

QUESTION:

Ticket splitting Presidential vs. Senatorial vote

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Dem. Pres. - Dem. Senate
2. Dem. Pres. - Rep. Senate
3. Rep. Pres. - Dem. Senate
4. Rep. Pres. - Rep. Senate

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA who voted for in presidential or congressional
    race; did not vote; refused to say if voted; DK/NA if
    voted; refused to say who voted for; "other"
    (independent/3rd party) vote; name given by R not on
    candidate list (1978-1988); Washington D.C.; no
    Post IW; voted, but not for president (1980-1992);
    voted, but not for Senate (1978-1992); did not
    vote in regular Senate election (California, 1992
    ONLY); forms III,IV (1972); no Senate race in state
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0704 and VCF0708.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0711

ELECTION: Does Respondent Always Vote for the Same Party

QUESTION:

Have you always voted for the same party or have you voted for
different parties for President?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Different party
2. Same party; mostly same party (1952-1970)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; R has never voted
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Prior to 1972, this question was open-ended: "mostly the same party"
(code 2) was either volunteered by respondent or deduced by
interviewer. Starting in 1972, boxes labeled "same" or 'different'
were available for the IWR to check.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520072
1956: 560094
1958: 580073
1960: 600096
1962: 620037
1964: 640155
1966: 660084
1968: 680128
1970: 700197(type 0)
1972: 720157
1974: 742212
1976: 763180
1980: 800351

===

VCF0712

ELECTION: Timing of Respondent's Presidential Vote Decision

QUESTION:

How long before the election did you decide that you were going to vote the way you did?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Knew all along (incl.: always vote for same party;
    1948 ONLY: all pre-convention cases)
2. When candidate announced (exc. 1948)
3. During conventions
4. Post-convention period
5. Last two weeks of campaign
6. On election day

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; unspecified 'other'; R did not vote; DK/NA
    if voted; refused to say if voted; voted, but not
    for president; no Post IW; form III,IV
    (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984: see VCF0015);
    voted but DK/NA/refused to say for whom (1964-1988
    only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "PRESIDENTIAL VOTE DECISION".
1948 NOTE:
No code corresponding to code 2 was used; code 1 includes all pre-convention mentions (no cases coded 2).
2008 NOTE:
Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File).
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480019
1952: 520183
1956: 560206
1960: 600204
1964: 640288
1968: 680318
1972: 720479
1976: 763666

1980: 800996
1984: 840790
1988: 880765
1992: 925611
1996: 961084
2000: 001251

===

VCF0713

ELECTION: Respondent Pre-election Intent for Vote for President

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS EXC. 1948,1992,2012:
So far as you know now, do you expect to vote in the national elections
this coming November or not? (IF YES:) Who do you think you will vote
for in the election for President?
1948:
On the coming Presidential election, do you plan to vote? (IF RESPONSE
NOT 'NO':) Do you plan to vote Republican, Democrat or something else?
1992 and 1996:
We all know the election is some time away and people are not certain at
this point who they will vote for. Still, who do you think you will vote
for in the election for President?
2012 PRE-ELECTION: (IF R IS NOT REGISTERED BUT INTENDS TO REGISTER, OR
IF R IS REGISTERED BUT DID NOT VOTE YET:) How about the election for
President? Do you intend to vote for a candidate for PRESIDENT? (IF
YES:) Who do you think you will vote for? [DEM PRES CAND NAME], [REP
PRES CAND NAME], or someone else?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democratic candidate (with or without qualifications,
      1952-1976)
2. Republican candidate (with or without qualifications,
      1952-1976)
3. Undecided; DK (except 1964)
4. R does not intend to vote (incl. "no, qualified" if
      will vote, 1952-1976)
9. Other candidate

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK (1964 only); NA; no Pre IW; DK/NA/RF (1952
    1976: or pro-con) if will vote; refused to say
    who will vote for; will vote, but not for president;
    R already voteD (early) in pre-election reporting (2012)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is a pre var.

For 1952-1976, codes 1 and 3 also include presidential candidate vote
intentions "with qualifications."   Codes for candidate vote intention
"with qualifications" did not appear after 1976.
In 1952-1976, if R's response to the question "As far as you know, do
you expect to vote in the elections this November?" was "yes,
qualified" (think so/ guess so/ probably, etc.), R was asked this
question; if R's response was "no, qualified" (probably not, etc.)
R has been included in code 4; if R's response was "pro-con," then
this has been coded 0.
After 1976, no codes appeared for "yes, qualified," "no, qualified,"
or "pro-con".

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480038,480039
1952: 520081
1956: 560100
1960: 600101
1964: 640160
1968: 680133
1972: 720170
1976: 763044
1980: 800137
1984: 840425
1988: 880397
1992: 923805
1996: 960548
2000: 000792,000793
2004: 043202,043203
2008: 083169,083169a
2012: prevote_intpres,prevote_intpreswho

===
VCF0714

ELECTION: Will the Presidential Election Be Close

QUESTION:

(IF R PREDICTS A WINNER IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION:) Do you think it [the
presidential race] will be a close race or will [R's predicted winning
candidate] win by quite a bit?
1980 AND LATER: (IF R REPLIES "DK" WHO WILL WIN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION:)
Do you think the presidential race will be close or will one candidate
win by quite a bit?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Will win by quite a bit
2. Close race
9. DK; pro-con; depends; etc.

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; R replies DK who will win
    (1952-1976); R's prediction NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1956 NOTE:
Cases "closer than last time," "same as last time" or "not so close as
last time" are coded 0.
1964 NOTE:
If R predicted a winner who was not from the major parties, this
question was not asked.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520014
1956: 560013
1960: 600018
1964: 640019
1968: 680026
1972: 720026
1976: 763027
1980: 800055
1984: 840077
1988: 880099
1992: 923103
1996: 960382
2000: 000486,000487
2004: 043094
2008: 083074
2012: preswin_close

==

VCF0715

ELECTION: State/Local Vote Straight Ticker or Split 5-Category

QUESTION:

How about the elections for other state and local offices, did you
vote a straight ticket or did you vote for candidates from different
parties. (IF STRAIGHT TICKET:) Which party?/ (IF SPLIT TICKET:) How
did you split it?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Straight ticket - Democratic
2. Split ticket - mostly Democratic
3. Split ticket - about half and half, NA how split
4. Split ticket - mostly Republican
5. Straight ticket - Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; R did not vote; DK, NA if voted; refused to
    say if voted; refused to say who voted for;
    form III or IV (1972); no Post IW; didn't vote (or
    DK/NA if voted) in state and local elections; no
    partisan state or local elections; voted straight
    ticket, NA which party; voted straight ticket,
    'other' party; voted split ticket, mostly 'other'
    party; Washington D.C. (non-presidential years)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1962 NOTE:
"Split ticket, mostly 'other' party" was combined in study data with
"split ticket, NA how split." Because of the very small number of
cases voting mostly or entirely for a 3rd/minor party, this combination
category was recoded to 3.
1958 NOTE:
If R voted Democratic or Republican with only 1 exception, then R
was coded as 'straight ticket.'

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520189
1956: 560214
1958: 580088
1960: 600213
1962: 620048

1964: 640292
1966: 660113
1968: 680328
1970: 700220,700221(type 0)
1972: 720492
1974: 742332
1980: 801008,801009,801010
1982: 820516,820517,820518
1984: 840799,840800,840801

==

VCF0716

ELECTION: State/Local Vote Straight Ticker or Split 2-Category

QUESTION:

1948:
Did you vote a straight ticket or did you vote for some candidates from
other parties?
ALL YEARS EXC. 1948:
How about the elections for other state and local offices, did you vote
a straight ticket or did you vote for candidates from different parties?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Split-ticket
2. Straight ticket

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; R did not vote; DK, NA if voted; refused to
    say if voted; refused to say who voted for; form
    III,IV (1972); no Post IW; didn't vote (or DK/NA
    if voted) in state and local elections; no partisan
    state or local elections; Washington D.C. (non-
    presidential years)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0715.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480023

1952: 520189
1956: 560214
1958: 580088
1960: 600213
1962: 620048
1964: 640292
1966: 660113
1968: 680328
1970: 700220(type 0)
1972: 720492
1974: 742332
1980: 801008
1982: 820516
1984: 840799

==

VCF0717

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Try to Influence the Vote of Others During the Campaign

QUESTION:

1952,1956,1960-1964:
I have a list of some of the things that people do that help a party or
a candidate win an election. I wonder if you could tell me whether you
did any of these things.
1968,1972 AND LATER:
Now I'd like to find out (1990 AND LATER: We'd/we would like to find
out) about some of the things that people do to help a party or
candidate win an election.
ALL YEARS:
During the campaign, did you talk to any people and try to
show them why they should vote for (1984 AND LATER: or against) one of
the parties or candidates?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation
vars) may have varied by study.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520203
1956: 560215
1958: 580076
1960: 600215
1962: 620049
1964: 640313
1966: 660070
1968: 680388
1970: 7000167(type 0)
1972: 720468
1974: 742195
1976: 763529
1978: 780457
1980: 800793
1982: 820473
1984: 840818
1986: 860314
1988: 880825
1990: 900366
1992: 925807
1994: 940808
1996: 961165
1998: 980361
2000: 001225
2002: 025007
2004: 045010
2008: 085029
2012: mobilpo_rmob

===

VCF0718

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Attend Political Meetings/Rallies During the Campaign

QUESTION:

Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, (1984 AND LATER:
speeches,) (1978,1980,1982: fund raising) dinners, or things like that
(1984 AND LATER: in support of a particular candidate)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0717.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520205
1956: 560217
1960: 600217
1962: 620051
1964: 640314
1968: 680397
1970: 700169(type 0)
1972: 720469
1974: 742196
1976: 763532
1978: 780458
1980: 800795
1982: 820474
1984: 840821
1986: 860317
1988: 880827
1990: 900368
1992: 925810
1994: 940810
1996: 961167
1998: 980363
2000: 001227
2002: 025009
2004: 045011
2008: 085030
2012: mobilpo_rally

==

VCF0719

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Work for Party or Candidate During the Campaign

QUESTION:

Did you do any {other} work for one of the parties or candidates?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0717.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520206
1956: 560218
1960: 600218
1962: 620052
1964: 640315
1968: 680398
1970: 700171(type 0)
1972: 720470
1974: 742197
1976: 763533
1978: 780459
1980: 800796
1982: 820475
1984: 840823
1986: 860318
1988: 880828
1990: 900369
1992: 925812
1994: 940811
1996: 961168
1998: 980364
2000: 001228
2002: 025010
2004: 045013
2008: 085032

==
VCF0720

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Display Candidate Button/Sticker During the Campaign

QUESTION:

1956,1960,1962-1982: Did you wear a campaign button or put a campaign
sticker on your car?
1984 AND LATER: Did you wear a campaign button, put a campaign
sticker on your car, or place a sign in your window or in front of
your house?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0717.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560220
1960: 600220
1962: 620054
1964: 640317
1968: 680399
1970: 700173(type 0)
1972: 720471
1974: 742198
1976: 763534
1978: 780460
1980: 800797
1982: 820476
1984: 840819

1986: 860315
1988: 880826
1990: 900367
1992: 925809
1994: 940809
1996: 961166
1998: 980362
2000: 001226
2002: 025008
2004: 045012
2008: 085031
2012: mobilpo_sign

==

VCF0721

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Donate Money to Party or Candidate During the Campaign

QUESTION:

1952,1956,1960,1962:
Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help the
campaign for one of the parties or candidates?
1964:
Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help a party or
candidate pay campaign expenses this year?
1966,1968:
During this last year were you or any member of your household asked to
give money or buy tickets to help pay the campaign expenses of a
political party or candidate? (IF YES) Did you give any money or buy
any tickets?
1972,1974:
Did you give any money to a political party this year?
1976:
Did you give any money to a political party or make any other
contribution this year? (responses : 1. yes, 5. no, 7. tax check-off).
1978:
Did you give any money to a political party or candidate this year?
1980,1982:
Now a few questions about giving money during this last election
campaign:
What about other political contributions [other than tax check-offs].
Did you give any money this year to a candidate running for public
office?;
Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about
contributions to any of the political parties. Did you give money to a
political party during this election year?
1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give
any money to an individual candidate, to a political party
organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a
particular issue or interest group?
(IF YES: Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about

contributions to any political party organization. Did you give money
to a political party during this election year? Now, apart from
contributions to a political party, did you give any money to an
individual candidate running for public office?)
1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give
any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party
organization?
1988 AND LATER:
During an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to
support campaigns. Did you give money to a political party during
this election year? Did you give money to an individual candidate
running for public office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No (includes "not asked for money" in 1966,1968)
2. Yes (includes "tax check-off" in 1976)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); DK/NA if asked for money
    (1966,1968 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0717.
See also VCF0739-VCF0741.
GENERAL NOTE:
For 1980, 1982, 1984, 1988 and later, a "yes" response for either or
both questions has been coded 2. A "no" response combined with
"no" or "DK" has been coded 1. Two "DK" responses have been coded 0.
(A "no" response with "NA" is coded 0.)
1984 NOTE:
In 1984, if R's response was "No," DK, NA to the filter question, then
the subsequent two contribution questions were not asked. If R's
response to the filter was "no," VCF0721 has been coded 1; if R's
response to the filter was DK or NA, then VCF0721 has been coded 0.
For 1984 Rs who responded "yes" to the filter question: if R responded
"yes" to either or both of the following contribution questions, then
VCF0721 has been coded 2. If R responded "yes" to the filter but then
responded "no" to both follow-up contribution questions or if R
responded "no" to one contribution question and replied "DK" to the
other, then VCF0721 has been coded 1. Rs who responded "yes" to the
filter but "DK" to both follow-ups have been coded 0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520204
1956: 560216
1960: 600216
1962: 620050
1964: 640335
1966: 660077
1968: 680423,680421
1972: 720472
1974: 742199
1976: 763535
1978: 780461
1980: 800802,800811
1982: 820481,820490
1984: 840826,840828
1986: 860320
1988: 880830,880832
1990: 900371,900373
1992: 925815,925817
1994: 940812,940814
1996: 961169,961171
1998: 980365,980367
2000: 001229,001331
2002: 025011,025012
2004: 045014,045015
2008: 085033,085034
2012: mobilpo_ctbcand,mobilpo_ctbpty

===
VCF0722

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Has Respondent Ever Written a Letter to a Public Official

QUESTION:

1972,1976:
Aside from this particular election campaign, here are some other ways
people can be involved in politics.
ALL YEARS:
Have you ever written a letter to any public officials giving them your
opinion about something that should be done?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0717.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640318
1968: 680425
1972: 720474
1976: 763537

===

VCF0723

MOBILIZATION: Count of Campaign Participation Activities 6-Category

QUESTION:

Campaign participation count [1]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Lowest level of participation (none)
2.
3.
4.
5.
6. Highest level of participation in campaign activities

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA in all questions; no Post IW; form III,IV
    (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0723A.
GENERAL NOTE:
Derived from VCF0717-VCF0721.
This count is available for all years except 1952, 1954, 1958, 1966
and 1970. This is the sum of the number of "yes" responses in vars

VCF0717- VCF0721, to which 1 is added.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0723a

MOBILIZATION: Count of Campaign Participation Activities 4-Category

QUESTION:

Campaign participation count [2]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Lowest level of participation (none)
2.
3.
4. Highest level of participation in campaign activities

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK/NA in all questions; no Post IW; form III,IV
    (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0723.
GENERAL NOTE:
Derived from VCF0717-VCF0719.
This count is available for all years except 1954, 1958, and 1966.
This is the sum of the number of "yes" responses in vars
VCF0717-VCF0719, to which 1 is added.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0724

MEDIA: Watch TV Programs about the Election Campaigns

QUESTION:

1952-1972,1976:
We're (1952: mainly) interested in this interview in finding out whether
people paid much attention to the election campaign this year.
Did you watch any programs about the campaign on television? (1952,1960-
1972,1976: (IF YES:) How many television programs about the campaign
would you say you watched -- a good many,several, or just one or two?
::
1974:
A lot of people didn't pay much attention to the election campaigns this
year. How about you--did you watch any programs about the campaign on
television? (IF YES:) How many television programs about the campaign
would you say you watched--a good many, several, or just one or two?
::
1978,1980,1982,1984,1986,1990,1992-LATER EXC. 2008 VERSION 'NEW':
(1978,1980,1982,1984: Some people don't pay much attention to
campaigns. How about you?) (1986: We're interested in this interview
in finding out whether people paid much attention to the election
campaign this year.)
Did you watch any programs about the campaigns on television?
(1978,1980,1984,1990,1996,2004,2008 VERSION 'OLD': IF YES: Would you
say you watched-- a good many, several, or just one or two?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, didn't watch TV programs about the campaign
2. Yes, watched TV program(s) about the campaign [a
    good many, several, just one or two, DK/NA
    frequency]

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; split versions: not asked (2008); no Post IW;
    form II,III,IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    R does not own a television
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

The order of media exposure questions (VCF0724-VCF0727) may have
varied by study.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version (version 'NEW') which was specific to the
Presidential campaign only.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0725

MEDIA: Hear Programs about Campaigns on the Radio 2-Category

QUESTION:

1952,1956:
How about radio--did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the
campaign on the radio? (1952 only: IF YES:) Would you say you listened
quite a lot or not very much.)
::
1960-1988,1992,1996:
(1960-1988: How about radio.) Did you listen to any speeches or
discussions about the campaign on the radio?
::
1960-1980,1984-1988,1992 AND LATER:
Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the
radio? (IF YES:) How many programs about the campaign did you listen to
on the radio [1996 and later: Would you say you listened to] --a good
many, several, or just one or two?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, didn't listen to radio programs about campaign
2. Yes, listened to radio program(s) [quite a lot
    (1952), not very much (1952), a good many, several,

just one or two, DK/NA frequency]

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972); abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form or Spanish language
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0724.
2008 NOTE:
In 2008, wording was specifically for the 'campaign for President'
and 2008 data are therefore not included.
2012 NOTE:
Same as for 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520174
1956: 560198
1960: 600192
1964: 640281
1968: 680296
1972: 720459
1976: 863600
1978: 780044
1980: 800745
1982: 820059
1984: 840723
1986: 860060
1988: 880138
1992: 923208
1996: 961335
2000: 001646
2004: 045005,045005a

==

VCF0726

MEDIA: Articles about Election Campaigns in Magazines

QUESTION:

How about magazines-- did you read about the campaign in any magazines.
1952 IF YES:
Would you say you read quite a lot or not very much?)
1960-1980,1984 IF YES:
How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read --
a good many, several, or just one or two?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, didn't read magazines about the campaign
2. Yes, read magazine(s) [quite a lot (1952), not very
    much (1952), a good many, several, just one or two,
    DK/NA frequency]

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972); abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form or Spanish language
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0724.
2008 NOTE:
In 2008, wording was specifically for the 'campaign for President'
and 2008 data are therefore not included.
2012 NOTE:
Same as for 2008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520176
1956: 560200
1960: 600194
1964: 640282
1968: 680299
1972: 720461
1976: 763602
1978: 780046
1980: 800747
1982: 820060
1984: 840725
1988: 880136
1992: 923206

===
VCF0727

MEDIA: Number of Articles about Election Campaigns in Magazines

QUESTION:

1952,1956,1960,1964,1968,1972,1976:
We're (1952: mainly) interested in this interview in finding out whether
people paid much attention to the election campaign this year. Take
newspapers for instance--did you read (1972 ONLY: much) about the
campaign in any newspaper?
1974:
(IF R READS A DAILY NEWSPAPER:) Did you read anything about the campaign
this year in any newspaper?
1978-1986,1990:
Did you read about the campaign in any newspapers?
1988,1992 AND LATER:
(IF R HAS READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER IN THE PAST WEEK:) Did you read about
the campaign in any newspaper?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, read no newspapers about the campaign
2. Yes, read newspaper(s) about the campaign

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; split versions: not asked (2008);
    form II,III,IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    DK/NA if R reads a daily newspaper (1974); R did not
    read daily paper in past week (1988, 1992, 1996);
    DK/NA if R read a daily paper in past week (1988,
    1992, 1996); short form or Spanish language (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0724.
GENERAL NOTE:
In 1974, 1988 and 1992, this question was preceded by a filter. The
1974 filter was: Do you read a daily newspaper? In 1988 and 1992 the
filter was: How many days in the past week did you read a daily
paper? Rs who replied "no" [1974] or "none" [1988] to the filter
question were not asked this question. However, 1974 Rs who replied
"no" have been coded 1 while 1988 and 1992 Rs who replied "none" have
been coded 0.
In most years, this question was accompanied by a follow-up question
which asked how much/how often R read campaign articles, how many
campaign articles R read, or how much attention R paid to campaign
articles. If the respondent had read articles at all, regardless how

little, then R has been coded 2. Several 1986, 1990, 1992, and 1996 respondents who replied "yes" to the main question, but who replied in the followup question that they paid "no attention" to articles, have still been coded 2. From the 1980 and 1984 studies, however, several respondents who answered "yes" to the main question but who then volunteered in the followup that they read "no" articles have been coded 1 rather than 2. The 1974 and 1978 follow-up questions have been disregarded.
1972 NOTE:
Addition of "much" to wording affected distributions significantly.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents were administered an alternative version (version 'NEW') which was specific to the Presidential campaign only.
2012 NOTE:
Wording in 2012 was not comparable ('campaign for President')

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520173
1956: 560196
1960: 600190
1964: 640279
1968: 680292
1972: 720456
1974: 742046,742063
1976: 763645
1978: 780072
1980: 800760,800761
1982: 820062
1984: 840727,840728
1986: 860062
1988: 880130,880134
1990: 900063
1992: 923204
1996: 960247
2000: 000336
2004: 043021
2008: 085008

===
VCF0728

MEDIA: Count of Media Exposure Types

QUESTION:

Campaign media exposure count

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No media
2.
3.
4.
5. All four media

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form or Spanish
   language (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This count is available for 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, 1968, 1972, 1976,
1978, 1980, 1982, 1984 and 1992. It is constructed from VCF0724-VCF0727
by summing the number of "yes" responses, plus 1.
All variables must be asked in a given year for this count to be
calculated: however, if all vars are asked but all are coded DK/NA (0
in VCF0724-VCF0727), then VCF0728 is coded 0. If at least 1 var is
coded with valid data during a year when all 4 questions are used by
NES, then this value is computed.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0729

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with House Majority Before the Election

QUESTION:

1958-1968: Do you happen to know which party had the most Congressmen
in Washington before the election this/last month? (IF NECESSARY:)
Which one?
1970 AND LATER:
Do you happen to know which party had the most members in the House of
Representatives in Washington before the elections (this/ last) month?
(IF NECESSARY:) Which one? (2000, 2004: DON'T PROBE DK)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Incorrect party mentioned; DK; No
2. Correct party mentioned

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For 1968,1970 and 1972, 1 response of "about even" has been coded 1.
1982 NOTE:
1 response "other" has been coded 1.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580019
1960: 600226
1964: 640305
1966: 660100
1968: 680386
1970: 700207(type 0)
1972: 720950
1976: 763683
1978: 780500
1980: 801028
1982: 820523
1984: 841006
1986: 860349
1988: 880878
1990: 900402
1992: 925951
1994: 941012
1996: 961072
1998: 980479
2000: 001356
2002: 025083
2004: 045089
2008: 085066
2012: knowl_housemaj

==
VCF0730

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with House Majority After the Election

QUESTION:

1958-1968:
Do you happen to know which party elected the most Congressmen in the
elections this/last month? (IF YES:) Which one?
1970-1984:
Do you happen to know which party elected the most members to the House
of representatives in the elections this/last month?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Incorrect party mentioned; DK; No
2. Correct party mentioned

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For 1968 and 1970, 5 responses of "half and half" in each year have
been coded 1.
1982 NOTE:
2 responses "other" were coded 1.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580020
1960: 600227
1964: 640306
1966: 660101
1968: 680387
1970: 700208(type 0)
1972: 720951
1976: 763684
1978: 580501

1980: 801029
1982: 820524
1984: 841007

===

VCF0731

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Respondent Discuss Politics with Family and Friends

QUESTION:

Do you ever discuss politics with your family or friends?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840105
1986: 860066
1990: 900068
1992: 925105
1994: 940128
1996: 961004
1998: 980211
2000: 001204
2002: 025003
2004: 045153
2008: 085108
2012: discuss_disc

===

VCF0732

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: How Often Respondent Discusses Politics with Family and Friends

QUESTION:

Do you ever discuss politics with your family or friends
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET)
How often do you discuss politics with your family or friends --
every day, 3 or 4 times a week, once or twice a week, or less often
than that?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Every day
2. 3 or 4 times a week
3. Once or twice a week
4. Less often
5. Never/No (to lead-in)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK/NA how often; DK/NA if ever discuss; no Post
   IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 5 includes several cases where R answered 'yes' to lead-in
(see VCF0731) but when asked how often replied 'never'.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840106
1986: 860067
1990: 900069
1992: 925106
1994: 940129
1998: 980212

==

VCF0733

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: How Often in the Last Week Respondent Discussed Politics

QUESTION:

How many days in the past week did you talk about politics with
your family or friend

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None or never discuss politics ('no' to lead-in)
1. One day
2. Two days
3. Three days
4. Four days
5. Five days
6. Six days
7. Every day

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK/NA how often; DK/NA if ever discuss; NA how often
   discuss in general; DK how often discuss in general
   (1992,1994); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 0 includes cases where R answered 'yes' to lead-in (see VCF0731)
but when asked how many days in past week replied 'never'; it also
includes cases where R answered 'no' to lead-in.
Respondents with NA response for how often R discusses politics with
family and friends (VCF0732) were INAP for this question.
Beginning 1992, respondents with DK response for how often R discusses
politics with family and friends (VCF0732) were also INAP for this
question.
1984 NOTE:
If R replied 'every day' for how often R discusses politics with family
and friends (VCF0732) then this question was not asked; for such
respondents 7 (every day) has been coded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840107
1986: 860068
1990: 900070
1992: 925107
1994: 940130
1996: 961005
1998: 980213
2000: 001205

2002: 025004
2004: 045153a
2008: 085108a
2012: discuss_disc,discuss_discpstwk

===
VCF0734

ELECTION: Intended Presidential Vote versus Actual Presidential Vote

QUESTION:

Reported Pre vote intention/reported Post vote - President

VALID_CODES:
----
1. INTENDED Democratic: voted Democratic
2. INTENDED undecided: voted Democratic;
     INTENDED 'other' party: VOTED Democratic
3. INTENDED Republican: voted Democratic
4. INTENDED Democratic: did not vote/voted 'other'
     party
5. INTENDED undecided: did not vote/voted 'other'
     party; INTENDED 'other' party: did not vote/
     voted 'other' party
6. INTENDED Republican: did not vote/voted 'other'
     party
7. INTENDED Democratic: voted Republican
8. INTENDED undecided: voted Republican; INTENDED
     'other' party: voted Republican
9. INTENDED Republican: voted Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA who will vote for; no Pre IW; no Post IW;
    DK/NA if will vote; refused to say who will vote
    for; will vote, but not for president; R does not
    intend to vote; DK/NA who voted for; R refused to
    say if voted; DK/NA if voted; refused to say who
    voted for; voted, but not for president
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Derived from VCF0706 and VCF0713.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0735

ELECTION: Vote for U.S. House- Candidate Code

QUESTION:

Candidate code of House vote

VALID_CODES:

IF R VOTED IN DISTRICT OF INTERVIEW:
DISTRICTS W/NO INCUMBENT RUNNING:
31. Democratic candidate
32. Republican candidate
DISTRICTS W/ RUNNING INCUMBENT:
33. Democratic incumbent
34. Republican incumbent
35. Democratic candidate
36. Republican candidate
39. Independent/minor party incumbent
DISTRICT W/ 2 RUNNING INCUMBENTS (REDISTRICTING):
71. Democratic incumbent in district with 2 incumbents (2012)
72. Republican incumbent in district with 2 incumbents (2012)
IF R VOTED OUTSIDE DISTRICT OF INTERVIEW:
DISTRICTS W/NO INCUMBENT RUNNING:
81. Democratic candidate
82. Republican candidate
IF R VOTED OUTSIDE DISTRICT OF INTERVIEW:
DISTRICTS W/ RUNNING INCUMBENT:
83. Democratic incumbent
84. Republican incumbent
85. Democratic challenger
86. Republican challenger
IF R VOTED OUTSIDE DISTRICT OF INTERVIEW:
ALL 'OUTSIDE' DISTRICTS:
91. DEMOCRAT -- no name given
92. REPUBLICAN--no name given
ALL DISTRICTS:
97. Non-incumbent minor party candidate; non-incumbent
    independent candidate; name given not on candidate
    list for race

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; refused to name candidate
99. NA; District of Columbia (1982,1986,1996);
    write-in candidate (1982); Louisiana (1978,1980,
    1982,1986); Florida (1978); no Post IW
00. R did not vote; NA/DK if voted; refused to say if
    voted; voted but not for House of Representatives;
    DK/NA if voted for House of Representatives
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See 1978-later question wording VCF0707.
See also VCF1011-VCF1013
GENERAL NOTE:
1980 was the first year that 'outside' Congressional District voting
was identified.
Codes 81-92 first appeared in 1980 study data (not in 1978 data).
1992 and later: Code 97 includes cases where R volunteered that
he/she voted "a straight ticket" but no candidate for R's party ran;
it also includes cases where R insists that he/she voted for a
specific party's candidate but no candidate from that party ran in R's
district. For Rs who voted outside district of interview location,
code 97 also includes candidates named by R but whose CD and party are
not known. It also includes cases where R names a candidate but the
name is not among names of candidates within a known 'outside' CD.
2012 NOTE:
See notes VCF0902.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507
1984: 840792
1986: 860266
1988: 880767
1990: 900288
1992: 925622
1994: 940613
1996: 961088
1998: 980312
2000: 001262
2002: 025028b
2004: 045033x
2008: 085050x
2012: typerace2012_hse,prevote_hsvtbc,prevote_hsvtnobc,postvote_hsvtbc,postvote_hsvtnobc

===

VCF0736

ELECTION: Vote for U.S. House- Party

QUESTION:

Congressional vote: including "other" (see also: VCF0707)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
5. Republican
7. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; R did not vote; R refused to say if
   voted; DK/NA if voted; refused to say who voted for;
   name given by R not on candidate list (1978-1988);
   Washington D.C.; no Post IW; voted, but not for House
   of Representatives; DK/NA if voted for House of
   Representatives; forms III,IV (1972); special
   districts with no House race in 1978 (LA03, LA07,
   FL08, FL10); special districts with no House race in
   1980 (LA03, LA07); special districts with no House
   race in 1982 (LA05, LA07); special district with no
   House race in 1986 (LA04)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0707.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520187
1956: 560212
1958: 580081
1960: 600211
1962: 620042
1964: 640290
1966: 660112
1968: 680323
1970: 700215(type 0)
1972: 720485
1974: 742322
1976: 763673
1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507

1984: 840792
1986: 860266
1988: 880768
1990: 900289
1992: 925623
1994: 940614
1996: 961089
1998: 980313
2000: 001263
2002: 025028b
2004: 045032x
2008: 085049x
2012: typerace2012_hse,prevote_hsvtbc,prevote_hsvtnobc,postvote_hsvtbc,postvote_hsvtnobc

==

VCF0737

ELECTION: Registered to Vote Pre-Election

QUESTION:

1948:
Were you registered (eligible) to vote?
All years exc. 1948:
Were you registered to vote in this election?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No
2. Yes (includes Rs who reported voting)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington, D.C.; NA if R
    voted; DK if R voted (1982 only); abbrev. telephone
    IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is a post var. For the pre version, see VCF0701.
This question was asked of non-voters and, except for 1982, was also
asked of Rs who did not know whether they voted.
A few Rs declared they were not required to register and are coded 9.
2012 NOTE:
In 2012, respondents were asked if they were registered in the Pre.
If they were not registered in the pre, they were asked if they were
registered in the post (not comparable). See summary in VCF0703.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: 480026
1952: 520181
1978: 780484
1980: 801011
1982: 820519
1984: 840802
1986: 860276
1988: 880757
1990: 900280
1992: 925602
1994: 940602
1996: 961075
1998: 980304
2000: 001241,001242
2002: 025016,025017
2004: 045018x
2008: 085039a

===

VCF0738

ELECTION: Party of Registration Post-election

QUESTION:

Were you registered in this election as being a Republican, a Democrat,
an Independent or what?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democratic party
5. Republican party
6. Voters: not required to declare party (VOLUNTEERED);
   voters: not required to register (VOLUNTEERED);
   non-voters: registered, not required to declare party
   (VOLUNTEERED)
7. Independent
8. Other party

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; absentee voter; NA; nonvoter who declares
   that voters are not required to register; NA if
   voted; refused to say if voted; DK if registered; NA
   if registered; R voted but stated s/he was not
   registered (Volunteered: 3 cases in 1978, 1 case in
   1980, 5 cases in 1982, 1 case in 1984, 2 cases in
   1986); no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)

0. R was not registered
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is a post var, asked of voters and of registered non-voters (and
also asked of Rs who did not know if they voted but who stated that
they were registered).
For voter or registered nonvoter who stated that registration did not
require declaration of party in R's area or if R was a (reported) voter
who stated that voters were not required to register: 6 has been coded.
Nonvoter Rs who replied that voters were not required to register in
their area have been coded 9. Nonvoter Rs who replied "DK" or NA when
asked if they were registered have also been coded 9. Nonvoter Rs who
replied that they were registered but, when asked for party of
registration, replied that voters were not required to register in
their areas have been coded 9.
If R was a non-voter who first declared registration status but, when
asked for party registered, replied that R was not registered, 0 has
been coded.
2012 NOTE:
R was asked if he/she was registered in the pre; if R was not registered
in the pre, R was asked if he/she was registered in the post.
In a future release of the CDF, 2012 registration data will be added
to a new registration summary variable not specific to wave.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780471,780485
1980: 800989,801012
1982: 820502,820520
1984: 840784,840803
1986: 860262,860277

==

VCF0738a

ELECTION: Party of Registration Pre-election

QUESTION:

(IF R IS REGISTERED) Are you registered as being a Republican, a
Democrat or anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democratic party
5. Republican party
6. No party/none (1976 also includes: none required)
8. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; DK/NA if R registered; form II (1972)
0. R was not registered
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is a pre-election variable.
2012 NOTE:
See note VCF0738.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720164,720165
1976: 763032,763033

===

VCF0739

MOBILIZATION: Respondent Made $1 Tax Checkoff for Political Contribution

QUESTION:

1980-1984: Now for a few questions about giving money during this last
election campaign.
All YEARS:
Did you use the one-dollar check-off option on your
Federal income tax return to make a political contribution this year?"

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
2. No

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Code 2 includes volunteered responses that R does not file a federal
income tax form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800799
1982: 820478
1984: 840824
1986: 860319
1988: 880829
1990: 900370
1992: 925814

==

VCF0740

MOBILIZATION: Contribute to Political Party During the Campaigns

QUESTION:

1980-1982:
Apart from contributions to specific candidates, how about contributions
to any of the political parties? Did you give money to a political party
during this election year?
1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the last year did you give any
money to an individual candidate, a political party organization, people
supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest
group? (IF YES:) Apart from contributions to specific candidates, how
about contributions to a political party organization? Did you give
money to a political party during this election year?
1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the past year did you give
any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party
organization? (IF YES:) Apart from contributions to specific candidates,
how about contributions to a political party organization? Did you give
money to a political party during this election year?

1988 AND LATER:
Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
2. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R responded "no" to the filter question, this has been coded 2.
1986 NOTE:
same as 1984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800811
1982: 820490
1984: 840825,840826
1986: 860320,860323
1988: 880832
1990: 900373
1992: 925817
1994: 940814
1996: 961171
1998: 980367
2000: 001231
2002: 025012
2004: 045015
2008: 085034
2012: mobilpo_ctbpty

===

VCF0741

MOBILIZATION: Contribute to PAC During the Campaigns

QUESTION:

1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the last year did you give any money to an individual candidate, a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group? (IF YES:) Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?
1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization? (IF YES:) Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?
ALL OTHER YEARS:
Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
2. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R responded "no" to the filter question, this has been coded 2.
1986 NOTE:
same as 1984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840825,840831
1986: 860320,860325
1988: 880834
1990: 900375
1992: 925819
1994: 940816
1996: 961173
1998: 980369
2000: 001233

2002: 025013
2004: 045016
2008: 085035
2012: mobilpo_ctboth

==
VCF0742

MOBILIZATION: Give Money to Individual Candidate During the Campaigns

QUESTION:

1980,1982:
What about other political contributions [other than tax check-offs].
Did you give any money this year to a candidate running for public
office?
1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give
any money to an individual candidate, to a political party organization,
people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or
interest group? (IF YES:) Now, apart from contributions to a political
party, did you give any money to an individual candidate running for
public office?
1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a
contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give
any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party
organization? (IF YES:) Now, apart from any contributions to a political
party, did you give money to an individual candidate running for public
office?
1988 AND LATER:
During an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to
support campaigns. Did you give money to an individual candidate
running for public office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
2. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R responded "no" to the filter question, this has been coded 2.
1986 NOTE:
same as 1984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800802
1982: 820481
1984: 840825,840828
1986: 860320,860321
1988: 880830
1990: 900371
1992: 925815
1994: 940812
1996: 961169
1998: 980365
2000: 001229
2002: 025011
2004: 045014
2008: 085033
2012: mobilpo_ctbcand

===
VCF0743

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Does R Belong to Political Organization or Club

QUESTION:

Do you belong to any political club or organization?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1962 NOTE:
The following optional text was also included: "to help one of the
parties or candidates".

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520207
1956: 560219
1960: 600219
1962: 620053
1964: 640316
1968: 680400
1970: 700172
1978: 780463
1980: 800798
1982: 820477

==

VCF0744

MEDIA: Have Access to Internet

QUESTION:

Do you have access to the Internet or the World Wide Web [exc. 2008:
("the Web")]?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2012 NOTE:
In 2012, the question was asked about anyone in the household rather
than asked about respondent's access to the internet.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 961160
1998: 980209
2000: 001433
2004: 045155
2008: 083018

==

VCF0745

MEDIA: Saw Election Campaign Information on the Internet

QUESTION:

1996-2004: (IF R HAS ACCESS TO THE INTERNET/WEB:) Have you seen any
information about this election campaign on (the Internet/the Web)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No; R does not have access

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; DK/NA if has access; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

For years 1996-2004, this question is a follow-up to VCF0744.
2008 NOTE:
In 2008, wording was specifically for the 'campaign for President'
and 2008 data are therefore not included.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 961161
1998: 980210
2000: 001434
2004: 045155,045155a
2008: 085010

==

VCF0746

MOBILIZATION: Did Religious/Moral Group Try to Influence Respondent Vote

QUESTION:

Were there any groups concerned with moral or religious issues that
tried to encourage you to vote in a particular way?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, there were groups
5. No, no groups tried to encourage

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 961175
1998: 980355
2000: 001235

==

VCF0747

MOBILIZATION: Information about Candidates/Parties/Issues at Church

QUESTION:

Was information about candidates, parties, or political issues made
available in your place of worship before the election?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No, no information available
7. No, don't attend church [VOL]

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 961176
1998: 980356
2000: 001236

==
VCF0748

ELECTION: Voted on Election Day or Before

QUESTION:

Did you vote on election day -- that is [date of election] or did
you vote at some time before this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. On election day
5. Some time before

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; R did not vote; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1994: 940607
1996: 961078
1998: 980308
2000: 001245
2002: 025021
2004: 045023
2008: 085042

==

VCF0749

ELECTION: How Long Before Election Did Respondent Vote

QUESTION:

(IF R VOTED BEFORE ELECTION DAY:)
How long before [date of election] did you vote?

VALID_CODES:
----
01. Less than one week, 1-6 days
02. One week; 7 days
03. 1-2 weeks; 8-14 days
04. 2-3 weeks; 15-21 days
05. 3-4 weeks; 22-28 days
06. One month; 29-31 days
07. More than one month; 32-60 days
11. A few days; a couple of days; several days -- NFS
12. A few weeks; a couple of weeks; several weeks -- NFS
91. More than a few days -- NFS
92. More than a few weeks --NFS
97. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. DK; NA; R did not vote; R did not vote before
     election day or DK/NA if voted before election day;
     no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1994: 940608
1996: 961079
1998: 980309
2000: 001246
2002: 025022
2004: 045023a

2008: 085042a

==

VCF0750

ELECTION: Vote in Person Or with Absentee Ballot

QUESTION:

(IF R VOTED BEFORE ELECTION DAY:)
Did you vote in person or by absentee ballot?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. In person
5. Absentee ballot
7. R volunteers: by mail [OREGON ONLY]

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; R did not vote; R did not vote prior to
    election day; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900284
1992: 925606
1994: 940609
1996: 961080
1998: 980310
2000: 001247
2002: 025023
2004: 045024
2008: 08503

==

VCF0801

IDEOLOGY: Index for Thermometer Rating of Liberals and Conservatives

QUESTION:

Liberal/conservative index

VALID_CODES:
----
00. Most liberal
.
49. Neutral
.
97. Most conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK in VCF0211 or VCF0212; don't recognize OR can't
    rate (1980 and later) in VCF0211 or VCF0212, or both
99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This index is constructed from the thermometer score for liberals
(VCF0211) and the thermometer score for conservatives (VCF0212).
The calculation used is the following: First, the value of VCF0211 is
subtracted from 97, and that difference is added to the value of
VCF0212. This sum is then divided by 2, and .5 is added to the
result. Finally, the solution is truncated to obtain an integer
value. If either VCF0211 or VCF0212 is 98, then VCF0801 is coded 98;
99 is coded in VCF0801 if it is the only missing data value coded
in VCF0211,VCF0212.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0803

IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here
is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale on which the
political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely
liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)
2000 TELEPHONE:
When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely
liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road,
slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought

much about this?
2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When
it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely
liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road,
slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought
much about this?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate, middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972); R not
    administered 7pt scale series (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For years 1984 and later, a follow-up 'choice' question was asked of
respondents who replied "don't know" or "haven't thought much" to this
question; except for years 1984, 1986 and 1990 this follow-up 'choice'
question was also asked of respondents who answered "moderate." For
these years, a final 3-category summary was constructed: the 'choice'
question is found in VCF0824; the final 3-category summary is VCF0849.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
using both modes (telephone and personal).
In addition to the traditional 7-point scale version of this question,
approximately half of the 2000 Study respondents (both modes) were
instead randomly selected for administration of a branching series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720652
1974: 742305

1976: 763286
1978: 780399
1980: 800267
1982: 820393
1984: 840369
1986: 860385
1988: 880228
1990: 900406
1992: 923509
1994: 940839
1996: 960365
1998: 980399
2000: 000440
2002: 023022
2004: 045117
2008: 083069
2012: libcpre_self

===

VCF0804

IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Scale 1972- COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here
is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale on which the
political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely
liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)
2000 TELEPHONE:
When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely
liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road,
slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought
much about this?
2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When
it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely
liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road,
slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought
much about this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Liberal
2. Moderate, middle of the road
3. Conservative
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0801, VCF0824 AND VCF0849.
GENERAL NOTE:
This collapses VCF0803: 1-3=1, 4=2, 5-7=3.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0805

ISSUES: Government Assistance with Medical Care

QUESTION:

1956,1960:
Around election time people talk about different things that our
government in Washington is doing or should be doing. Now I would like
to talk to you about some of the things that our government might do.
Of course, different things are important to different people, so we
don't expect everyone to have an opinion about all of these. I would
like you to look at this card as I read each question and tell me how
you feel about the question. If you don't have an opinion, just tell me
that; if you do have an opinion, choose one of the other answers.]
(CARD WITH RESPONSE CHOICES SHOWN TO R: AGREE STRONGLY/ AGREE BUT NOT
VERY STRONGLY/ NOT SURE, IT DEPENDS/DISAGREE BUT NOT VERY STRONGLY/
DISAGREE VERY STRONGLY).
'The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at
low cost.'
1962:
Now on a different problem. 'The government ought to help people get
doctors and hospital care at low cost.' Do you have an opinion on this
or not? (IF YES:) Do you agree that the government should do this or do
you think the government should not do it.
1964,1968:
Some say the government in Washington ought to help people get doctors
and hospital care at low cost; others say the government should not get
into this. Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side
over the other? (IF YES) What is your position?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Opinion: help people get doctors and hospital care at
    low cost
2. Opinion: stay out of this
9. No opinion; DK; not sure; depends; no interest; both;

other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0806.
GENERAL NOTE:
For 1956 and 1960, "agree strongly" and "agree but not very strongly"
were coded 1. "Disagree strongly" and "disagree but not very
strongly" were coded 2.
1962 NOTE:
"Yes," "yes, qualified," "yes, for the aged" and "yes, for those who
need it, for those financially unable" were coded 1.
"No," "no, qualified," and "no, except for the aged" were coded 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560038
1960: 600066
1962: 620057,620058
1964: 640074
1968: 680064

==

VCF0806

ISSUES: Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital
costs. Some (1988,1994-LATER: people) feel there should be a
government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital
expenses (1984 AND LATER: for everyone). (1996,2004: Suppose these
people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others feel that
(1988,1994-1996: all) medical expenses should be paid by individuals,
and through private insurance (1984 AND LATER: plans) like Blue Cross
(1984-1994: or [1996:some] other company paid plans). (1996,2004:
Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And of course,
some people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.)
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought

much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; split versions: not asked (2008); Form II (1972);
    no Post IW; telephone IW (1984: see VCF0015, 2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0805.
2000 NOTE 1:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face. Respondents interviewed by telephone were asked a
branching series and are not included.
2000 NOTE 2:
Approximately half of the respondents were randomly selected to be
administered this question with the introduction read with the
endpoint options in reverse order [private option first] and the
endpoint labels in the respondent booklet reversed.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version (version 'NEW').

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700134(type 0)
1972: 720208
1976: 763273
1978: 780381
1984: 841058
1988: 880318
1992: 923716

1994: 940950
1996: 960479
2000: 000609
2004: 043150
2008: 083119
2012: inspre_self

===

VCF0808

ISSUES: Guaranteed Jobs and Income

QUESTION:

1956-1960:
(Same introduction as in VCF0805 [CARD WITH RESPONSES SHOWN]).
'The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who
wants to work can find a job.'
1964,1968:
In general, some people feel that the government in Washington should
see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living.
Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his
own." Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over
the other. (IF YES:) Do you think that the government --
2002:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has A JOB AND A GOOD STANDARD OF LIVING. Others think the
government should just LET EACH PERSON GET AHEAD ON THEIR OWN. Which is
closer to the way you feel or haven't you thought much about this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, government should see to it that every person
    has a job and a good standard of living
2. Yes, should let each person get ahead on his own
9. Depends; other; both; no opinion; DK; no interest;
    haven't thought much about this (2002)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0809.
GENERAL NOTE:
For 1956, 1958 and 1960, "agree strongly" and "agree but not very
strongly" were coded 1. "Disagree strongly" and "disagree but not
very strongly" were coded 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560032
1958: 580023
1960: 600054
1964: 640078
1968: 680066
2002: 025122

===
VCF0809

ISSUES: Guaranteed Jobs and Income Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it
that every person has a job and a good standard of living. (1972-
1978,1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at
point 1). Others think the government should just let each person get
ahead on his/their own. (1972-1978,1996: Suppose these people are at
the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have
opinions somewhere in between, at pints 2,3,4,5 or 6.)
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on his own
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; split versions: not asked (2008);
    form A (1986); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also: VCF0808.
1972 NOTE:
This question was asked in the pre for form I and in the post for form

II (and IV).
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face. Respondents interviewed by telephone were asked a
branching series and are not included here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents were administered an
alternative version (version 'NEW').

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 721067
1974: 742265
1976: 763241
1978: 780357
1980: 801110
1982: 820425
1984: 840414
1986: 860486
1988: 880323
1990: 900446
1992: 923718
1994: 940930
1996: 960483
1998: 980457
2000: 000615
2004: 043152
2008: 083128
2012: guarpr_self

==
VCF0811

ISSUES: Urban Unrest Scale

QUESTION:

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with the problem
of urban unrest and rioting. Some say it is more important to use all
available force to maintain law and order -- no matter what results.
Others say it is more important to correct the problems of poverty and
unemployment that give rise to the disturbances.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Use all available force

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; haven't thought much about it
0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III (1972); short
    form or Spanish language (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1968 NOTE:
In contrast to other years, R self-placement followed rather than
preceded placements of parties/political figures.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680464
1970: 700085(type 0)
1972: 720670
1974: 742273
1976: 763767
1992: 923746

==

VCF0813

ISSUES: How Much Has the Position of Blacks Changed

QUESTION:

1964-1976:
In the past few years we have heard a lot about civil rights groups
working to improve the position of the Negro in this country. How much
real change do you think there has been in the position of the Negro in
the past few years: a lot, some, or not much at all?

1984 AND LATER:
In the past few years, we have heard a lot about improving the position
of black people in this country. How much real change do you think
there has been in the position of black people in the past few years: a
lot, some, or not much at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not much at all
2. Some
3. A lot
9. DK; depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form A
    (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640104
1966: 660042
1968: 680080
1970: 700070(type 2)
1972: 720111
1976: 763212
1984: 841075
1986: 860562
1988: 880846
1990: 900519
1992: 925930
1994: 941005

==

VCF0814

ISSUES: Civil Rights Pushes Too Fast or Not Fast Enough

QUESTION:

Some say that the civil rights people have been trying to push too
fast. Others feel they haven't pushed fast enough.
How about you: Do you think that civil rights leaders are trying to
push too fast, are going too slowly, or are they moving about the
right speed?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Too slowly
2. About right (1968 only: pro-con)
3. Too fast
9. DK; depends; other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form A
    (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1966 NOTE:
2 additional code categories were present besides those appearing
here. For 1966, "mostly about right but some going too fast" (8 cases)
was recoded to 3 here, and "mostly about right but some going too
slowly" (1 case) was recoded to 1.
1968 NOTE:
The category "about right" was a combination category which also
included "pro-con."

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640105
1966: 660043

1968: 680081
1970: 700071(type 2)
1972: 720112
1974: 742264
1976: 763213
1980: 801132
1984: 841073
1986: 860559
1988: 880845
1990: 900518
1992: 925929

===
VCF0815

ISSUES: Segregation or Desegregation

QUESTION:

(1964, 1968-1972, 1976: What about you?)
Are you in favor of desegregation, strict segregation, or something in
between?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Desegregation
2. In between
3. Strict segregation
9. Don't know

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
In years except 1978, this question followed questions asking R to
evaluate whether blacks/whites in R's area favor segregation.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640127
1968: 680088
1970: 700077(type 2)
1972: 720118
1976: 763217
1978: 780444

===

VCF0816

ISSUES: Should Government Ensure School Integration

QUESTION:

1962:
How about this statement, "The government in Washington should see to it
that white and colored children are allowed to go to the same
schools." Do you have an opinion on this or not? (IF YES:) Do you
agree that the government should do this or do you think that the
government should not do it?
1964-1986,1990 AND LATER:
Some people say that the government in Washington should see to it that
white and black (1962-1966: colored; 1968,1970: Negro) children go (1964-
1970: are allowed to go) to the same schools. Others claim this is not
the government's business. Have you been concerned (1986,1990 AND LATER:
interested) enough about [in] this question to favor one side over the
other? (IF YES)
Do you think the government in Washington should ---

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, R has an opinion: see to it that white and black
     children go (1962-1970: are allowed to go) to the
     same schools
2. Yes, R has an opinion: stay out of this area (except
      1962: as it is none of government's business)
9. No, no opinion; DK; depends; no interest/concern;
     other; both; pro-con

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; Form A (1986); form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as

code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1962 NOTE:
Additional code categories were present besides those appearing here.
1962 categories "yes, qualified," "yes, but there should be no force.
Moderate. Gradual," and "no, qualified" were recoded to 9 here.
1976 NOTE:
"Anti-busing statement qualified with statement that R is not against
integration or opportunity" has been included in code 9.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1962: 620062
1964: 640100
1966: 660025
1968: 680075
1970: 700062(type 2)
1972: 720106
1976: 763211
1978: 780443
1986: 860485
1990: 900470
1992: 925931,925932
1994: 941003,941004
2000: 000746,000747

===

VCF0817

ISSUES: School Busing Scale

QUESTION:

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with racial
problems. Some people think achieving racial integration of schools
is so important that it justifies busing children to schools out of
their own neighborhoods. Others think letting children go to their
neighborhood schools is so important that they oppose busing.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Bus to achieve integration
2.
3.

4.
5.
6.
7. Keep children in neighborhood schools
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984: See VCF0015)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720202
1974: 742288
1976: 763257
1980: 801133
1984: 841074

===

VCF0818

ISSUES: Should Government Ensure Fair Jobs/Housing for Blacks

QUESTION:

1956,1960:
If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the
government should see to it that they do'
1958:
If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the
government should see to it that they do. Do you have an opinion
on this or not? (IF YES:) Do you think the government should do
this.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree but not very strongly
3   Not sure; depends; DK; no opinion
4. Disagree but not very strongly
5. Disagree strongly

MISSING_CODES:
----

9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See also VCF9037 (jobs only).
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560044
1958: 580031
1960: 600062

==

VCF0819

ISSUES: Open Housing

QUESTION:

1964,1968-1972,1976:
Which of these statements would you agree with: (STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN
CODE CATEGORIES READ TO R)
1966:
Some people say that Negroes should be allowed to live in any part of
town they want to. How do you feel? Should Negroes be allowed to live
in any part of town they want to, or not?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. White people have a right to keep Negroes out of their
     neighborhoods if they want to
2. Negroes have a right to live wherever they can afford
     to, just like anybody else
9. DK; depends; can't decide; both

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1966 NOTE:
code categories were: "should be allowed" (recoded to 2 HERE), "should
be allowed, qualified" (recoded to 2), "should not be allowed" (recoded
to 1) and "should not be allowed, qualified" (recoded to 1).

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640116
1966: 660152
1968: 680084
1970: 700068(type 2)
1972: 720115
1976: 763214

===

VCF0820

ISSUES: Do Whites in the Area Favor Segregation

QUESTION:

How about white people in this area? How many would you say are in
favor of strict segregation of the races - all of them, most of them,
about half, less than half of them, or none of them?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. None of them
2. Less than half
3. About half
4. Most of them
5. All of them
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:

----
0. NA; no whites in R's area; Rs erroneously not
    asked this question (1964)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
In all years, this question followed VCF0821.
"No whites in area" is represented in code 0.
1964 NOTE 1:
219 were not asked this question by error.
1964 NOTE 2:
This question was preceded by 7 questions about the racial composition
of R's neighborhood, nearest grade school, nearest junior high school,
nearest high school, co-workers, friends and of the people where R
shops and trades. If the responses to these 7 questions did not reveal
the presence of any white people, then this question was not asked, and
VCF0820 has been coded 0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640126
1968: 680087
1970: 700076(type 2)
1972: 720117
1976: 763216

===

VCF0821

ISSUES: Do Blacks in the Area Favor Desegregation

QUESTION:

In general, how many of the black people (1964,1968,1970: Negroes) in
this area would you say are in favor of desegregation -- all of them,
most of them, about half, less than half of them, or none of them?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. None of them
2. Less than half
3. About half
4. Most of them
5. All of them
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Blacks in R's area
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
In all years, this question followed VCF0821.
"No blacks in area" is represented in code 0.
1964 NOTE 1:
219 were not asked this question by error.
1964 NOTE 2:
This question was preceded by 7 questions about the racial composition
of R's neighborhood, nearest grade school, nearest junior high school,
nearest high school, co-workers, friends and of the people where R
shops and trades. If the responses to these 7 questions did not reveal
the presence of any white people, then this question was not asked, and
VCF0820 has been coded 0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640125
1968: 680086
1970: 700074(type 2)
1972: 720116
1976: 763215

===

VCF0822

ISSUES: Rating of Government Economic Policy

QUESTION:

As to the economic policy of the government -- I mean steps taken to
fight inflation or unemployment -- would you say the government is
doing a good job, only fair, or a poor job?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Poor job
2. Only fair
3. Good job

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK
0. NA; Form II,III,IV (1972); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720512
1974: 742317
1976: 763748

===

VCF0823

ISSUES: Better off if U.S. Unconcerned with Rest of World

QUESTION:

1956-1960: (Same introduction as in VCF0805 [CARD WITH RESPONSES SHOWN]).
1968,1980:
Now I'd like to read some of the things people tell us when we interview
them (1968: and ask you; 1980: As I read, please tell me) whether you
agree or disagree with them.
1972: I'd like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each
of these next six statements.
1976: I am going to read you two statements about US foreign policy and
I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each
statement
1984-1988,1992: I am going to read a statement about US foreign policy,
and I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree.
1990,1994-LATER: Do you agree or disagree with this statement.

ALL YEARS:
'This country would be better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree (1956-1960: incl. 'agree strongly' and 'agree but not strongly')
2. Disagree (1956-1960: incl. 'disagree strongly' and 'disagree but not strongly')
9. DK; depends; not sure; no opinion, can't say; refused to say

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984: see v.15); form B (1986); form A (1990); noncomparable question format (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected for administration of the standard version of this question or an alternative version offering opposing positions on isolationism. Only data from the traditional format are represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560035
1958: 580025
1960: 600056
1968: 680522
1972: 720291
1976: 763926
1980: 801036
1984: 841057
1986: 860535
1988: 880254
1990: 900498
1992: 923604
1994: 941019
1996: 960410
1998: 980488

2000: 000513a
2002: 023033
2004: 043113
2008: 083096
2012: usworld_stay

===
VCF0824

ISSUES: If Compelled to Choose Liberal or Conservative

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
Here is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale on which
the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely
liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on
this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE
SHOWN TO R).
(IF R RESPONDS "DON'T KNOW" OR "HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS" IN
1984 AND LATER; IF R RESPONDS "MODERATE" IN 1988,1992,1996-LATER:)
If you had to choose, would you consider yourself a liberal or a
conservative?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Liberal
3. Moderate ('middle of the road')
5. Conservative
7. R refuses to choose
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA in either question
0. R has made choice on 7pt scale VCF0803
    1984,1986,1990); R has made choice on VCF0803 7pt
    scale other than 'moderate' (1988,1992 and later);
    R not administered 7pt scale series (2000); no post
    IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0803 and VCF0849.
GENERAL NOTE:
This is the follow-up 'choice' question asked 1984 and later of Rs
who replied to the full 7-point scale question (VCF0803) with "Don't
know" or "haven't thought much"; except for years 1984, 1986 and 1990
this question was also asked of Respondents who answered "moderate."
Using the initial 7-point scale (VCF0803) and this follow-up, a final
3-category summary was also constructed in these years: the final 3-
category summary is VCF0849.
If R's response to the 7-point scale question (VCF0803) was NA then

this follow-up question was not asked.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
using both modes; approximately half of the 2000 Study respondents (both
modes) were randomly selected for administration of a branching
series. The latter respondents are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840370
1986: 860386
1988: 880229
1990: 900407
1992: 923511,923512
1994: 940839,940840
1996: 960366
1998: 980401
2000: 000441
2002: 023023
2004: 045117,045117a
2008: 083069a
2012: libcpre_choose

==
VCF0825

ISSUES: How Likely for U.S. to be at War/in Bigger War

QUESTION:

How about the chances of our country getting into a bigger war?
Compared to a few years ago, do you think we are more likely, less
likely, or have about the same chances to get into a bigger war?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Less likely
2. About the same chances
3. More likely
9. DK; depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; Form II (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: 660039
1968: 680116
1970: 700045(type 1)
1972: 720051

===
VCF0826

ISSUES: Did U.S. Do Right Thing Getting Involved in War

QUESTION:

1952:
Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in
Korea two years ago or should we have stayed out?
1964,1966:
Have you been paying attention to what is going on in Vietnam? (IF
YES:) Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting
in Vietnam or should we have stayed out?
1968-1972:
Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in
Vietnam or should we have stayed out?
2008:
Do you think the United States should or should not have sent
troops to fight the war in Iraq in 2003?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. No, should have stayed out
2. Yes, did right thing
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. Depends (1964-1972); both (1964-1972); other (1964,
    1972); pro-con (1952); have not paid attention
    (1964,1966)
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; refused to answer
    (1966)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1966 NOTE:
Rs were not asked the filter question ('have you been paying
attention...') if they had named Vietnam as a problem in the "Most
Important Problem" question (see VCF0875).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520054
1964: 640350
1966: 660035
1968: 680103
1970: 700041(type 0)
1972: 720050
2008: 085298

==
VCF0827

ISSUES: How Should U.S. Proceed in Current War

QUESTION:

1952:
Which of the following things do you think it would be best for us to do
now in Korea? (OPTIONS CORRESPONDING TO CODE CATEGORIES READ TO R)
1964-1970:
Which of the following do you think we should do now in Vietnam?
(OPTIONS CORRESPONDING TO CODE CATEGORIES READ OR SHOWN)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Pull out entirely
2. Keep trying to get a peaceful settlement (1952); keep
    our soldiers in Vietnam but try to end the fighting
    (1964-1970)

3. Take a stronger stand (1952: and bomb Manchuria and
    China; 1964: even if it means invading North
    Vietnam)
9. DK; depends; pro-con; no opinion; other; have not paid
    attention (1964,1966 only)

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1964 note:
This question was not asked if R responded "no" to the VCF0826 filter
question ('have you been paying attention...') or, in 1964 only, if R's
response to VCF0826 was NA.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520055
1964: 640351
1966: 660036
1968: 680104
1970: 700042(type 0)

==

VCF0827a

ISSUES: U.S. Stand in Vietnam Scale

QUESTION:

(1968,1970: There is much talk about "hawks" and "doves" in connection
with Vietnam, and considerable disagreement as to what action the United
States should take in Vietnam.) (1972: With regard to Vietnam,)
Some people think we should do everything necessary to win a complete
military victory, no matter what results. Some people think we should
withdraw completely from Vietnam right now, no matter what results.
And, of course, other people have opinions somewhere between these two
extreme positions. Suppose the people who support an immediate
withdrawal are at one end of this scale (show card to R) at point number
1. And suppose the people who support a complete military victory are
at the other end of the scale at point number 7. At what point on the
scale would you place yourself on this scale (1972 only: or haven't you

thought much about this)? [RESPONDENT BOOKLET]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Immediate withdrawal
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Complete military victory
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; assigned to Post administration
   and no Post IW (1972)
0. Haven't thought much about it (1972 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1972 NOTE:
Respondents were assigned to pre or post administration by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680470
1970: 700092
1972: 721069

===
VCF0828

ISSUES: Should Government Cut Military Spending

QUESTION:

Some people believe that our armed forces are already powerful enough
and that we should spend less money for defense. Others feel that
military spending should at least continue at the present level.
How do you feel - should military spending be cut, or should it
continue at least at the present level?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Cut military spending
2. Continue spending at least at present level
9. DK; depends; pro-con; other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form II,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0843.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720588
1976: 763357

==

VCF0829

ISSUES: Is the Government in Washington Too Strong

QUESTION:

Some people are afraid the government in Washington is getting too
powerful for the good of the country and the individual person.
Others feel that the government in Washington is not getting too
strong (1964,1966,1970: has not gotten too strong for the good of the
country).
1964-1972:
Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other?
1976-1992:
Do you have an opinion on this or not?
ALL YEARS:
(IF YES:) What is your feeling? Do you think the government is too
powerful or do you think the government is not getting too strong?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Opinion: the government has not gotten too strong
2. Opinion: the government is getting too powerful
9. DK; depends; other; pro-con; no interest; no opinion

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; Form I (1972); no Post IW; telephone IW
   (1984: see v.15)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In 1964-1968, these questions were combined into a single variable.
Beginning in 1970, the filter question ('have you been interested
enough..') was represented in a separate variable. Beginning in
1970, in cases where R's response to the filter question was "no" or
"DK," then 9 has been coded.
1992 NOTE:
46 cases were not asked this question due to an error in skip
instructions.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640071
1966: 660021
1968: 680062
1970: 700058,700059(type 0)
1972: 720056,720057
1976: 763224,763225
1978: 780453,780454
1980: 801128,801129
1984: 841059,841060
1988: 880847,880848
1992: 926016
2000: 001512,001513

===

VCF0830

ISSUES: Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1970-1984, 1986 FORM B, 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks
(1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving
them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should

not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help
themselves (1970: but they should be expected to help themselves).
1986 FORM A, 1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
(prior to 1996 only: possible) effort to improve the social and economic
position of blacks. (1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of
a scale, at point 1). Others feel that the government should not make any
special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.
(1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.
And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between,
at points 2,3,4,5 or 6).
ALL YEARS: Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't
you thought much about it? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help minority groups/blacks
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Minority groups/ blacks should help themselves
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone IW (2000); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Note that form B in 1986, form B in 1988, and all previous years
specified "blacks and other minorities" in this question, while form A
in 1986, form A in 1988, and all cases in 1990 and after specified
only "blacks." To filter for form A/B responses, use variable
VCF0012.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face; telephone respondents were administered asked a branching
series and are not represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700106(type 0)
1972: 720629
1974: 742296
1976: 763264
1978: 780373
1980: 801062
1982: 820415
1984: 840382
1986: 860426(form B),860427(form A)
1988: 880332(form A),880340(form B)
1990: 900447
1992: 923724
1994: 940936
1996: 960487
1998: 980462
2000: 000641
2004: 043158
2008: 083137

===

VCF0832

ISSUES: Rights of the Accused Scale

QUESTION:

Some people are primarily concerned with doing everything possible to
protect the legal rights of those accused of committing crimes.
Others feel that it is more important to stop criminal activity even
at the risk of reducing the rights of the accused.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Protect rights of accused
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700120(type 0)
1972: 720621
1974: 742281
1976: 763248
1978: 780365

==
VCF0833

ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Equal Rights Amendment

QUESTION:

1976: An effort is being made to pass an amendment to the U.S.
Constitution which would guarantee equal rights for all citizens
regardless of sex.
ALL YEARS:
Do you approve or disapprove of the Equal Rights Amendment to the
Constitution (1978,1980: sometimes called the ERA amendment)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve
5. Disapprove
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: 763799
1978: 780452
1980: 801126

==
VCF0834

ISSUES: Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry and government. (2004: (Suppose these people are
at one en of a scale, at point 1)) Others feel that a women's place
is in the home. (2004: (Suppose these people are at the other end;
at point 7.) And of course, some people have opinions somewhere in
between, at points 2,3,4,5, or 6.)
ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 VERSION 2:
Where would you place yourself on this scale or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)
2000 VERSION 2:
Where would you place yourself on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone IW (2000); split versions: not asked
    (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE 1:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face; telephone respondents were administered a branching
series and are not represented here.
2000 NOTE 2:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered this question
with or without the option 'or haven't you thought much about this?'
read as part of the question text. Data for face-to- face respondents
administered either version are represented in this variable.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents (version 'NEW') were not
administered an alternative version.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720232
1974: 742302
1976: 763787
1978: 780389
1980: 801094
1982: 820435
1984: 840250
1988: 880387
1990: 900438
1992: 923801
1994: 940928
1996: 960543
1998: 980448
2000: 000755
2004: 043196
2008: 083166

===
VCF0836

ISSUES: Should Women Stay out of Politics

QUESTION:

1952 INTRO:
Now I'd like to read some of the kinds of things people tell me when I
interview them, and ask you whether you agree or disagree with them.
I'll read them one at a time, and you just tell me whether you agree or
disagree with them, and whether you agree or disagree a little or quite
a bit.
1972 INTRO:
Do you agree or disagree with each of these two statements:
ALL YEARS:
'Women should stay out of politics'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree (1952: incl. "agree quite a bit" and "agree a
     little")
2. Disagree (1952: incl. "disagree quite a bit" and
     "disagree a little")
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----

0. NA; no Post IW or Post is not form B (1952: see
    v.15)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1952 NOTE:
Response categories were "agree quite a bit" (recoded to 1) "agree a
little" (recoded to 1) "disagree a little" (recoded to 2) and "disagree
quite a bit" (recoded to 2).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520223
1972: 720251

===
VCF0837

ISSUES: When Should Abortion Be Allowed

QUESTION:

(1972,1976: Still on the subject of women's rights,)
There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years.
Which one of the opinions on this page (1972: card) best agrees with
your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Abortion should never be permitted.
2. Abortion should be permitted only if the life and
     health of the woman is in danger.
3. Abortion should be permitted if, due to personal
     reasons, the woman would have difficulty in caring
     for the child.
4. Abortion should never be forbidden, since one should
     not require a woman to have a child she doesn't
     want.
9. DK; other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0838.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: 720238
1976: 763796
1978: 780450
1980: 801136

===
VCF0838

ISSUES: By Law, When Should Abortion Be Allowed

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS EXCEPT 2000 TELEPHONE:
There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years.
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET) Which one of the opinions on this page best agrees
with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you
choose.
2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a short list of opinions. Please tell me which
one of the opinions best agrees with your view. You can just tell me the
number of the opinion you choose.

VALID_CODES:
----
1. By law, abortion should never be permitted.
2. The law should permit abortion only in case of rape,
   incest, or when the woman's life is in danger.
3. The law should permit abortion for reasons other than
   rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only
   after the need for the abortion has been clearly
   established.
4. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an
   abortion as a matter of personal choice.
9. DK; other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; split versions: not asked (2008);

INAP. Inap. question not used

===

VCF0839

ISSUES: Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending.
(2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.)
Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide
many more services even if it means an increase in spending.
(2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And
of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2,3,4,5, or 6.)
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce
   spending a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government should provide many more services: increase
   spending a lot
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone IW (2000); split versions: not asked
   (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1980 NOTE:
The 1980 version of this question was not comparable.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face. Respondents interviewed by telephone were asked a
branching series and are not represented here.
2004 NOTE:
Tbis question was asked in the pre-election survey and the post-
election survey. The pre-election data are reported here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents (version 'NEW') were
administered a branching series of questions.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: 820443
1984: 840375
1986: 860448
1988: 880302
1990: 900452
1992: 923701
1994: 940940
1996: 960450

1998: 980463
2000: 000545
2004: 043136
2008: 083105
2012: spsrvpr_ssself

==

VCF0840

ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Term Limits

QUESTION:

A law has been proposed that would limit members of Congress to no more
than 12 consecutive years of service in that office.
Do you favor or oppose such a law?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Favor
5. Oppose
8. DK; other (1994,1998)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; short version or Spanish language
    questionnaire (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
'Other' code was used only in 1994 and 1998.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923747
1994: 940651
1998: 980335

==

VCF0841

ISSUES: Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along
with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get
along with Russia.
1984-1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Cooperate more/try to get along with Russia
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher/big mistake to try to get along
    with Russia
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 801078
1984: 840408
1986: 860487
1988: 880368

===
VCF0842

ISSUES: Environmental Regulation Scale

QUESTION:

Some people think we need much tougher government regulations on business in order to protect the environment. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Other think that current regulations to protect the environment are already too much of a burden on business. (Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Much tougher regulations to protet the environment
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Regulations already too much of a burden on business
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted face-to-face. Respondents interviewed by telephone were asked a branching series and are not represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1996: 960537
1998: 980497
2000: 000771

==

VCF0843

ISSUES: Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
(1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point
1.) Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
(1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.)
(2004: And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in
between, at points 2,3,4,5, or 6).
Where would you place yourself on this scale or haven't you thought
much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending.
9. DK; haven't thought much about it

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; telephone IW (2000); split versions: not asked
    (2008)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0828.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale data from interviews conducted
face-to-face. Respondents interviewed by telephone were asked a
branching series and are not represented here.
2008 NOTE:
This question was administered to a random half sample of respondents
using verion 'OLD'; the remaining respondents (version 'NEW') were
administered a branching series of questions.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800281
1982: 820407
1984: 840395

1986: 860405
1988: 880310
1990: 900439
1992: 923707
1994: 940929
1996: 960463
2000: 000581
2004: 043142
2008: 083112
2012: defsppr_self

===

VCF0844

ISSUES: How Willing Should U.S. Be to Use Military Force

QUESTION:

In the future, how willing should the United States be to use military
force to solve international problems -- extremely willing, very
willing, somewhat willing, not very willing, or never willing?
(1992,1998: RESPONDENT BOOKLET)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely willing
2. Very willing
3. Somewhat willing
4. Not very willing
5. Never willing
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1996 NOTE:
Omission of response categories from Respondent Booklet was in error.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923605

==

VCF0845

RELIGIOSITY: Authority of the Bible 1964-1990

QUESTION:

Here are four statements about the Bible and I'd like you to tell me
which is closest to your own view. (STATEMENTS SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. The Bible is God's word and all it says is true
2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God but it
   contains some human errors.
3. The Bible is a good book because it was written by
   wise men, but God had nothing to do with it.
4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago
   that it is worth very little today.
9. DK; other

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984, see
   VCF0015); form A (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0850.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640414
1968: 680215
1980: 801176
1984: 841081
1986: 860507
1988: 880934
1990: 900516

==

VCF0846

RELIGIOSITY: Is Religion Important to Respondent

QUESTION:

(2002: Now on another topic. . .)
Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, important
2. No, not important

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984, see
   VCF0015); form B (1986); short form or Spanish
   language (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 801173
1984: 841078
1986: 860546
1988: 880932
1990: 900511
1992: 923820
1994: 941043
1996: 960571
1998: 980492
2000: 000872
2002: 023082
2004: 043219
2008: 083181
2012: relig_import

===

VCF0847

RELIGIOSITY: How Much Guidance from Religion

QUESTION:

(IF RELIGION IS IMPORTANT:) Would you say that (1996-LATER: Would you
say your) religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living,
quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-
day living (1996-LATER: "life")?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Some
2. Quite a bit
3. A great deal
5. Religion not important

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA; DK/NA if religion important in R's life;
    form B (1986); no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984, see VCF0015); short form or Spanish language
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This var is a follow-up to VCF0846. See VCF0846.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 801174
1984: 841079
1986: 860547
1988: 880933
1990: 900512
1992: 923821
1994: 941044
1996: 960572
1998: 980493
2000: 000873

2002: 023083
2004: 043220
2008: 083181,083182
2012: relig_guide

===
VCF0848

ISSUES: Concern about Conventional War

QUESTION:

1956:
Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the chances of our country
getting into war. Would you say that at the present time you are pretty
worried about this country getting into another war, somewhat worried,
or not worried at all?
1960,1964:
How about the chances of our country getting into war. Would you say
that at the present time you are pretty worried about this country
getting into another war, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?
1982-1992, 2000-2002:
How worried are you about our country (1982: How about the chances of)
getting into a conventional war (2000 and 2002: at this time), one in
which nuclear weapons are not used (1982: neither side uses nuclear
weapons)? Are you very (1982: pretty) worried (1982: about this
country getting into such a war at the present time), somewhat worried,
or not worried at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not worried
2. Somewhat worried
3. Very worried (1956-1982: pretty worried)
9. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; form B (1986); form
    A (1990); telephone IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
This variable was administered in face-to-face interviews only due to
an error in the survey application program.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560084
1960: 600085
1964: 640139
1982: 820307
1984: 840247
1986: 860534
1988: 880858
1990: 900497
1992: 923607
2000: 001488
2002: 025145

==
VCF0848a

ISSUES: Concern about Nuclear War

QUESTION:

How worried are you about our country getting into a nuclear war at this
time? Are you very worried, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Not worried
3. Somewhat worried
5. Very worried
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form A (1990); no Post IW; personal IW
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
This variable was administered in telephone interviews only due to an
error in the survey application program.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840248
1988: 880859
1990: 900499
1992: 923606
2000: 001487
2002: 025144

===

VCF0849

IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Position 1984- COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm
going to show you [1996-LATER: Here is] a 7-point scale on which the
political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely
liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself
on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE
SHOWN TO R).
(IF R RESPONDS "DON'T KNOW" OR "HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS"In
1984 AND LATER; IF R RESPONDS "MODERATE" IN 1988, 1992, 1996-LATER:)
If you had to choose, would you consider yourself a liberal or a
conservative?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Liberal
3. Moderate ('middle of the road')
5. Conservative
6. Refuses to choose (in follow-up [exc. 1988
    moderates]), don't know

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA to entire question
0. NA to follow-up; R not administered 7pt scale
    series (2000); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0803 and VCF0824.
GENERAL NOTE:
This is the final 3-cateogry summary for years 1984 and later,
constructed using the initial 7-point scale question (VCF0803) and the
follow-up 'choice' question (VCF0824), which was asked of respondents
who had replied "don't know" or "haven't thought much" to the 7-point
scale question and, except for years 1984, 1986, AND 1990, also asked
of respondents who had answered "moderate".
If R's response to the 7-point scale question was NA, then the follow-

up question ('if you had to choose...') was not asked and VCF0849 has been coded 9. If DK/HTM in first question and the response to the follow-up was "don't know," VCF0849 has been coded 8. If R refused to choose in the follow-up, VCF0848 has been coded 7.
Code 1 is comprised of "extremely liberal," "liberal," and "slightly liberal" responses to the 7-point scale question (codes 1-3 in VCF0803) and of "liberal" responses to the follow-up.
Code 3 for 1984,1986,1990 is comprised of Rs who replied "moderate" to the 7-point scale question (code 4 in VCF0803, with the follow-up not asked) and also of Rs who replied DK or "haven't thought much" to the 7-point scale question and who then replied "moderate" to the follow-up. For 1988, 1992, 1996 and later, code 3 is comprised of: 1) cases where R replied "moderate" to the 7-point scale question and then refused to choose another category or replied DK/NA to the follow-up; and 2) Rs who replied DK or 'haven't thought much' to the 7-point scale question and then replied "moderate" in the follow-up.
Code 5 is comprised of "extremely conservative," conservative," and "slightly conservative" responses to the 7-point scale question (codes 5-7 in VCF0803) and of "conservative" responses in the follow-up.
2000 NOTE:
This variable represents 7-point scale follow-up data from interviews conducted using both modes; approximately half of the 2000 Study respondents (both modes) were randomly selected for administration of a branching series and are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840369,840370
1986: 860385,860386
1988: 880230
1990: 900406,900407
1992: 923513
1994: 940839,940840
1996: 960365,960366,960367,960368
1998: 980399,980400,980401,980402
2000: 000441a
2002: 023024
2004: 045118
2008: 083069,083069a
2012: libcpre_self,libcpre_choose

==

VCF0850

RELIGIOSITY: Authority of the Bible 1984-

QUESTION:

2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a short list of statements. Please tell me) Which
of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the
Bible? You can just give me the number of the statement you choose.
1996,1998,2000 PERSONAL,2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Which of these statements
comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible? You can just
give me the number of your choice. (STATEMENTS SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. The Bible is the actual Word of God and is to be
    taken literally, word for word
2. The Bible is the Word of God but not everything in
    it should be taken literally, word for word
3. The Bible is a book written by men and is not the
    Word of God
9. Other; DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; form B (1990); short form or Spanish language
    questionnaire (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: 900517
1992: 923824
1994: 941047
1996: 960575
1998: 980496
2000: 000876
2004: 043222
2008: 083184
2012: relig_wordgod

==

VCF0851

MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Newer Lifestyles Contribute to Society Breakdown

QUESTION:

1986,1990,1994,1996:
Now, I am going to read several statements. After each I would like you
to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly with this statement.
(1986,1990:) You can just give me the number of your choice from the
booklet. The first statement is....
1988,1992:
Here are several more statements. As before, you can just give me the
number of your choice from the booklet. The first statement is....
1998: (Still on page [page]..)
2000 FACE-TO-FACE:
(Still looking at page [page] in the booklet:)
ALL YEARS:
'The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our
society.'
(2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Order of questions VCF0851-854 may have been in varying order by study.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860525
1988: 880954
1990: 900500
1992: 926118
1994: 941029

1996: 961247
1998: 980516
2000: 001530
2004: 045190
2008: 085140
2012: trad_lifestyle

===

VCF0852

MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Should Adjust View of Moral Behavior to Changes

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of
moral behavior to those changes.'
(2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0851.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860526
1988: 880951
1990: 900501
1992: 926115
1994: 941030

1996: 961248
1998: 980515
2000: 001531
2004: 045189
2008: 085139
2012: trad_adjust

===

VCF0853

MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Should be More Emphasis on Traditional Values

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'This country would have many fewer problems if there were more
emphasis on traditional family ties.'
(2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0851.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860527
1988: 880953
1990: 900502
1992: 926117
1994: 941031

1996: 961249
1998: 980517
2000: 001532
2004: 045192
2008: 085142
2012: trad_famval

==

VCF0854

MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Tolerance of Different Moral Standards

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to
their own moral standards, even if they are very different from our own.'
(2000: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0851.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860530
1988: 880952
1990: 900503
1992: 926116
1994: 941032

1996: 961250
1998: 980518
2000: 001533
2004: 045191
2008: 085141
2012: trad_tolerant

==

VCF0860

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Neighborhood- Respondent Description

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Is this neighborhood you now live in: [CHOICES]
1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is this neighborhood you now live in all
black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is this neighborhood you live in all white,
mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0861

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Grade School- Respondent Description

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Is the grade school nearest you: [CHOICES]
1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is the grade school nearest you all black,
mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is the grade school nearest you all white,
mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640119
1968: 680090
1970: 700079(type 2)
1972: 720133
1976: 763221

==
VCF0862

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Junior High School

QUESTION:

Is the junior high school nearest you: [CHOICES]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA; no junior high in area (1964,1968)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640120
1968: 680091
1970: 700080(type 2)

==

VCF0863

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of High School- Respondent Description

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Is the high school nearest you: [CHOICES]
1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is the high school nearest you all black,
mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is the high school nearest you all white,
mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent
the value coded was the one towards the center of the scale (for

example, 1 or 2 = 2; 2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640121
1968: 680092
1970: 700081(type 2)
1972: 720134

===

VCF0864

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Work Place- Respondent Description

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Are the people where you work: [CHOICES]
1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are the people who work where you work all
black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are the people who work where you work all
white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA; R doesn't work; R works alone (1968,1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as

code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)
1986 NOTE:
The 1986 version of this question is not coded comparably.

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640122
1968: 680093
1970: 700082(type 2)
1972: 720136

==

VCF0865

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Where R Shops- Respondent Description

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Are the people where you shop and trade: [CHOICES]
1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are the people who shop and trade where you do
all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white or all
white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are the people who shop and trade where you do
all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640123
1968: 680094
1970: 700083(type 2)
1972: 720137

===
VCF0866

DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Friends

QUESTION:

1964,1968,1970:
Are your friends: [CHOICES]
1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are your friends all black, mostly black,
about half and half, mostly white, or all white?
(IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are your friends all white, mostly white,
about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. All white
2. Mostly white
3. About half and half
4. Mostly Negro/black
5. All Negro/black

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0011/VCF0011A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0011.
Note that use of VCF0011/VCF0011A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 1 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1970 NOTE:
If range of 2 adjacent numbers was given by respondent the value coded
was the one towards the center of the scale (for example, 1 or 2 = 2;
2 or 3 = 3)

WEIGHT:

VCF0011x/VCF0011y/VCF0011z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: 640124
1968: 680095
1970: 700084(type 2)
1972: 720138
1976: 763222

==

VCF0867

ISSUES: Affirmative Action in Hiring/Promotion [1 of 2]

QUESTION:

Some people say that because of past discrimination blacks should be
given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such
preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it gives
blacks advantages they haven't earned. What about your opinion-- are
you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. For
5. Against
8. DK; 1990-1994: refused; 1996 and later: other

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. NA; Form A (1986); form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0867a.
1986 NOTE:
Respondents were administered 2 versions of the preference question in
two forms; data for the alternative version (worded 'preference in
hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates
against whites') are not included in this variable.
1988 NOTE:
Wording matched 1986 alternative wording for all cases; 1988 data are
not included here.
1996 NOTE:
Code 'other' first appeared in 1996.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860475
1990: 900463
1992: 925935
1994: 941001
1996: 961208
1998: 980470
2000: 000803
2004: 045207
2008: 085157
2012: aapost_hire

==
VCF0867a

ISSUES: Affirmative Action in Hiring/Promotion [2 of 2]

QUESTION:

Some people say that because of past discrimination blacks should be
given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such
preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it gives
blacks advantages they haven't earned. What about your opinion-- are
you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?
(IF FAVOR:) Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion strongly or
not strongly?

(IF OPPOSE:) Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion strongly
or not strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Favor strongly
2. Favor not strongly
4. Oppose not strongly
5. Oppose strongly
7. DK if favor/oppose; 1990-1994: refused; 1996 and
   later: other (in VCF0867)

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. Favor/oppose but DK if strongly or not strongly
9. NA if strongly or not strongly; NA whether favor
   or oppose (VCF0867); Form A (1986); form B
   (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0867.
1986 NOTE:
Respondents were administered 2 versions of the preference question in
two forms; data for the alternative version (worded 'preference in
hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it discriminates
against whites') are not included in this variable.
1988 NOTE:
Wording matched 1986 alternative wording for all cases; 1988 data are
not included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: 860476
1990: 900464
1992: 925936
1994: 941002
1996: 961209
1998: 980471
2000: 000806
2004: 045207,045207a
2008: 085157,085157a,085157b
2012: aapost_hire_x,aapost_hire

===
VCF0870

ISSUES: Better or Worse Economy in Past Year

QUESTION:

How about (1996-LATER: Now thinking about) the economy (1990,1994-
later: in the country as a whole)?
ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 VERSION 2:
Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten
better, stayed (all yrs. exc 1984: about) the same or gotten worse?
2000 VERSION 2:
Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten
worse, stayed about the same, or gotten better?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Better
3. Stayed same
5. Worse

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
0. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered this question
using either the standard format or and alternative version with the
order of options read aloud reversed.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800149
1982: 820327
1984: 840227
1986: 860372
1988: 880243
1990: 900422
1992: 923531
1994: 940908

1996: 960385
1998: 980418
2000: 000488a,000488b
2002: 023027
2004: 043097
2008: 083083
2012: econ_ecpast

===
VCF0871

ISSUES: How Much Better or Worse Economy in Past Year

QUESTION:

How about (1996-LATER: Now thinking about) the economy (1990,1994-
later: in the country as a whole)?
Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten
better, stayed (all yrs. exc 1984: about) the same or gotten worse?
(IF BETTER:) Would you say much better or somewhat better?
(IF WORSE:) Would you say much worse or somewhat worse?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. Stayed same
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK much or somewhat better/worse
9. NA much or somewhat better/worse
0. DK/NA if better or worse
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800150
1982: 820328
1984: 840228
1986: 860373
1988: 880244
1990: 900423

1992: 923532
1994: 940909
1996: 960386
1998: 980419
2000: 000491
2002: 023028
2004: 043098
2008: 083083,3083x
2012: econ_ecpast_x,econ_ecpast

===

VCF0872

ISSUES: Better or Worse Economy in Next Year

QUESTION:

What about the next 12 months (1980,1982: or so)?
ALL YEARS EXC. 2000:
Do you expect the (1986,1988,1992: national) economy to get better, get
worse, or stay about the same?
2000 VERSION 1:
Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get better,
stay about the same, or get worse?
2000 VERSION 2:
Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get worse, stay
about the same, or get better?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Get better
3. Stay about the same
5. Get worse

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK; RF; depends (1990)
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1992 NOTE:
This question was used in both the pre and post; the pre data are
incorporated here.
2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered this question
using either the standard format or and alternative version with the
order of options read aloud reversed.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800151
1982: 820329
1984: 840243
1986: 860381
1988: 880247
1990: 900424
1992: 923537
1994: 940910
1996: 960387
1998: 980420
2000: 000496a,000496b
2004: 043099
2008: 083084
2012: econ_ecnext

===
VCF0873

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Did R Delay Medical/Dental Treatment Due to the Expense

QUESTION:

In the past year did you (or anyone in your family living here/there)
put off medical or dental treatment because you didn't have the money?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short form or spanish-language
    questionnnaire (1992); R selected for Post
    administration and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly selected to be administered this question in
the Pre or the Post.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840157
1992: 923434
1994: 941027
2000: 001413a
2004: 043066

==

VCF0875

ISSUES Mention 1: What is the Most Important National Problem

QUESTION:

1960:
What would you personally feel are the most important problems the
government should try to take care of when the new President and
Congress take office in January?
1964:
As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in
other parts of the world. The question is, what should be done about
them and who should do it. We want to ask you about problems you think
the government in Washington should do something about and any problems
it should stay out of. First, what would you personally feel are the
most important problems the government should try to take care of when
the new President and Congress take office in January?
1966:
What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the
government in Washington should try to take care of?
1968,1980,1982:
As you well know, the government faces many serious problems in this
country and in other parts of the world. What do you personally feel
are the most important problems which the government in Washington
should try to take care of?
1970:
As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in
other parts of the world. We'd like to start out by talking with you
about some of them. What do you personally feel are the most important
problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?
1972-1978,1984 AND LATER:
What do you think are the most important problems facing this country?
(IF MORE THAN ONE PROBLEM:) Of all you've told me (1996-LATER: Of those
you've mentioned), what would you say is the single most important
problem the country faces?

VALID_CODES:
----

01. AGRICULTURAL
02. ECONOMICS; BUSINESS; CONSUMER ISSUES
    (includes foreign investment, tariffs/protection of
    U.S. industries, international trade deficit/balance
    of payments, immigration, interstate
    commerce/transportation; does not
    include unemployment [09], defense spending [03],
    foreign [03] or government spending on domestic
    social welfare [09])
03. FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE
    (includes: foreign aid, defense spending, the space
    program; does not include: international trade
    deficit [02])
04. GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING
    (not "the economy" [02])
05. LABOR ISSUES
    (not unemployment [09])
06. NATURAL RESOURCES
07. PUBLIC ORDER
    (includes: crime, drugs, civil liberties and non
    racial civil rights, women's rights, abortion
    rights, gun control, family/social/religious/moral
    'decay,' church and state, etc.)
08. RACIAL PROBLEMS
    (note: this primarily includes civil rights issues
    and racial equality; monetary assistance to
    minorities is primarily found in code 9, however
    there is a slight overlap: see Note 7 for specific
    codes; note especially 1988 code 300 and 1966-1972
    codes 61-63)
09. SOCIAL WELFARE
    (includes: population, child care, aid to education,
    the elderly, health care, housing, poverty,
    unemployment, 'welfare' etc.)
97. Other problems (incl. specific campaign issues)

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK (exc. 1960,1964,1966)
99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    Form I, III or IV (1972); no Pre IW; short form IW
    (1992); question not administered in assigned half
    sample [see VCF0012a] (1996, 2000)
00. None; "there were no issues;" "there was no campaign
    in my district" (non-presidential years); DK
    (1960,1964,1966 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM".
GENERAL NOTE:
Because of changes in the full sets of codes which have been used over
time, this variable is limited to preserving the major groupings which

have been utilized with essential consistency through all years. The appendix note gives exact study-by-study versions of the texts of individual codes which have been collapsed to form the VCF0875 group categories.

In the 1960, 1966, and 1970 study datasets, one multiple- response variable was coded which included up to 3 mentions (1970: 4). In 1960 and 1970, variables were coded in order of importance in cases where R mentioned more than one problem. Within the study documentation for these two years, it was also stated that, in cases of more than one mentioned problem, if order of importance was 'not clear,' responses were then coded in order of mention. From the 1966 documentation, it is not apparent if multiple responses were coded in order of importance or if they were coded in order of mention. The first CODED response (variable) in studies 1960, 1966, and 1970 has been used here.

In the 1964 and 1968 study datasets, one single-response variable was coded. This variable was described as including, in cases of more than one given response, the mention considered most important by R. Documentation in both years added that if order of importance was 'not clear,' responses were coded in order of mention: in such event, the single variable appearing in the study dataset represented the first mention.

Note that, for cases where R mentioned two or three problems but missing data (DK or NA) appeared in the 'choice' variable (i.e., R did not choose a single most important problem), the first mention has not been included here, but MD has been coded. EXCEPTION: in 1986, in 142 cases the interviewer mistakenly did not ask R to rank problems by importance when R gave more than one mention. In these 142 cases, the first mention of R has been incorporated.

In 1960, 1964 and 1966, the DK category was combined with "no issues" and is included in code 00.

1996 NOTE:
A half-sample of respondents were selected to be administered this question.

2000 NOTE:
same as 1996.

2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600050
1964: 640036
1966: 660019
1968: 680048
1970: 700039(type 0)

1972: 720546,720548
1974: 742079
1976: 763689
1978: 780311,780315
1980: 800979
1982: 820299
1984: 840993
1986: 860306
1988: 880817
1990: 900326
1992: 925726
1994: 940706
1996: 961141
1998: 980346
2000: 000436

===
VCF0875a

ISSUES Mention 2: What is the Most Important National Problem

QUESTION:

Most important national problem (2)

VALID_CODES:

Codes 1-990 and:

MISSING_CODES:
----
991. 1968: No problem mentioned; no second or third
     problem; 1970: No problem mentioned; no second,
     third or fourth problem
996. No mentions, DK (1960,1964)
997. No problem mentioned, DK (1966); no second or third
     problem
998. DK (1968,1970,1972)
999. NA (1960,1964,1966,1968,1970,1972)
000. no Post IW; Form I,III,IV (1972)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question wording and notes for 1974-later in VCF0875.
See Appendix note "MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1960-1972".
GENERAL NOTE:
The is is the full 3-digit coding for the summary variable in
years 1960-1972.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: 600050B
1964: 640036
1966: 660019
1968: 680048
1970: 700039(type 0)
1972: 720546,720548

===

VCF0875b

ISSUES Mention 3: What is the Most Important National Problem

QUESTION:

Most important national problem (3)

VALID_CODES:

Codes 100-959 and:
990. Other specific mentions of important problems

MISSING_CODES:
----
995. "There were no issues"; "there were no issues, just
    party politics"
996. "There was no campaign in my district"
998. DK
999. NA
000. no Post IW; R not selected for half-sample
    administration (1996,2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question wording and notes for 1974-later in VCF0875.
See Appendix note "MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1974 AND LATER".
GENERAL NOTE:
The is is the full 3-digit coding for the summary variable in
years 1974 and later.
2012 NOTE:
Not yet coded for the 2012 Time Series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

```
-----
Numeric  Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:
------------

1974: 742079
1976: 763689
1978: 780311,780315
1980: 800979
1982: 820299
1984: 840993
1986: 860306
1988: 880817
1990: 900326
1992: 925726
1994: 940706
1996: 961141
1998: 980346
2000: 000436
```

===

VCF0876

ISSUES: Law to Protect Homosexuals Against Discrimination

QUESTION:

Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job
discrimination?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Favor
5. Oppose
8. DK; depends (1988)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:
'Depends' was a coding option in 1988 only.
2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880852
1992: 925923
1996: 961193
2000: 001478
2004: 045156
2008: 083211
2012: gayrt_discstd

==
VCF0876a

ISSUES: Strength of Position on Law to Protect Homosexuals Against Discrimination

QUESTION:

Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job
discrimination?
Do you favor/oppose such laws strongly or not strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Favor strongly
2. Favor not strongly
4. Oppose not strongly
5. Oppose strongly
7. DK if favor or oppose; depends (1988); DK if
    favor/oppose strongly or not strongly

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if favor or oppose; NA if favor/oppose
    strongly or not strongly; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF0876.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880853
1992: 923426
1996: 961194
2000: 001481
2004: 045156,045156a
2008: 083211x
2012: gayrt_discstd_x,gayrt_discstd

===

VCF0877

ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Gays in the Military

QUESTION:

Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United
States Armed Forces or don't you think so?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, think so
5. Don't think so
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2012 NOTE:
This question was asked of a random 1/2 sample of respondents (the
remaining 1/2 sample was asked a different version of the question).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 925925
1996: 961194
2000: 000724
2004: 045157
2008: 083212
2012: gayrt_milstd

```
========================================================================
```
VCF0877a

ISSUES: Strength of Position on Gays in the Military

QUESTION:

Do you feel strongly or not strongly that homosexuals should be
allowed to serve in the United States Armed forces?
Do you feel strongly or not strongly that homosexuals should not be
allowed to serve in the United States Armed forces?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Feel strongly should be allowed
2. Feel not strongly should be allowed
4. Feel not strongly should not be allowed
5. Feel strongly should not be allowed
7. DK if favor or oppose; depends (1988); DK if
   favor/oppose strongly or not strongly

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if favor or oppose; NA if favor/oppose
   strongly or not strongly; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 925926
1996: 961195
2000: 000727
2004: 045157,045157a
2008: 083212x
2012: gayrt_milstd_x,gayrt_discstd

```
========================================================================
```
VCF0878

ISSUES: Should Gays/Lesbians Be Able to Adopt Children

QUESTION:

Do you think gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual

couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 925927
2000: 000748
2004: 045158
2008: 083213
2012: gayrt_adopt

==
VCF0879

ISSUES: Increase or Decrease Number of Immigrants to U.S. 6-Category

QUESTION:

Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who
are permitted to come to the United States to live should be
(1992,1994: increased a little, increased a lot, decreased a little,
decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?)
(1996,1998: increased a lot, increased a little, decreased a little,
decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?)
(2004,2008: increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as it is
now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased a lot
2. Increased a little
3. Same as now
4. Decreased a little
5. Decreased a lot
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 926235
1994: 941016
1996: 961325
1998: 980489
2004: 045115
2008: 085082
2012: immigpo_level

==

VCF0879a

ISSUES: Increase or Decrease Number of Immigrants to U.S. 4-Category

QUESTION:

1992,1994:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are
permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a
little, increased a lot, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left
the same as it is now?
1996,1998:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are
permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a
lot, increased a little, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left
the same as it is now?
2000:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are
permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased,
decreased, or left the same as it is now?
2004:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are
permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased
a lot, increased a little, left the same as it is now, decreased a
little, or decreased a lot?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Increased
3. Same as now
5. Decreased
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 926235
1994: 941016
1996: 961325
1998: 980489
2000: 000508
2004: 045115
2008: 085082
2012: immigpo_level

==

VCF0880

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Better or Worse Off in Past Year

QUESTION:

1962-1998,2004:
We are interested in how people are getting along financially these
days. Would you say that (1962,1966-1974: you [and your family]; 1976 and
later : you [and your family living here]) are better off or worse off
financially than you were a year ago.
2000-2002:
Would you say that you (and your family) (2000 FACE-TO-FACE ONLY: living
here) are better off, worse off, or just about the same financially as
you were a year ago?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Better Now
2. Same (2004: Volunteered)
3. Worse Now

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. DK; uncertain; depends
0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972); R
    assigned to Post administration and no Post IW
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to be administered this
question in either the Pre or Post.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1962: 620014
1966: 660044
1968: 680275
1970: 700048(type 1)
1972: 720501
1974: 742313
1976: 763137
1978: 780321
1980: 800147
1982: 820325
1984: 840139
1986: 860355
1988: 880206
1990: 900416
1992: 923425
1994: 940902
1996: 960337
1998: 980414
2000: 000398,001410
2002: 023025
2004: 043061
2008: 083057
2012: finance_finpast

===
VCF0880a

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: How Much Better/Worse Off in Past Year

QUESTION:

1984-1998,2004:
We are interested in how people are getting along financially these
days. Would you say that you and your family living here are better off
or worse off financially than you were a year ago.
2000-2002:
Would you say that you (and your family) (2000 FACE-TO-FACE ONLY: living
here) are better off, worse off, or just about the same financially as
you were a year ago? Is that much better/worse off or somewhat
better/worse off?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. Same
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; DK/NA if better or worse in past year;
    R assigned to Post administration and no Post IW
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2000 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned to be administered this question
in either the Pre or Post.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840140
1986: 860356
1988: 880207
1990: 900417

1992: 923426
1994: 940903
1996: 960338
1998: 980415
2000: 000398,001410,001412a
2002: 023026
2004: 043061,043062
2008: 083057x
2012: finance_finpast_x,finance_finpast

==

VCF0880b

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Financial Situation Better/Worse in Past Few Years

QUESTION:

During the last few years, has your financial situation been
getting better, getting worse, or has it stayed the same?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Getting better
3. Stayed the same
5. Getting worse

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560078
1958: 580049
1960: 600075
1964: 640129

==

VCF0881

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Better or Worse Off in Next Year

QUESTION:

1956-1960,1964:
Now looking ahead and thinking about the next few years, do you expect
your financial situation will stay about the way it is now, get better,
or get worse.
1962,1966 AND LATER:
Now looking ahead--do you think that a year from now (1962,1966-1970:
you people; 1972,1974: you [and your family]; 1976 AND LATER: you [and
your family; 2000 TELEPHONE,2004: living here]) will be better off
financially or worse off, or just about the same as now?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Better off (1956-1960,1964: get better)
2. Same (1956-1960,1964: stay the way it is)
3. Worse off (1956-1960,1964: get worse)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; both; uncertain
0. NA; Form B (1986); no Pre IW; no Post IW; form
    II,III,IV (1972); R assigned to Post administration
    and no Post IW (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Weight variable VCF0010/VCF0010A must be used if
distributions including 1970 data are desired: see VCF0010.
Note that use of VCF0010/VCF0010A as a weight reduces the
1970 total N for this variable: form 2 whites who should appear as
code 0 INAP cases are excluded from the 1970 total N.
1992 NOTE:
This question was asked in both the pre and post; the pre data have
been incorporated here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0010x/VCF0010y/VCF0010z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560080
1958: 580051
1960: 600077
1962: 620017
1964: 640131
1966: 660047

1968: 680278
1970: 700050(type 1)
1972: 720504
1974: 742314
1976: 763138
1978: 780322
1980: 800148
1982: 820326
1984: 840151
1986: 860358
1988: 880208
1990: 900420
1992: 923427
1994: 940904
1996: 960339
1998: 980416
2000: 000403,001414
2004: 043063
2008: 083058

===

FEDERAL SPENDING - GENERAL TEXT

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which
(1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see
spending increased and for which would you like to see spending
decreased:
Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept
about the same?

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Order of spending items (see also VCF9046-9050) varied among study
years.   In some years, the series was administered with a break mid-
sequence.-1

===
VCF0886

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Poor/Poor People

QUESTION:

1992,1996: poor people
2000,2012: aid to the poor
2002,2004: aid to poor people

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same

3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding this variable.
2002 NOTE 1:
There were two series of Federal spending questions. Respondents were
randomly assigned to one series in the Pre and the alternate in the
Post. Within each series, respondents were randomly assigned to one of
two possible orderings.
2002 NOTE 2:
Respondents were randomly assigned one of two wordings: "aid to poor
people" or "aid to the working poor". Data from "aid to poor people"
are represented here.
2012 NOTE:
The optional category "cut out entirely" was dropped as a code
in the federal spending battery.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923817
1996: 960565
2000: 000680
2002: 025115x
2004: 043172
2008: 083148
2012: fedspend_poor

===
VCF0887

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Child Care

QUESTION:

Child care

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880382
1990: 900385
1992: 923813
1994: 940824
1996: 960564
2000: 000685
2002: 025110x
2004: 043170
2008: 083146
2012: fedspend_child

===
VCF0888

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Dealing with Crime

QUESTION:

Dealing with crime

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:

----
9.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840997
1992: 923814
1994: 940825
1996: 960563
2000: 000684
2002: 025109x
2004: 043168
2008: 083148\4
2012: fedspend_crime

==

VCF0889

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Aids Research/Fight Aids

QUESTION:

1988,1990: fighting the disease AIDS
1992-1996,2000,2002: AIDS research

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Increased
2.   Same
3.   Decreased or cut out entirely
8.   DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880352
1990: 900379
1992: 923727
1994: 940821
1996: 960498
2000: 000677
2002: 025106x

===
VCF0890

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Public Schools

QUESTION:

Public schools

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were randomly assigned one of two wordings: "public school"
or "big-city schools". Data for "public schools" are represented here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: 840998
1988: 880349
1990: 900383
1992: 923818
1994: 940823
1996: 960562
2000: 000683
2002: 025108x
2004: 043166
2008: 083142
2012: fedspend_schools

==
VCF0891

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Fin Aid for College Students

QUESTION:

Financial aid for college students

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased or cut out entirely
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0892

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Foreign Aid

QUESTION:

Foreign aid

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased or cut out entirely
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0893

ISSUES: Federal Spending- The Homeless

QUESTION:

1988: the homeless
1990: government assistance for the homeless
1992,1996: solving the problem of the homeless

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased or cut out entirely
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: 880385
1990: 900384
1992: 923730
1996: 960501

==

VCF0894

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Welfare Programs

QUESTION:

Welfare programs

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased

2. Same
3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes for, and preceding,
VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1992: 923726
1994: 940820
1996: 960497
2000: 000676
2002: 025107x
2004: 043169
2008: 083145
2012: fedspend_welfare

==
VCF0900

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Congressional District of Residence

QUESTION:

Congressional district of interview

VALID_CODES:

Codes 1-53 Plus:

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. District of Columbia
00. NA; wrong district identified
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Congressional district corresponds to the districting in effect during
the year of the interview, with the exception of California only for
1974: the redistricting occurring in California during 1974 was not
completed in time to be represented in the 1974 study. District
numbers associated with 1974 California respondents are the district
numbers which were in effect in 1973.
Note that in some years several cases of corrections have been made to
states and/or Congressional districts due to inconsistencies or errors
in the STUDY data.
1992 NOTE 1:
For panel cases, this provides the congressional district of R's
original address (1990) rather than that of the address at which R was
residing in 1992. Additionally, even if R did not move since 1990, the
redistricting which took place in many areas in 1992 may have changed
R'S district number in 1992.
1992 NOTE 2:
Late in 1994, it was discovered that in 50 cases an incorrect CD number
had been assigned. These errors affect all questions related to House
race which are administered according to assigned-CD candidate names.
In the introduction to this codebook (p. iv) is a listing of 1992 (pre)
case IDs with correct congressional districts, however no data have
been changed in this file as a result. Users of CDF data can delete
these cases from affected vars if desired.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases who moved since their original, VCF0900 records the
congressional district where R was interviewed for the current Study.
The candidate list information also corresponds to the district where R
was residing during the current Study interview.
1996 NOTE:
same as 1994.
2000 NOTE:
3 cases were misidentified PA in the Preload but should have been NJ.
These cases are coded 00.
2002 NOTE:
Preload district assignment was incorrect in 1 case.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: 560008
1958: 580010
1960: 600011
1964: 640013
1966: 660011

1968: 680015
1970: 700025(type 0)
1972: 720006
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780011
1980: 800007
1982: 820019
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880013
1990: 900013
1992: 923019
1994: 940015
1996: 960107
1998: 980090
2000: 000083
2002: 021202
2004: 041202,041204
2012: sample_district

==

VCF0900a

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- ICPSR

QUESTION:

ICPSR state and Congressional district of interview

MISSING_CODES:

9999. 0,98,99 in VCF0900 or 00,99 in VCF0901
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0901 and VCF0900.
2004 NOTE:
The 2004 study included a variable comparable to this, thus 2004
data is not built from VCF0901 and VCF0900.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007,560008
1958: 580009,580010
1960: 600011,600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012,640013
1966: 660010,660011
1968: 680014,680015
1970: 700018(type 0),700025(type 0)
1972: 720004,720006
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780011,780012
1980: 800007,800008
1982: 820015,820019
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012,880013
1990: 900012,900013
1992: 920017,920019
1994: 940014,940015
1996: 960107,960109
1998: 980086,980090
2000: 000079,000083
2002: 021201,021202
2004: 041202,041204c
2012: sample_state,sample_district

===

VCF0900b

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- FIPS

QUESTION:

FIPS state and Congressional district of interview

MISSING_CODES:

9999. 00,98,99 in VCF0900 or 00,99 in VCF0901a
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0901a and VCF0900.
2004 NOTE:
The 2004 study included a variable comparable to this, thus 2004
data is not built from VCF0901a and VCF0900.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007,560008
1958: 580009,580010
1960: 600011,600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012,640013
1966: 660010,660011
1968: 680014,680015
1970: 700018(type 0),700025(type 0)
1972: 720004,720006
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780011,780012
1980: 800007,800008
1982: 820015,820019
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012,880013
1990: 900012,900013
1992: 920017,920019
1994: 940014,940015
1996: 960107,960109
1998: 980086,980090
2000: 000079,000083
2002: 021201,021202
2004: 041202,041204b
2012: sample_state,sample_district

==

VCF0900c

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- Postal Abbrev and CD

QUESTION:

Postal code and Congressional district of interview

MISSING_CODES:

9999. 00,98,99 in VCF0900 or blank in VCF0901b
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0901b and VCF0900.
2004 NOTE:

The 2004 study included a variable comparable to this, thus 2004
data is not built from VCF0901b and VCF0900.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Character-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007,560008
1958: 580009,580010
1960: 600011,600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012,640013
1966: 660010,660011
1968: 680014,680015
1970: 700018(type 0),700025(type 0)
1972: 720004,720006
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780011,780012
1980: 800007,800008
1982: 820015,820019
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012,880013
1990: 900012,900013
1992: 920017,920019
1994: 940014,940015
1996: 960107,960109
1998: 980086,980090
2000: 000079,000083
2002: 021201,021202
2004: 041202,041204a
2012: sample_state,sample_district

==
VCF0901

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Code- ICPSR

QUESTION:

State of interview - ICPSR code

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA

00. Wrong state identified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES".
GENERAL NOTE:
NES samples are not designed to be representative at the state level.
Samples include cases from only some U.S. states; in many states only a
small handful of interviews are taken.
1992 NOTE:
For panel cases, this provides the state of R's original address (when
sample selection was made in 1990), rather than the state in which R
was residing in 1992.
1994 NOTE:
For panel cases who moved since their original, VCF0900 records the
congressional district where R was interviewed for the current Study.
The candidate list information also corresponds to the district where R
was residing during the current Study interview.
1996 NOTE:
same as 1994.
2000 NOTE:
3 cases were misidentified PA in the Preload but should have been NJ.
These cases are coded 00.
2004 NOTE:
This Is the ICPSR code for the state corresponding to the
respondent's sampling address.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007
1958: 580009
1960: 600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012
1966: 660010
1968: 680014
1970: 700018(type 0)
1972: 720004
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780012
1980: 800008
1982: 820015

1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012
1990: 900012
1992: 923017
1994: 940014
1996: 960109
1998: 980086
2000: 000079
2002: 021201
2004: 041203
2012: sample_state

===

VCF0901a

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Code- FIPS

QUESTION:

State of interview - FIPS code

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA
00. Wrong district identified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix "STATE AND COUNTRY CODES".
See notes VCF0901.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007
1958: 580009
1960: 600010
1962: 620003
1964: 640012
1966: 660010
1968: 680014
1970: 700018(type 0)
1972: 720004

1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780012
1980: 800008
1982: 820015
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012
1990: 900012
1992: 923017
1994: 940014
1996: 960109
1998: 980086
2000: 000079
2002: 021201
2004: 041202
2012: sample_state

===

VCF0901b

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Postal Abbrev

QUESTION:

State of interview - state postal code (abbreviation)

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA; wrong district identified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0901a.
NA, INAP in VCF0901a are represented here as 99. Washington D.C. is
represented as "DC".

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Character-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: 520006
1956: 560007
1958: 580009
1960: 600010

1962: 620003
1964: 640012
1966: 660010
1968: 680014
1970: 700018(type 0)
1972: 720004
1974: 742007
1976: 763007
1978: 780012
1980: 800008
1982: 820015
1984: 840013
1986: 860049
1988: 880012
1990: 900012
1992: 923017
1994: 940014
1996: 960109
1998: 980086
2000: 000079
2002: 021201
2004: 041202
2012: sample_state

===
VCF0902

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Type of U.S. House Race

QUESTION:

Type of House race (district level)

VALID_CODES:
----
12. Democratic incumbent running--Republican challenger
13. Democratic incumbent--other challenger
14. Democratic incumbent running--unopposed
19. Democratic incumbent running--Republican challenger
     and others
21. Republican incumbent running--Democratic challenger
23. Republican incumbent--other challenger
24. Republican incumbent running--unopposed
29. Republican incumbent running--Democratic challenger
     and others
31. Other incumbent running--Democratic challenger
32. Other incumbent running--Republican challenger
34. Other incumbent running--unopposed
35. Other incumbent running--Democratic and Republican
     challengers
36. Other incumbent running--Republican and other
     challengers
37. Other incumbent running--Democratic and other
     challengers

39. Other incumbent running -- Democratic, Republican,
    other challengers
40. Democratic and Republican incumbents running--no
    other candidate (see note)
41. Two Democratic incumbents running (see note)
45. Two Republican incumbents running (see note)
49. Democratic and Republican incumbents running--other
    candidate (see note)
51. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic candidate
    unopposed
52. No incumbent Repr. running--Republican candidate
    unopposed
53. No incumbent Repr. running--other candidate unopposed
55. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and Republican
    candidates
56. No incumbent Repr. running--Republican and other
    candidates
57. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and other
    candidates
59. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and Republican
    and other candidates
83. No identifiable incumbent, Democratic candidate in
    open race due to redistricting
84. No identifiable incumbent, Republican candidate in
    open race due to redistricting
85. No identifiable incumbent, Democratic and Republican
    candidates in open race due to redistricting
89. No identifiable incumbent, Democratic, Republican
    and other candidates in open race due to
    redistricting

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA
00. Washington D.C.; California (1974 only, due to
    redistricting type of race could not be determined);
    wrong district identified; no post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable is available for 1970, 1974 and 1976 as well as 1978 and
later. See warning note below. In some years this variable is not
available for no-post cases.
ANES samples are not designed to be representative at the Congressional
district level. Samples include cases from only some U.S.
Congressional districts; for most congressional districts in which
interviewing actually takes place, only a small number of interviews
are taken.
Codes 40,41,45 and 49 apply as a result of redistricting: for other
Cumulative Data File variables referent to "the incumbent" and "the
challenger" the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent' and the other

candidate (incumbent previously not representing R's sample location)
has been considered the 'challenger'; if two incumbents ran against
each other due to redistricting but neither had previously represented
R's location, neither candidate has been treated as an 'incumbent'.
SEE 2012 NOTE FOR CHANGE IN 2012.
1970,1974,1976 WARNING NOTE:
In 1970, 1974 and 1976, no type of race var was present in the original
NES datasets. Data for these years have been added to VCF0902 by
implementing a case-by-case determination of type of race for every R's
congressional district through consultation of reference materials.
The resultant data in VCF0902 for these years have been checked
somewhat, but perfect accuracy cannot be guaranteed due to the nature
of attempting case-by-case coding. The type of race established in
VCF0902 (and data in VCF0904-905 by derivation) for 1970, 1974 and 1976
should be used with caution and at the user's risk.
1978 NOTE:
1978 data in this variable do not exactly match the 1978 Study data:
several congressional districts in 1978 were not accurately coded for
for type of House race. MS03 was coded as 14 in the original 1978 data
but should have been coded 12 (24 cases); NY19 was coded as 12 in the
original 1978 data but should have been coded 14 (9 cases); NY38 was
coded as 21 but should have been coded 24 (14 cases). In VCF0902 these
cases have been corrected. However, note that in other Cumulative Data
File 900s-series congressional vars except for VCF0904, VCF0905 and
VCF1004-1014, candidate-level data continue to accord with the
original 1978 study designated type of race for MS03, NY19 and NY38.
1984 NOTE:
1 case in TX22 and 1 case in WA01 were mistakenly coded 65 in the
Study dataset and have been corrected to 55 here. Also, 1 case in WI05
was mistakenly coded 13 and has been corrected to 14 here. 1 case in
OH08 and 1 case in WI09 were mistakenly coded 12 and have been
corrected to 21 here. Finally, 4 cases in CA38 were incorrectly coded
(1 as 13, 3 as 21) and have been corrected to 12 here. These changes
have been reflected in VCF1004 and VCF1005.
1992 NOTE 1:
For panel cases, this provides the type of race for the 1992
congressional district of R's original address (1990) rather than the
address to which R may have moved by the time of the 1992 interview(s).
1992 NOTE 2:
Late in 1994, it was discovered that in 50 cases an incorrect CD number
had been assigned. These errors affect all questions related to House
race which were administered according to assigned-CD candidate names.
In the introduction to this codebook is a listing of case IDs with
correct districts, however no data have been changed in this file as a
result. Users can delete these cases from affected vars if desired.
1994 NOTE:
Codes represent type of race in district of interview location for the
current Study year.
1996 NOTE 1:
same as 1994.
1996 NOTE 2:
14 Pre interviews were conducted before the status of the congressional
race in R's district assumed its final form. These cases are flagged
in 1996 Study variable V960127, and the race type projected at the time

the Pre interview was administered is documented in 1996 Study variable
V960128. (In such cases Pre survey data are consistent with V960128.)
1998 NOTE:
2 districts had the incorrect type of race identified, and the 1998
instrument was administered according to the incorrect type of House
race. Cumulative Data File variables utilize 1998 data which have not
had corrections made: In 1998, cases in AL07 should have been type
race 14 (instead of 24); cases in CA41 should have been type race 55
(instead of 12).
2000 NOTE:
3 cases were misidentified PA in the Preload but should have been NJ.
These cases are coded 00.
2002 NOTE:
Code 55 includes 2 cases from LA05 where a Democratic and 2 Republican
candidates were running.
2004 NOTE:
The extent of the Texas redistricting prior to the 2004 election
produced House races with incumbents running in areas where he or
she had provided little or no prior representation, thus no Texas
candidate has been identified as a true incumbent (running or
retiring) for the new Texas districts (House type race 44-49).
2012 NOTE:
This variable describes type of race at district level.
In 2012, for the first time it was possible to identify at case level
the Respondent's previous (pre-redistricting) House representative (in
effect, real case-level 'incumbent') according to Congressional
representation for the specific location of the respondent household;
these identifications cannot, however, be qualified as the 'incumbents'
in VCF0902-VCF0905,VCF0908, which can only identify whether or not a
candidate running for Congress in 2012 was in office in Congress prior
to the 2012 Congressional elections.
The extent of redistricting in 2012 prohibited singling out, at
district level, one candidate who not only ran in 2012 to represent
households within the boundaries of the new district which corresponded
to R's household location AND who was also, prior to the redistricting,
the U.S. House representative for households within the boundaries of
the previous district that corresponded to R's household location
(prior to redistricting). Overlap of new and old district was often
very small.
Note that VCF1014 (House winner) is coded at district level according
to type House race in VCF0902.
Louisiana district 3 is coded for House race type 45; a Democratic
challenging candidate also ran in the district.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780004
1980: 800740
1982: 820006
1984: 840059
1986: 860043
1988: 880050
1990: 900058
1992: 923021
1994: 940017
1996: 960097
1998: 980065
2000: 000194
2002: 024500a
2004: 044502
2012: typerace2012_hse

==

VCF0903

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Is House Incumbent Running

QUESTION:

Incumbent candidate - checkpoint

VALID_CODES:
----
1. US House Representative is running for re-election in
     R's district
2. US House Representative is NOT running for re-
     election in R's district ('retiring')

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
     wrong district identified (2000); Washington D.C.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
1970, 1974 and 1976 data have been derived from VCF0902 (q.v.).
VCF0903 has not been affected [i.e., no correction is required] by
changes in 1978 data for type of House race (SEE VCF0902). 1984
corrections to original type of race data (SEE VCF0902) are not
reflected in VCF0903-905.
Code 1 includes congressional districts where 2 incumbents ran due to
redistricting.
Note that for districts where 2 incumbents were running due to
redistricting, neither of whom had previously represented R's location,
this variable has been coded 2.
2004 NOTE:
Note that for districts where 2 incumbents were running due to

redistricting, neither of whom had previously represented R's
location, this variable has been coded 2; when unclear whether
either incumbent had previously represented the district then
2 has been coded.
2012 NOTE:
See VCF0902 notes.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780004
1980: 800928
1982: 820175
1984: 840932
1986: 860219
1988: 880714
1990: 900237
1992: 923021
1994: 940017
1996: 961122
1998: 980325
2000: 000194
2002: 024500a
2004: 044502
2012: typerace2012_hse

===
VCF0904

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Is House Incumbent Opposed

QUESTION:

Incumbent opposed/ unopposed - checkpoint

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Running incumbent is unopposed
2. Running incumbent is opposed

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Washington D.C.; no Post IW; wrong district
    identified (2000)
0. No incumbent running in CD
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
1970, 1974 and 1976 data have been derived from VCF0902 (Q.V.).
Code 2 includes opposition from a non-major party candidate if his/her
name was on the candidate list.
Note that for districts where 2 incumbents were running due to
redistricting, neither of whom had previously represented R's location,
this variable has been coded 0.
1978 NOTE:
Several changes to data for type of House race from 1978 have been
made since previous release of the Cumulative Data File (see notes
VCF0902). As a result, VCF0904 and VCF0905 have been changed
accordingly.
1984 NOTE:
Corrections to original type of race data (SEE VCF0902) are not
reflected in VCF0903-905.
2004 NOTE:
The extent of the Texas redistricting prior to the 2004 election
produced House races with incumbents running in areas where he or
she had provided little or no prior representation, thus no Texas
candidate has been identified as a true incumbent (running or
retiring) for the new Texas districts (House type race 44-49).
2012 NOTE:
See VCF0902 notes.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780196
1980: 800740
1982: 820006
1984: 840059
1986: 860230
1988: 880725
1990: 900248
1992: 923021
1994: 940017
1996: 960097
1998: 980065
2000: 000194
2002: 024500a
2004: 044502
2012: typerace2012_hse

==
VCF0905

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Number of Candidates in U.S. House Race

QUESTION:

Number of candidates - checkpoint

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Major party candidate, unopposed
2. Two or more major party candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----

9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    Washington D.C.; candidate(s) not in major party;
    wrong district identified
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable is available for 1970 and 1974-1992. The 1970, 1974 and
1976 data were derived from VCF0902 (Q.V.).
Note that for districts where 2 incumbents were running due to
redistricting, neither of whom had previously represented R's location,
this variable has been coded 0.
1978 NOTE:
Several changes to data for type of House race from 1978 have been
made since previous release of the Cumulative Data File (see notes
VCF0902). As a result, VCF0904 and VCF0905 have been changed
accordingly.
1984 NOTE:
Corrections to original type of race data (SEE VCF0902) are not
reflected in VCF0903-905.
2002 NOTE:
Several cases a where non-major-party incumbent was opposed by a major
party challenger have been coded 2.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780004
1980: 800740

1982: 820168
1984: 840928
1986: 860212
1988: 880050
1990: 900058
1992: 923021
1994: 940017
1996: 960097
1998: 980065
2000: 000194
2002: 024500a
2004: 044502
2012: typerace2012_hse

===

VCF0906

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic House Candidate

QUESTION:

House Democratic candidate - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990. No Democratic candidate
997. R doesn't recognize name
998. DK where to rate; can't judge
999. NA; refused; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone
    IW (1984); Washington D.C.; short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782005
1980: 800855
1982: 820132

1984: 840753
1986: 860136
1988: 880601
1990: 900145
1992: 925311
1994: 940238
1996: 960278
1998: 980239
2000: 001298
2002: 025044
2004: 045046,044502
2012: ftpo_hdc

==

VCF0907

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican House Candidate

QUESTION:

House Republican candidate -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990. no Republican candidate
997. R doesn't recognize name
998. DK where to rate; can't judge
999. NA; refused; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone
     IW (1984); Washington D.C.; short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782006
1980: 800856
1982: 820133
1984: 840754

1986: 860137
1988: 880602
1990: 900146
1992: 925312
1994: 940239
1996: 960279
1998: 980240
2000: 001299
2002: 025045
2004: 045047, 044502
2012: ftpo_hrc

===

VCF0908

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Incumbent House Candidate

QUESTION:

Running House incumbent candidate -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:
----
0 -100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990.   Incumbent is not running
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone
       IW (1984); Washington D.C.; short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0906,VCF0907.
2000 NOTE:
Data for independent running incumbents (VT01 VT05) are included.
2004 NOTE:
The extent of the Texas redistricting prior to the 2004 election
produced House races with incumbents running in areas where he or
she had provided little or no prior representation, thus no Texas
candidate has been identified as a true incumbent (running or
retiring) for the new Texas districts (House type race 44-49).
2012 NOTE:
See notes VCF0902. This represents any district candidates running in
2012 (113th Congress) who had been in the House in any district for the
112th Congress (prior to the redistricting).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782007
1980: 800855,800856
1982: 820132,820133
1984: 840753,840754
1986: 860136,860137
1988: 880601,880602
1990: 900145,900146
1992: 925311,925312
1994: 940238,940239
1996: 960278,960279
1998: 980239,980240
2000: 001298,001299,001303
2002: 025044,025045
2004: 044502, 045046, 045047
2012: ftpo_hdc,ftpo_hrc

===
VCF0909

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Challenger House Candidate

QUESTION:

Challenger to running House incumbent -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:
----
0 -100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990. Incumbent is unopposed or not running
997. R doesn't recognize name
998. DK where to rate; can't judge
999. NA; refused; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone
    IW (1984); Washington D.C.; short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0906,VCF0907.
2012 NOTE:
See notes VCF0908.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782008
1980: 800855,800856
1982: 820132,820133
1984: 840753,840754
1986: 860136,860137
1988: 880601,880602
1990: 900145,900146
1992: 925311,925312
1994: 940238,940239
1996: 960278,960279
1998: 980239,980240
2000: 001298,001299
2002: 025044,025045
2004: 044502,045046,045047
2012: ftpo_hdc,ftpo_hrc

===
VCF0910

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional
candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On
this page are some of these ways.
Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/
who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district.
Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her)
through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No, no contact at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbreviated IW (1984);
   short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Districts in which the respondent's U.S. House Representative was not
running for re-election have been coded 0.
1984 NOTE:
If R was in a district where no incumbent was running BUT the interview
administered was a telephone IW, then VCF0910-917 have been coded 9,
not 0. If R was in a district where no incumbent was running BUT the
interview administered was an abbreviated telephone IW, then VCF0918
has been coded 9, not 0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782033
1980: 800918
1982: 820176,820213,820223
1984: 840936
1986: 860220
1988: 880715
1990: 900238
1992: 925502,925513
1994: 940502,940513

==
VCF0911

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Met Him

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT MET [incumbent] PERSONALLY

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-917;
   no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
   (1984); short form IW (1992)

0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782034
1980: 800919
1982: 820177,820214,820224
1984: 840937
1986: 860221
1988: 880716
1990: 900239
1992: 925503,925514
1994: 940503,940514

==
VCF0912

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Attended Meeting

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [incumbent] SPOKE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-917;
   no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
   (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782035
1980: 800920
1982: 820178,820215,820225
1984: 840938
1986: 860222
1988: 880717
1990: 900240
1992: 925504,925515
1994: 940504,940515

==

VCF0913

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Talked to Staff

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [incumbent's] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN
[incumbent's] OFFICE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF0917;
   no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
   (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782036
1980: 800921
1982: 820179,820216,820226
1984: 840939
1986: 860223
1988: 880718
1990: 900241
1992: 925505,925516
1994: 940505,940516

==
VCF0914

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Received Mail

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [incumbent]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF0917;
   no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
   (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782037
1980: 800922
1982: 820180,820217,820227
1984: 840940
1986: 860224
1988: 880719
1990: 900242
1992: 925506,925517
1994: 940506,940517

==

VCF0915

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Read About

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [incumbent] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF917;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C. telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782038
1980: 800923
1982: 820181,820218,820228
1984: 840941
1986: 860225
1988: 880720
1990: 900243
1992: 925507,925518
1994: 940507,940518

===

VCF0916

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Heard on Radio

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT HEARD [incumbent] ON THE RADIO

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911
    VCF0917; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782039
1980: 800924
1982: 820182,820219,820229
1984: 840942
1986: 860226

1988: 880721
1990: 900244
1992: 925508,925519
1994: 940508,940519

==
VCF0917

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Saw on TV

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT SAW [incumbent] ON TV

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911
    VCF0917; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782040
1980: 800925
1982: 820183,820220,820230
1984: 840943
1986: 860227
1988: 880722
1990: 900245
1992: 925509,925520
1994: 940509,940520

===

VCF0918

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who
have had some contact with [incumbent]?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
     telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   No incumbent candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0910.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782042
1980: 800927
1982: 820185,820222,820232
1984: 840945
1986: 860229
1988: 880724
1990: 900247
1992: 925511,925522
1994: 940511,940522

===

VCF0919

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

How about [challenging candidate] who also ran for has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district.
Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No, no contact at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
   (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running;
   challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Districts in which the respondent's U.S. House representative was not running for re-election have been coded 0.
1984 NOTE:
if R was in a district where no incumbent was running or where the incumbent was unopposed (or opposed by a non-major party challenger) BUT the interview administered was a telephone IW, then VCF0919-926 have been coded 9, not 0. If R was in a district where no incumbent was running or where the incumbent was unopposed (or opposed by a non-major party challenger) BUT the interview administered was an abbreviated telephone IW, then VCF0927 has been coded 9, not 0.
1986 NOTE:
in the 1986 Study data, 8 major party challengers to the running U.S. House incumbent were mistakenly excluded from challenger data (6 Republican challengers, 2 Democratic challengers). Contact data for these individuals have been coded 9 (NA) in VCF0919-927 and VCF0947.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782043
1980: 800929
1982: 820186,820213,820223
1984: 840946
1986: 860231
1988: 880726

1990: 900249
1992: 925502,925513
1994: 940502,940513

==

VCF0920

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Met Him

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT MET [challenger] PERSONALLY

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
    contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
    "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782044
1980: 800930
1982: 820187,820214,820224
1984: 840947
1986: 860232
1988: 880727
1990: 900250
1992: 925503,925514
1994: 940503,940514

===

VCF0921

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Attended Meeting

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [challenger] SPOKE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
     no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
     (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
     contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
     "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782045
1980: 800931
1982: 820188,820215,820225
1984: 840948
1986: 860233
1988: 880728
1990: 900251
1992: 925504,925515
1994: 940504,940515

===

VCF0922

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Talked to Staff

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [challenger's] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN
[challenger's] OFFICE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
    contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
    "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782046
1980: 800932
1982: 820189,820216,820226
1984: 840949
1986: 860234
1988: 880729
1990: 900252
1992: 925505,925516
1994: 940505,940516

===
VCF0923

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Received Mail

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [challenger]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
     no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
     (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
     contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
     "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782047
1980: 800933
1982: 820190,820217,820227
1984: 840950
1986: 860235
1988: 880730
1990: 900253
1992: 925506,925517
1994: 940506,940517

==
VCF0924

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Read About

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [challenger] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
    contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
    "other;" challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782048
1980: 800934
1982: 820191,820218,820228
1984: 840951
1986: 860236
1988: 880731
1990: 900254
1992: 925507,925518
1994: 940507,940518

===
VCF0925

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Heard on Radio

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT HEARD [challenger] ON THE RADIO

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
    contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
    "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782049
1980: 800935
1982: 820192,820219,820229
1984: 840952
1986: 860237
1988: 880732
1990: 900255
1992: 925508,925519
1994: 940508,940519

===
VCF0926

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Saw on TV

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT SAW [challenger] ON TV

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0919-926;
    no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW

    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no
    contact; only contact mentioned is an unspecified
    "other"; challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782050
1980: 800936
1982: 820193,820220,820230
1984: 840953
1986: 860238
1988: 880733
1990: 900256
1992: 925509,925520
1994: 940509,940520

===

VCF0927

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who
have had some contact with [challenger]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running;
    challenger not in major party
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0919.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782052
1980: 800938
1982: 820195,820222,820232
1984: 840955
1986: 860240
1988: 880735
1990: 900258
1992: 925511,925522
1994: 940511,940522

==

VCF0928

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

QUESTION:

Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative
from this district/ who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from
this district].
Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her)
through any of these ways?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No, no contact at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R was in a district where no Democratic candidate was running BUT

the interview administered was a telephone IW, then VCF0928-935 have
been coded 9, not 0. If R was in a district where no Democratic
candidate was running BUT the interview administered was an abbreviated
telephone IW, then VCF0936 has been coded 9, not 0.
1986 NOTE:
In the 1986 Study dataset, 8 major party challengers to the running
U.S. House incumbent were mistakenly excluded from challenger data (SEE
VCF0919). Two of the omitted challengers were Democratic: contact
data for them appear in code 9 (NA) in VCF0928- VCF0936 and VCF0948.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782013
1980: 800918,800929,800939
1982: 820176,820186,820213,820267
1984: 840936,840946,840968
1986: 860220,860231,860241
1988: 880715,880726,880736
1990: 900238,900249,900259
1992: 925502
1994: 940502

===
VCF0929

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Met Him

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT MET [Democratic candidate] PERSONALLY

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
    VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782014
1980: 800919,800930,800940
1982: 820177,820187,820214,820268
1984: 840937,840947,840969
1986: 860221,860232,860242
1988: 880716,880727,880737
1990: 900239,900250,900260
1992: 925503
1994: 940503

===
VCF0930

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Attended Meeting

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [Democratic candidate]
SPOKE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
     VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
     telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
     contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782015
1980: 800920,800931,800941
1982: 820178,820188,820215,820269
1984: 840938,840948,840970
1986: 860222,860233,860243
1988: 880717,880728,880738
1990: 900240,900251,900261
1992: 925504
1994: 940504

===
VCF0931

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Talked to Staff

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [Democratic candidate] STAFF OR
SOMEONE IN [Democratic candidate's] OFFICE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
    VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782016
1980: 800921,800932,800942
1982: 820179,820189,820216,820270
1984: 840939,840949,840971
1986: 860223,860234,860244
1988: 880718,880729,880739
1990: 900241,900252,900262
1992: 925505
1994: 940505

===
VCF0932

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Received Mail

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [Democratic candidate]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
    VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0933

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Read About

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [Democratic candidate] IN A NEWSPAPER OR
MAGAZINE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
   VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
   telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

1980: 800923,800934,800944
1982: 820181,820191,820218,820272
1984: 840941,840951,840973
1986: 860225,860236,860246
1988: 880720,880731,880741
1990: 900243,900254,900264
1992: 925507
1994: 940507

==
VCF0934

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Heard on Radio

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT HEARD [Democratic candidate] ON THE RADIO

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929-VCF935;
     no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
     (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
     contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782019
1980: 800924,800935,800945
1982: 820182,820192,820219,820273
1984: 840942,840952,840974
1986: 860226,860237,860247
1988: 880721,880732,880742

1990: 900244,900255,900265
1992: 925508
1994: 940508

==

VCF0935

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Saw on TV

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT SAW [Democratic candidate] ON TV

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929
    VCF0935; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782020
1980: 800925,800936,800946
1982: 820183,820193,820220,820274
1984: 840943,840953,840975
1986: 860227,860238,860248
1988: 880722,880733,880743
1990: 900245,900256,900266
1992: 925509
1994: 940509

==

VCF0936

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who
have had some contact with [Democratic candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Democratic candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0928.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782022
1980: 800927,800938,800948
1982: 820185,820195,820222,820276
1984: 840945,840955,840977
1986: 860229,860240,860250
1988: 880724,880735,880745
1990: 900247,900258,900268
1992: 925511
1994: 940511

===

VCF0937

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

QUESTION:

Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative

from this district/ who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from
this district].
Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her)
through any of these ways?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW
    (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R was in a district where no Republican candidate was running BUT
the interview administered was a telephone IW, then VCF0928-935 have
been coded 9, not 0. If R was in a district where no Republican
candidate was running BUT the interview administered was an abbreviated
telephone IW, then VCF0936 has been coded 9, not 0.
1986 NOTE:
In the 1986 Study dataset, 8 major party challengers to the running
U.S. House incumbent were mistakenly excluded from challenger data (SEE
VCF0919). Six of the omitted challengers were Republican: contact
data for them appear in code 9 (NA) in VCF0928- VCF0936 and VCF0948.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782023
1980: 800918,800929,800949
1982: 820176,820186,820223,820277
1984: 840936,840946,840978
1986: 860220,860231,860251
1988: 880715,880726,880746
1990: 900238,900249,900269
1992: 925513
1994: 940513

===

VCF0938

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Met Him

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT MET [Republican candidate] PERSONALLY

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
   VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
   telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782024
1980: 800919,800930,800950
1982: 820177,820187,820224,820278
1984: 840937,840947,840979
1986: 860221,860232,860252
1988: 880716,880727,880747
1990: 900239,900250,900270
1992: 925514
1994: 940514

===
VCF0939

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Attended Meeting

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [Republican candidate] SPOKE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
   VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
   telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782025
1980: 800920,800931,800951
1982: 820178,820188,820225,820279
1984: 840938,840948,840980
1986: 860222,860233,860253
1988: 880717,880728,880748
1990: 900240,900251,900271
1992: 925515
1994: 940515

==
VCF0940

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Talked to Staff

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [Republican candidate's] STAFF OR
SOMEONE IN [Republican candidate's] OFFICE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
   VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782026
1980: 800921,800932,800952
1982: 820179,820189,820226,820280
1984: 840939,840949,840981
1986: 860223,860234,860254
1988: 880718,880729,880749
1990: 900241,900252,900272
1992: 925516
1994: 940516

==
VCF0941

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Received Mail

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [Republican candidate]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:

----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
    VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact;
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782027
1980: 800922,800933,800953
1982: 820180,820190,820227,820281
1984: 840940,840950,840982
1986: 860224,860235,860255
1988: 880719,880730,880750
1990: 900242,900253,900273
1992: 925517
1994: 940517

==
VCF0942

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Read About

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [Republican candidate] IN A NEWSPAPER OR
MAGAZINE

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
    VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)

0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782028
1980: 800923,800934,800954
1982: 820181,820191,820228,820282
1984: 840941,840951,840983
1986: 860225,860236,860256
1988: 880720,880731,880751
1990: 900243,900254,900274
1992: 925518
1994: 940518

===
VCF0943

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Heard on Radio

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT HEARD [Republican candidate] ON THE RADIO

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
   VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
   telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
   contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782029
1980: 800924,800935,800955
1982: 820182,820192,820229,820283
1984: 840942,840952,840984
1986: 860226,860237,860257
1988: 880721,880732,880752
1990: 900244,900255,900275
1992: 925519
1994: 940519

===

VCF0944

CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Saw on TV

QUESTION:

Which ones?
RESPONDENT SAW [Republican candidate] ON TV

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938
    VCF0944; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only
    contact mentioned is an unspecified "other"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782030
1980: 800925,800936,800956
1982: 820183,820193,820230,820284
1984: 840943,840953,840985
1986: 860227,860238,860258
1988: 880722,880733,880753
1990: 900245,900256,900276
1992: 925520
1994: 940520

==
VCF0945

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who
have had some contact with [Republican candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. No Republican candidate running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0937.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 782032
1980: 800927,800938,800958
1982: 820185,820195,820232,820286
1984: 840945,840955,840987
1986: 860229,860240,860260
1988: 880724,880735,880755
1990: 900247,900258,900278
1992: 925522
1994: 940522

==
VCF0946

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

QUESTION:

Number of specified contacts made with running incumbent candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No contacts
1. One contact
2. Two contacts
3. Three contacts
4. Four contacts
5. Five contacts
6. Six contacts
7. Seven contacts

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. Incumbent not running
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0911-917.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable does not count contacts other than the 7 specified
types of contact.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0946a

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

QUESTION:

Contact with running incumbent? (YES/NO)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact
5. No, no contact

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. MD in VCF0946
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This var collapses VCF0946.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0947

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

QUESTION:

Number of specified contacts made with challenger to running
incumbent candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No contacts
1. One contact
2. Two contacts
3. Three contacts
4. Four contacts
5. Five contacts
6. Six contacts
7. Seven contacts

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. Incumbent not running or running unopposed
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone
    IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0920-926.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable does not count contacts other than the 7 specified
types of contact.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0947a

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

QUESTION:

Contact with challenger to running incumbent? (YES/NO)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact
5. No, no contact

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. MD in VCF0947
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This var collapses VCF0947.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0948

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- U.S. House Democratic Cand

QUESTION:

Number of specified contacts made with Democratic candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No contacts
1. One contact
2. Two contacts
3. Three contacts
4. Four contacts
5. Five contacts
6. Six contacts
7. Seven contacts

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. Democrat not running
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone
   IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0928-935.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable does not count contacts other than the 7 specified
types of contact.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0948a

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

QUESTION:

Contact with Democratic candidate? (YES/NO)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact
5. No, no contact

MISSING_CODES:

----
0. MD in VCF0948
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This variable collapsed from VCF0948.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0949

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- U.S. House Republican Cand

QUESTION:

Number of specified contacts made with Republican candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. No contacts
1. One contact
2. Two contacts
3. Three contacts
4. Four contacts
5. Five contacts
6. Six contacts
7. Seven contacts

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. Republican not running
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone
    IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Derived from VCF0937-944.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable does not count contacts other than the 7 specified
types of contact.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0949a

CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

QUESTION:

Contact with Republican candidate? (YES/NO)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact
5. No, no contact

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. MD in VCF0949
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This var collapses VCF0949.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0950

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)

0. Incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Districts where the incumbent was not running have been coded 0.
1984 NOTE:
if R was in a district where the U.S. House representative was not
running for re-election BUT the interview administered was an
abbreviated telephone IW, then VCF0950-960 have been coded 9, not 0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780227
1980: 800959
1982: 820196,820233,820250
1984: 840956
1986: 860282
1988: 880780
1990: 900303
1992: 925701
1994: 940628

===
VCF0951

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Express Opinion

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Was it to express an opinion?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
   telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;

incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780228
1980: 800960
1982: 820197,820234,820251
1984: 840957
1986: 860283
1988: 880781
1990: 900304
1992: 925702
1994: 940629

==

VCF0952

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Information

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Was it to seek information?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;
    incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780229
1980: 800961
1982: 820198,820235,820252
1984: 840958
1986: 860284
1988: 880782
1990: 900305
1992: 925703
1994: 940630

==
VCF0953

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Help

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Was it to seek help on a problem (/problem that you had)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;
    incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780230
1980: 800962
1982: 820199,820236,820253
1984: 840959
1986: 860285
1988: 880783
1990: 900306
1992: 925704
1994: 940631

==
VCF0954

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Response to Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Did you get a response from [running U.S. House incumbent] or
someone in his/her office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;
    incumbent not running; type of contact NA (1992
    ONLY: NA in VCF0951-953)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780231
1980: 800963
1982: 820200,820237,820254
1984: 840960
1986: 860286
1988: 880784
1990: 900307
1992: 925705
1994: 940632

==
VCF0955

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Satisfied w/Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Did you get a response from [running U.S. House incumbent] or
someone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) How satisfied were you with the response: very satisfied,
somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
4. Not very satisfied
5. Not at all satisfied

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. never (or DK/NA if) received response; never
    (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; incumbent not
    running; type of contact NA (1992 Only: NA in
    VCF09451-953)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780232
1980: 800964
1982: 820201,820238,820255
1984: 840961
1986: 860287
1988: 880785
1990: 900308
1992: 925706
1994: 940633

===
VCF0956

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Know Anyone (Else) Who Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House
incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780233
1980: 800965
1982: 820202,820239,820256
1984: 840962
1986: 860288
1988: 880786
1990: 900309
1992: 925707
1994: 940634

==

VCF0957

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Get Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House
incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
     telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0.   Doesn't know (or DK/NA if knows) of anyone
     else; incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780234
1980: 800966
1982: 820203,820240,820257
1984: 840963
1986: 860289

1988: 880787
1990: 900310
1992: 925708
1994: 940635

===
VCF0958

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Satisfied w/Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House
incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?
Did this (person/group) get a response?
1978-1986: (IF YES:) Was this (person/group) satisfied with the response?
1988-1992: (IF YES:) How satisfied was this (person/group) with the
response?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very satisfied (1978-1984: Yes; satisfied)
2. Somewhat satisfied
4. Not very satisfied (1978-1984: Somewhat dissatisfied)
5. Not at all satisfied (1978-1984: No; not satisfied)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Person/group did not get (or DK/NA if got) a
    response; R does not know (or DK/NA if knows) of
    anyone else; incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780235
1980: 800967
1982: 820204,820241,820258
1984: 840964

1986: 860290
1988: 880788
1990: 900311
1992: 925709
1994: 940636

==

VCF0959

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Would Running U.S. House Incumbent be Helpful with Problem

QUESTION:

If you had (another/a) problem that [running U.S. House incumbent]
could do something about, do you think (he/she) would be very helpful,
somewhat helpful, or not very helpful?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very helpful
2. Somewhat helpful
3. Not very helpful
7. Depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780236
1980: 800968
1982: 820205,820242,820259
1984: 840965
1986: 860291
1988: 880791
1990: 900312
1992: 925712

1994: 940639

==
VCF0960

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Running U.S. House Incumbent Done Anything Special for District

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember anything special that [running U.S. House
incumbent] has done for his/her district or for the people of his/her
district while s/he has been in Congress?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev.
    telephone IW (1984); short form IW (1992)
0. Incumbent not running
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0950.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780237
1980: 800969
1982: 820206,820243,820260
1984: 840966
1986: 860292
1988: 880792
1990: 900316
1992: 925713
1994: 940640

==
VCF0961

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1990 NOTE:
For New Jersey congressional district 01, the U.S. Representative was
neither 'retiring' nor running at the time of the 1990 general
elections. The Representative from NJ01 had campaigned for and been
elected to another office in 1989, and the office of Representative in
NJ 01 was not (in effect) occupied until after the 1990 elections.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780227
1980: 800959
1986: 860282
1990: 900303

===

VCF0962

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Express Opinion

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?
(IF YES:) Was it to express an opinion?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent
    incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780228
1980: 800960
1986: 860283
1990: 900304

==
VCF0963

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Information

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?
(IF YES:) Was it to seek information?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent

incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780229
1980: 800961
1986: 860284
1990: 900305

===
VCF0964

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Help

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?
(IF YES:) Was it to seek help on a problem?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent
    incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780230
1980: 800962
1986: 860285
1990: 900306

==
VCF0965

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Response to Contact with Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?
(IF YES:) Did you get a response from [U.S. House representative] or
someone in his/her office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent
    incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780231

1980: 800963
1986: 860286
1990: 900307

==

VCF0966

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Satisfied w/Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted
[retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her
office?
(IF YES:) Did you get a response from [U.S. House representative] or
someone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) How satisfied were you with the response: very satisfied,
somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
4. Not very satisfied
5. Not at all satisfied

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Never (or DK/NA if) received response; never (or
    DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent incumbent
    (1990, NJ01:10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780232
1980: 800964
1986: 860287
1990: 900308

==

VCF0967

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Know Anyone (Else) Who Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S.
House representative] or anyone in his/her office?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780233
1980: 800965
1986: 860288
1990: 900309

==

VCF0968

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Get Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S.
House representative] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. Doesn't know (or DK/NA if knows) of anyone else; no
   recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780234
1980: 800966
1986: 860289
1990: 900310

==
VCF0969

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Satisfied w/Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S.
House Representative] or anyone in his/her office?
(IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?
1978,1980: (IF YES:) Was this (person/group) satisfied with the response?
1986,1990: (IF YES:) How satisfied was this (person/group) with the
response?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very satisfied (1978,1980: Yes; satisfied)
2. Somewhat satisfied
4. Not very satisfied (1978,1980: Somewhat dissatisfied)
5. Not at all satisfied (1978,1980: No; not satisfied)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)

0. Person/group did not get (of DK/NA if got) a
    response; R does not know (or DK/NA if knows) of
    anyone else; no recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10
    cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780235
1980: 800967
1986: 860290
1990: 900311

==
VCF0970

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Would Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent be Helpful with Problem

QUESTION:

If you had (another/a) problem that [retiring OR running U.S. House
representative] could do something about, do you think (he/she) would
be very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not very helpful?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very helpful
2. Somewhat helpful
3. Not very helpful
7. Depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia
    (1986); short form (1992)
0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780236
1980: 800968
1986: 860291
1990: 900312

===
VCF0971

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent Done Anything Special for District

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember anything special that [retiring OR running
U.S. House representative] has done for his/her district or for the
people of his/her district while s/he has been in Congress?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)
0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0961.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780237
1980: 800969
1986: 860292
1990: 900316

==
VCF0972

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Recall Names of U.S. House Candidates

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--
that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington--[1996-LATER:
Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this
district in November?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No; DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; form II,III,
    IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580095
1964: 640307
1966: 660088
1968: 680378,680379
1970: 700202(type 0)
1972: 720945
1974: 742214
1978: 780115
1980: 800823
1982: 820098
1984: 840737
1986: 860103
1988: 880565
1990: 900107

1992: 925109
1994: 940210
1996: 961006
1998: 980223
2000: 000343

==

VCF0973

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--
that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER:
Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this
district in November?
(IF YES:) Who were they?
(1996-LATER:) What is [NAME'S] party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. NAME:valid,   PARTY: correct
2. NAME:valid,   PARTY: incorrect
3. NAME:valid,   PARTY: DK/NA
4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any
5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6. NAME:DK/NA,   PARTY: any
7. NAME:DK,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    NAME:NA,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    R says s/he recalls no names in VCF0972

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
    Washington D.C.; short form (1992); NA if R
    remembers any names (9 in VCF0972); NA name
    and DK party (1978 only); R's district misidentified
    and R said he/she remembered a name
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
1958, 1964-1974 data were not coded comparably and are excluded.
1978 NOTE:
Tthe second part of code 7 does not apply: it was combined with other
missing data (code 9).
2000 NOTE:
Cases have been coded for 0 recalls in VCF0973-VCF0975 and in VCF0976
for the following: 1 case with district identification NA where R said
he/she recalled no names; 2 cases with district misidentified (see
VCF0900) where R said he/she recalled no names. The last of 3 cases
with misidentified district produced a single recall from R and has

been coded 9 in VCF0973-VCF0975 and 99 in VCF0976.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780118
1980: 800826
1982: 820102
1984: 840741
1986: 860107
1988: 880569
1990: 900111
1992: 925113
1994: 940214
1996: 961010
1998: 980227
2000: 000347

===
VCF0974

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--
that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER:
Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this
district in November? (IF YES:)
Who were they? (2ND MENTION)
[1996-LATER:] What was (NAME'S) party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. NAME:valid,   PARTY: correct
2. NAME:valid,   PARTY: incorrect
3. NAME:valid,   PARTY: DK/NA
4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any
5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6. NAME:DK/NA,   PARTY: any
7. NAME:DK,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    NAME:NA,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    R says s/he recalls no names in VCF0972;
    No second mention

MISSING_CODES:

----
9.   Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
     Washington D.C.; short form (1992); NA if R
     remembers any names (9 in 972); NA and DK party
     (1978 only); R's district misidentified and R said
     he/she remembered a name
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0973.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780121
1980: 800829
1982: 820106
1984: 840745
1986: 860111
1988: 880573
1990: 900115
1992: 925117
1994: 940218
1996: 961014
1998: 980231
2000: 000351

==
VCF0975

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--
that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER:
Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this
district in November? (IF YES:)
Who were they? (3RD MENTION)
[1996-LATER:] What was (NAME'S) party?

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   NAME:valid,   PARTY: correct
2.   NAME:valid,   PARTY: incorrect

3. NAME:valid, PARTY: DK/NA
4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any
5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6. NAME:DK/NA, PARTY: any;
7. NAME:DK, PARTY: DK/NA;
   NAME:NA, PARTY: DK/NA;
   R says s/he recalls no names in VCF0972;
   No second or third interview

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
   Washington D.C.; short form (1992); NA if R
   remembers any names (9 in 972); NA name and DK party
   (1978 only); R's district misidentified and R said
   he/she remembered a name
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0973.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780124
1980: 800832
1982: 820110
1984: 840749
1986: 860115
1988: 880577
1990: 900119
1992: 925121
1994: 940222
1996: 961018
1998: 980235
2000: 000355

===

VCF0976

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Number of Recalled Names of U.S. House Candidates

QUESTION:

Summary: number of correct recalls-- U.S. House candidates

VALID_CODES:

NO NAME CORRECT
00. R's recall of any name(s) incorrect/DK/NA; any party
    mention(s) OR party mentions DK/NA; R says s/he
    recalls no names in VCF0972
ONE CORRECT NAME
10. R's recall correct for one name; party mention
    incorrect/DK/NA
11. R's recall correct for one name; party mention correct
TWO CORRECT NAMES
20. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions
    incorrect/ DK/NA
21. R's recall correct for 2 names; one party mention
    correct
22. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions
    correct
THREE CORRECT NAMES
30. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions
    incorrect/DK/NA
31. R's recall correct for 3 names; one party mention
    correct
32. R's recall correct for 3 names; two party mentions
    correct
33. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions
    correct

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW ;
    Washington D.C.; short form (1992); NA if R remembers
    any names (9 in VCF0972); R's district misidentified
    and R said he/she remembered a name
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Based on VCF0973 - VCF0975

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780115,780118,780121,780124
1980: 800823,800826,800829,800832
1982: 820098,820102,820106,820110

1984: 840737,840741,840745,840749
1986: 860103,860107,860111,860115
1988: 880569,880573,880577
1990: 900111,900115,900119
1992: 925113,925117,925121
1994: 940214,940218,940222
1996: 961010,961014,961018
1998: 980227,980231,980235
2000: 000347,000351,000355

===

VCF0977

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Know If One U.S. House Candidate Was Already in the U.S. House

QUESTION:

1958,1964,1966:
Do you happen to know if (either/the) candidate is already in Congress?
1968:
Do you happen to know if (either one of these candidates/if he) is
already in Congress:
1978 AND LATER:
Do you happen to know if [candidate in district where only 1 candidate
ran] / either [first candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] or
[second candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] was already in the
U.S. House of Representatives before the election?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, candidate was/ one candidate was/ (some years:
    [see VCF0978]: both)
3. No, candidate wasn't/neither candidate was
5. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no major party candidate running; no Post
    IW; abbrev. telephone 1984); Washington D.C.; short
    form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1968 NOTE:
In 1968, 27 respondents were administered incorrect candidate names;
these casea are coded 9.
1996 NOTE:
For districts with 2 major party candidates, the order in which the
Democratic and Republican House candidate names were read within the
question text was randomized.
1998 NOTE:
same as 1996
2000 NOTE:

same as 1996

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580097
1964: 640312
1966: 660093
1968: 680383
1978: 780180
1980: 800912
1982: 820169
1984: 840929,840932
1986: 860213,860216
1988: 880708,880711
1990: 900231,900234
1992: 925435,925438
1994: 940431,940434
1996: 961068,961070
1998: 980299,980301
2000: 001353a,001354

==
VCF0978

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Correct Whether a U.S. House Candidate Was Already in Office

QUESTION:

1958,1964,1966:
Do you happen to know if (either/the) candidate is already in Congress?
(IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:) Which {candidate} was
that?
1968:
Do you happen to know if (either one of these candidates/if he) is
already in Congress? (IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:)
Which one?
1978 AND LATER:
Do you happen to know if [candidate in district where only 1 candidate
ran] / either [first candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] or
[second candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] was already in the
U.S. House of Representatives before the election?
(IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:) Which {candidate} was
that?

VALID_CODES:

----
1. CORRECT: correct incumbency status; correct candidate
   [districts w/incumbents running with major party
   opposition]
2. INCORRECT: incorrect incumbency status; incorrect
   candidate [districts w/incumbents running with major
   party opposition]

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK if incumbent; DK which is incumbent; NA if
   incumbent; NA which is incumbent; no major party
   candidate running; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
   (1984); Washington D.C.; short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0977.
GENERAL NOTE:
If no incumbent was running in R's district and R replied "yes" (1 or
2 major party candidates), then 2 has been coded. If an incumbent was
running unopposed in R's district and R answered "yes," then 1 has
been coded.
If an incumbent was running with major party opposition in R's district
and R answered "yes," then R has been coded according to whether R
correctly identified WHICH candidate was the incumbent.
If R responded that "both" candidates were incumbents but R did not
live in one of the districts where two 'incumbents' were actually
running (due to redistricting), then R's response has been considered
'incorrect'. If, however, there actually were two 'incumbents' in R's
congressional district, then an answer of 'both' OR an answer of either
of the two incumbents' names has been considered 'correct'.
2000 DATA:
1 case where respondent's district was NA and 3 cases where respondent
district was misidentified have been coded 9.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: 580097
1964: 640312
1966: 660094
1968: 680385
1978: 780180,780181
1980: 800913

1982: 820172
1984: 840929,840932
1986: 860213,860216
1988: 880709,880712
1990: 900232,900235
1992: 925436,925439
1994: 940432,940435
1996: 961068,961070
1998: 980299,980301
2000: 000194,001353b,001354

==

VCF0980

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1.   One negative mention (dislikes)
2.   Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3.   Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4.   Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6.   "I don't know anything about this candidate"
     (Volunteered)
7.   DK if liked anything about candidate; liked
     something about candidate but DK what
8.   No Democratic candidate in R's district (includes
     Washington D.C.)
9.   NA if liked anything about candidate; liked
     something about candidate but NA what; no Post
     IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992);
     district NA (2000); district misidentified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Four possible mentions were coded in all original study datasets except
1988 and later, which coded 5.
Rs who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that you
liked about the US House Democratic candidate?" have been coded here
as 0 mentions. "DK" responses to this question and "I don't know
anything about this candidate" responses have been maintained as MD
codes, unlike VCF0401-402 and VCF0405-406, because of the very high
numbers of respondents falling into these categories [for consistency,

NA responses to this question have also been retained as MD]. In
addition, if R responded "yes" to "Is there anything in particular
that you liked about the US House Democratic candidate" but R provided
no mentions (DK or NA in first mention), then R has been coded in
the corresponding MD category in VCF0980.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order in which the
Democratic and Republican House candidate names were administered for
the set of 'likes/dislikes' questions.
1984 AND 1992 NOTE:
For 1984 and 1992: if R was in a district where no Democratic
candidate was running BUT the interview administered was an
abbreviated telephone interview (1984) or a short form interview
(1992), then VCF0980 has been coded 9, not 8.
1998 NOTE:
1 case (0062) that was coded "yes" in the 1998 study data as response
whether there was anything R liked about the Democratic House candidate
should have been coded "I don't know anything about this candidate" but
has been correctly categorized in variables VCF0980 and VCF0981.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780160,780161,780162,780163,780164
1980: 800892,800893,800894,800895,800896
1982: 820148,820149,820150,820151,820152
1984: 840908,840909,840910,840911,840912
1986: 860184,860185,860186,860187,860188
1988: 880674,880675,880676,880677,880678,880679
1990: 900198,900199,900200,900201,900202,900203
1992: 925401,925402,925403,925404,925405,925406
1994: 940401,940402,940403,940404,940405,940406
1996: 961044,961045,961046,961047,961048,961049
1998: 980275,980276,980277,980278,980279,980280
2000: 001328,001329,001330,001331,001332,001333

===
VCF0981

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is/Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S.
House Democratic candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:

----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
    (Volunteered)
7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but DK what
8. No Democratic candidate in R's district (includes
    Washington D.C.)
9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but NA what; no Post
    IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992);
    District NA (2000); district misidentified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0980.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780165,780166,780167,780168,780169
1980: 800897,800898,800899,800900,800901
1982: 820153,820154,820155,820156,820157
1984: 840913,840914,840915,840916,840917
1986: 860189,860190,860191,860192,860193
1988: 880680,880681,880682,880683,880684,880685
1990: 900204,900205,900206,900207,900208,900209
1992: 925407,925408,925409,925410,925411,925412
1994: 940407,940408,940409,940410,940411,940412
1996: 961050,961051,961052,961053,961054,961055
1998: 980281,980282,980283,980284,980285,980286
2000: 001334,001335,001336,001337,001338,001339

===

VCF0982

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Democratic House candidate

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0980,VCF0981)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic House candidate 'likes' minus the
number of Democratic House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0980-VCF0981).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0983

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Democratic House candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
8. Eight or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0980,VCF0981)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Democratic House candidate 'likes' plus the
number of Democratic House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0980+VCF0981).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0984

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is/Was there anything in particular that you liked about [U.S. House
Republican candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
     (Volunteered)
7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked something
     about candidate but DK what
8. No Republican candidate in R's district (includes
     Washington D.C.)
9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked
     something about candidate but NA what; no
     Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
     (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
     (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Four possible mentions were coded in all original study datasets except
1988 and later, which coded 5.
Rs who responded "no" to "Is there anything in particular that you
liked about the US House Republican candidate?" have been coded here
as 0 mentions. "DK" responses to this question and "I don't know
anything about this candidate" responses have been maintained as MD
codes, unlike VCF0401-402 and VCF0405-406, because of the very high
numbers of respondents falling into these categories [for consistency,
NA responses to this question have also been retained as MD]. In
addition, if R responded "yes" to "Is there anything in particular
that you liked about the US House Republican candidate" but R provided
no mentions (DK or NA in first mention), then R has been coded in
the corresponding MD category in VCF0980.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order in which the

Democratic and Republican House candidate names were administered for
the set of 'likes/dislikes' questions.
1984 AND 1992 NOTE:
For 1984 and 1992: if R was in a district where no Republican
candidate was running BUT the interview administered was an
abbreviated telephone interview (1984) or a short form interview
(1992), then VCF0980 has been coded 9, not 8.
1998 NOTE:
1 case (0062) that was coded "yes" in the 1998 study data as response
whether there was anything R liked about the Republican House candidate
should have been coded "I don't know anything about this candidate" but
has been correctly categorized in variables VCF0980 and VCF0981.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780170,780171,780172,780173,780174
1980: 800902,800903,800904,800905,800906
1982: 820158,820159,820160,820161,820162
1984: 840918,840919,840920,840921,840922
1986: 860194,860195,860196,860197,860198
1988: 880686,880687,880688,880689,880690,880691
1990: 900210,900211,900212,900213,900214,900215
1992: 925413,925414,925415,925416,925417,925418
1994: 940413,940414,940415,940416,940417,940418
1996: 961056,961057,961058,961059,961060,961061
1998: 980287,980288,980289,980290,980291,980292
2000: 001340,001341,001342,001343,001344,001345

===

VCF0985

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is/Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S.
House Republican candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
    (Volunteered)
7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but DK what
8. No Republican candidate in R's district (includes
    Washington D.C.)
9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but NA what; no
    Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
    (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF0984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: 780175,780176,780177,780178,780179
1980: 800907,800908,800909,800910,800911
1982: 820163,820164,820165,820166,820167
1984: 840923,840924,840925,840926,840927
1986: 860199,860200,860201,860202,860203
1988: 880692,880693,880694,880695,880696,880697
1990: 900216,900217,900218,900219,900220,900221
1992: 925419,925420,925421,925422,925423,925424
1994: 940419,940420,940421,940422,940423,940424
1996: 961062,961063,961064,961065,961066,961067
1998: 980293,980294,980295,980296,980297,980298
2000: 001346,001347,001348,001349,001350,001351

==

VCF0986

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward Republican House candidate

MISSING_CODES:

----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0984,VCF0985)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican House candidate 'likes' minus the
number of Republican House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0984 and VCF0985).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0987

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of Republican House candidate

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
8. Eight or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0984,VCF0985)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of Republican House candidate 'likes' plus the
number of Republican House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0984+VCF0985).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF0988

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Net affect toward major party House candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,
    VCF0984,VCF0985)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The net affect toward major party House candidates is the difference
between two sums: the sum of Democratic House candidate 'likes' and
Republican House candidate 'dislikes' MINUS the sum of Democratic
House candidate 'dislikes' and Republican House candidate 'likes:'
[VCF0980+VCF0985] - [VCF0981+VCF0984], which is the same as:
VCF0982-VCF0986.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0989

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Major party House candidate salience

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
16. Sixteen or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,
   VCF0984,VCF0985)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Major party House candidate salience is the sum of all 'likes' and
'dislikes' about both the Democratic and Republican House candidates:
[VCF0980+VCF0981] + [VCF0984+VCF0985], which is the same as:
VCF0983+VCF0987.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0990

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Relative salience of major party House candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,
     VCF0984,VCF0985)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Relative salience of major party House candidates is the sum of
'likes' and 'dislikes' about the Democratic House candidate MINUS the
sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes' about the Republican House candidate:
[VCF0980+VCF0981] - [VCF0984+VCF0985], which is the same as:
VCF0983-VCF0987.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0991

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve/Disapprove of Running U.S. U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way [running U.S.
House incumbent Representative] has been handling his/her job?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Approve
5. Disapprove
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----

9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
   short form (1992)
0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1984 NOTE:
If R is in a district where no incumbent was running or where the
incumbent was unopposed (or opposed by a non-major party challenger)
BUT the interview administered was a telephone IW, then VCF0991 has
been coded 9, not 0.
2012 NOTE:
See notes VCF0902. In contrast to variables related to type of House
race (VCF0902-VCF0904), in 2012 approval of House incumbent was asked
about the U.S. House Representative who was in office and representing
the location of respondent household prior to the 2012 elections,
regardless whether that Representative also ran for re-election in the
same district number after new districting was mapped in 2012
(representation for which the November 2012 elections determined).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800972
1982: 820212,820249,820266
1984: 840967
1986: 860353
1988: 880789
1990: 900058,900404
1992: 925710
1994: 940637
1996: 961123
1998: 980326

2000: 001358
2004: 045091,045092
2012: hseinc_approval

==

VCF0992

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve/Disapprove of U.S. Congress

QUESTION:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the U.S. Congress has been
handling its job?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve
5. Disapprove
8. DK; pro-con; both

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: 800783
1982: 820063
1984: 840843
1986: 860100
1988: 880880
1990: 900164
1992: 925949
1994: 940320
1996: 960270
1998: 980236
2000: 000356
2002: 023008
2004: 043036
2012: congapp_job

==

VCF0993

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you liked about [U.S. House
incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
     (Volunteered)
7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked something
     about candidate but DK what
8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district
     (includes Washington D.C.)
9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked
     something about candidate but NA what; no
     Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
     (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
     (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0980,VCF0984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0994

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S. House
incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:

----

0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
    (Volunteered)
7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but DK what
8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district
    (includes Washington D.C.)
9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
    something about candidate but NA what; no
    Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
    (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0981,VCF0985.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF0995

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward incumbent House candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0993,VCF0994)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of incumbent House candidate 'likes' minus the
number of incumbent House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0993-VCF0994).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0996

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of incumbent House candidates

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
8. Eight or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0993,VCF0994)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of incumbent House candidate 'likes' plus the
number of incumbent House candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0993+VCF0994).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0997

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you liked about [challenger to
U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero positive mentions (likes)
1. One positive mention (likes)
2. Two positive mentions (likes)
3. Three positive mentions (likes)
4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
    (Volunteered)
7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked
    something about candidate but DK what
8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district
    (includes Washington D.C.) or incumbent not
    challenged
9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked
    something about candidate but NA what; no
    Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
    (1992); District NA (2000); district misidentified
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0980,VCF0984.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===
VCF0998

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

QUESTION:

Is there anything in particular that you didn't like about [challenger
to U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)
1. One negative mention (dislikes)
2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)
3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)
4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)

MISSING_CODES:
----
6. "I don't know anything about this candidate"
   (VOLUNTEERED)
7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
   something about candidate but DK what
8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district
   (includes Washington D.C.) or incumbent not
   challenged
9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked
   something about candidate but NA what; no
   Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form
   (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
   (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0981,VCF0985.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF0999

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Affect toward challenger to incumbent House candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0997,VCF0998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of House challenger candidate 'likes' minus the
number of House challenger candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0997-VCF0998).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1000

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Salience of challenger to incumbent House candidates

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
8. Eight or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0997,VCF0998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is the number of House challenger candidate 'likes' plus the
number of House challenger candidate 'dislikes' (VCF0997+VCF0998).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1001

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Net affect toward incumbent and challenger House candidates

MISSING_CODES:
----
999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,
    VCF0997,VCF0998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The net affect toward incumbent and challenger House candidates is the
difference between two sums: the sum of incumbent House candidate
'likes' and challenger House candidate 'dislikes' MINUS the sum of
incumbent House candidate 'dislikes' and challenger House candidate
'likes:' [VCF0993+VCF0998] - [VCF0994+VCF0997], which is the same as:
VCF0995-VCF0999.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1002

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Incumbent and challenger House candidate salience

VALID_CODES:
----
0. Zero mentions
.
.
16. Sixteen or more mentions

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,
    VCF0997,VCF0998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Incumbent and challenger House candidate salience is the sum of all
'likes' and 'dislikes' about both the incumbent and challenger House
candidates: [VCF0993+VCF0994] + [VCF0997+VCF0998], which is the
same as: VCF0996+VCF1000.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1003

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

QUESTION:

Relative salience of Incumbent and challenger House candidates

MISSING_CODES:

999.MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,
   VCF0997,VCF0998)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Relative salience of incumbent and challenger House candidates is the
sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes' about the incumbent House candidate
MINUS the sum of 'likes' and 'dislikes' about the challenger House
candidate: [VCF0993+VCF0994] - [VCF0997+VCF0998], which is the same
as: VCF0996-VCF1000.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1004

PARTISANSHIP: Party of Respondent/Party of U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Party ID of respondent and House incumbent

VALID_CODES:
----
1. R is:Democrat;   INCUMBENT:Democrat
2. R is:Republican; INCUMBENT:Republican
3. R is:Democrat;   INCUMBENT:Republican
4. R is:Republican; INCUMBENT:Democrat

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. R does not have major party partisanship or NA if has
    major party partisanship; no incumbent running;

Washington D.C.; California (1974 only: due to
redistricting type of race could not be determined);
incumbent is not member of major party (1994,2000);
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This variable has been created from R's party ID (VCF0301) and
from type of congressional race (VCF0902). The respondent has
been considered a partisan if R was coded as 'strong' 'weak' or leaning.
WARNING:
In years prior to 1978, no 'type of race' var was present in study
datasets. Data were added, however, to 'type of race' cumulative file
var 902 for 1970, 1974 and 1976 using a lengthy case-by-case
procedure. Although the resultant 'type of race' data have been
checked to some extent, the possibility of some error must be
recognized: the 'type of race' established for 1970, 1974 and 1976--
and, as a further result, data in VCF1004 and VCF1005 for 1970, 1974
and 1976 (which have been built using type-of-race data)-- should be
used with caution and at the user's risk.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700184
1974: 742204
1976: 763174
1978: 780004,780433
1980: 800266,800740
1982: 820006,820291
1984: 840059,840318
1986: 860043,860300
1988: 880050,880274
1990: 900058,900320
1992: 923021,923634
1994: 940017,940655
1996: 960420,960097
1998: 980339,980065
2000: 000194,000523
2002: 023036,024500a
2004: 043116,044502
2012: pid_self,pid_x,typerace2012_x

==

VCF1005

PARTISANSHIP: Party of Voting Respondent/Party of U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

Voter from same major party as House incumbent?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. R Voted: R is partisan of same party as incumbent
2. R Voted: R is partisan of same major party as
    challenger OR (unopposed races) R is partisan of
    major party different from incumbent's party
3. R is major party partisan but R did not vote, DK/NA
    if voted, or R voted but not (or DK/NA if) in House
    race

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. R does not have major party partisanship or NA if has
    major party partisanship; no incumbent running;
    Washington D.C.; no Post IW; California (1974 only,
    due to redistricting type of race could not be
    determined); incumbent is not member of major
    party; district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF1004
GENERAL NOTE:
If R has no major party partisanship AND did not vote, then s/he
appears in code 9, not code 3.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700184,700213
1974: 742204,742320
1976: 763174,763671
1978: 780004,780433,780473
1980: 800266,800740,800997
1982: 820006,820291,820505
1984: 840059,840318,840791
1986: 860043,860265,860300

1988: 880050,880274,880766
1990: 900058,900279,900320
1992: 923021,923634,925601
1994: 940017,940655,940601
1996: 960420,960097,961074,961087
1998: 980339,980065,980303,980311
2000: 000194,000523
2002: 023038x,025020,025028a
2004: 043116,044502,045018x,045031x
2012: hsevote2012_x,pid_self,pid_x,typerace2012_x

==

VCF1006

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--
that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington--who ran in
this district this November [1996-LATER: the November election from
this district]?
(IF YES:) Who were they?
1996-LATER: What was [House candidate's] party?
FIRST HOUSE CANDIDATE RECALL-- CANDIDATE CODE

VALID_CODES:
----
31. Democratic candidate in race without running
     incumbent
32. Republican candidate in race without running
     incumbent
33. Democratic incumbent
34. Republican incumbent
35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent
36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent
39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
     party candidate
80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
     party candidate [not used after 1988: combined
     into code 97]

MISSING_CODES:
----
97. Name given not on candidate list for House
99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name
     replies DK or NA; R says s/he does not remember any
     (or DK/NA if remembers any) names; Washington
     D.C.; California (1974 only, due to redistricting
     type of race could not be determined); no Post IW;
     short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In the original ANES datasets 1978 and later, the recall variables
which appeared had codes comparable to the codes appearing VCF1006-
VCF1008. Prior to 1978, however, recall vars in ANES datasets were
coded quite differently, and translating pre-1978 recall data into
VCF1006-1008 data involves lengthy case-by-case consultation to
reference sources for type of race in R's congressional district.
Among pre-1978 studies, recall data have been incorporated for 1970 and
1974 only. NO attempt has been made to include recall data from ANES
studies prior to 1970.
1970 AND 1974 NOTE:
every House candidate was assigned a unique candidate number. Correct
names of candidates given by R in response to the recall question were
coded within 1970 Study data by that individual candidate number.
Indications are that, if the name mentioned by the respondent was not
on a complete list of candidates and candidate numbers which existed
for R's STATE, then the response was simply coded as 'incorrect.'
However, it is not apparent that any attempt was made to ascertain
whether a name "correctly" given was actually a correct name from the
congressional race in R's own district: if R correctly named a
candidate from another-- or wrong-- district within the state, the
response was still included among 'correct' responses. For VCF1006-
VCF1008, individual candidate numbers within the original 1970 recall
var have been examined on a case-by-case basis to determine if the
candidate number given by R corresponded to a name from the race in R's
own congressional district. If so, the response has been included as a
recall. If not, the response has been coded as no recall (99 MD).
This same procedure was followed for including 1974 data, although the
1974 study's method for handling individual candidate codes of names
outside R's district of residence was not specifically described in any
1974 study documentation. Additional note for 1970 and 1974:   to
create the specific candidate-type codes which appear in CDF VCF1006-
VCF1008, each correctly recalled name (once determined appropriate to
R's congressional district) was checked individually according to type
of race to determine the named candidate's exact status (e.g.,
Republican incumbent, etc.).
WARNING NOTE:
The procedures used in the creation of VCF1006-1008 for 1970 and 1974
produced data that have been checked somewhat, but perfect accuracy
cannot be completely guaranteed due to the nature of attempting case-by-
case correction. Data in VCF1006-1008 for 1970 and 1974 should be used
with caution and at the user's risk.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700203
1974: 742215
1978: 780116
1980: 800824
1982: 820100
1984: 840738
1986: 860104
1988: 880566
1990: 900108
1992: 925110
1994: 940211
1996: 961007
1998: 980224
2000: 001207

==

VCF1007

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Second candidate recall

VALID_CODES:
----
31. Democratic candidate in race without running
     incumbent
32. Republican candidate in race without running
     incumbent
33. Democratic incumbent
34. Republican incumbent
35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent
36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent
39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
     party candidate
80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
     party candidate [not used after 1988: combined
     into code 97]

MISSING_CODES:
----
97. Name given not on candidate list for House
99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name
     replies DK or NA; R says s/he does not remember any
     (or DK/NA if remembers any) names; Washington
     D.C.; California (1974 only, due to redistricting
     type of race could not be determined); no further
     mention; no Post IW; short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF1006.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700203
1974: 742216
1978: 780119
1980: 800827
1982: 820104
1984: 840742
1986: 860108
1988: 880570
1990: 900112
1992: 925114
1994: 940215
1996: 961011
1998: 980228
2000: 001211

===

VCF1008

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Third candidate recall

VALID_CODES:
----
31. Democratic candidate in race without running
    incumbent
32. Republican candidate in race without running
    incumbent
33. Democratic incumbent
34. Republican incumbent
35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent
36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent
39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
    party candidate
80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor
    party candidate [not used after 1988: combined
    into code 97]

MISSING_CODES:

----
97. Name given not on candidate list for House
99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name
     replies DK or NA; R says s/he does not remember any
     (or DK/NA if remembers any) names; Washington
     D.C.; California (1974 only, due to redistricting
     type of race could not be determined); no further
     mention; no Post IW; short form (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF1006.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700203
1974: 742217
1978: 780122
1980: 800830
1982: 820108
1984: 840746
1986: 860112
1988: 880574
1990: 900116
1992: 925118
1994: 940219
1996: 961015
1998: 980232
2000: 001215

===
VCF1009

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party of Recalled U.S. House Candidate Name(s)

QUESTION:

Recall summary: major party candidate recalls

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 1 Recall: Democratic candidate
2. 1 Recall: Republican candidate
3. 2 Recalls: both major party candidates (in races

contested by both major parties)
4. 0 Recalls: no major party candidate recall

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   Washington D.C.; no Post IW; short form
     (1992); NA if R recalls any candidate names
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF1006-VCF1008.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700203
1974: 742215,742216,742217
1978: 780116,780119,780122
1980: 800824,800827,800830
1982: 820100,820104,820108
1984: 840738,840742,840746
1986: 860104,860108,860112
1988: 880566,880570,880574
1990: 900108,900112,900116
1992: 925110,925114,925118
1994: 940211,940215,940219
1996: 961007,961011,961015
1998: 980224,980228,980232
2000: 001207,001211,001215

==
VCF1010

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Did Respondent Recall U.S. House Candidate Name From Respondent's Own Party

QUESTION:

Recall summary: does R recall own/other major party candidate?

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   1 Recall: Own major party's candidate
2.   1 Recall: Other major party's candidate
3.   2 Recalls: both major party candidates (in races

contested by both major parties)
4. 0 Recall: no major party candidate recall

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   Washington D.C.; no Post IW; short form
     (1992); NA if R recalls any candidate names;
     R has no major party partisanship or NA if has major
     party partisanship
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0301 and VCF1009.
This variable has been created from R's party ID (VCF0301) and from
House recall summary VCF1009. The respondent has been considered a
partisan if R was 'strong', 'weak' or 'leaning'.
If R has no major party candidate recall AND has no major party
partisanship, then R is coded 9, not 4.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700184,700203
1974: 742204,742216,742217
1978: 780116,780119,780122,780433
1980: 800266,800824,800827,800830
1982: 820099,820103,820107
1984: 840318,840740,840744,840748
1986: 860106,860110,860114,860300
1988: 880274,880568,880572,880576
1990: 900108,900112,900116,900320
1992: 923634,925110,925114,925118
1994: 940655,940211,940215,940219
1996: 960420,961007,961011,961015
1998: 980339,980224,980228,980232
2000: 001207,001211,001215,000523

==

VCF1011

ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for U.S. House Candidate From Own Party

QUESTION:

1968,1970:
How about the vote for Congressman. Did you vote for a candidate for
Congress? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?
1972:
How about the election for Congressman--that is, for the House of
Representatives in Washington? Which party's candidate did you vote for
Congressman?
1974,1976:
How about the election for Congressman--that is, for the House of
Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for
Congress? Whom did you vote for? Which party was that?
1978 AND LATER:
Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How
about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington. Did
you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? Who did
you vote for? (BALLOT CARD SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. R's Vote: for major party candidate from party same
    as R's partisanship
2. R's Vote: for major party candidate from party
    different than R's partisanship

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but not (or
    DK/NA if) in House race; DK/NA who voted for; R has
    no major party partisanship; R voted for candidate
    whose name was not on candidate list (1978-1988) or
    for third party candidate(all years); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The respondent has been considered a partisan if R was 'strong', 'weak'
or 'leaning'.
In 1978 and later, R selected name from ballot card. When R gave a
name not on the candidate list, MD was coded, and party of vote was
undetermined.
In 1970-1976, every House candidate was assigned a unique candidate
number. Rs who reported their House vote were coded into two
variables, the first of which recorded the candidate number of the
named candidate, if the name was correctly given. If the name
mentioned by the respondent was not on the complete list of candidates
and candidate numbers, then the response was simply coded as
'incorrect.' The respondent was then asked for the party of the
candidate which s/he named. VCF1011-1013 WERE BUILT FOR 1970-1976
USING THE SECOND, OR "PARTY OF VOTE," VARIABLE (even in cases where the
party given by R was not appropriate for a correctly rendered candidate
name). [NOTE: if name given in 1970-1976 was 'incorrect' or DK/NA,
"party of vote" variable was still used unless missing data: if "party
of vote" was missing data and name was 'incorrect' or DK/NA, vote in

VCF1011-1013 has been coded 9.] Note that VCF0707, VCF0736 vote vars
were also created from this "party of vote" variable for 1970-1976, but
the vote data present in VCF1011-1013 differ slightly from that in
VCF0707 and VCF0736 in 1970-1976 for the following cases: if R
correctly gave the name of a candidate who was on the complete list of
candidates and candidate numbers BUT did not provide any party
designation (DK or NA) in the followup 'party of vote' var, then the
party of the candidate correctly named in the first recall (name) var
was ascertained and incorporated into VCF1011-1013. This procedure was
not undertaken for 1970-1976 in vars VCF0707 and VCF0736, which retain
these cases as missing data.
Note that, because no ballot card was used, for 1968-1976 the party
for which R claimed to have voted in the House election is represented
in VCF1011-1013 even for so-called 'impossible' cases: e.g., when R
declares R voted for a Democrat when R lives in a Congressional
district in which only a Republican incumbent ran in the House
election: in such a case, VCF1011-1013 are coded as if R did indeed
vote for a Democrat.
1968 NOTE:
R's response to the House vote question was coded into a single summary
variable which provided categories to establish whether R provided a
correct or incorrect Democratic House candidate name, a correct or
incorrect Republican House candidate name, a party mention only, or a
minor party/write-in/unidentifiable candidate name. This 1968 variable
was accompanied by the following note: "When R's mention of candidate
name and party were inconsistent, the response was coded as if party
were the dominant element. Example: R mentioned 'Burke, a Democrat'
but Burke was a Republican. Response was coded 'incorrect Republican
candidate.'" For VCF1011-1013, party of R's 1968 House vote was taken
from this variable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: 680120,680323
1970: 700184,700215
1972: 720140,720485
1974: 742204,742322
1976: 763174,763673
1978: 780433,780474
1980: 800266,800998
1982: 820291,820506
1984: 840318,840792
1986: 860267,860300
1988: 880274,880768
1990: 900289,900320

1992: 923634,925623
1994: 940655,940614
1996: 961089
1998: 980313
2000: 000523,001263
2002: 023038x,025020,025028a
2004: 043116,045018x,045031x,045033x
2012: hsevote2012_x,pid_self,pid_x

===

VCF1012

ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for Incumbent U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Did R vote for incumbent?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. R's Vote: for incumbent candidate in race involving
    running incumbent
2. R's Vote: for candidate other than incumbent in race
    involving running incumbent (1970-1988: incl. 3rd
    party/ind. candidates)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but
    not (or DK/NA if) in House race; DK/NA who voted for;
    no incumbent running in congressional district; R
    voted for name not on candidate list (1978-1990); R
    voted for third party/independent candidate who is
    not an incumbent (1990 and later); R voted out of
    district, NA if incumbent (91,92 in VCF0735);
    Washington D.C.; no Post IW; California (1974 only,
    due to redistricting type of race could not be
    determined)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF1011.
GENERAL NOTE:
Beginning in 1990 Study data, third party and independent candidates
were combined with unknown names coded in 'name not on candidate list'
(code 97) whenever the non-major party candidate was not on the
Candidate List; only independent or 3rd party candidates who were on
the Candidate List were given a separate code (code 30).
In 1970-1988, independent or 3rd party candidates could be coded
distinct from 'name not on candidate list' even if their name was
NOT on the Candidate List. For 1970-1988, if R voted for a third
party or independent candidate who was not the incumbent, then
VCF1012 has been coded 2 even if the candidate's name was not on the

Candidate List.
WARNING NOTE:
In years prior to 1978, no 'type of race' var was present in Study
data. Data were added, however, to 'type of race' VCF0902 for 1970,
1974 and 1976 using a lengthy case-by-case procedure. Although the
resultant 'type of race' data have been checked to some extent, the
possibility of some error must be recognized: the 'type of race'
established for 1970, 1974 and 1976-- and, as a further result, data in
VCF1012 for 1970, 1974 and 1976-- should be used with caution and at
the user's risk.
1974 NOTE:
California data for VCF1012 is not recoverable because 'type of race'
in California districts for the 1974 election can not be determined.
1992 NOTE:
1 case [2063] which was erroneously coded to candidate code 34 for
House vote but which should have been code 32 is coded 9 here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700215
1974: 742322
1976: 763673
1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507
1984: 840792
1986: 860266
1988: 880767
1990: 900058,900288
1992: 925622
1994: 940613
1996: 961088
1998: 980312
2000: 001262
2002: 025028a
2004: 045018x,045031x,045033x
2012: hsevote2012_x,typerace2012_hse

==

VCF1013

ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for Winning U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Did R vote for winner?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. R's Vote: for winner
2. R's Vote: for candidate other than the winner (incl.
    names not on candidate list)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but not
    (or DK/NA if) in House race; DK/NA who voted for;
    Washington D.C.; no Post IW; R voted outside
    his/her district of interview (1978-later only, not
    determinable prior to 1978)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built using VCF1014 (except 1974).
See notes VCF1011 describing process which establishes who R voted
for. Note the following exception for 1974 California cases: Rs who
gave the party of their vote BUT who gave an 'incorrect' [or DK/NA]
name could not be traced to their congressional district number which
was in effect after the 1974 redistricting in CA, so that party of
winning candidate was unknown: all such cases have been coded 2 here
[25 cases].
1974 NOTE:
The winners in the 1974 California House congressional races which were
mistakenly overlooked in the 1974 Study release have been restored
here. (Note, however, that 1974 California data for VCF1014 'Who Won'
is not recoverable.)
WARNING note:
The procedures used in the creation of the VCF1014 'winner'
var produced data that have been checked somewhat, but perfect
accuracy cannot be completely guaranteed due to the nature of
attempting coding from reference material. The possibility of some
error must be recognized and the 'winner' established in VCF1014
--and, as a further result, data in VCF1013 (which has been built
using 'winner' data) -- should be used with caution and at the user's
risk.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700215
1974: 742321,742322
1976: 763673
1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507
1984: 840793
1986: 860267
1988: 880768
1990: 900288
1992: 925622
1994: 940613
1996: 961088
1998: 980312
2000: 001262
2002: 024524,025028a
2004: 044502,044514b,045018x,045031x,045033x
2012: hsevote2012_x

===
VCF1014

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Candidate Code of Winning U.S. House Candidate

QUESTION:

Who won House race?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. WINNER: incumbent, Democrat
2. WINNER: incumbent, Republican
3. WINNER: challenger, Republican (loser: Democratic
        incumbent)
4. WINNER: challenger, Democrat (loser: Republican
        incumbent)
5. WINNER: open-seat candidate, Democrat (race
        contested)
6. WINNER: open-seat candidate, Republican (race
        contested)
7. WINNER: uncontested open-seat candidate, Democrat
8. WINNER: uncontested open-seat candidate, Republican

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Washington D.C.; California (1974 only, due to
    redistricting, type of race could not be determined);
    winner not from major party (2000); respondent
    district NA (2000); district misidentified (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1974 NOTE:

Note: 1974 California data for VCF1014 'Who Won' is not recoverable
because 'type of race' in California districts for the 1974 election
cannot be determined.
WARNING NOTE:
The procedures used in the creation of the VCF1014 'winner' for 1970,
and 1974 produced data that have been checked somewhat, but perfect
accuracy cannot be completely guaranteed due to the nature of
attempting case- by-case coding from reference material. The
possibility of some error must be recognized and the 'winner'
established in VCF1014 should be used with caution and at the user's
risk.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: 700215
1974: 742321,742322
1976: 763673
1978: 780474
1980: 800998
1982: 820507
1984: 840793
1986: 860267
1988: 880768
1990: 900288
1992: 925622
1994: 940613
1996: 961088
1998: 980312
2000: 001262
2002: 024524
2004: 044502,044514b

===

VCF1015

STUDY ADMIN: Number of Days Pre-Election IW Conducted Before Election

QUESTION:

Number of days from Pre-election IW until day of election

VALID_CODES:

Exact number of days is coded, except:

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA; no Pre IW; abbrev. Pre IW (1980, see
     VCF0015)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF1016.
GENERAL NOTE:
studies are not designed to produce representative samples with respect
time period.
1992 NOTE:
Two cases of interviews mistakenly coded 11/2/1992 in Study data should
have been coded 11/3/1992 [election day but prior to voting]; the
correct date has been used in the calculation here.
2004 NOTE:
When the beginning and ending date of pre interview are different, the
ending date of pre interview (042010b) was used.
2012 NOTE:
One ftf case interviewed on election day Nov 6, 2012; several web cases
began interview prior to election day, finished on election day.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: V2: 52001
1956: V56000
1960: V60001
1964: V64001
1968: V68002
1972: V72002
1976: V76302
1980: V80002
1984: V84003
1988: V880043,V88004
1992: V923026,V92302
1996: V96001
2000: V00000
2002: V022012
2004: V042010a,V042010
2012: admin_pre_ftf_iwdatefin
admin_pre_web2_iwdatefin

===

VCF1016

STUDY ADMIN: Number of Days Post-Election IW Conducted After Election

QUESTION:

Number of days from day of election until day of Post-election IW

VALID_CODES:

Exact number of days is coded, except:

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Studies are not designed to produce representative samples with respect
time period.
Election days are as follows:
2008 Nov 4   2012 Nov 6
2004 Nov 2   2002 Nov 5   2000 Nov 7
1998 Nov 3   1996 Nov 5   1994 Nov 7
1992 Nov 3   1990 Nov 6   1988 Nov 8
1986 Nov 4   1984 Nov 6   1982 Nov 2
1980 Nov 4   1978 Nov 7   1976 Nov 2
1974 Nov 5   1972 Nov 7   1970 Nov 3
1968 Nov 5   1966 Nov 8   1964 Nov 3
1962 Nov 6   1960 Nov 8   1958 Nov 4
1956 Nov 6

2004 NOTE:
When the beginning and ending date of post interview are different, the
ending date of post interview (044010b) was used.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: V56019
1958: V58001
1960: V60027
1964: V64027
1966: V66001
1968: V68027

1970: V70003
1972: V72044
1974: V74202
1976: V76352
1978: V78003
1980: V80003
1982: V82003
1984: V84005
1986: V86000
1988: V880063,V88006
1990: V900052,V90005
1992: V925005,V92500
1994: V94003
1996: V96090
1998: V98000
2000: V00013
2002: V024012
2004: V044010a,V044010
2012: admin_post_ftf_iwdatebeg
admin_post_web1_iwdatebeg

===

VCF1017

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Thermometer Avg

QUESTION:

Thermometers -- both major party Congressional candidates

VALID_CODES:

0-100 Degrees.

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK in VCF0906 or VCF0907
999. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0906 and VCF0907 as: (VCF0906+VCF0907)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V782005,V78200
1980: V800855,V80085
1982: V820132,V82013
1984: V840753,V84075
1986: V860136,V86013
1988: V880601,V88060
1990: V900145,V90014
1992: V925311,V92531
1994: V940238,V94023
1996: V960278,V96027
1998: V980239,V98024
2000: V001298,V00129
2002: V025044,V02504
2004: V044502,V045046,V04504

===

VCF1018

CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Thermometer Index

QUESTION:

Major party Congressional candidate thermometer index

VALID_CODES:
----
0.   Most Republican
.
50.   Neutral
.
100. Most Democratic

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. DK in VCF0906 or VCF0907
999. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF0906 and VCF0907 as: (VCF0906-VCF0907 +100)/2.
Fractional results are rounded to the next highest integer.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF1020

CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK
9.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short
     form (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
     (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0980.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82014
1984: V84090
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90019
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00132

==
VCF1021a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82014
1984: V84090
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90019
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00132

==

VCF1021b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1021a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82014
1984: V84090

1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90019
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00132

===

VCF1022a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.
1996 NOTE:
Documentation for code 205 (1 case) has not been found.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040

1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00133

==

VCF1022b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1022a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091

1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00133

===

VCF1023a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027

2000: V00133

==
VCF1023b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1023a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88067

1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00133

==

VCF1024a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00133

===

VCF1024b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1024a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540

1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98027
2000: V00133

==

VCF1025a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

==

VCF1025b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1020; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1025a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88067
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96104
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1026

CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short
    form (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0981.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86018
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1027a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

==

VCF1027b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1027a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1028a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1028b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1028a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80089
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92540
1994: V94040
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1029a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1029b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the

Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1029a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1030a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

==

VCF1030b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1030a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78016
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

==

VCF1031a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===
VCF1031b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)

23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1026; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1031a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88068
1990: V90020
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00133

===

VCF1032

CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short
   form (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
   (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0984.
Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00134

===
VCF1033a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00134

==

VCF1033b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)

31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1033a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82015
1984: V84091
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00134

==

VCF1034a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00134

===

VCF1034b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

----

11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)

22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1034a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98028
2000: V00134

===
VCF1035a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1035b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)

24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1035a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88068
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96105
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

===

VCF1036a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

===

VCF1036b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)

32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1036a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1037a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;

abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
(2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1037b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1032; no post IW;

abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
(2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1037a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

===

VCF1038

CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short
    form (1992); district NA (2000); district misidentified
    (2000)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See notes VCF0985.

Code 5 includes cases where R says he/she did not know anything about
the candidate.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86019
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92541
1994: V94041
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1039a

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877

MISSING_CODES:

8888. DK (mention 1 only)
8889. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
    (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
    misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1039b

CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

MISSING_CODES:
----

88. DK (mention 1 only)
89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)
INAP. Inap. 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW
     (1984); short form (1992); district NA (2000); district
     misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1039a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1040a

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==
VCF1040b

CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)

INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1040a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80090
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==
VCF1041a

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:

See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80091
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

===

VCF1041b

CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA

(2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1041a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80091
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90021
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00134

==

VCF1042a

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80091
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90022
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00135

==

VCF1042b

CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1042a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78017
1980: V80091
1982: V82016
1984: V84092
1986: V86020
1988: V88069
1990: V90022
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00135

==
VCF1043a

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:

0001-8877
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
   (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
See Appendix "PARTY-CANDIDATE 1972-LATER" master code.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88069
1990: V90022
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00135

===

VCF1043b

CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

QUESTION:

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the
Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

VALID_CODES:
----
11. People within party (0001-0097)
12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)
21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)
22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)
23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)
24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)
31. Government management (0601-0697)
32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)
33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)
34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)
35. Group connections (1201-1299)
40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)
50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)
INAP. Inap. no further mention; 5,6,7,8,9 in VCF1038; no post IW;
    abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short form (1992); district NA
    (2000); district misidentified (2000); question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Collapsed from full code VCF1043a.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1988: V88069
1990: V90022
1992: V92542
1994: V94042
1996: V96106
1998: V98029
2000: V00135

==
VCF9001

DEMOGRAPHICS: Length of Residence in Community

QUESTION:

How long have you lived here in (1986 AND LATER: your present) (1984:
this) city/town/township/county (2002: community) ?

VALID_CODES:
----

0. 1 Year or less (2002,2004: less than 1 year)
1. 13-23 Mos. (1988-1992 only) (2002,2004: 12-18 months)
2. 2 Years (1994-later: includes 13-23 months)
     (2002,2004: 19-24 months)
3. 3 Years
.
.
89. 89 Years or more
90. "All of life" (regardless of number of years)
     (exc.1974,2004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. DK; NA; Panel (2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In Pre-Post study years, this was a pre var.
In 1968-1978, if number of years given included a fraction of 6 or
more months, then the number of years coded was rounded up to the next
highest whole number. In 1980-1986, this practice was restricted to
instances where the total number of years (and months) given was less
than 2 years; if the number of years given was greater than 2, then

any fraction was dropped.
In 1988-1990, all fractions of years were dropped with the exception
of months less than a year (coded as 1 year, code 0), and 13-23 months
(code 1). In 1994 and later, all fractions of years were dropped with
the exception of months less than a year (coded 0); the code "13-23
months; 2 years" has been recoded to 2.
1974 NOTE:
Code "all of life" was not used.
2002 NOTE:
This question was asked only of Fresh Cross respondents.
2004 NOTE:
Code 76 includes, "76 years or more." Code, "All of life"
was not used.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1968: V68026
1970: V70038
1972: V72041
1974: V74254
1976: V76350
1978: V78062
1980: V80071
1982: V82075
1984: V84070
1986: V86075
1988: V88054
1990: V90068
1992: V92413
1994: V94142
1996: V96071
1998: V98066
2000: V001020a,V001020b,V001020
2002: V02313
2004: V04330

==

VCF9002

DEMOGRAPHICS: Length of Residence in Home

QUESTION:

How long have you lived (2012: at this address?) in this house
(condo/apartment) (2002: your current home) ?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. 4 years or less
2. 5-9 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 20-29 years
5. 30 or more years (2004: includes 76 years or more)
6. 'All of life' (regardless of number of years)
   (exc.1974,1976,2004)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA
0. Panel (2002)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1960 NOTE:
Post-only Rs were asked this question in the post: their responses were
incorporated into the pre var used here.
1974 NOTE:
Code "all of life" was not used.
1976 NOTE:
same as 1974.
2002 NOTE:
This question was asked only of Fresh Cross respondents.
2004:
Case 462 indicates a longer residence in home than in
community. Code 5, "30 years or more" includes "76
years or more). Code "All of life" was not used.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1958: V58022
1960: V60018
1964: V64026
1966: V66023
1970: V70038
1974: V74254
1976: V76350
1978: V78062
1980: V80071
1982: V82076

1984: V84070
1986: V86075
1988: V88055
1990: V90068
1992: V92413
1994: V94142
1996: V96071
1998: V98066
2000: V001021a,V001021b,V001021
2002: V02314
2004: V04330

===
VCF9003

GROUP THERMOMETER: Evangelical Groups

QUESTION:

Evangelical groups active in politics -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96.   Degrees as coded
97.   97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98.   DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)
99.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80088
1984: V84077
1988: V88061

===
VCF9004

GROUP THERMOMETER: Elderly

QUESTION:

Older people (or the elderly) -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96.   Degrees as coded
97.   97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98.   DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)
99.   NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: V74236
1976: V76382
1980: V80086
1984: V84077
1988: V88061
1994: V94031
1996: V96104
2000: V00131
2002: V02506
2004: V04507

===
VCF9005

GROUP THERMOMETER: Supreme Court

QUESTION:

The Supreme Court -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96.   Degrees as coded
97.   97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)
99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80086
1984: V84077
1988: V88062
1996: V96102
2000: V00130
2002: V02505
2004: V04507
2012: ftgr_ussc

==
VCF9006

GROUP THERMOMETER: Women

QUESTION:

Women -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96.   Degrees as coded
97.   97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1988,2004)
99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: V76383
1984: V84076
1988: V88060
2004: V04508

===
VCF9007

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Jesse Jackson

QUESTION:

Jesse Jackson -- feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

00-96.   Degrees as coded
97.   97-100 Degrees

MISSING_CODES:
----
98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1986,1988,1990,1992,1996)
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84029
1986: V86014
1988: V88016
1990: V90013
1992: V92331
1994: V94022
1996: V96028
2002: V02301

==

VCF9008

PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Most Important Problem mentioned by Respondent

QUESTION:

Which party do you think would do a better job of handling the
problem of pollution and (1990,1994: protection of) the environment?

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Better by Democrats
3.   Same by both
5.   Better by Republicans
8.   DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Volunteered responses 'neither' have been recoded to 3.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: V90039
1994: V94083
1998: V98038

==

VCF9009

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve of President Performance on Economy

QUESTION:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way [president] is handling the
economy?
(IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE:) Do you approve/disapprove strongly or not
strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve strongly
2. Approve not strongly
4. Disapprove not strongly
5. Disapprove strongly
8. DK if approve/disapprove strongly or not strongly;
    DK/NA if approve or disapprove

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA if approve/disapprove strongly or not strongly
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
President: Reagan 1984, 1986, 1988; George Bush Sr. 1990, 1992;
Clinton 1994,1996,1998,2000; George W. Bush 2002,2004.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84026
1986: V86009
1988: V88022
1990: V90010
1992: V92332
1994: V94020
1996: V96029
1998: V98021
2000: V00050
2002: V023042
2004: V043026,V04302
2012: presapp_econ_x

==

VCF9010

PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Inflation

QUESTION:

Do you think inflation would be handled better by the Democrats, by
the Republicans, or about the same by both?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Better by Democrats
3. Same by both
5. Better by Republicans
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Volunteered responses 'neither' have been recoded to 3.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: V76314
1978: V78034
1980: V80020
1982: V82033

==

VCF9011

PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Unemployment

QUESTION:

Do you think the problems of unemployment would be handled better by
the Democrats, by the Republicans, or about the same by both?

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Better by Democrats
3. Same by both
5. Better by Republicans
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: V76314
1978: V78034
1980: V80020
1982: V82033

==

VCF9012

PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Pollution

QUESTION:

(IF R HAS MENTIONED A 'MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM' IN THE NATION:)
Which political party do you think would be most likely to get the
government to do a better job in dealing with this problem (1972: to
be helpful on this problem) --the Republicans, the Democrats, or
wouldn't there be much difference between them?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrats
3. Not much difference
5. Republicans
8. DK; other (1972 only); neither

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form I, II, IV (1972); short
   form (1992); question not administered in assigned
   half-sample [see VCF0012A] (1996, 2000)
0. R has not identified any problem
INAP. Inap. question not used

===

VCF9013

EQUALITARIANISM: Society Ensure Equal Opportunity to Succeed

QUESTION:

1988 AND LATER:
Using page [page] for our choice of answers, I would like you to tell me
how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)
1984,1986,1990,1996:
I am going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you
to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor
disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly.
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)
2004:

Pleae look at page [page] of the booklet. I am going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree.
ALL YEARS:
'Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which VCF9013-9018 questions appeared in the original studies varied by study.
1984 NOTE:
Egalitarianism series was administered with a break mid-sequence.
1988 NOTE 1:
Placement varied by form.
1988 NOTE 2:
The order of egalitarianism items was scrambled among form B respondents.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84020
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90042
1992: V92602
1994: V94491
1996: V96122
2000: V00152
2004: V04521

2012: egal_equal

==

VCF9014

EQUALITARIANISM: We Have Gone Too Far Pushing Equal Rights

QUESTION:

'We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro text and notes VCF9013.
1972 NOTE:
The 1972 version of this question was not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84020
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90042
1992: V92602
1994: V94091
1996: V96123
1998: V98042
2000: V00152
2004: V04521
2012: egal_toofar

==

VCF9015

EQUALITARIANISM: Big Problem that Not Everyone Has Equal Chance

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give
everyone an equal chance.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro text and notes VCF9013.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84020
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90042
1992: V92602
1994: V94091
1996: V96123
2000: V00152
2004: V04521
2012: egal_bigprob

==

VCF9016

EQUALITARIANISM: Not Big Problem if Some Have More Chance in Life

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'It is not really that big a problem if some people have more of a
chance in life than others.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro text and notes VCF9013.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84025
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90043
1992: V92602
1994: V94091
1996: V96123
2000: V00152
2004: V04521
2012: egal_notbigprob

===

VCF9017

EQUALITARIANISM: Should Worry less about How Equal People Are

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'The (2004: This_ country would be better off if we worried less
about how equal people are.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro text and notes VCF9013.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84025
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90042
1992: V92602
1994: V94491
1996: V96123
2000: V00152
2004: V04521
2012: egal_worryless

==

VCF9018

EQUALITARIANISM: U.S. Fewer Problems if Everyone Treated Equally

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS:
'If people were treated more equally in this country we would have

many fewer problems.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro text and notes VCF9013.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84025
1986: V86036
1988: V88092
1990: V90043
1992: V92602
1994: V94091
1996: V96123
1998: V98042
2000: V00152
2004: V04521
2012: egal_fewerprobs

===
VCF9019

CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Most Desirable Goal for the Nation: #1

QUESTION:

For a nation, it is not always possible to obtain everything one might
wish. On this page (1988,1992: on page [PAGE] of the booklet)
(1972, 1976: on this card), several different goals are listed.
If you had to choose among them, which one would seem most desirable

to you?   (RESPONDENT BOOKLET OR SHOW CARD SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Giving the people more say in important political
    decisions
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72055
1976: V76394
1980: V80117
1984: V84107
1988: V88093
1992: V92601

===

VCF9020

CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Most Desirable Goal for the Nation: #2

QUESTION:

(IF FIRST CHOICE GIVEN:) Which one {goal for our nation} would be your
second choice?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Giving the people more say in important political
    decisions

3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK 2nd choice
9. NA 2nd choice; no Post IW; NA or DK 1st choice
    (8 or 9 in VCF9019); form I,III,IV (1972); telephone
    IW (1984); no 2nd choice
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See intro and notes VCF9019.
This is a follow-up to VCF9019.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72055
1976: V76395
1980: V80117
1984: V84107
1988: V88093
1992: V92601

===

VCF9021

MOBILIZATION: Did Anyone Talk to R about Voting or Registering

QUESTION:

During the campaign this year, did anyone talk to you about registering
to vote or getting out to vote (1984,1986: or about voting)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This was a post var.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84084
1986: V86032
1988: V88083
1990: V90037
1992: V92582
1994: V94080
1996: V96117
1998: V98035
2000: V00123
2002: V02501
2012: mobilpo_reg

===
VCF9022

ELECTION: Voter Strength of Preference- Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED): How about the election for president? Did
you vote for a candidate for president? (IF YES) Who did you vote
for? Would you say that your preference for this candidate was strong
or not strong?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Strong
5. Not strong

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
0. R did not vote or DK/NA/refused to say if voted; R
    voted but did not vote (or DK/NA/refused to say if
    voted) for president; R voted for president but
    DK/NA/refused to say who voted for (1988 only)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This is a follow-up to VCF0704-VCF0706.
1980 NOTE:
Some Rs who refused to identify who they voted for or who DK/NA who
voted gave valid code responses.
1984 NOTE:
same as 1980.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80099
1984: V84078
1988: V88076
1992: V92561
1996: V96108
2000: V00125
2004: V045026
2012: prevote_presstr, postvote_presstr

==

VCF9023

ELECTION: Nonvoter Strength of Preference- Presidential Cand

QUESTION:

(ALL YEARS: ASKED OF Rs WHO DID NOT VOTE):
1948,1952,1956,1960,1964,1968:
Who (1948: whom) would you have voted for if you had voted?
1980,1984,1988,1992,1996:
How about the election for president? Did you prefer one of the
candidates for president? (IF YES:) Who did you prefer?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Preference: Democrat
2. Preference: Republican
3. Preference: Other
7. No preference (1968 and later)

MISSING_CODES:
----

9. DK; NA; refused; no Post IW
0. R voted or DK/NA/refused to say if voted (for
   president)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This is a follow-up to VCF0704-VCF0706.
GENERAL NOTE:
In 1952,1956,1960,1964 no category appeared (coded) for "no preference."
Although a category appeared for "no preference" in 1968, R was not
asked the filter question, "Did you prefer one of the candidates for
president?" and the absence of this filter was reflected in the small
1968 "no preference" N (presumably volunteered responses). In 1980,
1984, 1988 and 1992 Rs who replied "no" to the filter question were
coded 7 here.
1956 NOTE:
One case from dual "nonvoter, NA preference; voted but not for
president" has been coded 9 here.
1968 NOTE:
One case originally coded "Nixon or Wallace" has been coded 9 here.
2004 NOTE:
Code 5, "Ralph Nader" and code 7, "Other" have been coded 3 here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: V2: 52017
1956: V56020
1960: V60020
1964: V64028
1968: V68031
1980: V801014,V80101
1984: V840805,V84080
1988: V880774,V88077
1992: V92563
1996: V961098,V96109
2000: V00127
2004: V045028,V04502
2012: postvote_prefprwho

==

VCF9024

ELECTION: Voter Strength of Preference- U.S. House Cand

QUESTION:

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED): Here is a list of candidates for the major
races in this district. How about the election for the House of
Representative in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the
U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?
Would you say that your preference for this candidate was strong or
not strong?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Strong
5. Not strong

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    short form (1992)
0.   R did not vote or DK/NA/refused to say if voted; R
    voted but did not vote (or DK/NA/refused to say if
    voted) for House candidate; R voted for House but
    DK/refused to say who voted for (not 1984,1988); R
    voted for House but NA who voted for (not 1980
    1990); special districts with no House race in
    1978 (1978, 4 districts: LA03, LA07, FL08, FL10);
    special districts with no House race in 1980 (1980,
    2 districts: LA03, LA07)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This is a follow-up to VCF0707,VCF0735,VCF0736.
GENERAL NOTE:
In 1980, 1984, 1988 and 1990 study datasets only, some Rs coded NA for
House vote gave valid code responses.
1984 NOTE 1:
Some Rs who refused to identify /DK who they voted for gave valid code
responses.
1984 NOTE 2:
3 cases in the study dataset which were abbreviated telephone IWs were
placed in the wrong MD code (0). They are correctly coded here (9).
1988 NOTE:
same as 1984 NOTE 1.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78047
1980: V80099
1984: V84079
1988: V88076
1990: V90029
1992: V92562

==

VCF9025

ELECTION: Vote for Governor- Party

QUESTION:

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED):
How about the vote/election for Governor (1952, 1958: here in [state])?
Did you vote for a candidate for Governor? (IF YES:) Who did you vote
for? Which party was that?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Other

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK; NA; did not vote; DK/NA/refused to say if
    voted; voted, but not for governor; voted but
    DK/NA/refused to say if voted for governor;
    DK/NA/refused to say who voted for; name given by R
    not on candidate list (1978-1990); no Post IW; form
    III,IV (1972)
0. No gubernatorial race in state (includes Washington
    D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
GENERAL NOTE:
Ballot card was not used until 1978. In 1978-1982, 1986 R selected
name from ballot card. When R gave a name not on the candidate list,
MD was coded, and party of vote was undetermined.
In 1952, 1958, 1964-1968 (no ballot card), when an incorrect name--
i.e., not on the candidate list--was given with a party association,
the party given was coded. When a correct name was given with an
incorrect party, then the actual party associated with the named
candidate was coded: "Smith, a Democrat" was coded as a Republican if,
in fact (contrary to R's perception) Smith was indeed a Republican.
In 1970-1976 (no ballot card), R's perception of candidate's party was
given. If an incorrect name (not on the candidate list) was given,

party associated was still coded. If a given party was not the actual
party of a correctly named candidate, party as given was still coded.
In 1952, 1958, 1960 and 1964, this question was coded as a multiple
response variable allowing, when applicable, for candidate-at-large
mentions (2nd response) as well as district choice of candidates (1st
response). Second responses were excluded in coding VCF9025.
If R did not vote AND R's state did not have a gubernatorial race,
then 0 (not 9) has been coded.
In 1980, 1982, 1986, 1990: if there was no race in state of IW BUT it
was determined that R voted outside of state of IW AND R designated
his/her vote for governor in the other state, then this variable has
been coded for the party of R's "outside" vote, not coded 0 MD (no
race in state). Before 1980, it was not determined whether R voted
outside of state of IW, and no information was previously available
for any votes for governor outside of state of IW.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1952: V2: 52018
1958: V58008
1964: V64029
1966: V66010
1968: V68032
1970: V70021
1972: V72048
1974: V74232
1976: V76367
1978: V78048
1980: V80100
1982: V82051
1986: V86027
1990: V90029
1994: V94062
1998: V98032
2012: prevote_vtgovbc, postvote_vtgovbc

==

VCF9026

ELECTION: Vote in Presidential Primary- Party

QUESTION:

1972:
(ASKED OF Rs WHO SAID THEY WERE REGISTERED/ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN

NOVEMBER): How about the primary election this year. Did you vote in
a presidential primary this spring or summer? (IF YES:) Which party's
primary did you vote in?
1976:
(ASKED OF Rs WHO SAID THEY WERE REGISTERED/ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN
NOVEMBER): How about the primary election this year? Do you happen
to recall if there was a presidential primary election here in [state]
this spring or summer? (IF YES:) Did you vote in the presidential
primary election? (IF YES:) Which party's primary did you vote in?
1980:
Your state held a primary election on [date]. Did you vote in that
election, or were you unable to do so? (IF VOTED:) Did you vote in the
Republican primary or the Democratic primary? (SEE NOTE FOR ARKANSAS,
SOUTH CAROLINA, MISSISSIPPI)
1988:
This state held a presidential primary/caucus election in [month]. In
talking to people about elections, we find that a lot of people were not
able to vote because they weren't registered, they didn't meet party
qualifications, they were sick or just didn't have the time. How about
you--did you vote in that primary election/ caucus? (IF YES:) Did you
vote in the Republican or the Democratic primary/caucus?
1992:
This state held a Presidential (primary/caucus) election in [month]. In
talking to people about elections, we find that many people did not vote
for a variety of reasons. How about you--did you vote in that primary
(election/caucus)? (IF YES:) Did you vote in the Republican or
Democratic (primary/caucus)?

2012:
Did you vote in a Presidential primary election or caucus this year?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Voted: Democratic Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)
2. Voted: Republican Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)
3. Voted: DK/NA/Refused which Pres. Primary (1988: or
        caucus)
5. Voted: 'Other' (minor party) Pres. Primary (1972,1976)
7. Did not vote in Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK/NA/refused to say if voted in primary/caucus;
   form II (1972); short form of Spanish language IW
   (1992); R is not (or DK/NA if) registered/eligible to
   vote (1972,1976); R's state did not have a primary
   (1972,1976,1980); R could not recall if his/her state
   has a primary (1976 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
1972 NOTE 1:

'Caucus' was not specified.
1972 NOTE 2:
This question was only asked of Rs who said they were registered
(eligible) to vote; if NA whether registered/ eligible or R didn't know
if R was registered/eligible, then R was not asked this question.
Additionally, in 1976, R was first asked the question whether R
recalled if R's state had a primary during the spring/summer of the
study year: if R did recall whether there was a primary AND if R's
state did indeed have a primary, then this question was asked.
1976 NOTE 1:
same as 1972 note 1.
1976 NOTE:
same as 1972 note 2.
1980 NOTE 1:
same as 1972.
1980 NOTE 2:
votes in nonmajor party primaries were not accounted for (no code 5).
1980 NOTE 3:
Several states had only one primary for one major party. In 1980
Arkansas held a Democratic primary; South Carolina held a Republican
primary; and Mississippi held a Republican primary. If R indicated
that R voted in the party's primary that year, then R was coded here
for the party of the primary held. The question asked in Arkansas,
South and Carolina and Mississippi in 1980 was: Your state held a
primary election on [date]. As you may know, the [Democratic/
Republican] party did not have a primary contest in [state] this year,
so there was only a [Democratic/Republican] primary election. Did you
vote in that election or were you unable to do so?
1988 NOTE 1:
All states represented in the time series study had a primary or
caucus. However, in some states (Kansas, Michigan and Wyoming
Democratic and Republican caucuses were held on separate dates and the
lead-in question was modified accordingly.
1988 NOTE 2:
same as 1980 note 2.
1992 NOTE:
same as 1988 (Arizona, Iowa, Minnesota, Virginia and Wyoming)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72016
1976: V76303
1980: V80037
1988: V88014
1992: V92330

2012: prevote_primv

==
VCF9027

ELECTION: Vote in Previous Presidential Election - Party

QUESTION:

1948:
Do you remember whether you voted in [year] when [Democratic
presidential candidate] ran against [Republican Presidential
candidate]? (IF YES:) Whom did you vote for then?
1952-1962:
(1958,1962: Two years ago,) In [year], you remember that [Democratic
presidential candidate] ran against [Republican presidential candidate]
(1958: for the 2nd time). Do you remember for sure whether or not you
voted in that election? (IF YES, VOTED:) Which one did you vote for?/
(1958: Did you vote for [Democratic presidential candidate] or
[Republican presidential candidate]?)
1964 FORM 1:
Now, the last presidential election was four years ago, in 1960. Do you
remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election? (IF YES,
VOTED:) Did you vote Republican or Democratic in that election?
1964 FORM 2,1966-1972,1976,1980,1982,1988-2002:
In [year], {you remember that} [Republican presidential candidate] ran
on the Republican ticket against [Democratic presidential candidate] for
the Democrats/ (1970,1972: against Mr. Humphrey on the Democratic ticket
and Mr. Wallace on the Independent ticket; 1982: against Jimmy Carter
for the Democrats and John Anderson as an independent candidate). Do
you remember for sure whether or not you voted for in that election?
(IF YES, VOTED:) Which one did you vote for?
2004:
In 2000 Al Gore ran on the Democratic ticket against George W.
Bush for the Republicans and Ralph Nader as the Reform party
candidate.Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in
that election?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Voted: Democratic Pres. Candidate
2. Voted: Republican Pres. Candidate
3. Voted: DK/NA/Refused which Pres. Candidate
5. Voted: Other candidate

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. DK/NA/refused to say if voted in previous presidential
   election; no Pre IW; no Post IW; short form or
   Spanish language IW (1992); NA if R has ever voted
   before (1956,1960,1976,1980); DK if R has ever voted
   before (1968)
0. R did not vote in previous election; R has never voted
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This question refers to the Presidential election preceding the current
year.
In 1952-1960,1964-1972,1976,1980, if R answered the filter, "In the
elections for president since you have been old enough to vote, would
you say that you have voted in all of them, most of them, some of them,
or none of them?" with "none of them" or answered that s/he was never
before able to vote because s/he was previously not a citizen or old
enough, then this question was not asked.
In 1956, 1960, 1976 and 1980, if it was NA whether R had ever voted,
then this question was not asked. In 1968, if R DK whether R had ever
voted, then this question was not asked.
In 1962, 1982, 1988, 1990 and 1992 no filter was used, but Rs who did
not vote in the previous presidential election because of age or
citizenship ineligibility (or for any other reason) were simply coded
"did not vote".
In 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1964 the study documentation stated that
residents of Washington D.C. were INAP; however, in the data, it
some Washington D.C. residents were INAP while others were not.
1952 NOTE 1:
Code 9 contains 9 cases of respondents who replied that they "thought"
they had voted Democratic in 1948 and 3 cases of respondents who
replied that they "thought" they had voted Republican in 1948.
1952 NOTE 2:
In the original 1952 dataset, 1948 presidential votes for two
specified nonmajor party candidates were individually coded, and there
also appeared a combination category labeled "other or NA or DK who"
(9 cases). Rs who said they had voted for the specified nonmajor
party candidates in 1948 have been coded 5 here, while Rs from the
combination category of the original 1952 dataset have been coded 3
here.
1956 NOTE:
All cases (unknown number) of Rs who only "thought" they voted for any
particular candidate in 1952 were combined with other missing data:
these cases are coded 9 here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1948: V48002
1952: V52007
1954: V540014
1956: V56009
1958: V58007

1960: V60009
1962: V62003
1964: V64015
1966: V66008
1968: V68012
1970: V700199,V70020
1972: V720159,V72016
1976: V763182,V76318
1980: V800353,V80035
1982: V820292,V82029
1988: V880630,V88063
1990: V900166,V90016
1992: V923107,V92310
1994: V940324,V94032
1996: V960204,V96020
1998: V980214,V98021
2000: V000303,V00030
2004: V043002,V04300
2012: prevote_primv

==

VCF9028

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Which Presidential Candidate Will Win in State

QUESTION:

How [1996,2004: What] about here in [R's state]. Which candidate
for President do you think will carry this state? (1984,1988,1992,
2004: IF NECESSARY: Which candidate will win in this state?)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Democratic Pres. candidate
2. Republican Pres. candidate
3. Other Pres. candidate
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Pre IW; Washington D.C.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

2004 NOTE:
Code 5, "Ralph Nader" and code 7, "Other" have been coded 3 here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF9029

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Which Presidential Race in State Be Close

QUESTION:

How about here in [R's state]. Which candidate for President do you
think will carry this state? (1988,1984, IF NECESSARY: Which
candidate will win in this state?)
Do you think (1972: it) (1988,1996,2004: the Presidential race) will
be close here in [R's state] or will [name given] win by quite a bit?
1980,1984,1988,1992 ONLY: (IF DK) Do you think the Presidential race
will be close here in [R's state] or will one candidate win by quite a
bit?

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Close race
3.   Win by quite a bit
8.   DK; depends

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; NA who R thinks will carry R's state (9 in
     VCF9028) (all years); DK who will win in R's state
     (8 in VCF9028)(1972,1976 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1952 NOTE:
The 1952 version of this question was not comparable.
1972 NOTE:
If R replied DK to 'Which candidate do you think will carry this
state?' (VCF9028) then this question was not asked.
1976 NOTE:
same as 1972.

2004 NOTE:
A programming error early in the field period resulted in
52 respondents who replied DK to VCF9028 not being asked
VCF9029; these 52 cases are coded "99. NA" in 2004 data
file and "9. NA" here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72002
1976: V76302
1980: V80005
1984: V84007
1988: V88010
1992: V92310
1996: V96038
2004: V04309
2012: preswin_closest

==
VCF9030

MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Which Major Party

QUESTION:

(1956,1960,1964,1966,1968: You know that) (other years exc. 1988,1996:
As you know,) The political parties try to talk to as many people as
they can to get them to vote for their candidate(s).
Did anyone from one (1956,1960,1964,1966,1968: either) of the political
parties call you up or come around and talk to you about the (1956,1960,
1964,1966,1968: during the) campaign (1976ff: this year)?
(IF YES:) Which party was that (1956,1960: were they from)?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact: Democratic party
2. Yes, contact: Republican party
3. Yes, contact: both major parties
4. Yes, contact: other
5. Yes, contact: DK which party
6. Yes, contact: NA which party
7. No contact

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK if contact
9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV
   (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF9030a,VCF9030b,VCF9030c.
GENERAL NOTE:
This was a Post variable.
1952 NOTE:
The 1952 version of this question was not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: V56022
1960: V60022
1964: V640325,V640326,V64032
1966: V660071,V660072,V660073,V66007
1968: V680401,V680402,V680403,V68040
1972: V720466,V72046
1974: V742193,V74219
1976: V763539,V76354
1978: V780464,V78046
1980: V800785,V80078
1982: V820464,V82046
1984: V840812,V84081
1986: V860309,V86031
1988: V880820,V88082
1990: V900361,V90036
1992: V925801,V92580
1994: V940801,V94080
1996: V961162,V96116
1998: V980349,V98035
2000: V001219,V00122
2002: V025005,V02500
2004: V045008,V045008
2012: mobilpo_party, mobilpo_wparty

===

VCF9030a

MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Any Major Party

QUESTION:

Did PARTY contact R about election campaign?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact by major party
2. No contact by major party;

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party
9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV
   (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF9030 intro and notes.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: V56022
1960: V60022
1964: V640325,V640326,V64032
1966: V660071,V660072,V660073,V66007
1968: V680401,V680402,V680403,V68040
1972: V720466,V72046
1974: V742193,V74219
1976: V763539,V76354
1978: V780464,V78046
1980: V800785,V80078
1982: V820464,V82046
1984: V840812,V84081
1986: V860309,V86031
1988: V880820,V88082
1990: V900361,V90036
1992: V925801,V92580
1994: V940801,V94080
1996: V961162,V96116
1998: V980349,V98035
2000: V001219,V00122
2002: V02500
2004: V045008,V045008

==

VCF9030b

MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Democratic Party

QUESTION:

Did Democratic Party contact R about election campaign

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact by Democratic party
2. No contact by Democratic party

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party
9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV
   (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF9030 intro and notes.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: V56022
1960: V60022
1964: V640325,V640326,V64032
1966: V660071,V660072,V660073,V66007
1968: V680401,V680402,V680403,V68040
1972: V720466,V72046
1974: V742193,V74219
1976: V763539,V76354
1978: V780464,V78046
1980: V800785,V80078
1982: V820464,V82046
1984: V840812,V84081
1986: V860309,V86031
1988: V880820,V88082
1990: V900361,V90036
1992: V925801,V92580
1994: V940801,V94080
1996: V961162,V96116
1998: V980349,V98035

2000: V001219,V00122
2002: V02500
2004: V045008,V045008
2012: mobilpo_wparty

===
VCF9030c

MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Republican Party

QUESTION:

Did Republican Party contact R about election campaign

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, contact by Republican party
2. No contact by Republican party

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party
9.   NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV
     (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF9030 intro and notes.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1956: V56022
1960: V60022
1964: V640325,V640326,V64032
1966: V660071,V660072,V660073,V66007
1968: V680401,V680402,V680403,V68040
1972: V720466,V72046
1974: V742193,V74219
1976: V763539,V76354
1978: V780464,V78046
1980: V800785,V80078
1982: V820464,V82046
1984: V840812,V84081
1986: V860309,V86031

1988: V880820,V88082
1990: V900361,V90036
1992: V925801,V92580
1994: V940801,V94080
1996: V961162,V96116
1998: V980349,V98035
2000: V001219,V00122
2002: V02500
2004: V045008,V045008
2012: mobilpo_wparty

==
VCF9031

MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Anyone Other than Parties

QUESTION:

1980-2004:
Other than someone from the two major parties, did anyone else call you
up or come around and talk to you about supporting specific candidates
in this last election?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);
    Washington D.C.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This was a post variable.
1978 NOTE:
This question applied only to support of House candidates and was not
comparable in these two years.
1982 NOTE:
same as 1978

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80078
1984: V84081
1986: V86031
1988: V88082
1990: V90036
1992: V92580
1994: V94080
1996: V96116
1998: V98035
2000: V00122
2004: V04500
2012: mobilpo_contactoth

===

VCF9032

MEDIA: Hear Programs about Campaigns on the Radio 4-Category

QUESTION:

Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign [2012:
for President] on the radio?
(IF YES:) Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just
one or two?

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None ('No')
1. Good many
3. Several
5. One or two

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK how many
9. NA how many; DK/NA whether listened to any; no
    Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972); abbrev. telephone
    IW (1984); short form or Spanish language IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This was a post-election variable all years except 1988 and 1992.
1984 NOTE:
Code 0 includes 2 cases where R replied "yes" that R had listened to
speeches/discussions on the radio but, when asked how many, replied
"none."

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1960: V60019
1964: V64028
1968: V68029
1972: V720459,V72046
1976: V763600,V76360
1978: V780044,V78004
1980: V800745,V80074
1984: V840723,V84072
1986: V860060,V86006
1988: V880138,V88013
1992: V923208,V92320
1996: V961335,V96133
2000: V00164
2004: V045005,V045005
2012: mediapo_radio, mediapo_radioamt

==
VCF9033

MEDIA: Number of Days Read Newspaper in Last Week

QUESTION:

How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?
[2012: During a typical week, how many days do you read news in a
printed newspaper, not including sports?]

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One day
.
.
7. Every day

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short form or Spanish language IW (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Actual number of days coded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84011
1986: V86006
1988: V88013
1990: V90007
1992: V92320
1994: V94012
1996: V96024
1998: V98020
2000: V00033
2002: V02300
2004: V04301
2012: prmedia_wkpaprnws

==
VCF9034

MEDIA: Read Daily Newspaper

QUESTION:

1974,1978,1980:
Now let's switch to newspapers.
1976:
How about newspapers.
ALL YEARS:
Do you read a daily newspaper?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This was a post-election variable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: V74204
1976: V76363
1978: V78005
1980: V80075

==
VCF9035

MEDIA: Number of Days Watched National TV News in Past Week

QUESTION:

How many days in the past week did you watch national news (1986: a
national news program) (1984,1990-1994: the news; 1996-2000: the
national news) (2002,2004: the national network news) on TV?
[2012: During a typical week, how many days do you watch national news
on TV, not including sports?]

VALID_CODES:
----
0. None
1. One day
.

.
7. Every day

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; DK/NA if watches national network TV news (1984
    only); short form or Spanish language IW
    (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

Actual number of days coded.
GENERAL NOTE:
This was a post variable in 1986 only.
1984 NOTE:
This variable was preceded by the question, "How often do you watch the
national network news on TV...?" and if R replied that R watched
national network news at all, then R was asked how many days in the
past week R watched the news. NOTE: distributions vary considerably.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V840108,V84011
1986: V86007
1988: V88012
1990: V90007
1992: V92320
1994: V94012
1996: V96024
1998: V98020
2000: V00032
2002: V02300
2004: V04301
2012: prmedia_wktvnws

===
VCF9036

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with Senate Majority Before the Election

QUESTION:

Do you happen to know which party had the most members in the U.S.
Senate before the election this/last month? (IF NECESSARY:) Which one?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Republicans - correct
2. Democrats   - correct
4. Republicans - incorrect
5. Democrats   - incorrect
7. Other (comments)
8. DK (No)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V82052
1984: V84100
1986: V86035
1988: V88087
1990: V90040
1992: V92595
1994: V94101
1996: V96107
1998: V98048
2000: V00135
2004: V04509

==
VCF9037

ISSUES: Government Should Ensure Fair Jobs for Blacks

QUESTION:

Some people feel that if black people (1964,1968: negroes) are not
getting fair treatment in jobs, the government in Washington ought
to see to it that they do. Others feel that this is not the federal
government's business.
Have you had enough interested in this question to favor one side over
the other?
1964,1968,1972:
(IF YES) How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see to
it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or should the
government in Washington leave these matters to the states and local
communities?
1986 AND LATER:
(IF YES) How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see to
it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or is this not the
federal government's business?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. See to it that black people get fair treatment in
     jobs
5. 1992 and later: Not the federal government's
     business /1964,1968,1972: leave to the states and
     local communities
9. Other; depends; DK; no interest

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA opinion; DK/NA whether 'interested enough;'
    no Post IW; form A (1986)

INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See also VCF0818.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable combines data from question versions in which the second
response option differs.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: V64009
1968: V68007
1972: V720103,V72010
1986: V860505,V86050
1988: V880864,V88086
1992: V925937,V92593
1996: V961205,V96120
2000: V000799,V00080
2004: V045109,V045109
2012: fairjob_opin

===

VCF9038

ISSUES: Guaranteed Equal Opportunity Is Not Government Job

QUESTION:

1986:
Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following
statement. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R) Do you agree strongly,
agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or
disagree strongly with that statement?)
1988:
Now looking again at [respondent booklet] for your choices, here are
several more statements. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)
ALL YEARS;
'Equal opportunity for blacks and whites is very important but it's
not really the government's job to guarantee it.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat

3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86052
1988: V88096

==
VCF9039

RACIAL RESENTMENT: Conditions Make it Difficult for Blacks to Succeed

QUESTION:

1986,1990,1994:
In past studies we have asked people why they think white people seem to
get more of the good things in life in America-- such as better jobs and
more money--than black people do. These are some of the reasons given
by both blacks and whites. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree
with each reason as to why white people seem to get more of the good
things in life. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R).
1988,1992:
Now looking again at [respondent booklet] for your choices, here are
several more statements. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R).
ALL YEARS:
'Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions
that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower
class.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly

2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1972 NOTE:
The 1972 version of this question was not comparable.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86058
1988: V88096
1990: V90052
1992: V92612
1994: V94105
2000: V00151
2004: V04519
2012: resent_slavery

===

VCF9040

RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Should Not Have Special Favors to Succeed

QUESTION:

2004: Now I'm going to read several more statements. After each
one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree.
The first statement is:
ALL YEARS:
'Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice
and worked their way up. Blacks should to the same without any
special favors.'

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes VCF9039.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86056
1988: V88096
1990: V90052
1992: V92612
1994: V94104
1998: V98051
2000: V00150
2004: V04519

===

VCF9041

RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Must Try Harder to Succeed

QUESTION:

'It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks
would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree

4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes VCF9039.
1972 NOTE:
The 1972 version of this question was not comparable.
See question text and notes VCF9039.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86057
1988: V88096
1990: V90052
1992: V92612
1994: V94105
2000: V00151
2004: V04519
2012: resent_try

==

VCF9042

RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Gotten Less than They Deserve Over the Past Few Years

QUESTION:

'Over the past few years blacks have gotten less than they deserve.'

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agree strongly
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree strongly

8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See question text and notes VCF9039.
1988 NOTE:
Placement varied by form.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86056
1988: V88096
1990: V90052
1992: V92612
1994: V94104
1998: V98051
2000: V00150
2004: V04519
2012: resent_deserve

==
VCF9043

ISSUES: School Prayer Allowed 4-Category

QUESTION:

Which of the following views comes closest to your opinion on the
issue of school prayer? [1996-LATER: Just give me the number of your
choice] (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. By law, prayer should not be allowed in public
   schools
2. The law should allow public schools to schedule time
   when children can pray silently if they want to
3. The law should allow public schools to schedule time
   when children as a group can say a general prayer
   not tied to a particular religious faith

4. By law, public schools should schedule a time when
   all children would say a chosen Christian prayer
9. Other, DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. NA; no Post IW; form A (1990); short form IW
   (1992)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86048
1988: V88086
1990: V90046
1992: V92594
1994: V94102
1996: V96121
1998: V98045

==

VCF9043a

ISSUES: Strength of Opinion When School Prayer Allowed 4-Category

QUESTION:

Which of the following views comes closest to your opinion on the
issue of school prayer? [1996-LATER: Just give me the number of your
choice] (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)]
Do you favor that choice strongly or not strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Strongly
5. Not strongly

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; other/DK/NA opinion (except 1990,1996);
   DK/NA opinion (1990,1996); form A (1990); short
   form questionnaire (1992); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years except 1990 and 1996, this question was not asked
of respondents who gave an 'other' opinion about school prayer
(see VCF9043)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86048
1988: V88086
1990: V90046
1992: V92594
1994: V94102
1996: V96121
1998: V98045

==

VCF9044

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Effect of Federal Economic Policies 7-Category

QUESTION:

(1988 AND LATER: Over the past year) Would you say that the economic
policies of the federal government have made the nation's economy
better, worse, or haven't they made much difference either way? (IF
BETTER/WORSE:) Would you say the economy is much better/worse or
somewhat better/worse?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. Same ('haven't made much difference')
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse
6. Better, DK/NA how much
7. Worse, DK/NA how much

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK if better/worse/same
9. NA if better/worse/same
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84024
1986: V860374,V86037
1988: V880245,V88024
1992: V923541,V92354
1994: V940911,V94091
1996: V96039

===
VCF9044a

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Effect of Federal Economic Policies 3-Category

QUESTION:

(1988,1992-LATER: Over the past year) Would you say that the economic
policies of the federal government have made the nation's economy
better, worse, or haven't they made much difference either way?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Better
2. Same ('haven't made much difference')
3. Worse
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
THIS IS A RECODE OF VCF9044: 1,2,6=1   3=2   4,5,7=3   8=8   9=9   0=0.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF9045

CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Position of the U.S. Weaker/Stronger in the Past Year

QUESTION:

1958,1960,1964,1968:
Would you say that in the past year or so our position in the world has
become stronger, less strong, or has it stayed about the same?
1984 AND 1984-LATER:
(2002,2004: Turning to some other issues facing the country) During
the past year, would you say that the United States' position in the
world has grown weaker, stayed about the same, or has it grown
stronger?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Weaker (1958,1960,1964,1968: less strong)
3. Same
5. Stronger
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

1984: V84024
1986: V86052
1988: V88025
1990: V90049
1992: V92360
1994: V94101
1996: V96040
1998: V98048
2000: V00050
2002: V02303
2004: V04311
2012: usworld_stronger

==

VCF9046

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Food Stamps

QUESTION:

Food stamps

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased
7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84100
1986: V86033
1988: V88034
1990: V90038

1992: V92372
1994: V94082
1996: V96049
2000: V00067

===

VCF9047

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Improve and Protect the Environment

QUESTION:

Improving and protecting the environment
[2012: protecting the environment]

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased
7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84099
1986: V86032
1988: V88037
1990: V90037
1992: V92381
1994: V94481
1996: V96056
2000: V00068
2002: V025113

===

VCF9048

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Space/Science/Technology

QUESTION:

1984,1992,2004: Science and technology
1986,1988: Space and scientific research
1990: the space program

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased
7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84100
1986: V86033
1988: V88038
1990: V90038
1992: V92381
2004: V04316
2012: fedspend_scitech

==

VCF9049

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Social Security

QUESTION:

Social Security

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased
7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW (1984); abbrev. telephone IW
   (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84099
1986: V86032
1988: V88034
1990: V90038
1992: V92381
1994: V94081
1996: V96056
2000: V00068
2002: V025117
2004: V04316
2012: fedspend_ss

===
VCF9050

ISSUES: Federal Spending- Assistance to Blacks

QUESTION:

Programs that assist blacks
1984: assistance to blacks
2002: aid to blacks

VALID_CODES:

----
1. Increased
2. Same
3. Decreased
7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)
8. DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See federal spending question text and notes preceding VCF0886.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84100
1986: V86033
1988: V88038
1990: V90038
1992: V92372
2000: V00068
2002: V025119

==

VCF9051

ISSUES: School Prayer Allowed 2-Category

QUESTION:

Some people think it is all right for the public schools to start each
day with a prayer. Others feel that religion does not belong in the
public schools but should be taken care of by the family and the
church.
Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the
other? (IF YES) Which do you think--schools should be allowed to start
each day with a prayer or religion does not belong in the schools?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Schools should be allowed to start with prayer
5. Religion does not belong in the school

8. Other; depends; both (1964-1968); DK; no interest

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA opinion; DK/NA if interested; no Post IW;
   abbrev. telephone IW (1984)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: V64008
1966: V66003
1968: V68045
1980: V801134,V80113
1984: V841037,V84103

==
VCF9052

CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Are Things in U.S. Going Well or Not

QUESTION:

Let's talk about the country as a whole.
Would you say that things in the country are generally going very
well, fairly well, not too well or not well at all?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Very well
2. Fairly well
4. Not too well
5. Not well at all

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form B (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84022
1986: V86054
1988: V88023

==

VCF9053

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Income Kept Up with Costs in Last Year

QUESTION:

Do you think that over the last year your/your family's income has
gone up more than the cost of living, has it fallen behind, or has it
stayed about even with the cost of living?
(IF GONE UP OR FALLEN BEHIND) Has it (gone up/fallen behind) a lot or
(gone up/fallen behind) a little?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gone up a lot
2. Gone up a little
3. Same
4. Fallen behind a little
5. Fallen behind a lot
6. Gone up, DK/NA how much
7. Fallen behind, DK/NA how much

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK if gone up/fallen behind/stayed same
9. NA if gone up/fallen behind/stayed same; Form B
    (1986)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1980 NOTE:
The 1980 version of this variable was not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V840154,V84015
1986: V860362,V86036
1988: V880211,V88021
1992: V923429,V92343

===

VCF9054

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Senate Race in State

QUESTION:

Checkpoint: Senate race in state of IW?

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   U.S. Senate race in state
2.   No U.S. Senate race in state

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   no Post IW; Washington D.C.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
GENERAL NOTE:
To determine whether a Senate race was held for no-post-IW cases, see
VCF9055 codes 0, 81-85.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78047
1980: V80083
1982: V82011
1984: V84006
1986: V86011
1988: V88057
1990: V900012,V900013,V90005
1992: V92302
1994: V94001
1996: V96109

1998: V98031
2000: V00020
2002: V024500b,V02504
2004: V04450
2012: prevote_senhhstate

==

VCF9055

ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Type of U.S. Senate Race

QUESTION:

Type of Senate race - state of IW

VALID_CODES:
----
12. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER
13. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- OTHER CHALLENGER
14. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- UNOPPOSED
19. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER
    CHALLENGERS
21. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER
23. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- OTHER CHALLENGER
24. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- UNOPPOSED
29. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER
    CHALLENGERS
51. DEMOCRATIC CAND UNOPPOSED (Democratic incumbent not
    running)
52. REPUBLICAN CAND UNOPPOSED (Democratic incumbent not
    running)
55. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (Democratic
    incumbent not running)
59. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDS (Democratic
    incumbent not running)
61. DEMOCRATIC CAND UNOPPOSED (Republican incumbent not
    running)
62. REPUBLICAN CAND UNOPPOSED (Republican incumbent not
    running)
65. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (Republican
    incumbent not running)
69. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDS (Republican
    incumbent not running)
75. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (other incumbent not
    running)
81. 2 DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS: NO RACE IN STATE
82. 2 REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS: NO RACE IN STATE
83. 1 DEMOCRATIC AND 1 OTHER INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN STATE
84. 1 REPUBLICAN AND 1 OTHER INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN STATE
85. 1 DEMOCRATIC AND 1 REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN
    STATE
95. 2 Senate elections in state [regular Senate election
    and special Senate election] (1992: CA ONLY; note
    that regular Senate election is open race with 2

nonincumbent candidates) (1994: TN ONLY)

MISSING_CODES:
----
00. Washington D.C.; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Non-major-party candidates are not accounted for here unless they are incumbents.
1984 NOTE:
1 case in Connecticut which was mistakenly coded 82 in the study data has been corrected to 85 here. Also 1 case in Pennsylvania in 1984 which was mistakenly coded 85 in the study data has been corrected to 82 here.
2002 NOTE:
LA05 cases, where a Democratic incumbent was challenged by 2 Republicans, has been coded to 12.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78000
1980: V80074
1982: V82000
1984: V840010,V84006
1986: V86004
1988: V880012,V88005
1990: V90005
1992: V92302
1994: V94001
1996: V96009
1998: V98006
2000: V00020
2002: V024500
2004: V04450
2012: typerace2012_sen

===

VCF9056

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Democratic Candidate

QUESTION:

Senate Democratic candidate - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990.   No Democratic candidate
996.   No race in state; Washington D.C.
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
If there was no senate race in state AND no post IW, then 999 (no
post) has been coded.
1992 NOTE:
In California in 1992, the regular Senate election and a second
"special" Senate election were held. This variable codes data for the
Democratic candidate in the regular Senate election only.
1994 NOTE:
same as 1992, for Tennessee

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78200
1980: V80084
1982: V82012
1986: V86013
1988: V88059
1990: V90014
1992: V92530
1994: V94023
1998: V98024
2000: V001300,V00130
2002: V02504
2004: V044507,V04505
2012: ftpo_sdc

===

VCF9057

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Republican Candidate

QUESTION:

Senate Republican candidate - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990.   No Republican candidate
996.   No race in state; Washington D.C.
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
If there was no senate race in state AND no post IW, then 999 (no
post) has been coded.
1992 NOTE:
In California in 1992, the regular Senate election and a second
"special" Senate election were held. This variable codes data for the
Democratic candidate in the regular Senate election only.
1994 NOTE:
same as 1992, for Tennessee

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78200
1980: V80084
1982: V82012
1986: V86013
1988: V88059
1990: V90014
1992: V92530
1994: V94023

1998: V98024
2000: V001300,V00130
2002: V025048,V02504
2004: V044507,V04505
2012: ftpo_src

===

VCF9058

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Incumbent Candidate

QUESTION:

Senate incumbent candidate - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990.   No incumbent candidate
996.   No race in state; Washington D.C.
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
If there was no senate race in state AND no post IW, then 999 (no
post) has been coded. If there was no senate race in state AND no post
IW, then 999 (no post) has been coded.
1992 NOTE:
In California in 1992, the regular Senate election and a second
"special" Senate election were held. This variable codes data for the
Democratic candidate in the regular Senate election only.
1994 NOTE:
same as 1992, for Tennessee

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78200

1980: V800848,V80084
1982: V820126,V82012
1986: V860131,V86013
1988: V880596,V88059
1990: V900140,V90014
1992: V925304,V92530
1994: V940231,V94023
1998: V980241,V98024
2000: V001300,V001301,V00130
2002: V024500b,V025047,V025048,V02504
2004: V044507,V045050,V045051,V04505

===

VCF9059

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Challenger

QUESTION:

Senate challenger to incumbent candidate - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
990.   No incumbent candidate; incumbent candidate is
       unopposed
996.   No race in state; Washington D.C.
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.
GENERAL NOTE:
If there was no senate race in state AND no post IW, then 999 (no
post) has been coded. If there was no senate race in state AND no post
IW, then 999 (no post) has been coded.
1992 NOTE:
In California in 1992, the regular Senate election and a second
"special" Senate election were held. This variable codes data for the
Democratic candidate in the regular Senate election only.
1994 NOTE:
same as 1992, for Tennessee

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78200
1980: V800848,V80084
1982: V820126,V82012
1986: V860131,V86013
1988: V880596,V88059
1990: V900140,V90014
1992: V925304,V92530
1994: V940231,V94023
1998: V980241,V98024
2000: V001300,V001301,V00130
2002: V024500b,V025047,V025048,V02504
2004: V044507,V045050,V045051,V04505

==

VCF9060

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: (State w/Race) Senator

QUESTION:

Senator not up for re-election in state with Senate race - feeling
thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
996.   No race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 senate
       races: CA (1992 ONLY), TN (1994 ONLY)
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF9061

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senator 1 (State w/o Race)

QUESTION:

First Senator in state without Senate race - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
996.   Race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 Senate
       races: CA (1992 ONLY), TN (1994 ONLY)
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78014
1980: V80085

1982: V82012
1986: V86013
1988: V88060
1990: V90014
1992: V92530
1994: V94023
2004: V044507,V04505

===
VCF9062

POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senator 2 (State w/o Race)

QUESTION:

Second Senator in state without Senate race - feeling thermometer

VALID_CODES:

0-100.   Degrees as given

MISSING_CODES:
----
996.   Race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 Senate
       races: CA (1992 ONLY), TN (1994 ONLY)
997.   R doesn't recognize name
998.   DK where to rate; can't judge
999.   NA; refused; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See Appendix note "STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES".
See thermometer question text and notes preceding VCF0201.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78014
1980: V80085
1982: V82013
1986: V86013
1988: V88059
1990: V90014
1992: V91531
1994: V94023

2004: V044507,V04505

==

VCF9063

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Recall Names of U.S. Senate Candidates

QUESTION:

ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:
How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States
Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates'
names were?
1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:
As you know, there were two Senate races in California this year. Do
you happen to remember what the candidates' names were?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No; DK

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.
0.   No Senate race in state
INAP. Inap. question not used

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1974: V74217
1978: V78012
1980: V80083
1982: V82011
1986: V86011
1988: V88057
1990: V90012
1992: V925202,V92521

==

VCF9064

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

QUESTION:

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States
Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates'
names were? /
(1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:) As you know, there were two Senate races in
California this year. Do you happen to remember what the candidates'
names were
ALL YEARS:
Who were they? (1ST MENTION)

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   NAME: valid,   PARTY: correct
2.   NAME: valid,   PARTY: incorrect
3.   NAME: valid,   PARTY: DK/NA
4.   NAME: invalid, PARTY: any
5.   NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6.   NAME: DK/NA,   PARTY: any
7.   NAME: DK,   PARTY: DK/NA;
     NAME: NA,   PARTY: DK (except 1978)
     R says that s/he recalls no names (5 in VCF9063)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9.   Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
     Washington D.C.; NA if remembers any names (9 in
     VCF9063)
0.   No Senate race in state
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

1974 NOTE:
1974 data are not coded comparably.
1978 NOTE:
NA in code 9 also includes "NA name, DK party."
1992 NOTE:
In California in 1992, in addition to the regular Senate election a
second "special" Senate election was held and 4 --rather than 3 --
Senate recall mentions were coded for CA only in the original data.
For 1992 CA cases, CDF vars VCF9064-9066 are coded only for mentions
which are not mentions of "special" election candidates (not candidate
'93' nor '94' in the original study data). If a 1992 California
respondent has recall but R's ONLY mention(s) refer to the special
election candidates, then 8 has been coded in VCF9064-9066 [98 in
VCF9067].

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

1978: V78012
1980: V80083
1982: V82011
1986: V86012
1988: V88058
1990: V90012
1992: V925206,V925216,V92521

===

VCF9065

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

QUESTION:

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States
Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates'
names were?
Who were they? (2ND MENTION)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. NAME: valid,   PARTY: correct
2. NAME: valid,   PARTY: incorrect
3. NAME: valid,   PARTY: DK/NA
4. NAME: invalid, PARTY: any
5. NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6. NAME: DK/NA,   PARTY: any
7. NAME: DK,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    NAME: NA,   PARTY: DK (1978 only)
    R says that s/he recalls no names (5 in VCF9063);
    R only has recall(s) for "special" election (1992,
    CA only); no second mention

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
    Washington D.C.
0. No Senate race in state
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF9064.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78013
1980: V80084
1982: V82011
1986: V86012
1988: V88058
1990: V90012
1992: V925210,V92522

==
VCF9066

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

QUESTION:

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States
Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates'
names were?
Who were they? (3RD MENTION)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. NAME: valid,   PARTY: correct
2. NAME: valid,   PARTY: incorrect
3. NAME: valid,   PARTY: DK/NA
4. NAME: invalid, PARTY: any
5. NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA
6. NAME: DK/NA,   PARTY: any
7. NAME: DK,   PARTY: DK/NA;
    NAME: NA,   PARTY: DK (1978 only)
    R says that s/he recalls no names (5 in VCF9063);
    R only has recall(s) for "special" election (1992,
    CA only); no second mention

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
    Washington D.C.
0. No Senate race in state
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF9064.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78013
1980: V80084
1982: V82012
1986: V86012
1988: V88059
1990: V90013
1992: V925214,V92522

==
VCF9067

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Number of Recalled Names of U.S. Senate Candidates

QUESTION:

Summary: number of corrent recalls-- U.S. Senate candidates

VALID_CODES:

NO NAME CORRECT
00. R's recall of any name(s) incorrect/DK/NA and any
    party mention(s) mention incorrect/DK/NA; R says s/he
    recalls no names; R only has recall(s) for "special"
    election (1992, CA only)
ONE CORRECT NAME
10. R's recall correct for one name; party mention
    incorrect/DK/NA
11. R's recall correct for one name; party mention correct
TWO CORRECT NAMES
20. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions
    incorrect/DK/NA
21. R's recall correct for 2 names; one party mention
    correct
22. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions
    correct
THREE CORRECT NAMES
30. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions
    incorrect/DK/NA
31. R's recall correct for 3 names; one party mention
    correct
32. R's recall correct for 3 names; two party mentions
    correct
33. R's recall correct for 3 names; three party mentions
    correct

MISSING_CODES:

----
97. No Senate race in state
99. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;
    Washington D.C.
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Built from VCF9063-VCF9066

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780129,V780132,V78013
1980: V800837,V800840,V80084
1982: V820115,V820118,V82012
1986: V860121,V860125,V86012
1988: V880583,V880587,V88059
1990: V900125,V900129,V90013
1992: V925202,V925206,V925210,V925214,V925215,V925216,V925219,V925223,V92522

===

VCF9069

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Strength Approve/Disapprove Running U.S. U.S. House Incumbent

QUESTION:

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way [running U.S. House
incumbent Representative] has been handling his/her job?
(IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE) Do you approve/disapprove strongly or approve/
disapprove not strongly?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Approve strongly
2. Approve not strongly
4. Disapprove not strongly
5. Disapprove strongly
8. DK strongly or not strongly; DK if approve/
    disapprove (8 in VCF0991)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA strongly or not strongly; NA if approve/

disapprove; no Post IW (presidential years);
   short form (1992)
0.   No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

This is a follow-up to VCF0991.
GENERAL NOTE:
If the U.S. House representative in R's district was NOT running for
re-election (i.e., was 'retiring'), then this question does not apply
(0 coded).
If there was no running incumbent and no post IW, then 9 (no post) has
been coded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80097
1986: V86035
1988: V88079
1990: V900404,V90040
1992: V925710,V92571
1994: V940637,V94063
1996: V96112
1998: V980326,V98032
2000: V00136
2004: V045091,V045092,V045092
2012: hseinc_approval_x

==
VCF9070

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Agreement w/ Running House Incumbent's Legislative Votes

QUESTION:

Now we would like your opinion about the way [running U.S. House
incumbent representative] has voted on bills that have come up in the
U.S. House of Representatives in Washington.
1982:
Would you say that you generally agreed or generally disagreed with the
way he/she has voted on bills, have you agreed sometimes but disagreed
others, or haven't you thought much about this?
1986,1988:
Would you say that you have generally agreed with the way he/she has

voted on bills, agreed and disagreed about equally, generally disagreed,
or haven't paid much attention to this?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agreed
3. Agreed and disagreed about equally (1982: Agree
   sometimes, disagree sometimes)
5. Disagreed

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. Haven't paid much attention (1986,1988); haven't
   thought much about this (1982)
9. NA; no Post IW
0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
If the U.S. House representative in R's district was NOT running for
re-election (i.e., was 'retiring'), then this question does not
apply (0 coded).
If there was no running incumbent and no post IW, then 9 (no post) has
been coded.
1978 NOTE:
The 1978 version of this variable was not coded comparably.
1982 NOTE:
Study data included variables for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the running incumbent who represented R's sampling location
BEFORE the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent' for
Cumulative Data File definition. See note VCF0902 describing the
congressional districts affected and designation of candidates as the
(running) 'incumbent.'

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V820207,V820244,V82026
1986: V86029
1988: V88079

==

VCF9071

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Remember Running House U.S. House Incumbent Vote on Any Bill

QUESTION:

Was there any bill in particular that you remember how [House running incumbent] voted on in the last couple of years?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.);
   NJ01 (1990)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
If the U.S. House representative in R's district was NOT running for re-election (i.e., was 'retiring'), then this question does not apply (0 coded).
If there was no running incumbent and no post IW, then 9 (no post) has been coded.
1990 NOTE:
for New Jersey congressional district 01, the U.S. Representative was neither 'retiring' nor running at the time of the 1990 general elections. The Representative from NJ01 had campaigned for and been elected to another office in 1989, and the office of Representative was not (in effect) occupied until after the 1990 elections (code 0).
1978 NOTE:
The 1978 version of this variable were not comparable.
1982 NOTE:
same as 1978.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86029
1988: V88079
1990: V900058,V90031

===

VCF9072

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Agree With Running House U.S. House Incumbent Vote on Bill

QUESTION:

Was there any bill in particular that you remember how s/he [House
running incumbent] voted on in the last couple of years?
(IF YES) Did you agree or disagree with the way s/he voted on that bill?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Agreed
5. Disagreed

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.); R
    does not remember or DK/NA if remembers any House
    votes (5,8,9 in VCF9071)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
If the U.S. House representative in R's district was NOT running for
re-election (i.e., was 'retiring'), then this question does not apply
(0 coded).
If there was no running incumbent and no post IW, then 9 (no post) has
been coded.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1986: V86029
1988: V88079
1990: V900058,V90031

===

VCF9073

ISSUES: President on Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people believe that we should spend much less money
for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly
increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.
And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere
in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place
[president] on this issue?
ALL YEARS:
Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
    about it" on same 7pt scale (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years before 1996, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much
about it" or if his/her response was NA in rating self on this same 7-
point scale, then R was not asked this question.
Presidents: Jimmy Carter 1980; Ronald Reagan 1982,1984,1986,1988;
George Bush Sr. 1990,1992; Bill CLinton 1996; George W. Bush, 2004.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80028
1982: V82040
1984: V84039
1986: V86040
1988: V88031
1990: V90044
1992: V92370
1996: V96046
2004: V04314

==

VCF9074

ISSUES: President on Cooperation with USSR Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along
with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get
along with Russia.
1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Cooperate more/try to get along with Russia
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher/big mistake to try to get along
     with Russia

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about it"
   on same 7pt scale
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80107
1984: V84040
1988: V88037

===

VCF9075

ISSUES: President on Women's Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's
rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal
role with men in running business, industry, and
government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the
home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at
point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [president] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry and government. Others feel that women's place is
in the home.
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK

9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
   about it" on same 7pt scale (not 1996 or later)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72023
1976: V76378
1978: V78039
1980: V80109
1982: V82043
1988: V88039
1996: V96054
1998: V98044
2004: V04319

===

VCF9076

ISSUES: President on Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1970-1984,1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks
(1970: negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving
them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should
not make any special effort ot help minorities because they should help
themselves.
1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks.
Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to
help blacks because they should help themselves.
2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people feel that the government in Washington
should make every effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are

at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that
the government should not make any special effort to
help blacks because they should help themselves.
(Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.)
And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [president] on this issue?
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help minority blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
   about it" on same 7pt scale (1972-1984,1988,
   1990); R self-rating is "haven't thought much about
   it" (1970)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.
ADDITIONAL NOTE:
Note that form B in 1988 and all previous years specified "blacks and
other minorities" in this question while form A in 1988 and all cases
in 1990 specified only "blacks." To filter for form A/B responses,
use variableVCF0012.
2000 NOTE:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series and are excluded
here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: V70010

1972: V72063
1974: V74229
1976: V76326
1978: V78037
1980: V80106
1982: V82041
1984: V84038
1988: V880339(form A,V880347(form B
1990: V90044
1994: V94093
1996: V96049
2000: V00064
2004: V04316
2012: aidblack_self

===
VCF9077

ISSUES: President on Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital
costs.
Some people feel there should be a government insurance plan which
would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1994: for everyone).
Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and
through private insurance[1996: plans] like Blue Cross (1994: or
[1996:some] other company paid plans).
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form II (1972)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
    about it" on same 7pt scale (1972,1976,1978); R
    self-rating is "haven't thought much about it" (1970)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1970: V70013
1972: V72020
1976: V76327
1978: V78038
1994: V94095
1996: V96048
2012: inspre_self

===
VCF9078

ISSUES: President on Government Spending/Services Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people think the government should provide fewer
services even in areas such as health and education
in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at
one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is
important for the government to provide many more services
even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these
people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course,
some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [president] on this issue?
ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide
many more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should provide many fewer services: Reduce
    spending a lot
2.
3.
4.

5.
6.
7. Government should provide many more services:
    Increase spending a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);
    telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" on same 7pt scale (all years before 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.
2000 NOTE:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series and are excluded
here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V82044
1984: V84037
1986: V86044
1988: V88030
1990: V90045
1992: V92370
1994: V94094
1996: V96045
1998: V98046
2000: V00055
2004: V04313
2012: spsrvpr_ssself

===

VCF9079

ISSUES: President on Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Please look at page 9 of the booklet.
Some people feel the government in Washington should see

to it that every person has a job and a good standard of
living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others think the government should just let
each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people
are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some
other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [president] on this issue?
ALL YEARS:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it
that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others
think the government should just let each person ahead on his own.
And, of course, other people have opinions somewhere in between.
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN
TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on his own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK; haven't thought much about it
9. NA; no Post IW; form II (1972); short-form or
    Spanish language IW (1992)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
    about it" on same 7pt scale (all yrs. exc. 1992,
    1996 and later)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72017
1974: V74226
1976: V76324

1978: V78035
1980: V80111
1982: V82042
1984: V84041
1988: V88033
1992: V92371
1994: V94093
1996: V96048
1998: V98045
2004: V04315
2012: guarpr_self

==
VCF9080

ISSUES: President on Liberal-Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
I'm going to [1996-LATER: Here is a] show you a 7-point scale on which
the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely
liberal to extremely conservative. (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)
Where would you place [president] on this scale?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; forms III, IV (1972); R
    selected for branching version of this question
0. DK/Haven't thought about self-rating on same 7pt
    scale [see above] (not 1996 or later)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9073.
2000 NOTE:
Telephone respondents were asked a branching series and are excluded
here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72065
1974: V74230
1976: V76328
1978: V78040
1980: V80026
1982: V82039
1984: V84037
1986: V86038
1988: V88023
1990: V90040
1992: V92351
1994: V94084
1996: V96036
1998: V98040
2000: V00044
2004: V04308
2012: libcpo_self

==
VCF9081

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people believe that we should spend much less money
for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly
increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.
And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere
in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate]
(on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.

4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);
    telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
    about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Democratic Presidential candidates: McGovern 1972; Carter 1976, 1980;
Mondale 1984; Dukakis 1988; Clinton 1992, 1996; Gore 2000.
In all years except 1996 and 2000, if R replied DK or "haven't thought
much about it" rating self on same 7-point scale, then R was not asked
this question.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order of the major
Presidential candidate names for this placement.
2000 NOTE:
Telephone respondents were administered a branching series instead and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80028
1984: V84039
1988: V88031
1992: V92370
1996: V96046
2000: V00058
2004: V04314
2012: defsppr_dpc

==

VCF9082

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard
to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too
hard to get along with Russia.
1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/
    Important to try very hard to get along with Russia
    (1980)
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big
    mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80107
1984: V84041
1988: V88036

===
VCF9083

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's
rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal
role with men in running business, industry, and
government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the
home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at
point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is
in the home.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.   Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK
9.   NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)
0.   R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
      about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF9084

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1972,1976,1980,1984 and 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
(1972, 1976: possible) effort to improve the social and economic
position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other minorities)
(1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel
that the government should not make any special effort to help
minorities because they should help themselves.
1988 Form A, 1996 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others
feel that the government should not make any special effort to help
blacks because they should help themselves.
2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people feel that the government in Washington
should make every effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are
at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that
the government should not make any special effort to
help blacks because they should help themselves.
(Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.)
And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.

6.
7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much
   about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.
1988 NOTE:
Form A asked about "blacks" only, while Form B asked about "blacks and
other minorities" (to filter for Form A/B responses, use variable
VCF0012).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72063
1976: V76326
1980: V80106
1984: V84038
1988: V880333,V88034
1996: V96049
2000: V00065
2004: V04316
2012: aidblack_dpc

===
VCF9085

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital
costs. Some feel there should be a government insurance plan which
would cover all medical and hospital expenses. Others feel that
medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private
insurance like Blue Cross.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form II (1972)
0. "haven't thought much about it" for Democratic
   candidate's rating (1988 only); R self-rating
   is DK or "haven't thought much about it" on same 7pt
   scale (1972,1976)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72021
1976: V76327
1988: V88031
1996: V96048
2012: inspre_dpc

==

VCF9086

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people think the government should provide fewer
services even in areas such as health and education
in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at

one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is
important for the government to provide many more services
even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these
people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course,
some other people have opinions somewhere in between,
at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many
more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gov't provide many fewer servcies, reduce spending
    a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
    a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);
    telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" on same 7pt scale (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.
1980 NOTE:
The 1980 version of the question in not comparable.
1984 NOTE:
In 1984 this question appeared in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are
included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84037
1988: V88030
1992: V92370
1996: V96045
2000: V00055
2004: V04313
2012: spsrvpr_ssdpc

==
VCF9087

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people feel the government in Washington should see
to it that every person has a job and a good standard of
living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others think the government should just let
each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people
are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some
other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the
government should just let each person get ahead on his (1988: their)
own.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form II (1972); no Post IW; short-form or
    Spanish language IW (1992); telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "Haven't thought much

about it" on same 7pt scale (all years exc.
   1988,1992,1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9081.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72017
1976: V76324
1980: V80111
1984: V84041
1988: V88032
1992: V92372
1996: V96048
2000: V00062
2004: V04315
2012: guarpr_dpc

==
VCF9088

CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might
hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:

----
8. DK
9. NA; mail questionnaire; no Post IW; R
   selected for branching series version of this
   question (2000)
0. R did not rate self on same 7pt scale (see above)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Democratic Presidential candidates: McGovern 1972; Carter 1976, 1980;
Mondale 1984; Dukakis 1988; Clinton 1992, 1996; Gore 2000.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order of the major
Presidential candidate names for this placement.
In 1972-1980, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this question.
[Note that in 1972-1982 there was no follow-up question ('if you had to
choose.') for self-rating.]
In 1984,1988,1992, if R's self-placement was NA on the 7-point scale,
then this question was not asked. If R replied "haven't thought much
about it" or DK to this same 7-point scale, then R was prompted, 'If
you had to choose...' If R's response to the follow-up in 1984-1992
was DK, RF or NA, then R was not asked this question.
1972 NOTE:
Respondents in Post mail sample were not asked this question.
1980 NOTE:
In 1980, this question appeared in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are
included here.
2000 NOTE:
The 7-point scale version from both modes is represented here; both
telephone and FTF respondents were randomly selected for administration
of the traditional 7-pt scale version of this question or a branching
series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72065
1976: V76328
1980: V80026
1984: V84037
1988: V88023
1992: V92351
1996: V96036
2000: V00045

2004: V04308

==
VCF9089

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people believe that we should spend much less money
for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly
increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.
And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere
in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate]
(on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);
    telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "Haven't thought much
    about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Republican Presidential candidates: Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush Sr.
1988,1992; Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000.
In all years except 1996 and 2000, if R replied DK or "haven't thought
much about it" rating self on same 7-point scale, then R was not asked
this question.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order of the major
Presidential candidate names for this placement.

2000 NOTE:
Telephone respondents were administered a branching series instead and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80028
1984: V84039
1988: V88031
1992: V92370
1996: V96046
2000: V00059
2004: V04314
2012: defsppr_rpc

==

VCF9090

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along
with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get
along with Russia.
1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/
    Important to try very hard to get along with
    Russia (1980)
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big

Mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about
   it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80108
1984: V84040
1988: V88037

===
VCF9091

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's
rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal
role with men in running business, industry, and
government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the
home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at
point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is
in the home.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this

scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's palce is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "Haven't thought much
   about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72023
1976: V76378
1980: V80109
1988: V88038
1996: V96054
2000: V00076
2004: V04319

===

VCF9092

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1972,1976,1980,1984 and 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
(1972, 1976: possible) effort to improve the social and economic
position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other minorities)

(1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel
that the government should not make any special effort to help
minorities because they should help themselves.
1988 Form A, 1996 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others
feel that the government should not make any special effort to help
blacks because they should help themselves.
2004:
2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people feel that the government in Washington
should make every effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are
at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that
the government should not make any special effort to
help blacks because they should help themselves.
(Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.)
And, of course, some other people have opinions
somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "Haven't thought much
    about it" (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.
1988 NOTE:
Form A asked about "blacks" only, while Form B asked about "blacks and
other minorities" (to filter for Form A/B responses, use variable
VCF0012).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72063
1976: V76326
1980: V80106
1984: V84038
1988: V880334,V88034
1996: V96049
2000: V00065
2004: V04316
2012: aidblack_rpc

===
VCF9093

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Government Health Insurance Scale

QUESTION:

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital
costs. Some feel there should be a government insurance plan which
would cover all medical and hospital expenses. Others feel that
medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private
insurance like Blue Cross.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government insurance plan
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Private insurance plan

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form II (1972)
0. "Haven't thought much about it" for Republican
    candidate's rating (1988 only); R self-rating
    is DK or "Haven't thought much about it" on same 7pt
    scale (1972,1976)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72020
1976: V76327
1988: V88032
1996: V96048
2012: inspre_rpc

==

VCF9094

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people think the government should provide fewer
services even in areas such as health and education
in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at
one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is
important for the government to provide many more services
even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these
people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course,
some other people have opinions somewhere in between,
at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many
more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending
    a lot
2.

3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
   a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);
   telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about it"
   on same 7pt scale (not 1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.
1980 NOTE:
The 1980 version of the question in not comparable.
1984 NOTE:
In 1984 this question appeared in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are
included here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84037
1988: V88030
1992: V92370
1996: V96045
2000: V00056
2004: V04313
2012: spsrvpr_ssrpc

==
VCF9095

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people feel the government in Washington should see

to it that every person has a job and a good standard of
living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale,
at point 1. Others think the government should just let
each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people
are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some
other people have opinions somewhere in between, at
points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican presidential
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has a job and a good standard of living.
Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on
his (1988 and after: their) own.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R) (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; Form II (1972); no Post IW; short-form or
    Spanish language IW (1992); telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about it"
    on same 7pt scale (all years exc. 1988,1992,1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72017
1976: V76324
1980: V80111

1984: V84041
1988: V88032
1992: V92371
1996: V96048
2000: V00062
2004: V04315
2012: guarpr_rpc

==

VCF9096

CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might
hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; mail questionnaire; no Post IW; R
    selected for branching series version of this
    question (2000)
0. R did not rate self on same 7pt scale (see above)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9089.
GENERAL NOTE:
Republican Presidential candidates: Reagan 1980,1984; George Bush Sr.
1988,1992; Dole 1996; George W. Bush 2000.
In 1996 and later, randomization occurred for the order of the major
Presidential candidate names for this placement.
In 1972-1980, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this question.
[Note that in 1972-1982 there was no follow-up question ('if you had to
choose.') for self-rating.]
In 1984,1988,1992, if R's self-placement was NA on the 7-point scale,
then this question was not asked. If R replied "haven't thought much

about it" or DK to this same 7-point scale, then R was prompted, 'If
you had to choose...' If R's response to the follow-up in 1984-1992
was DK, RF or NA, then R was not asked this question.
1972 NOTE:
Respondents in Post mail sample were not asked this question.
1980 NOTE:
In 1980, this question appeared in both the Pre and Post; Pre data are
included here.
2000 NOTE:
The 7-point scale version from both modes is represented here; both
telephone and FTF respondents were randomly selected for administration
of the traditional 7-pt scale version of this question or a branching
series.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1972: V72065
1976: V75328
1980: V80026
1984: V84037
1988: V88023
1992: V92351
1996: V96037
2000: V00046
2004: V04308
2012: libcpre_rpc

===
VCF9097

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is
in the home.
Where would you place [the Democratic House Candidate] on this scale?
(7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.

3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
    thermometer)
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it"; no Democratic candidate in district race (incl.
    Washington DC)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Responses responses for independent or "other" candidate are not
included here for districts having only one major party candidate
(opposite party)..
In all years before 1998, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much
about it" in rating self on this same scale, then R was not asked this
question.
1998 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House
candidate names for this placement.
1998 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic Candidate for the
thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78039
1980: V80109
1982: V82043
1998: V98045

==

VCF9098

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks
(1970: negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means
giving them preferential treatment).
Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to
help minorities because they should help themselves.
Where would you place [the Democratic House candidate] on this scale?
(7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it"; no Democratic candidate in district race (incl.
    Washington DC)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9097.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78037
1980: V80106
1982: V82041

==

VCF9099

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people think the government should provide fewer
services even in areas such as health and education
in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at
one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is
important for the government to provide many more services
even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these
people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course,
some other people have opinions somewhere in between,
at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Democratic house candidate]
(on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many
more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending
     a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.   Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
     a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
      thermometer)
9.   NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW; telephone
      IW (2000)
0.   R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
      it"; no Democratic candidate in district race
      (incl. Washington DC)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9097.
1996 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House
candidate names for this placement.
1996 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic candidate for the
thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.

2000 NOTE:
This question was administered as a 7-point scale to FTF respondents
only; telephone respondents were administered a branching series and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V82044
1984: V84103
1986: V86045
1990: V90045
1994: V94094
1996: V96045
1998: V98046
2000: V001391
2004: V045046,V04512

===
VCF9100

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has a job and a good standard of living.
Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on
his own.
Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
     thermometer)

9. NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
   it"; no Democratic candidate in district race
   (incl. Washington DC)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9097.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78036
1980: V80111
1982: V82042
1984: V84105
1994: V94093
1998: V98046

===

VCF9101

CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might
hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on

thermometer)
9. NA; no Post IW (1980,2000); telephone IW (2000)
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no Democratic candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington DC)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9097.
1996 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House
candidate names for this placement.
1996 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic candidate for the
thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.
2000 NOTE:
This question was administered as a 7-point scale to FTF respondents
only; telephone respondents were administered a branching series and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78040
1980: V80104
1982: V82040
1986: V86038
1990: V90040
1994: V94084
1996: V96037
1998: V98040
2000: V001378
2002: V045046,V04511

==
VCF9102

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some
people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running
business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is
in the home.

Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on thermometer)
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about it"; no Republican candidate in district race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Responses responses for independent or "other" candidate are not included here for districts having only one major party candidate (opposite party)..
In all years before 1998, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in rating self on this same scale, then R was not asked this question.
1998 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House candidate names for this placement.
1998 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic Candidate for the thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78039
1980: V80110
1982: V82044
1998: V98045

===
VCF9103

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every
(1978: possible) effort to improve the social and economic position of
blacks and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving the
preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not
make any special effort to help minorities because they should help
themselves.
Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.   Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK/Don't Recognize
9.   NA; no Post IW
0.   R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
     it"; no Republican candidate in district race (incl.
     Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See VCF9102 note.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78037
1980: V80106
1982: V82042

===

VCF9104

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet.
Some people think the government should provide fewer
services even in areas such as health and education
in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at
one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is
important for the government to provide many more services
even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these
people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course,
some other people have opinions somewhere in between,
at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6.
Where would you place [the Republican U.S. house
candidate] (on this issue)?
ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many
more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending
     a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
     a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
     thermometer)
9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
     it"; no Republican candidate in district race
     (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9102.

1996 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House
candidate names for this placement.
1996 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic candidate for the
thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.
2000 NOTE:
This question was administered as a 7-point scale to FTF respondents
only; telephone respondents were administered a branching series and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V82044
1984: V84103
1986: V86045
1990: V90045
1994: V94094
1996: V96046
1998: V98046
2000: V001397
2004: V045047,V04512

===
VCF9105

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the
government should just let each person get ahead on his own.
Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
   thermometer)
9. NA; telephone IW (1984); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
   it"; no Republican candidate in district race
   (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9102.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78036
1980: V80111
1982: V82043
1984: V84105
1994: V94093
1998: V98046

==
VCF9106

CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives.
Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might
hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.
Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this
scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative

7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on
   thermometer)
9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching
   series version of this question (2000)
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
   it" (see above); no Republican candidate in
   district race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9097.
1996 NOTE 1:
Randomization occurred for the order of the 2 major party House
candidate names for this placement.
1996 NOTE 2:
If R did not recognize the name of the Democratic candidate for the
thermometer rating, then this question was not asked.
2000 NOTE:
This question was administered as a 7-point scale to FTF respondents
only; telephone respondents were administered a branching series and
are excluded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78040
1980: V80105
1982: V82040
1986: V86038
1990: V90041
1994: V94084
1996: V96037
1998: V98040
2000: V001380
2004: V045047,V04512

==

VCF9107

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Women's equal role -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9097, VCF9102.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780395,V78039
1980: V800740,V801099,V80110
1982: V820006,V820439,V82044
1998: V980451,V98045

==
VCF9108

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

Aid to blacks -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1.   Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.   Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8.   DK/Don't Recognize
9.   NA; no Post IW
0.   R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
     it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
     race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9098, VCF9103.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780377,V78037
1980: V800740,V801067,V80106
1982: V820006,V820419,V82042

==

VCF9109

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Govt services/spending -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce
   spending a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government should provide many more services: increase
   spending a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9099, VCF9104.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==
VCF9110

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Guaranteed jobs/living -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9100, VCF9105.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other

candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780361,V78036
1980: V800740,V801115,V80111
1982: V820006,V820429,V82043
1984: V840059,V841051,V84105
1994: V940932,V94093
1998: V980460,V98046

==
VCF9111

CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

Liberal/conservative -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching
     series version of this question (2000)
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
     it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
     race (incl. Washington D.C.)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9101, VCF9106.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780404,V78040
1980: V800740,V801049,V80105
1982: V820006,V820401,V82040
1986: V860043,V860388,V86038
1990: V900058,V900409,V90041
1994: V940843,V94084
1996: V960375,V96037
1998: V980407,V98040
2000: V001378a,V001380
2004: V044502,V045046,V045047.045119,V04512

==

VCF9112

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

QUESTION:

Women's equal role -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Women and men should have an equal role
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Women's place is in the home

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.); incumbent unopposed
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9097, VCF9102.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780395,V78039
1980: V800740,V801099,V80110
1982: V820006,V820439,V82044
1998: V980451,V98045

==
VCF9113

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

Aid to blacks -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help Blacks/minorities
2.
3.

4.
5.
6.
7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.); incumbent unopposed
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9098, VCF9103.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780077,V78037
1980: V800740,V801067,V80106
1982: V820006,V820419,V82042

==
VCF9114

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Govt services/spending -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point
scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending
    a lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
    a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.); incumbent unopposed
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9099, VCF9104.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V820006,V820447,V82044
1984: V840059,V841031,V84103
1986: V860043,V860450,V86045
1990: V900058,V900454,V90045
1994: V940942,V94094
1996: V960459,V96046
1998: V980466,V98046

2000: V001391a,V001397
2004: V044502,V045046,V045047,V045122,V04512

==

VCF9115

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Guaranteed jobs/living -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point
scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA;telephone(1984); no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.); incumbent unopposed
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9100, VCF9105.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

==

VCF9116

CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

QUESTION:

Liberal/conservative -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Slightly liberal
4. Moderate; middle of the road
5. Slightly conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK/Don't Recognize
9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching
    series version of this question (2000)
0. R self-rating was DK or "haven't thought much about
    it" (see above); no incumbent candidate in district
    race (incl. Washington D.C.); incumbent unopposed
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
For all years, this var has been built from placements of Democratic
and Republican House candidates. See VCF9101, VCF9106.
1982 NOTE:
1982 study data included 2 sets of vars for 2 running incumbents due to
redistricting in two congressional districts (19 cases affected). For
this year, the incumbent who represented R's sampling location BEFORE
the 1982 redistricting has been considered R's 'incumbent'. The other
candidate, the incumbent previously representing another Congressional
district (i.e., not previously representing the district of R's sample
location) has been considered the 'challenger' to the running
incumbent.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780004,V780404,V78040
1980: V800740,V801049,V80105
1982: V820006,V820401,V82040
1986: V860043,V860388,V86038
1990: V900058,V900409,V90041
1994: V910843,V94084
1996: V960375,V96037
1998: V980407,V98040
2000: V001378a,V001380
2004: V044502,V045046,V045047,V045119,V04512

==
VCF9117

ISSUES: Federal Government on Cooperation with USSR Scale

QUESTION:

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along
with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get
along with Russia.
1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with
Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings
with Russia.
ALL YEARS:
Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the
present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/
    Important to try very hard to get along with
    Russia (1980)
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big
    Mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK/"haven't thought much about it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on this same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this
question.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80109
1984: V84041
1988: V88037

===
VCF9118

ISSUES: Federal Government on Defense Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.
Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased.
Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the
present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Greatly decrease defense spending
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Greatly increase defense spending

MISSING_CODES:
----

8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)
0. R self-rating was DK/"haven't thought much about it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on this same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this
question.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80028
1982: V82041
1984: V84040
1986: V86041
1988: V88031
1990: V90044
1992: V92371

==

VCF9119

ISSUES: Federal Government on Aid to Blacks Scale

QUESTION:

1980,1982, 1984 and 1988 FORM B: Some people feel that the government
in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other
minorities) (1980: even if it means giving the preferential
treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any
1988 Form A,1990 AND LATER: Some people feel that the government in
Washington should make every effort to improve the social and
economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should
not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help
themselves.
ALL YEARS: Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing
at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government should help blacks (1988a)/minorities

(1988b)/minority groups (1980,1984)
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Blacks (1988a)/Minorities (1988b)/Minority groups
    (1980,1984) should help themselves

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW
0. R self-rating was DK/"haven't thought much about it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on this same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this
question.
1988 NOTE:
Form A asked about "blacks" only, while Form B asked about "blacks and
other minorities." (To filter for Form A/B responses, use variable
VCF0012.)

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80107
1982: V82042
1984: V84038
1988: V880336,V88034
1990: V90045

==
VCF9120

ISSUES: Federal Government on Government Services/Spending Scale

QUESTION:

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even
in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending.
Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many

more services even if it means an increase in spending.
Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the
present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending a
    lot
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending
    a lot

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)
0. R self-rating was DK/"haven't thought much about it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on this same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this
question.
1980 NOTE:
The 1980 version of this question is not comparable.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1982: V82045
1984: V84038
1986: V86045
1988: V88030
1990: V90045
1992: V92370

==

VCF9121

ISSUES: Federal Government on Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

QUESTION:

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that
every person has a job and a good standard of living.
Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on
his (1988: their) own.
Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the
present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Government see to job and good standard of living
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Government let each person get ahead on own

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK
9. NA; no Post IW; short-form or Spanish language
    IW (1992)
0. R self-rating was DK/"haven't thought much about it"
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
In all years, if R replied DK or "haven't thought much about it" in
rating self on this same 7-point scale, then R was not asked this
question.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80112
1982: V82043
1984: V84041
1988: V88032
1992: V92372

===

VCF9122

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number of Politically Eligible Adults in HH

QUESTION:

Household composition, number of politically eligible adults

VALID_CODES:
----
1. One politically eligible adult
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. Seven or more politically eligible adults

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Panel (1992,1996)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
NES samples include eligible persons residing in the coterminous 48
states and not institutionalized. Eligible persons are those eligible
to vote by age and and U.S. citizen status.
1966 NOTE:
Politically eligible adults are represented from the primary family
unit only. 1966 Rs who were politically eligible but from a secondary
family unit (23 CASES) are missing data, code 9. 'Politically eligible'
adults were citizens who were 18 or over in Georgia and Kentucky, 21 or
over elsewhere.
1968 NOTE:
'Politically eligible' adults were citizens who were 18 or over in
Georgia and Kentucky, 21 or over elsewhere.
1972-LATER NOTE:
Respondents were politically eligible if they were 18 or older by
election day and U.S. citizens.
2002 NOTE:
Respondents were politically eligible if they were 18 or older on
the day of interview and U.S. citizens.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1966: V66001
1968: V68002
1972: V72001
1974: V74202
1976: V76302
1978: V78003
1980: V80004
1982: V82005
1984: V84007
1986: V86001
1988: V88009
1990: V90002
1992: V92307
1994: V94005
1996: V96004
1998: V98003
2000: V00003
2002: V02110
2004: V041102
2012: hhlist_elighhtot

==
VCF9123

STUDY ADMIN: Number of Pre-Election Interviewer Calls

QUESTION:

Call number of last interviewer call to housing unit, pre-election.

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The actual number of telephone calls or personal trips made to the
household by the interviewer is coded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1980: V80003

1984: V84003
1988: V88002
1992: V92303
1996: V96002
2000: V000027,V00002
2002: V02200
2004: V04201

===

VCF9124

STUDY ADMIN: Number of Post-Election Interviewer Calls

QUESTION:

Call number of last interviewer call to housing unit, post-election.

MISSING_CODES:
----
99. NA
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The actual number of telephone calls or personal trips made to the
household by the interviewer is coded here.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78003
1980: V80003
1982: V82004
1984: V84005
1986: V86001
1988: V88005
1990: V90003
1992: V92501
1994: V94004
1996: V96091
1998: V98002
2000: V000150,V00015
2002: V02400
2004: V04401

==

VCF9125

STUDY ADMIN: Post-Election Persuasion Letter

QUESTION:

Was a persuasion letter requested/sent to the respondent?

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
5. No

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
This is a post-election variable.
In 1980,1992,1996,2000 this question appeared in both the pre and
post; POST data are represented here.
2012: refusal conversion letter.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V78003
1980: V80003
1982: V82003
1986: V86001
1988: V88002
1990: V90003
1992: V92502
1994: V94009
1996: V96091
1998: V98001
2000: V00014
2002: V02402
2012: admin_post_ltr_refcon

==

VCF9131

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Less Government Better OR Government Do More

QUESTION:

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements
I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some
extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your
(2000: own) views:
ONE, the less government the better; or
TWO, there are more things that government should be doing

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Less government the better
2. More things government should be doing
8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
The order in which items VCF9131-VCF9134 were administered may have
varied by study.
Interviewer instruction: [IF NECESSARY, PROBE "Which Closer" ONCE EACH
QUESTION]
2000 NOTE:
A code for "both, depends" was not used.
2004 NOTE:
A code for "both, depends" was not used.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: V90033
1992: V92572
2000: V00142
2004: V04515
2012: govrole_lessmore

==

VCF9132

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Govt Handle Economy OR Free Market Can Handle

QUESTION:

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements
I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some
extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your
(2000: own) views:
ONE, we need a strong government to handle today's complex
economic problems; or
TWO, the free market can handle these problems without government
being involved

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Strong government
2. Free market
8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF9131.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: V90033
1992: V92573
2000: V00142
2004: V04515
2012: govrole_market

===

VCF9133

SYSTEM SUPPORT: Govt Too Involved in Things OR Problems Require

QUESTION:

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements

I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some
extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your
(2000: own) views:
ONE, the main reason government has become bigger over the years
is because it has gotten involved in things that people should
do for themselves; or
TWO, government has become bigger because the problems we face
have become bigger

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Gotten involved in things
2. Problems we face are bigger
8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF9131.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: V90033
1992: V92573
2000: V00142
2004: V04515
2012: govrole_big

===
VCF9134

AUTHORITARIANISM: More Important to Be Cooperative OR Self-reliant

QUESTION:

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements
I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some
extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your
(2000: own) views:
ONE, it is more important to be a cooperative person who works
well with others; or

TWO, it is more important to be a self-reliant person able to take care of oneself

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Cooperative
2. Self-reliant
8. DK; both, depends (1990)

MISSING_CODES:
----
9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See notes VCF9131.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1990: V90033
2000: V00142

==
VCF9149

VOTE VALIDATION: Election Office Number

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:

3-Digit Number 1-182 Coded, Except:

MISSING_CODES:
----
998. R self-report registered outside of area, attempt
     made by phone to elicit registration and vote
     information from outside area election office
     (1984,1990 only)
000. Records not checked (1984,1986 only)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

GENERAL NOTE:
Vars VCF9149-9155 are variables related to special Vote Validation
studies which have been conducted for some years of the ANES time
series. Vote validation studies were conducted in 1964, 1976, 1978,
1980, 1984, 1986, 1988, and 1990. Information available in the
Study data across these years varies in completeness and coding; for
some of these years the Study data do not provide information (or
sufficient information) to code some variables VCF9149-9155.
This is the jurisdiction, county or municipality in which
registration and voting records are located for persons living in the
particular sample segment in which R was living when interviewed.
In 1988 and 1990 only, if records were not checked for R, the vote
validation office number which would have been assigned to R if
his/her records had been checked was coded.
In 1984 and 1990 only, if R reported that s/he was registered outside
of the sample area, telephone contact with the outside election
office was made to attempt to elicit registration and vote information
about R. In 1986 and 1988, no such attempt was made, and Rs who self-
reported their registration outside the sample area were not included
in vote validation checks for those years.
Note that in 1986 1 case coded 87 and 2 cases coded 152 in the
original office number variable (VCF0772) should have been MD (records
not checked/ registered out of area); they are corrected here (000).
For a description of cases in code 000 SEE VCF9152 (codes 2-7).

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1984: V84112
1986: V86077
1988: V84111
1990: V90071

===
VCF9150

VOTE VALIDATION: R Registration Status (Self-reported)

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----

1. Yes, implicit (R self-report voted)
2. Yes, explicit
3. No, not registered; DK; NA; etc.

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. no Post IW (no self-report of registration)
   (1980,1984,1988)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149.
GENERAL NOTE:
CODE 1: Respondents who said that they voted have implicitly claimed
to be registered to vote (even "same-day registration" states usually
require registration).
CODE 2:   In NES, only those who said that they did not vote are
explicitly asked if they were registered so they could have voted.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1978: V780470,V78048
1980: V800988,V80101
1984: V840783,V84080
1986: V86027
1988: V88114
1990: V900279,V90028
2012: prevote_voted, postvote_rvote

===
VCF9151

VOTE VALIDATION: R Turnout (Self-reported)

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, voted
5. No, did not vote

MISSING_CODES:

----
8. DK; NA; refused
9. 1976 non-Panel Rs
0. no Post IW (no self-report of vote)
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149
1976 NOTE:
Only 1976 time-series respondents who also participated in the 1972-
1974-1976 panel study (ICPSR 7607) were included in 1976 vote
validation. In vars 9151,9152,9154,9155, 1976 prepost Rs who did
not also participate in the panel study are INAP.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: V64028
1976: V76365
1978: V78047
1980: V80098
1984: V84078
1986: V86026
1988: V880756,V88114
1990: V90027

===

VCF9152

VOTE VALIDATION: Attempted Validation of Registration

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, attempted
2. No: R says is not registered (1984-1990);
      R says not required/DK?NA if registered
      (1984-1990)
3. No: No respondent named and/or insufficient address
      (all years); registerd out of area (except
      1984,1990); Washington DC [Note: code 2 has
      priority]

4. No: Same-day registration (1964,1980)
5. No: Records not sent out due to: Office error (1980);
    No Post IW (1964,some cases in 1976)
7. No: Office refuses all access to registration records

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. 1976 non-Panel Rs
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149.
GENERAL NOTE:
Code 1: For 1984 and 1990, code 1 includes telephone attempts at
validation of cases registered outside of sample area (998 in
VCF9149). Similar attempts were not made in other years. For 1980,
code 1 includes 31 cases (code 9 in original var 1207) where respondent
was discovered to be registered at a different address: note, however,
that for these cases no effort was subsequently made to
Code 2: Applies to 1984-1990 only. In 1984-1990, vote validation
was intended for Rs who: 1) reported that they voted; or 2) reported
that they didn't vote but were registered; or 3) had no post IW.
That is, in years 1984-1990, POST RS WHO DID NOT REPORT THAT THEY WERE
REGISTERED WERE NOT VALIDATED.
Codes 3-7: All years: complications in the ability to carry out
registration records-checks prevented the validation of registration
status for some Rs for whom validation was originally intended.
Validation was intended in 1984-90 for all Rs except nonvoters who
didn't report being registered. Prior to 1984, vote validation was
intended for all ANES respondents [exception: alidation was not
intended for 1964 no-posts (code 5). Validation was not intended for
1976 no-posts, however ANES was able to carry out validation for some
1976 no-posts.]
Code 4: although registration status was not checked (assumed
unnecessary), voting records WERE checked (for 1980, 1 in VCF9153).
1986 NOTE:
4 cases for which validation was not attempted (due to insufficient
address, no name, or registered out of area) were mistakenly coded
"attempted." They are corrected in VCF9152 (code 3) and in VCF9154-
9155 (code 0).
1976 NOTE:
Only 1976 time-series respondents who also participated in the 1972-
1974-1976 panel study (ICPSR 7607) were included in 1976 vote
validation. In vars 9151,9152,9154,9155, 1976 prepost Rs who did not
also participate in the panel study are INAP.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

===

VCF9153

VOTE VALIDATION: Status of Office Voting Records

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Office records appear to be adequate, no information
    about deficiencies
2. Some office voting records not accessible*
3. R's name unknown and/or insufficient address and/or
    registered out of area** (not 1984,1986: see code 0)
5. No office voting records accessible***

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (1980: 0,9 in orig. dataset var 1207: 27 cases
     office error [5 in VCF9152] and 31 cases registered
     at different address [see note VCF9152]; 1976: 5 in
     VCF9152, records not sent to field)
9. Office refused (7 in VCF9152)
0. Office not identified (0 in VCF9149: 1984,1986 only);
     1976 non-Panel Rs
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149,VCF9152.
GENERAL NOTE:
This variable basically describes conditions at the records office
identified in VCF9149:
A- If R's election office was identified in VCF9149 then VCF9153 has
been coded-- regardless whether R was validated or not
applies specifically to 1988,1990).
B- In 1984 and 1986, R's records office was not identified if R
was unvalidated (0 in VCF9149): 1984 and 1986 unvalidated Rs
appear in MD code 0.

C- Records offices were not identified at all prior to 1984, however some (limited) information about cases of inaccessibility of voting records was obtained during 1980, 1978 and 1976. Note that all 1976-1980 cases have been coded 1 except for such exceptions (described below and coded 5) and for name/address problems (code 3).
In 1978 and 1976, identification of records office (VCF9149) was not established, and minimal information about condition/accessibility of office records was collected. Information available from 1978 is that in 32 cases (8 in original var 1409) of Rs with active registration (coded 1 in VCF9152), interviewers were unable to check voting records at all: these cases have been coded 5 in VCF9153. Similarly, information available from 1976 indicates that in 31 cases of Rs (weighted: code 8 in original var 5012) with active registration status (coded 1 in VCF9152), interviewers were unable to check vote records: these cases have also been coded 5 in VCF9153. No cases in VCF9153 are coded 2 for 1978 or 1976.
Code 1: 1984: includes 40 cases which were coded 67, 68, or 998 in VCF9149 (election office) and which were labeled "problem with registration records" in the original dataset's variable (V1129).
For all but 11 of these 40 cases, however, a voting record was found, and, of the 11 for whom no voting record was subsequently found, 7 were cases of telephone (limited) attempt at validation.
Code 3: Except for 1984 and 1986, code 3 encompasses situations in which it was impossible to check specifically for R's records. Information identical to code 3 for 1984 and 1986 is found in VCF9152 code 3.
Code 5: 1984: No cases appear in code 5 for 1984, because the original dataset variable combined cases of voting records "wholly OR partially unavailable" into a single code category (contained here in code 2).
CODE ANNOTATION:
*   1988: election offices 65,75,80,81,89,90,110,111
*   1986: election offices 3,17,37-39,50,75,111,125,145,156.
*   1984: election offices 61,65,76,79,82
** 1990: 9 in orig. dataset var V2003
** 1988: 2,9 in orig. dataset var V1143.
*** 1990: election office 182
*** 1988: code 1 in orig. dataset var 1145 [all cases, election
        office 76]
*** 1986: election offices 68,69,79 and 1 case election office
        169 (3 other cases in 169 coded 1 in VCF9153 in
        accordance with original dataset)
*** 1976-1980: see above
1980 NOTE:
Identification of records office (VCF9149) was not established, and minimal information about condition/accessibility of office records was collected. Information available is that in 1980 in Montgomery County Alabama, Madison County Alabama, and Acadia Parish Lousiana, the electoral offices would not allow any voting records to be accessible (20 cases, 5 in VCF9153)-- although the office had already allowed verification of registration status (coded 1 in VCF9152). There are no cases in code 2 for 1980.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1976: V76501
1978: V78140
1980: V80120
1984: V84112
1986: V86080
1988: V881117,V881143,V88114
1990: V902003,V90200

==
VCF9154

VOTE VALIDATION: Was R Registration Validated

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes, a registration record was found that matches
2. A registration record was found but it is inactive/
    purged/to be process (1976,1978,1984-1990 only,
    see note above)
5. No registration record was found

MISSING_CODES:
----
8. DK (1980 ONLY: code 9 in original var 1207, 31 cases
     registered at different address)
0. 3,7 in VCF9152 (all years); 2 in VCF9152 (1984
     1990 only); 5 in VCF9152 (1964,1976,1980 only); 4
     in VCF9152 (1964,1980 only)
9. 1976 non-Panel Rs
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149,VCF9152.
GENERAL NOTE:
Note that information describing status [code 2] of non-active files
was not collected systematically before 1984. Non-active-
registration cases prior to 1984 appear in either code 1 or code 5,
with the following exceptions: in 1978, original var 1408 indicated

whether registration records were eligible/active on election day (or ineligible/inactive); 53 cases of inactive registration in 1978 have been coded 2. Similarly, in 1976, original var 5003 indicated a registration record but inactive for 70 cases, who have been coded 2 in VCF9154.
Code 1 includes several cases identified as 'registration record found, NA if active/inactive' (applies specifically to 1988,1990).
Code 2 for 1990 includes 1 case of "other" inactive file and 2 cases of "NA" type of inactive file.
1976 NOTE:
Only 1976 time-series respondents who also participated in the 1972-1974-1976 panel study (ICPSR 7607) were included in 1976 vote validation. In vars 9151,9152,9154,9155, 1976 prepost Rs who did not also participate in the panel study are INAP.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: V640423,V64042
1976: V765002,V76500
1978: V781400,V78140
1980: V80120
1984: V84112
1986: V860773,V86077
1988: V84114
1990: V902006,V902024,V90202

==
VCF9155

VOTE VALIDATION: Was R Vote Validated

QUESTION:

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

VALID_CODES:
----
1. Yes
3. Registration record was found, no record of R voting
5. No registration record found; no record of voting
    found

MISSING_CODES:
----
0. 3,7 in VCF9152 (all years); 2 in VCF9152 (1984

1990 only); 5 in VCF9152 (1964,1976); 5 in VCF9152 or
   8 in VCF9153 (1980 only)
9. 1976 non-Panel Rs
INAP. Inap. question not used

NOTES:

See note VCF9149,VCF9152.
GENERAL NOTE:
Code 3 and code 5 include cases of limited access to vote records
(codes 2 and 5 in VCF9153). Codes 3 and 5 also incorporate 1984 and
1990 cases of attempted validation by phone of Rs registered out of
area (998 in VCF9149).
In cases where registration is not required or where voting and
registration lists are for some reason kept entirely separate, this
code implies that an independent check for voting was also done and no
record of R voting was found.
In all Pre-Post years except 1964 (and some cases in 1976), this
variable includes in valid codes respondents who did not give a post-
election interview.
1964 and 1980 are the only years with cases categorized for same-day
registration. Registration was not 'checked' in such cases but voting
records WERE checked (4 in VCF9152 and [1980] 1 in VCF9153). The
results of the vote record checks for "same-day registration" Rs in
1964 and 1980 are represented here in codes 1 (voted) and 3 (did not
vote), with nocases of same-day registration coded 5.
1976 NOTE;
Only 1976 time-series respondents who also participated in the 1972-
1974-1976 panel study (ICPSR 7607) were included in 1976 vote
validation. In vars VCF9151,9152,9154,9155, 1976 prepost Rs who did
not also participate in the panel study are INAP.

WEIGHT:

VCF0009x/VCF0009y/VCF0009z

TYPE:

Numeric Dec 0-1

SOURCE_VARS:

1964: V640423,V640424,V64042
1976: V765002,V76501
1978: V781400,V781409,V78141
1980: V80120
1984: V841121,V84113
1986: V860773,V860778,V860789,V86080
1988: V88114
1990: V902006,V90204

1

ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File (1948-2012)

Appendix

RELEASE VERSION: 20150514 (May 14, 2015)

>> WEIGHTS IN THE 2012 RELEASE OF THE CUMULATIVE DATA FILE

To accommodate the addition of ANES 2012 Time Series Study data to the ANES Cumulative Data File, weights in the file have been replaced.

Selection among the new CDF weights depends upon how CDF data from 2012 are used. The ANES 2012 Time Series Study included both face-to-face (in-person) interviews and Web interviews. Data from both of the 2012 modes are present in the CDF.

It must first be decided whether CDF data for 2012 should be used from the full 2012 (combined) sample, from the 2012 FTF-only sample, or from the 2012 internet-only sample.

When using the 2012 combined sample, one of the following three CDF weight variables can apply:
  VCF0009z, VCF0010z, VCF0011z
When using the 2012 FTF-only sample, one of the following three CDF weight variables can apply:
  VCF0009x, VCF0010x, VCF0011x
When using the 2012 Web-only sample, one of the following three CDF weight variables can apply:
  VCF0009y, VCF0010y, VCF0011y

Once the desired sample from 2012 has been identifed, and the choise of weight has been narrowed down to one of the three "z" variables, or one of the three "x" variables, or one of the three "y" variables), selection of a specific weight variable numbered 0009, 0010, or 0011 (from among the set of three weights with the same letter suffix, "x" or "y" or "z") now depends upon the type of 1970 data being used.

In the 1970 Time Series study, weights were applicable at variable level for 3 types of 1970 variables, Type "0", Type "1" and Type "2".
In CDF codebook documentation, indication is provided for every CDF variable whether 1970 data are from Type 0, Type 1, or Type 2 variables. For 1970, the three "0009" weight variables (VCF0009x,VCF0009y,VCF0009z) are for 1970 type 0; the three "0010" weight variables (VCF0010x,VCF0010y,VCF0010z) are for 1970 type 1, and the three "0011" weight variables (VCF0011x,VCF0011y,VCF0011z) are for 1970 Type 2.

If, for example, you have chosen to work with the FTF-only sample from 2012, an "x" variable should be chosen; VCF0009x should be selected if the CDF variable being used has documentation in the codebook indicating 1970 data were Type 0, VCF0010x should be selected if the CDF variable being used has documentation in the codebook indicating 1970 data were Type 1, and VCF0011x should be selected if the CDF variable being used has documentation in the codebook indicating 1970 data were Type 2

If use of the CDF includes 2012 data but excludes 1970 data, it does not matter whether the 0009, 0010, or 0011 variable is used as long as the "x" or "y" or "z" suffix is appropriate. Values are identical across variables having the same

suffix (x or y or z) for all years except 1970.

If use of the CDF includes 1970 data but excludes 2012 data, the "x" or "y" or "z" suffix does not matter as long as the number (0009 or 0010 or 0011) is appropriate to the type of 1970 data.

If neither 1970 nor 2012 data from the CDF are being used, than any of the 9 variables can be used: all 9 weights are identical for years other than 1970 and 2012.

NOTE: most variables in the ANES Timeseries Cumulative Data File that include 1970 data use "Type 0" data from 1970.
CDF variables including 1970 Type 1 and 1970 Type 2 are the following:

        VCF0522 ype 1
        VCF0601 ype 1
        VCF0602 ype 1
        VCF0603 ype 1
        VCF0622 ype 1
        VCF0623 ype 1
        VCF0624 ype 1
        VCF0625 ype 1
        VCF0649 ype 1
        VCF0813 ype 2
        VCF0814 ype 2
        VCF0815 ype 2
        VCF0816 ype 2
        VCF0818 ype 2
        VCF0819 ype 2
        VCF0820 ype 2
        VCF0821 ype 2
        VCF0825 ype 1
        VCF0860 ype 2
        VCF0861 ype 2
        VCF0862 ype 2
        VCF0863 ype 2
        VCF0864 ype 2
        VCF0865 ype 2
        VCF0866 ype 2
        VCF0880 ype 1
        VCF0881 ype 1

>> 1992 ERRORS IN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ASSIGNMENTS

    Late in 1994, in conjunction with field work for the 1994
    NES, it became apparent that in 50 cases of the 1992 NES
    Study an incorrect congressional district number had been
    assigned. These errors affect all questions related to House
    race which are administered according to assigned-CD
    candidates. Below is a listing of 1992 (pre) case IDs with
    correct congressional districts, however no data have been
    changed in this file as a result. Users of CF data can
    delete these cases from affected vars if desired. NES plans

to produce in 1995 a technical report examining the 1992
incidence of CD misassignment and its possible effects on
1992 NES data.

92 PRE ID	OLD ST/CD	CORRECT ST/CD	CORRECT TYPERACE
0001	3405	3406	12
0006	4404	4406	21
0007	4404	4406	21
0008	3405	3404	12
0056	2103	2101	12
0059	2103	2101	12
0071	3405	3404/3406	12/12
0124	1205	1209	12
0137	3306	3305	12
0167	3306	3305	12
0180	3306	3305	12
0188	4707	4708	12
0211	2103	2101	12
0212	4404	4406	21
0233	1319	1317	12
0249	2310	2312	12
0304	7144	7148	21
0332	2310	2312	12
0345	4707	4708	12
0355	1319	1317	12
0376	3405	3404/3406	12/12
0381	1319	1317	12
0383	7144	7148	21
0428	4707	4708	12
0441	1302	1301	12
0442	1302	1301	12
0452	3405	3404	12
0508	3405	3404	12
0524	4404	4406	21
0587	4707	4708	12
0703	3405	3404	12
0709	3306	3305	12
0710	3306	3305	12
0746	1205	1209	12
0753	7144	7148	21
0757	7144	7148	21
0770	1205	1209	12
0781	4707	4708	12
0808	7144	7148	21
0828	2310	2312	12
0865	3405	3404	12
0866	1319	1317	12
0867	1319	1317	12
0879	3306	3305	12
0932	2310	2312	12
0938	7144	7148	21
0943	2103	2101	12
0945	4404	4406	21

```
0986    1205    1209    12
0992    1205    1209    12
1007    1319    1317    12
1013    1319    1317    12
1045    4707    4708    12
1058    7144    7148    21
1059    7144    7148    21
1065    1302    1301    12
1068    1302    1301    12
1085    7144    7148    21
1087    7144    7148    21
1092    7144    7148    21
1096    3306    3305    12
1119    7144    7148    21
1122    7144    7148    21
1123    7144    7148    21
1124    7144    7148    21
1125    7144    7148    21
2322    4707    4708    12
2358    4707    4708    12
2468    4707    4708    12
2496    4707    4708    12
2595    4707    4708    12
```

>> URBANISM NOTE

Definitions describing urbanism categories have continued to change over
time. The following summarizes by year the recoding of original NES
variable categories into the categories contained in Cumulative File
variable 111. The code categories of CF var 111 are:

        Code 1: Central Cities
        Code 2: Suburban areas
        Code 3: Rural, small towns, outlying and adjacent areas

_____

    NOTE FOR 1954-1960 CODES:
        SR   "self-representing PSUs"
        NSR "non-self-representing PSUs" {1954: "other PSUs"}

    CF V111   ORIGINAL VARIABLE CODES   ORIG. CODE #

1952:   CODE 1: - urban metro area   [10]
               - city 50,000 and over   [40]

        CODE 2: - suburban metro area   [20]
               - city 2500-50,000 -- south   [50]
               - city 2500-50,000 -- north   [60]

```
   CODE 3:  - rural metro area                    [30]
            - city under 2500 -- south            [70]
            - city under 2500 -- north            [80]
            - open country -- south               [90]
            - open country -- north               [00]
--------------------------------------------------------------------

1954:   CODE 1:  - SR central city                   [1]
            - SR suburbs--50,000 and over            [2]
            - NSR cities 50,000 and over             [5]

        CODE 2:  - SR suburbs--2500-49,999            [3]
            - NSR cities 2500-49,999                 [6]

        CODE 3:  - SR suburbs--rural (under 2500)          [4]
            - NSR rural towns and congested areas under 2500  [7]
            - NSR rural blocks and open country           [8]
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

        CF V111   ORIGINAL VARIABLE CODES          ORIG. CODE #

1956:   CODE 1:  - SR central cities                     [01]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 100,000 and over    [02]
            - NSR census name places 100,000 and over        [07]

        CODE 2:  - SR suburbs, census name places 50,000-99,999     [03]
            - NSR census name places 50,000-99,999          [08]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 10,000-49,999 &
              some 'urban fringe'                   [04]
            - NSR census name places 10,000-49,999 and some
              'urban fringe'                        [09]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 2500-9,999 & some
              'urban fringe'                        [05]

        CODE 3:  - NSR census name places 2500-9,999 and some
              'urban fringe'                        [10]
            - NSR census name places less than 2500          [11]
            - SR suburbs, rural parts of PSUs            [06]
            - NSR PSUs:  remainder of PSUs (rural)           [12]
--------------------------------------------------------------------------

1958:   CODE 1:  - SR central city                    [01]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 100,000 and over    [02]
            - NSR census name places 100,000 and over        [07]

        CODE 2:  - SR suburbs, census name places 50,000-99,999     [03]
            - NSR census name places 50,000-99,999          [08]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 10,000-49,999     [04]
            - NSR census name places 10,000-49,999          [09]
            - SR suburbs, census name places 2500-9,999       [05]

        CODE 3:  - SR rural parts                    [06]
            - NSR census name places 2500-9,999            [10]
```

```
        - NSR census name places under 2500           [11]
        - NSR rural                        [12]
--------------------------------------------------------------------

1960:   CODE 1:  - SR central cities                    [01]
              - SR suburbs, census name places 100,000 and over   [02]
              - NSR census name places 100,000 and over      [07]

        CODE 2:  - SR suburbs, census name places 50,000-99,999    [03]
              - NSR census name places 50,000-99,999         [08]
              - SR suburbs, census name places 10,000-49,999 &
                some 'urban fringe'           [04]
              - NSR census name places 10,000-49,999         [09]
              - SR suburbs, census name places 2500-9,999 &
                some 'urban fringe'           [05]

        CODE 3:  - NSR census name places 2500-9,999 & some
                'urban fringe'               [00]
              - NSR census name places under 2500          [11]
              - SR suburbs, rural parts of PSUs          [06]
              - NSR remainder of PSUs               [10]
--------------------------------------------------------------------

1962:   SEE NOTE BELOW **
--------------------------------------------------------------------


        CF V111   ORIGINAL VARIABLE CODES           ORIG. CODE #

1964-
1970:   CODE 1:   - central cities of 12 largest SMSAs (including
                consolidated areas)             [01]
              - central cities of other SMSAs          [02]

        CODE 2:   - suburban areas of 12 largest SMSAs (including
                consolidated areas)             [03]
              - suburban areas of other SMSAs          [04]

        CODE 3:   - adjacent areas                 [05]
              - outlying areas                 [06]
--------------------------------------------------------------------

1972:   CODE 1:   - self-representing SMSA PSUs--central cities
                350,000 and over             [11]
              - central cities in SMSA: non-self-representing
                PSUs, 350,000 and over             [34]
              - central cities in SMSA: non-self-representing
                PSUs, 150,000-349,999             [33]
              - central cities in SMSA: non-self-representing
                PSUs, 100,000-149,999             [32]
              - central cities in SMSA: non-self-representing
                PSUs, 50,000-99,999             [31]

        CODE 2:   - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
                350,000 and over (major cities in 2
```

      consolidated areas)   [27]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        150,000-349,999   [26]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        150,999 and over   [46]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        100,000-149,999   [25]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        100,000-149,999   [45]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        50,000-99,999   [24]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        50,000-99,999   [44]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        30,000-49,999   [23]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        30,000-49,999   [43]
      - central cities in SMSA: non-self-representing
        PSUs, under 50,000   [30]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        10,000-29,999   [22]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        10,000-29,999   [42]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        2500-9999 + other urban areas   [21]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        2500-9999 +other urban areas   [41]

    CODE 3:   - non-SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        30,000-49,999   [52]
      - non-SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        10,000-29,999   [52]
      - non-SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        2500-9999   [51]
      - suburbs of 12 self-representing SMSA PSUs,
        rural (under 2500)   [20]
      - suburbs in SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs,
        rural (under 2500)   [40]
      - non-SMSA, non-self-representing PSUs, rural
        (under 2500)   [50]

1974,1976:   same as 1964-1970

    CF V111   ORIGINAL VARIABLE CODES   ORIG. CODE #

1978-
1980:   CODE 1:   - central cities of the 2 Standard Consolidated
        Areas (SCAs) plus the 10 next largest SMSAs
        (pop. over 2,000,000)   [1]
      - central cities of SMSAs with less than 2,000,000
        (exclusive of those in the 2 SCAs)   [2]

CODE 2: - suburbs of the 2 SCAs plus the 10 next largest
          SMSAs   [3]
        - suburbs of other SMSAs   [4]

CODE 3: - adjacent areas (includes all territory beyond
          the outer boundary of the suburban belt but
          within 50 miles of the central business
          district of a central city)
        - outlying areas (includes all territory more
          than 50 miles from the central business
          district of a central city)   [6]

1982:   CODE 1: - central cities of the 5 largest Standard
          Consolidated Statistical Areas (SCSAs)
          plus the 10 next largest SMSAs (pop.
          over 2,000,000)   [1]
        - central cities of SMSAs with less than 2,000,000
          (exclusive of those in the 5 largest SCSAs)   [2]

CODE 2: - suburbs of the 5 largest SCSAs and of the 10 next
          largest SMSAs   [3]
        - suburbs of other SMSAs   [4]

CODE 3: - adjacent areas (includes all territory beyond
          the outer boundary of the suburban belt but
          within 50 miles of the central business
          district of a central city)
        - outlying areas (includes all territory more
          than 50 miles from the central business
          district of a central city)   [6]

1984-
1990:   CODE 1: - central cities of the 6 largest (population over
          4,500,000) Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical
          Areas (CMSAs), plus 12 of the 15 next largest
           CMSA/MSAs (population over 2,000,000)   [1]
        - central cities CMSAs and MSAs with fewer than
          2,000,000 pop. exclusive of those in the 21
          largest CMSA/MSAs   [2]

CODE 2: - suburbs of the 6 largest CMSAs and 12 of the 15
          next largest CMSA/MSAs   [3]
        - suburbs of all other CMSA/MSAs   [4]

CODE 2: - adjacent areas (includes all territory beyond
          the outer boundary of the suburban belt but
          within 50 miles of the central business
          district of a central city)   [5]
        - outlying areas (includes all territory more
          than 50 miles from the central business
          district of a central city)   [6]

CF V111   ORIGINAL VARIABLE CODES   ORIG. CODE #

1992:   CODE 1:   - central cities of the 6 largest Standard
                      Consolidated Statistical Areas (SCSAs)
                      [1992: CMSAs] plus 5 out of the 10 next
                      largest SMSAs [1992: 12 of the next 15
                      largest CMSA/MSAs](pop. over 2,000,000)   [1]
                    - central cities of SMSAs [1992: CMSAs and MSAs]
                      with less than 2,000,000 (exclusive of those
                      in the 6 largest SCSAs/1992: 21 largest
                      CMSA/MSAs)   [2]

         CODE 2:   - suburbs of the 6 largest SCSAs [1992: CMSAs] and
                      of 5 of the 10 next largest SMSAs [1992: and of
                      12 of the 15 next largest CMSA/MSAs]   [3]
                    - suburbs of other SMSAs [1992: CMSA/MSAs]   [4]

         CODE 3:   - adjacent areas (includes all territory more than
                      50 miles from the central business district of
                      a central city)   [5]
                    - outlying areas (includes all territory more than
                      50 miles from the central business district of
                      a central city)   [6]

** NOTE:

   In 1962, no variable was created in the original dataset which described
   the urbanism of R's place of interview. Thus, for 1962 CF V111 was
   created directly from an original var which listed PSU codes.

   PSU codes in 1962 were 4-digit numbers in which the third digit indicated
   "type." Types were described as follow:

      type 1,2 "Self-Representing PSUs--12 largest metropolitan areas
             defined by the 1950 Census."
      type 3,4 "Suburbs of the 12 self-representing PSUs."
      type 5,6 "Non-Self-Representing PSUs which include a city of over
             50,000."
      type 7,8 "Non-Self-Representing PSUs which do not include a city of
             over 50,000."

   PSU codes type 1 and 2 were recoded to CF V111 code 1.
   PSU codes type 3 and 4 were recoded to CF V111 code 2.
   PSU codes type 7 and 8 were recoded to CF V111 code 3.
   PSU codes type 5 and 6 were recoded to either CF V111 code 1 or code 2.

   To identify the specific type 5 and type 6 locations (PSU codes) recoded
   to CF V111 code 1 or code 2, the NES study staff can provide a listing
   upon request.

>> TRANSLATION TO FIPS COUNTY CODE

From vars VCF0170b, VCF0170b, VCF0170a

Code 170c	Cod1 170b	Cod2 170b	Cod1 170a	Cod2 170a	FIPS	FIPS NAME
41026	016	0402			1051	Elmore, AL
41045					1089	Madison, AL
41051	441	0401			1101	Montgomery, AL
61007	831				4013	Maricopa, AZ
42010	531	0791			5019	Clark, AR
42047	511				5093	Mississippi, AR
42060	421	0301			5119	Pulaski, AR
42063	010	0303			5125	Saline, AR
71001	012	0272	1071		6001	Alameda, CA
71007	014				6013	Contra Costa, CA
71015					6029	Kern, CA
71019	001	0171	0071		6037	Los Angeles, CA
		0671			6047	Merced, CA
71028					6055	Napa, CA
71030	002	0072			6059	Orange, CA
71032	891				6063	Plumas, CA
71033	803				6065	Riverside, CA
71034					6067	Sacramento, CA
71036	802				6071	San Bernardino, CA
71037	801	0371			6073	San Diego, CA
71038	011	0271			6075	San Francisco, CA
71041	013				6081	San Mateo, CA
71043	841				6085	Santa Clara, CA
71046	892				6091	Sierra, CA
71048	022				6095	Solano, CA
71054	871				6107	Tulare, CA
62016					8031	Denver, CO
62038	881				8075	Logan, CO
		0571			8101	Pueblo, CO
01001	971	1013	0331		9001	Fairfield, CT
	972				9009	New Haven, CT
01006	941	0511			9011	New London, CT
11002					10003	New Castle, DE
43013	391				12025	Dade, FL
		0681			12073	Leon, FL
43041	482	0702			12081	Manatee, FL
43048	461				12095	Orange, FL
43058	481	0701			12115	Sarasota, FL
43059	462				12117	Seminole, FL
44025					13051	Chatham, GA
44031	004				13063	Clayton, GA
	(372)					
	373				13067	Cobb, GA
44044	374				13089	De Kalb, GA
44050					13101	Echols, GA
44060	371				13121	Fulton, GA
44067	375	0881			13135	Gwinnett, GA
		0991			13161	Jeff Davis, GA

```
44092 015          13185  Lowndes, GA
         0871      16049  Idaho, ID
21016 101 111 0141 1041 17031  Cook, IL  (see also PSU-county code 1042)
21022 105          17043  DuPage, IL
21037             17073  Henry, IL
21045       1042     17089  Kane, IL  Primarily Kane County but also small part of Cook Co.
21049 102          17097  Lake, IL
   (103)
21054 661          17107  Logan, IL
21060 144          17119  Madison, IL
21079 017          17157  Randolph, IL
21081             17161  Rock Island, IL
21082 143          17163  St. Clair, IL
22010             18019  Clark, IN
22020             18039  Elkhart, IN
22022             18043  Floyd, IN
22030             18059  Hancock, IN
22045       1043     18089  Lake, IN
22049 761    0351     18097  Marion, IN
22050 631          18099  Marshall, IN
22055 009          18109  Morgan, IN
22064 104          18127  Porter, IN
31007 721    0451     19013  Black Hawk, IA
         0452     19019  Buchanan, IA
31024 621    0751     19047  Crawford, IA
         0661     19145  Page, IA
32059             20117  Marshall, KS
      0741     20125  Montgomery, KS
      0501     21019  Boyd, KY
51034 471          21067  Fayette, KY
      0502     21089  Greenup, KY
51056 381    0391     21111  Jefferson, KY
51089 561    0781     21177  Muhlenberg, KY
45001 003          22001  Acadia, LA
45018 541    0601     22035  East Carroll, LA
45026             22051  Jefferson, LA
02016 911          23031  York, ME
52002 303          24003  Anne Arundel, MD
52003 302    0091     24005  Baltimore, MD
52013             24025  Harford, MD
52016 313          24031  Montgomery, MD
52017       0081     24033  Prince George's, MD
03009 272    0011     25017  Middlesex, MA
03011 273          25021  Norfolk, MA
03012             25023  Plymouth, MA
03013 271    0211     25025  Suffolk, MA
03014 981    0321     25027  Worcester, MA
23025 731    0441     26049  Genesee, MI
23044 007          26087  Lapeer, MI
23050 133    0542     26099  Macomb, MI
23058 021          26115  Monroe, MI
23063 132    0042     26125  Oakland, MI
      0541     26147  St. Clair, MI
23075 641    0651     26149  St. Joseph, MI
```

23082	131	0241	0041	26163	Wayne, MI
33002	773			27003	Anoka, MN
	774			27037	Dakota, MN
33027	771	0341		27053	Hennepin, MN
33062	772	0343		27123	Ramsey, MN
		0851		27155	Traverse, MN
33082	775			27163	Washington, MN
46061	551			28121	Rankin, MS
46064	019			28127	Simpson, MS
	341	0801		28147	Walthall, MS
34001	651	0641		29001	Adair, MO
34050				29099	Jefferson, MO
34092				29183	St. Charles, MO
		0062		29185	St. Clair, MO
34095	142	0261	0061	29189	St. Louis, MO
34104	611			29207	Stoddard, MO
35031	601	0841		31061	Franklin, NE
12002	243	1024		34003	Bergen, NJ
12003				34005	Burlington, NJ
12004	284			34007	Camden, NJ
12007	242	1023		34013	Essex, NJ
12009	241	1022		34017	Hudson, NJ
12011	961			34021	Mercer, NJ
12012				34023	Middlesex, NJ
12014	246			34027	Morris, NJ
12016	245			34031	Passaic, NJ
12018		0531		34035	Somerset, NJ
12020	244	1021		34039	Union, NJ
		0771		35053	Socorro, NM
13003	201	0111		36005	Bronx, NY
		0611		36023	Cortland, NY
13014				36027	Dutchess, NY
13015				36029	Erie, NY
13024	211	0121		36047	Kings, NY
13027	993			36053	Madison, NY
13030	232	1011		36059	Nassau, NY
13031	221	0131		36061	New York, NY
13034	991	0311		36067	Onondaga, NY
13038	992			36075	Oswego, NY
13041	202	0112		36081	Queens, NY
		0421		36083	Rensselaer, NY
13043	231	0132		36085	Richmond, NY
13044	235			36087	Rockland, NY
13052	233			36103	Suffolk, NY
13056	921			36111	Ulster, NY
13060	234	1012		36119	Westchester, NY
47027	591			37053	Currituck, NC
47029				37057	Davidson, NC
	351	0481		37067	Forsyth, NC
47074	491	0591		37147	Pitt, NC
	352	0482		37169	Stokes, NC
47095	581	0901		37189	Watauga, NC
24009	711	0461		39017	Butler, OH
24018	121	0251	0051	39035	Cuyahoga, OH

24028				39055	Geauga, OH
24029	753			39057	Greene, OH
24032	681			39063	Hancock, OH
24042	671	0561		39083	Knox, OH
24043	122			39085	Lake, OH
24048	741			39095	Lucas, OH
	752			39109	Miami, OH
24057	751	0361		39113	Montgomery, OH
		0462		39165	Warren, OH
53019	403			40037	Creek, OK
53057	402			40113	Osage, OK
53072	401			40143	Tulsa, OK
72020	851			41039	Lane, OR
14002	291	0231	0031	42003	Allegheny, PA
	292			42007	Beaver, PA
	283			42017	Bucks, PA
14015				42029	Chester, PA
		0021		42045	Delaware, PA
14025				42049	Erie, PA
14040		0411		42079	Luzerne, PA
14041	931			42081	Lycoming, PA
14046	282			42091	Montgomery, PA
14051	281	0221		42101	Philadelphia, PA
14055	020			42109	Snyder, PA
14058	901	0621		42115	Susquehanna, PA
14063	293			42125	Washington, PA
14065	294	0521		42129	Westmoreland, PA
48032	452	0492		45063	Lexington, SC
48040	451	0491		45079	Richland, SC
37049	701	0551		46099	Minnehaha, SD
		0553		46125	Turner, SD
54004	005			47007	Bledsoe, TN
54041	571	0981		47081	Hickman, TN
54079				47157	Shelby, TN
49041				48081	Coke, TX
49061				48121	Denton, TX
49072	521	0691		48143	Erath, TX
49079	008			48157	Fort Bend, TX
49101	361	0381		48201	Harris, TX
49127	432	0582		48253	Jones, TX
49146				48291	Liberty, TX
49170				48339	Montgomery, TX
49221	431	0581		48441	Taylor, TX
49227				48453	Travis, TX
67006	018			49011	Davis, UT
67018	821			49035	Salt Lake, UT
	312			51013	Arlington, VA
40021	412			51041	Chesterfield, VA
40029	314	0082		51059	Fairfax, VA
40043	413			51087	Henrico, VA
40075	501	0891		51155	Pulaski, VA
40122	411			51159	Richmond, VA
55001	311	0181		51191	Washington, VA
73017	811			53033	King, WA

```
                    0471      53053  Pierce, WA
73031  812                   53061  Snohomish, WA
73037  861                   53073  Whatcom, WA
56020  006                   54039  Kanawha, WV
                    0761      55005  Barron, WI
25041                        55079  Milwaukee, WI
25060  691                   55117  Sheboygan, WI
68007                        56013  Fremont, WY
```

>> ETHNICITY

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

    North America
    ----
      010. American Indian or Native American; tribal mentions
      020. Canadian; not specified as French-Canadian (03)
      030. Canadian, of French origin
      040. Mexican (excluding explicit mention of "Chicano",
           "Mexican-American")
      050. Central American

    West Indies
    ----
      070. Barbados
      080. Cuban
      090. Dominican Republic
      100. Haitian
      110. Jamaican
      120. Puerto Rican
      130. West Indian--not from one of the above countries
      140. West Indian--NA which country

    South America
    ----
      160. South American--any country

EUROPE

    British Isles
    ----
      180. English, British
      190. Irish (not specified as from Northern Ireland, Ulster--22)
      200. Scottish
      210. Welsh
      220. From Northern Ireland (Ulster)
      230. Scot-Irish
      240. From British Isles; from two or more countries of the
           British Isles

```
--------------
Western Europe
--------------
   260. Austrian
   270. Belgian
   280. French
   290. German; also Pennsylvania Dutch
   300. Luxembourg
   310. Netherlands, Holland; Dutch
   320. Swiss
   330. From Western Europe; two or more countries of Western Europe
 -----------
 Scandinavia
 -----------
   350. Danish
   360. Finn, Finnish
   370. Norwegian
   380. Swedish
   390. Icelander
   400. Scandinavian; reference to two or more Scandinavian
        countries
 ---------------------------------------------------
 Multiple - Western Europe/Scandinavia/British Isles
 ---------------------------------------------------
   410. Reference to two or more countries from combination of the
        following areas:  British Isles, Western Europe,
        Scandinavia, Mediterranean countries, Greece
--------------
Eastern Europe
--------------
   430. Czechoslovakian, Slavic
   431. Slovakian (specific)
   432. Czech (specific); Bohemian (part of Czech Republic)
   433. Slovenian
   440. Estonian
   450. Hungarian
   460. Latvian
   470. Lithuanian
   480. Polish
   490. Russian; from U.S.S.R.
   500. Ukrainian
   510. Eastern Europe; reference to two or more countries of
        Eastern Europe
 ----------------
 Balkan Countries
 ----------------
   530. Albanian
   540. Bulgarian
   550. Greek
   560. Rumanian
   570. Yugoslavian
   580. Croatian
   581. Serbian
   582. Bosnian
```

590. Mention of two or more Balkan Countries

Mediterranean Countries

----

600. Italian
610. Portugese
620. Spanish
630. Maltese

Multiple - Europe

----

640. European; general mention of Europe; reference to two or
     more European countries of Europe not codeable above

ASIA (exc. NEAR EAST)
650. Pakistani
660. Afghan
670. Indian (not American Indian, code 01)
680. Southeast Asia--from Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Burma,
     Philippines, Indonesia
690. Chinese
700. Japanese; Japanese American
710. Korean
720. Asian

NEAR EAST
730. Egyptian
740. Iranian, Persian
750. Iraqi
760. Israeli
770. Jordanian
780. Lebanese
790. Arab, Arabian, Saudi Arabian
800. Syrian
810. Turk, Turkish
820. Armenian

AFRICA
830. African; from any African country excluding only Egypt
     (U.A.R.); South African

OCEANIA
840. South Pacific Islander other than 850 (incl native Hawaiian)
850. Australian, New Zealander, Tasmanian

ETHNIC GROUPS
860. White, Caucasian
861. 'Anglo'
862. Black; Negro; American Black; African American
863. Chicano; Mexican-American; Hispanic; Latin American
864. Asian-American (exc. specifically Japanese American, 700)

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS
870. Catholic

871. Protestant
872. Jewish
873. Other religious groups
874. Other group; combinations not codeable above
877. 'American'; 'Just American'; none; neither (response to
   'choice' question); NA

MISSING DATA
   888. DK

>> INCOME

These are the income ranges corresponding to percentiles in VCF0114.

YEAR	0-16 PERCENTILE	17-33 PERCENTILE	34-67 PERCENTILE	68-95 PERCENTILE	96-100 PERCENTILE
1948	none-$999	$1000-1999	$2000-2999	$3000-4999	$5000+
1952	none-$1999	$2000-2999	$3000-3999	$4000-9999	$10000 +
1954	none-$1999	$2000-2999	$4000-5999	$4000-9999	$10000 +
1956	none-$1999	$2000-3999	$4000-5999	$6000-9999	$10000 +
1958	none-$1999	$2000-3999	$4000-5999	$6000-14999	$15000 +
1960	none-$1999	$2000-3999	$4000-5999	$6000-14999	$15000 +
1962	none-$2999	$3000-3999	$4000-7499	$7500-14999	$15000 +
1964	none-$2999	$3000-4999	$5000-7499	$7500-14999	$15000 +
1966	none-$2999	$3000-3999	$4000-7499	$7500-14999	$15000 +
1968	none-$2999	$3000-5999	$6000-9999	$10000-19999	$20000 +
1970	none-$2999	$3000-4999	$5000-9999	$10000-24999	$25000 +
1972	none-$3999	$4000-5999	$6000-11999	$12000-24999	$25000 +
1974	none-$3999	$4000-6999	$7000-14999	$15000-34999	$35000 +
1976	none-$3999	$4000-7999	$8000-14999	$15000-34999	$35000 +
1978	none-$5999	$6000-10999	$11000-19999	$20000-34999	$35000 +
1980	none-$6999	$7000-11999	$12000-24999	$25000-49999	$50000 +
1982	none-$6999	$7000-12999	$13000-24999	$25000-49999	$50000 +
1984	none-$6999	$7000-12999	$13000-29999	$30000-59999	$60000 +
1986	none-$8999	$9000-14999	$15000-34999	$35000-74999	$75000 +
1988	none-$9999	$10000-14999	$15000-34999	$35000-89999	$90000 +
1990	none-$9999	$10000-16999	$17000-34999	$35000-89999	$90000 +
1992	none-$9999	$10000-19999	$20000-39999	$40000-89999	$90000 +
1994	none-$11999	$12000-21999	$22000-44999	$45000-104999	$105000 +
1996	none-$11999	$12000-21999	$22000-49999	$50000-104999	$105000 +
1998	none-$8999	$9999-21999	$22000-49999	$50000-104999	$105000 +
2000	none-$14999	$15000-34999	$35000-64999	$65000-124999	$125000 +
2004	none-$16999	$17000-34999	$35000-69999	$70000-119999	$120000 +

>> CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES

For all years, 'occupation' in the original studies may represent
present OR past employment. Exact employment information taken from
the original data are described below, by year. Note that, in 1980

and thereafter, for Rs working after retirement, both past and current
occupations were determined in the original studies, but past employ-
ment is incorporated here.

Since 1984 (exc. 2002):
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT used in this variable applies to Rs who are also
homemakers and students only if R works more than 20 hours per week
NOT CODED 7,8 in VCF0116]. Rs who are working after retirement are
categorized by their past employment, regardless of current number of
working hours (and regardless whether included in "working now" in
VCF0116/VCF0118). The working "disabled" are coded for current
employment. PAST EMPLOYMENT used in this var applies to retirees, the
unemployed (if they have ever worked), and the nonworking disabled (if
they have ever worked), but does not cover non-working students and
homemakers who have worked in the past 6 months, even though
occupational data for their most recent job is available in the
original study data [but see VCF0151]. NONEMPLOYMENT: If the
unemployed and disabled have never worked, they are not included in
valid data; students working less than 20 hours per week as well as
nonworking students are not in valid data. Homemakers not working
or working less than 20 hours per week appear in code 6.

1980-1982:
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT used in this variable applies to Rs who are also
homemakers and students only if R works more than 20 hours per week
[NOT CODED 7,8 in VCF0116]. Rs who are working after retirement are
categorized by their past employment, regardless of current number of
working hours (and regardless whether included in "working now" in
VCF0116/VCF0118). Anyone identified as "disabled" is presumed not
currently working and is therefore not classified for current
occupation; if R is disabled and works, R's work status is "working
now" rather than "permanently disabled" and R is coded for current
employment (not past employment).   PAST EMPLOYMENT used in this var
applies to retirees, the unemployed (if they have ever worked), and
the disabled (if they have worked in the past), but does not include
those nonworking students and homemakers who have worked in the past
12 months, even though occupational data for their most recent job
is available in the original study data [but see VCF0151].
NONEMPLOYMENT: If the unemployed and disabled have never worked, they
are not included in valid data; nonworking students and students
working less than 20 hours per week are not in valid data (are 0),
while nonworking homemakers and homemakers working less than 20 hours
per week appear in code 6.

1972-1978:
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT used in this variable applies to Rs who are also
homemakers or students only if R works 20 or more hours per week [NOT
coded 7,8 in VCF0116]; no information at all was present these years
about occupations (past or current) of housewives/students working
less than 20 hours per week. Rs who are working after being retired
or disabled may be coded here according to present OR past (pre-
retirement/disablement) employment, depending upon the following
condition: if R's current job is related to his/her past employment,
then current job is coded (and R is identified as "working now" rather

than "retired" or "disabled" in VCF0116/VCF0118); if R's current job
is not related to his/her past employment, then past job is
represented (R is identified as "retired" or "disabled" in
VCF0116/VCF0118). PAST EMPLOYMENT used in this var applies to the
"retired" (according to the condition above), to the unemployed (if
they have ever worked), and to the "disabled" (if they have worked
in the past and according to the condition above), but does not
include those nonworking students and homemakers who have worked
in the past 12 months, even though occupational data for their most
recent job is available in the original study data [but see VCF0151].
NONEMPLOYMENT: If the unemployed and disabled have never worked,
they are not included in valid data; nonworking students and
students working less than 20 hours per week are not in valid data
(are 0), while nonworking homemakers and homemakers working less
than 20 hours per week appear in code 6.

1970:
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT used in this variable is not defined in terms of
number of hours. Only those Rs who identify themselves as "employed"
or who volunteer "on strike" in response to the direct work status
question (choices given to R: employed/unemployed/ retired/
housewife/student/'or what') are coded for current employment.
However, even though Rs who identify themselves as "housewives" or
"students" (and all Rs coded into 'other' in the work status variable)
are subsequently asked if they also do any work for pay [and, if so,
what], occupational data for current jobs of working "student"-
identifiers and working "homemaker"-identifiers are not incorporated
here [but see VCF0151]. Because the disabled are not identified in
1970, it is indeterminable whether they were coded for employment
(current or past). The "retired" are not asked about any
post-retirement employment. PAST EMPLOYMENT used in this var applies
to those who identify themselves as "retired" or "unemployed."
Nonworking homemakers and students are not asked about past
employment (if any). NONEMPLOYMENT: If the unemployed have never
worked, they are not included in valid data. Those who identify
themselves as "students" are included in missing data (0), even if
they are also currently working. Those who identify themselves as
"housewives" appear in code 6, even if they are also currently
working .

1968:
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT used in this variable is not defined in terms of
number of hours. Note that the original study's occupation data
appeared in 2 vars, for 'occupation' and 'second job,' and only the
first var is represented here.   Those who identify themselves as
"employed now" in response to the direct work status question (choices
given to R: employed now/ unemployed, laid off or sick/ retired/
permanently disabled/ housewife/ student/ 'or what') are coded for
current employment given. Rs who identify themselves as "housewives"
or "students" are subsequently asked if they also do any work for pay
and, if so, what: the occupational data for current jobs of working
"student"-identifiers and working "homemaker"-identifiers are not
incorporated here [but see VCF0151] --unless R is working full time
and is a student "only in the evening." Of 10 cases identified as

"physically disabled" in the original data, 6 are coded for some
current occupation and the remaining 4 are in NA missing data for
occupation. The "retired" are not asked about any post-retirement
employment. PAST EMPLOYMENT used in this var applies to those who
identify themselves as "retired" or "unemployed, laid off, or sick."
Nonworking homemakers and students are not asked about past employment
(if any). NONEMPLOYMENT: If the unemployed have never worked, they
are not included in valid data. Those who identify themselves as
"students" (daytime) are included in missing data (0), even if they
are also currently working. Rs who identify themselves as
"housewives" are in code 6, even if they are also currently working.

1952-1964:
During these years, two separate occupation questions were used in the
original data: the first codes ALL Rs' employment, including
"student," "homemaker," "retired" and "unemployed" as categories. Rs
falling into the latter two categories were then asked the second
occupation question which determines past employment and is also
represented here. No information is available from any of these years
about disabled Rs, or about post-retirement occupations of retired Rs
(if any). Nonworking "housewives" and "students" are not asked about
past employment (if any) during any years 1952-1964. For 1956-1964,
homemakers who are also working part time are coded by current
occupation, not as housewives, and working students attending day
classes-- even part time-- are coded as students, while Rs attending
classes part time in the evening are coded by occupation. For 1952,
only full-time employment is coded in the original data and here:
students and homemakers working part time are not coded by occupation;
they appear in 0 missing data (students) and code 6 (homemakers).

The 1954,1962,1966 occupation vars have not been included here since
they only described respondents who were also heads of households.

Since 1984, this variable has been a recode taken from a collapsed
version of the 1980 U.S. Census Occupation codes [full U.S. Census
occupation codes were also available in the original datasets].

Prior to 1984, the original variables used to create this var were
recodes from the following:

1976-1982: 1970 U.S. Census Occupation codes
1968-1974: CPS Political Behavior Occupation codes
1964: 1960 U.S. Census Occupation codes
1956-1960: 1950 U.S. Dept. of Commerce Census of occupations

The original 1952 occupational data appeared in categories created by
by NES. This coding scheme had fewer and broader occupational cate-
gories than subsequent years and could only approximately be recoded
into the categories appearing here. [The original codes were:
19.Professional and semi-professional; 20.Self-employed businessmen
and artisans, managers; 30.Clerical and sales, buyers, agents,
brokers; 40.Skilled and semi-skilled; 60.Unskilled, service workers,
farm laborers; 61.Protective service; 80.Farm operators;
90.Unemployed; 92.Student; 95.Retired; 6. Housewife.]

The 1954 recode used for VCF0115 is:
19=1, 20=1, 30=2, 40=3, 61=3, 60=4, 80=5, 96=6, else=0.

      I. 1980 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES
     II. 1990 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES

I. 1980 Census 0ccupation codes

The full 3-digit 1980 Census Occupation Code was used to
code the occupation of respondents. In order to minimize
the amount of highly specific information released about
respondents, the full occupation code has been recoded to a
71 category code, which is based on the occupation code
sub-headings in the Census Code.

In the code description that follows, the full 1980 Census
Code is presented. At the beginning of each recoded
section, the statement "(XXX) THROUGH (YYY) ARE RECODED TO
(ZZ)" indicates the code values to which the specific
occupations have been recoded. Numbers in parentheses
following the occupation categories are the U.S. Department
of Commerce's 1980 Standard Occupational Classification code
equivalents. The abbreviation "pt" means "part" and
"N.E.C." means "not elsewhere classified".

  MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS

    Executive, Administrative, and Managerial

     (003) THROUGH (019) ARE RECODED TO: 01

 003   LEGISLATORS (111)
 004   CHIEF EXECUTIVES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS, PUBLIC
      ADMINISTRATION (112)
 005   ADMINISTRATORS AND OFFICIALS, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
      (1132-1139)
 006   ADMINISTRATORS, PROTECTIVE SERVICES (1131)
 007   FINANCIAL MANAGERS (122)
 008   PERSONNEL AND LABOR RELATIONS MANAGERS (123)
 009   PURCHASING MANAGERS (124)
 013   MANAGERS, MARKETING, ADVERTISING, AND PUBLIC
      RELATIONS (125)
 014   ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATION AND RELATED FIELDS (128)
 015   MANAGERS, MEDICINE AND HEALTH (131)
 016   MANAGERS, PROPERTIES AND REAL ESTATE (1353)
 017   POSTMASTERS AND MAIL SUPERINTENDENTS (1344)
 018   FUNERAL DIRECTORS (PT 1359)
 019   MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, N.E.C.(121, 126, 127,
      132-139, EXCEPT 1344, 1353, PT 1359)

     Management-Related Occupations

    (023) THROUGH (037) ARE RECODED TO: 02

023   ACCOUNTANTS AND AUDITORS (1412)
024   UNDERWRITERS (1414)
025   OTHER FINANCIAL OFFICERS (1415, 1419)
026   MANAGEMENT ANALYSTS (142)
027   PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND LABOR RELATIONS
     SPECIALISTS (143)
028   PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, FARM PRODUCTS (1443)
029   BUYERS, WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE, EXCEPT FARM
     PRODUCTS (1442)
033   PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, N.E.C. (1449)
034   BUSINESS AND PROMOTION AGENTS (145)
035   CONSTRUCTION INSPECTORS (1472)
036   INSPECTORS AND COMPLIANCE OFFICERS, EXC.
     CONSTRUCTION (1473)
037   MANAGEMENT RELATED OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (149)

     Professional Specialty Occupations
       ....
    - engineers, architects and surveyors -

    (043) THROUGH (063) ARE RECODED TO: 03

043   ARCHITECTS (161)

     ENGINEERS

044   AEROSPACE ENGINEERS (1622)
045   METALLURGICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERS (1623)
046   MINING ENGINEERS (1624)
047   PETROLEUM ENGINEERS (1625)
048   CHEMICAL ENGINEERS (1626)
049   NUCLEAR ENGINEERS (1627)
053   CIVIL ENGINEERS (1628)
054   AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERS (1632)
055   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERS (1633, 1636)
056   INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS (1634)
057   MECHANICAL ENGINEERS (1635)
058   MARINE ENGINEERS AND NAVAL ARCHITECTS (1637)
059   ENGINEERS, N.E.C. (1639)
063   SURVEYORS AND MAPPING SCIENTISTS (164)

    - mathematical and computer scientists -

    (064) THROUGH (068) ARE RECODED TO: 04

064   COMPUTER SYSTEMS ANALYSTS AND SCIENTISTS (171)

065   OPERATIONS AND SYSTEMS RESEARCHERS AND ANALYSTS
      (172)
066   ACTUARIES (1732)
067   STATISTICIANS (1733)
068   MATHEMATICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1739)

        - natural scientists -

        (069) THROUGH (083) ARE RECODED TO: 05

069   PHYSICISTS AND ASTRONOMERS (1842, 1843)
073   CHEMISTS, EXCEPT BIOCHEMISTS (1845)
074   ATMOSPHERIC AND SPACE SCIENTISTS (1846)
075   GEOLOGISTS AND GEODESISTS (1847)
076   PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1849)
077   AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENTISTS (1853)
078   BIOLOGICAL AND LIFE SCIENTISTS (1854)
079   FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION SCIENTISTS (1852)
083   MEDICAL SCIENTISTS (1855)

        - health diagnosing occupations -

        (084) THROUGH (089) ARE RECODED TO: 06

084   PHYSICIANS (261)
085   DENTISTS (262)
086   VETERINARIANS (27)
087   OPTOMETRISTS (281)
088   PODIATRISTS (283)
089   HEALTH DIAGNOSING PRACTITIONERS, N.E.C. (289)

     - health assessment and treating occupations -

        (095) THROUGH (106) ARE RECODED TO: 07

095   REGISTERED NURSES (29)
096   PHARMACISTS (301)
097   DIETITIANS (302)

      THERAPISTS

098   INHALATION THERAPISTS (3031)
099   OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS (3032)
103   PHYSICAL THERAPISTS (3033)
104   SPEECH THERAPISTS (3034)
105   THERAPISTS, N.E.C. (3039)
106   PHYSICIANS' ASSISTANTS (304)

        - teachers, postsecondary -

(113) THROUGH (154) ARE RECODED TO: 08

113   EARTH, ENVIRONMENTAL AND MARINE SCIENCE TEACHERS
    (2212)
114   BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2213)
115   CHEMISTRY TEACHERS (2214)
116   PHYSICS TEACHERS (2215)
117   NATURAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2216)
118   PSYCHOLOGY TEACHERS (2217)
119   ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2218)
123   HISTORY TEACHERS (2222)
124   POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2223)
125   SOCIOLOGY TEACHERS (2224)
126   SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2225)
127   ENGINEERING TEACHERS (2226)
128   MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2227)
129   COMPUTER SCIENCE TEACHERS (2228)
133   MEDICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2231)
134   HEALTH SPECIALTIES TEACHERS (2232)
135   BUSINESS, COMMERCE, AND MARKETING TEACHERS (2233)
136   AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY TEACHERS (2234)
137   ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC TEACHERS (2235)
138   PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (2236)
139   EDUCATION TEACHERS (2237)
143   ENGLISH TEACHERS (2238)
144   FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (2242)
145   LAW TEACHERS (2243)
146   SOCIAL WORK TEACHERS (2244)
147   THEOLOGY TEACHERS (2245)
148   TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL TEACHERS (2246)
149   HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2247)
153   TEACHERS, POSTSECONDARY, N.E.C. (2249)
154   POSTSECONDARY TEACHERS, SUBJECT NOT SPECIFIED

    - teachers, except postsecondary -

  (155) THROUGH (165) ARE RECODED TO: 09

155   TEACHERS, PREKINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN (231)
156   TEACHERS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (232)
157   TEACHERS, SECONDARY SCHOOL (233)
158   TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION (235)
159   TEACHERS, N.E.C. (236,239)
163   COUNSELORS, EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL (24)
    LIBRARIANS, ARCHIVISTS, AND CURATORS
164   LIBRARIANS (251)
165   ARCHIVISTS AND CURATORS (252)

    - social scientist and urban planners -

  (166) THROUGH (173) ARE RECODED TO: 10

166 ECONOMISTS (1912)
167 PSYCHOLOGISTS (1915)
168 SOCIOLOGISTS (1916)
169 SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1913, 1914, 1919)
173 URBAN PLANNERS (192)

- social, recreation, and religious workers -

   (173) THROUGH (177) ARE RECODED TO: 11

174 SOCIAL WORKERS (2032)
175 RECREATION WORKERS (2033)
176 CLERGY (2042)
177 RELIGIOUS WORKERS, N.E.C. (2049)

       - lawyers and judges -

   (178) THROUGH (179) ARE RECODED TO: 12

178 LAWYERS (211)
179 JUDGES (212)

- writers, artists, entertainers, and athletes -

   (183) THROUGH (199) ARE RECODED TO: 13

183 AUTHORS (321)
184 TECHNICAL WRITERS (398)
185 DESIGNERS (322)
186 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS (323)
187 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS (324)
188 PAINTERS, SCULPTORS, CRAFT-ARTISTS, AND ARTIST
     PRINTMAKERS (325)
189 PHOTOGRAPHERS (326)
193 DANCERS (327)
194 ARTISTS, PERFORMERS, AND RELATED WORKERS, N.E.C.
     (328, 329)
195 EDITORS AND REPORTERS (331)
197 PUBLIC RELATIONS SPECIALISTS (332)
198 ANNOUNCERS (333)
199 ATHLETES (34)

   TECHNICIANS AND RELATED SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS

   Health Technologists and Technicians

   (203) THROUGH (208) ARE RECODED TO: 14

203 CLINICAL LABORATORY TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS
     (362)

```
204   DENTAL HYGIENISTS (363)
205   HEALTH RECORD TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS (364)
206   RADIOLOGIC TECHNICIANS (365)
207   LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES (366)
208   HEALTH TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (369)
```

Technologists and Technicians, except Health
         ....
- engineering and related technologists and technicians -

   (213) THROUGH (218) ARE RECODED TO: 15

```
213   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC TECHNICIANS (3711)
214   INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS (3712)
215   MECHANICAL ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS (3713)
216   ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3719)
217   DRAFTING OCCUPATIONS (372)
218   SURVEYING AND MAPPING TECHNICIANS (373)
```

         - science technicians -

   (223) THROUGH (225) ARE RECODED TO: 16

```
223   BIOLOGICAL TECHNICIANS (382)
224   CHEMICAL TECHNICIANS (3831)
225   SCIENCE TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3832, 3833, 384, 389)
```

- technicians, except health, engineering, and science -

   (226) THROUGH (235) ARE RECODED TO: 17

```
226   AIRPLANE PILOTS AND NAVIGATORS (825)
227   AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (392)
228   BROADCAST EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (393)
229   COMPUTER PROGRAMMERS (3971, 3972)
233   TOOL PROGRAMMERS, NUMERICAL CONTROL (3974)
234   LEGAL ASSISTANTS (396)
235   TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (399)
```

         SALES OCCUPATIONS

      Supervisors and Proprietors

         (243) IS RECODED TO: 18

243   SUPERVISORS AND PROPRIETORS, SALES OCCUPATIONS (40)

  Sales Representatives, Finance and Business Services

      (253) THROUGH (257) ARE RECODED TO: 18

253   INSURANCE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4122)
254   REAL ESTATE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4123)
255   SECURITIES AND FINANCIAL SERVICES SALES OCCUPATIONS
      (4124)
256   ADVERTISING AND RELATED SALES OCCUPATIONS (4153)
257   SALES OCCUPATIONS, OTHER BUSINESS SERVICES (4152)

   Sales Representatives, Commodities except Retail

      (258) THROUGH (259) ARE RECODED TO: 19

258   SALES ENGINEERS (421)
259   SALES REPRESENTATIVES, MINING, MANUFACTURING, AND
      WHOLESALE (423, 424)

   Sales Workers, Retail and Personal Services

      (263) THROUGH (278) ARE RECODED TO: 20

263   SALES WORKERS, MOTOR VEHICLES AND BOATS
      (4342, 4344)
264   SALES WORKERS, APPAREL (4346)
265   SALES WORKERS, SHOES (4351)
266   SALES WORKERS, FURNITURE AND HOME FURNISHINGS
      (4348)
267   SALES WORKERS; RADIO, TELEVISION, HI-FI, AND
      APPLIANCES (4343, 4352)
268   SALES WORKERS, HARDWARE AND BUILDING SUPPLIES
      (4353)
269   SALES WORKERS, PARTS (4367)
274   SALES WORKERS, OTHER COMMODITIES (4345, 4347, 4354,
      4356, 4359, 4362, 4369)
275   SALES COUNTER CLERKS (4363)
276   CASHIERS (4364)
277   STREET AND DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES WORKERS (4366)
278   NEWS VENDORS (4365)

      Sales Related Occupations

      (283) THROUGH (285) ARE RECODED TO: 21

283   DEMONSTRATORS, PROMOTERS AND MODELS, SALES (445)
284   AUCTIONEERS(447)
285   SALES SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (444, 446, 449)

   ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, (incl. Clerical supervisors)

      Clerical Supervisors

(303) THROUGH (307) ARE RECODED TO: 22

303   SUPERVISORS, GENERAL OFFICE (4511, 4513-4519, 4529)
304   SUPERVISORS, COMPUTER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4512)
305   SUPERVISORS, FINANCIAL RECORDS PROCESSING (4521)
306   CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OPERATORS (4523)
307   SUPERVISORS; DISTRIBUTION, SCHEDULING, AND
      ADJUSTING CLERKS (4522, 4524-4528)

      Computer Equipment Operators

      (308) THROUGH (309) ARE RECODED TO: 23

308   COMPUTER OPERATORS (4612)
309   PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4613)

      Secretaries, Stenographers, and Typists

      (313) THROUGH (315) ARE RECODED TO: 24

313   SECRETARIES (4622)
314   STENOGRAPHERS (4623)
315   TYPISTS (4624)

      Information Clerks

      (316) THROUGH (323) ARE RECODED TO: 25

316   INTERVIEWERS (4642)
317   HOTEL CLERKS (4643)
318   TRANSPORTATION TICKET AND RESERVATION AGENTS (4644)
319   RECEPTIONISTS (4645)
323   INFORMATION CLERKS, N.E.C. (4649)

   Records Processing Occupations, except Financial

      (325) THROUGH (336) ARE RECODED TO: 26

325   CLASSIFIED-AD CLERKS (4662)
326   CORRESPONDENCE CLERKS (4663)
327   ORDER CLERKS (4664)
328   PERSONNEL CLERKS, EXCEPT PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING
      (4692)
329   LIBRARY CLERKS (4694)
335   FILE CLERKS (4696)
336   RECORDS CLERKS (4699)

   Financial Records Processing Occupations

(337) THROUGH (344) ARE RECODED TO: 27

337   BOOKKEEPERS, ACCOUNTING, AND AUDITING CLERKS (4712)
338   PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING CLERKS (4713)
339   BILLING CLERKS (4715)
343   COST AND RATE CLERKS (4716)
344   BILLING, POSTING, AND CALCULATING MACHINE OPERATORS
    (4718)

Duplicating, Mail and Other Office Machine Operators

(345) THROUGH (347) ARE RECODED TO: 28

345   DUPLICATING MACHINE OPERATORS (4722)
346   MAIL PREPARING AND PAPER HANDLING MACHINE OPERATORS
    (4739)
347   OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4729)

Communications Equipment Operators

(348) THROUGH (353) ARE RECODED TO: 29

348   TELEPHONE OPERATORS (4732)
349   TELEGRAPHERS (4733)
353   COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4739)

Mail and Message Distributing Occupations

(354) THROUGH (357) ARE RECODED TO: 30

354   POSTAL CLERKS, EXC. MAIL CARRIERS (4742)
355   MAIL CARRIERS, POSTAL SERVICE (4743)
356   MAIL CLERKS, EXC. POSTAL SERVICE (4744)
357   MESSENGERS (4745)

Material Recording, Scheduling, and Distributing Clerks,
          N.E.C.

(359) THROUGH (374) ARE RECODED TO: 31

359   DISPATCHERS (4751)
363   PRODUCTION COORDINATORS (4752)
364   TRAFFIC, SHIPPING, AND RECEIVING CLERKS (4753)
365   STOCK AND INVENTORY CLERKS (4754)
366   METER READERS (4755)
368   WEIGHERS, MEASURERS, AND CHECKERS (4756)
369   SAMPLERS (4757)
373   EXPEDITERS (4758)
374   MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING, AND DISTRIBUTING
   CLERKS, N.E.C. (4759)

        Adjusters and Investigators
        (375) THROUGH (378) ARE RECODED TO: 32

375   INSURANCE ADJUSTERS, EXAMINERS, AND INVESTIGATORS
      (4782)
376   INVESTIGATORS AND ADJUSTERS, EXCEPT INSURANCE
      (4783)
377   ELIGIBILITY CLERKS, SOCIAL WELFARE (4784)
378   BILL AND ACCOUNT COLLECTORS (4786)

   Miscellaneous Administrative Support Occupations

      (379) THROUGH (389) ARE RECODED TO: 33

379   GENERAL OFFICE CLERKS (463)
383   BANK TELLERS (4791)
384   PROOFREADERS (4792)
385   DATA-ENTRY KEYERS (4793)
386   STATISTICAL CLERKS (4794)
387   TEACHERS' AIDES (4795)
389   ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (4787,
      4799)

          SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

      Private Household Occupations

      (403) THROUGH (407) ARE RECODED TO: 34

403   LAUNDERERS AND IRONERS (503)
404   COOKS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (504)
405   HOUSEKEEPERS AND BUTLERS (505)
406   CHILD CARE WORKERS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (506)
407   PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD CLEANERS AND SERVANTS
      (502, 507, 509)

      Protective Service Occupations
            ....
      -supervisors, protective service occupations-

      (413) THROUGH (415) ARE RECODED TO: 35

413   SUPERVISORS, FIREFIGHTING AND FIRE PREVENTION
      OCCUPATIONS (5111)
414   SUPERVISORS, POLICE AND DETECTIVES (5112)
415   SUPERVISORS, GUARDS (5113)

      -firefighting and fire prevention occupations-

(416) THROUGH (417) ARE RECODED TO: 35

416   FIRE INSPECTION AND FIRE PREVENTION OCCUPATIONS
      (5122)
417   FIREFIGHTING OCCUPATIONS (5123)

            -police and detectives-

      (418) THROUGH (424) ARE RECODED TO: 35

418   POLICE AND DETECTIVES, PUBLIC SERVICE (5132)
423   SHERIFFS, BAILIFFS, AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT
      OFFICERS (5134)
424   CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION OFFICERS (5133)

            -guards-

      (425) THROUGH (427) ARE RECODED TO: 35

425   CROSSING GUARDS (5142)
426   GUARDS AND POLICE, EXCEPT PUBLIC SERVICE (5144)
427   PROTECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5149)

  Service Occupations, except Protective and Household
            ....
      -food preparation and service occupations-

      (433) THROUGH (444) ARE RECODED TO: 36

433   SUPERVISORS, FOOD PREPARATION AND SERVICE
      OCCUPATIONS (5211)
434   BARTENDERS (5212)
435   WAITERS AND WAITRESSES (5213)
436   COOKS, EXCEPT SHORT ORDER (5214)
437   SHORT-ORDER COOKS (5215)
438   FOOD COUNTER, FOUNTAIN AND RELATED OCCUPATIONS
      (5216)
439   KITCHEN WORKERS, FOOD PREPARATION (5217)
443   WAITERS'/WAITRESSES' ASSISTANTS (5218)
444   MISCELLANEOUS FOOD PREPARATION OCCUPATIONS (5219)

            -health service occupations-

      (435) THROUGH (447) ARE RECODED TO: 37

445   DENTAL ASSISTANTS (5232)
446   HEALTH AIDES, EXCEPT NURSING (5233)
447   NURSING AIDES, ORDERLIES, AND ATTENDANTS (5236)

-cleaning and building service occupations, exc. household-

(448) THROUGH (455) ARE RECODED TO: 38

448   SUPERVISORS, CLEANING AND BUILDING SERVICE WORKERS
      (5241)
449   MAIDS AND HOUSEMEN (5242, 5249)
453   JANITORS AND CLEANERS (5244)
454   ELEVATOR OPERATORS (5245)
455   PEST CONTROL OCCUPATIONS (5246)

-personal service occupations-

(456) THROUGH (469) ARE RECODED TO: 39

456   SUPERVISORS, PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS (5251)
457   BARBERS (5252)
458   HAIRDRESSERS AND COSMETOLOGISTS (5253)
459   ATTENDANTS, AMUSEMENT AND RECREATION FACILITIES
      (5254)
463   GUIDES (5255)
464   USHERS (5256)
465   PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ATTENDANTS (5257)
466   BAGGAGE PORTERS AND BELLHOPS (5262)
467   WELFARE SERVICE AIDES (5263)
468   CHILD CARE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (5264)
469   PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5258, 5269)

FARMING, FORESTRY, AND FISHING OCCUPATIONS

Farm Operators and Managers

(473) THROUGH (476) ARE RECODED TO: 40

473   FARMERS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5512-5514)
474   HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMERS (5515)
475   MANAGERS, FARMS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5522-5524)
476   MANAGERS, HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMS (5525)

Other Agricultural and Related Occupations
           ....
      -farm occupations, except managerial-

(477) THROUGH (484) ARE RECODED TO: 41

477   SUPERVISORS, FARM WORKERS (5611)
479   FARM WORKERS (5612-5617)
483   MARINE LIFE CULTIVATION WORKERS (5618)
484   NURSERY WORKERS (5619)

-related agricultural occupations-

(485) THROUGH (489) ARE RECODED TO: 42

485   SUPERVISORS, RELATED AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS
      (5621)
486   GROUNDSKEEPERS AND GARDENERS, EXCEPT FARM (5622)
487   ANIMAL CARETAKERS, EXCEPT FARM (5624)
488   GRADERS AND SORTERS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5625)
489   INSPECTORS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5627)

-forestry and logging occupations-

(494) THROUGH (496) ARE RECODED TO: 43

494   SUPERVISORS, FORESTRY AND LOGGING WORKERS (571)
495   FORESTRY WORKERS, EXCEPT LOGGING (572)
496   TIMBER CUTTING AND LOGGING OCCUPATIONS (573, 579)

-fishers, hunters, and trappers-

(497) THROUGH (499) ARE RECODED TO: 43

497   CAPTAINS AND OTHER OFFICERS, FISHING VESSELS
      (PT 8241)
498   FISHERS (583)
499   HUNTERS AND TRAPPERS (584)

PRECISION PRODUCTION, CRAFT, AND REPAIR OCCUPATIONS

      Mechanics and Repairers
          ....
      -mechanics and repairers supervisors-

(503) IS RECODED TO: 44

503   SUPERVISORS, MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS (60)

-mechanics and repairers, vehicle and mobile equipment-

(505) THROUGH (517) ARE RECODED TO: 44

505   AUTOMOBILE MECHANICS (PT 6111)
506   AUTOMOBILE MECHANIC APPRENTICES (PT 6111)
507   BUS, TRUCK, AND STATIONARY ENGINE MECHANICS (6112)
508   AIRCRAFT ENGINE MECHANICS (6113)
509   SMALL ENGINE REPAIRERS (6114)
514   AUTOMOBILE BODY AND RELATED REPAIRERS (6115)
515   AIRCRAFT MECHANICS, EXCEPT ENGINE (6116)

516   HEAVY EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6117)
517   FARM EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6118)

      -mechanics and repairers, except
       vehicle and mobile equipment-

      (518) THROUGH (534) ARE RECODED TO: 45

518   INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY REPAIRERS (613)
519   MACHINERY MAINTENANCE OCCUPATIONS (614) ELECTRICAL
      AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS
523   ELECTRONIC REPAIRERS, COMMUNICATIONS AND INDUSTRIAL
      EQUIPMENT (6151, 6153, 6155)
525   DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6154)
526   HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE AND POWER TOOL REPAIRERS (6156)
527   TELEPHONE LINE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6157)
529   TELEPHONE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6158)
533   MISCELLANEOUS ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT
      EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6152, 6159)
534   HEATING, AIR CONDITIONING, AND REFRIGERATION
      MECHANICS (616)

      -miscellaneous mechanics and repairers

      (535) THROUGH (549) ARE RECODED TO: 46

535   CAMERA, WATCH, AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENT REPAIRERS
      (6171, 6172)
536   LOCKSMITHS AND SAFE REPAIRERS (6173)
538   OFFICE MACHINE REPAIRERS (6174)
539   MECHANICAL CONTROLS AND VALVE REPAIRERS (6175)
543   ELEVATOR INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6176)
544   MILLWRIGHTS (6178)
547   SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS, N.E.C.
      (6177, 6179)
549   NOT SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS

      Construction Trades
      ....
      -supervisors, construction occupations-

      (553) THROUGH (558) ARE RECODED TO: 47

553   SUPERVISORS; BRICKMASONS, STONEMASONS, AND TILE
      SETTERS (6312)
554   SUPERVISORS, CARPENTERS AND RELATED WORKERS (6313)
555   SUPERVISORS, ELECTRICIANS AND POWER TRANSMISSION
      INSTALLERS (6314)
556   SUPERVISORS; PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS, AND PLASTERERS
      (6315)

557 SUPERVISORS; PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND
     STEAMFITTERS (6316)
558 SUPERVISORS, N.E.C. (6311, 6318)

     -construction trades, except supervisors-

     (563) THROUGH (599) ARE RECODED TO: 48

563 BRICKMASONS AND STONEMASONS, (PT 6412, PT 6413)
564 BRICKMASON AND STONEMASON APPRENTICES
     (PT 6412, PT 6413)
565 TILE SETTERS, HARD AND SOFT (6414, PT 6462)
566 CARPET INSTALLERS (PT 6462)
567 CARPENTERS (PT 6422)
569 CARPENTER APPRENTICES (PT 6422)
573 DRYWALL INSTALLERS (6424)
575 ELECTRICIANS (PT 6432)
576 ELECTRICIAN APPRENTICES (PT 6432)
577 ELECTRICAL POWER INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6433)
579 PAINTERS, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE (6442)
583 PAPERHANGERS (6443)
584 PLASTERERS (6444)
585 PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND STEAMFITTERS (PT 645)
587 PLUMBER, PIPEFITTER, AND STEAMFITTER APPRENTICES
     (PT 645)
588 CONCRETE AND TERRAZZO FINISHERS (6463)
589 GLAZIERS (6464)
593 INSULATION WORKERS (6465)
594 PAVING, SURFACING, AND TAMPING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
     (6466)
595 ROOFERS (6468)
596 SHEETMETAL DUCT INSTALLERS (6472)
597 STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS (6473)
598 DRILLERS, EARTH (6474)
599 CONSTRUCTION TRADES, N.E.C. (6467, 6475, 6476,
     6479)

     Extractive Occupations

     (613) THROUGH (617) ARE RECODED TO: 49

613 SUPERVISORS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (632)
614 DRILLERS, OIL WELL (652)
615 EXPLOSIVES WORKERS (653)
616 MINING MACHINE OPERATORS (654)
617 MINING OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (656)

     Precision Production Occupations
          ....
     -production occupation supervisors-

(633) IS RECODED TO: 50

633   SUPERVISORS, PRODUCTION OCCUPATIONS (67, 71)

        -precision metalworking occupations-

        (634) THROUGH (655) ARE RECODED TO: 50

634   TOOL AND DIE MAKERS (PT 6811)
635   TOOL AND DIE MAKER APPRENTICES (PT 6811)
636   PRECISION ASSEMBLERS, METAL (6812)
637   MACHINISTS (PT 6813)
639   MACHINIST APPRENTICES (PT 6813)
643   BOILERMAKERS (6814)
644   PRECISION GRINDERS, FITTERS, AND TOOL SHARPENERS
       (6816)
645   PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, METAL (6817)
646   LAY-OUT WORKERS (6821)
647   PRECIOUS STONES AND METALS WORKERS (JEWELERS)
       (6822, 6866)
649   ENGRAVERS, METAL (6823)
653   SHEET METAL WORKERS (PT 6824)
654   SHEET METAL WORKER APPRENTICES (PT 6824)
655   MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION METAL WORKERS (6829)

        -precision woodworking occupations-

        (656) THROUGH (659) ARE RECODED TO: 51

656   PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, WOOD (6831)
657   CABINET MAKERS AND BENCH CARPENTERS (6832)
658   FURNITURE AND WOOD FINISHERS (6835)
659   MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WOODWORKERS (6839)

        -precision textile, apparel, and
          furnishings machine workers-

        (666) THROUGH (674) ARE RECODED TO: 52

666   DRESSMAKERS (PT 6852, PT 7752)
667   AILORS (PT 6852)
668   UPHOLSTERERS (6853)
669   SHOE REPAIRERS (6854)
673   APPAREL AND FABRIC PATTERNMAKERS (6856)
674   MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION APPAREL AND FABRIC WORKERS
       (6859, PT 7752)

        -precision workers, assorted materials-

(675) THROUGH (684) ARE RECODED TO: 53

675   AND MOLDERS AND SHAPERS, EXCEPT JEWELERS (6861)
676   PATTERNMAKERS, LAY-OUT WORKERS, AND CUTTERS (6862)
677   OPTICAL GOODS WORKERS (6864, PT 7477, PT 7677)
678   DENTAL LABORATORY AND MEDICAL APPLIANCE TECHNICIANS
      (6865)
679   BOOKBINDERS (6844)
683   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ASSEMBLERS
      (6867)
684   MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WORKERS, N.E.C. (6869)

      -precision food production occupations-

      (686) THROUGH (688) ARE RECODED TO: 54

686   BUTCHERS AND MEAT CUTTERS (6871)
687   BAKERS (6872)
688   FOOD BATCHMAKERS (6873, 6879)

      -precision inspectors, testers and related workers-

      (689) THROUGH (693) ARE RECODED TO: 55

689   INSPECTORS, TESTERS, AND GRADERS (6881, 828)
693   ADJUSTERS AND CALIBRATORS (6882)

         Plant and System Operators

      (694) THROUGH (699) ARE RECODED TO: 56

694   WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT OPERATORS (691)
695   POWER PLANT OPERATORS (PT 693)
696   STATIONARY ENGINEERS (PT 693, 7668)
699   MISCELLANEOUS PLANT AND SYSTEM OPERATORS (692, 694,
      695, 696)

         OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS

   Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors
            ....
   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
   metalworking and plastic working machine operators-

      (703) THROUGH (717) ARE RECODED TO: 57

703   LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE SET-UP OPERATORS (7312)
704   LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE OPERATORS (7512)
705   MILLING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS (7313, 7513)

706   PUNCHING AND STAMPING PRESS MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7314, 7317, 7514, 7517)
707   ROLLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7316, 7516)
708   DRILLING AND BORING MACHINE OPERATORS (7318, 7518)
709   GRINDING, ABRADING, BUFFING, AND POLISHING MACHINE
      OPERATORS (7322, 7324, 7522)
713   FORGING MACHINE OPERATORS (7319, 7519)
714   NUMERICAL CONTROL MACHINE OPERATORS (7326)
715   MISCELLANEOUS METAL, PLASTIC, STONE, AND GLASS
      WORKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7329, 7529)
717   FABRICATING MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (7339, 7539)

    -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    metal and plastic processing machine operators-

        (719) THROUGH (725) ARE RECODED TO: 58

719   MOLDING AND CASTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7315, 7342,
      7515, 7542)
723   METAL PLATING MACHINE OPERATORS (7343, 7543)
724   HEAT TREATING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (7344, 7544)
725   MISCELLANEOUS METAL AND PLASTIC PROCESSING MACHINE
      OPERATORS (7349, 7549)

    -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
          woodworking machine operators-

        (726) THROUGH (733) ARE RECODED TO: 59

726   WOOD LATHE, ROUTING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7431, 7432, 7631, 7632)
727   SAWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7433, 7633)
728   SHAPING AND JOINING MACHINE OPERATORS (7435, 7635)
729   NAILING AND TACKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7636)
733   MISCELLANEOUS WOODWORKING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7434, 7439, 7634, 7639)

    -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
          printing machine operators-

        (734) THROUGH (737) ARE RECODED TO: 60

734   PRINTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7443, 7643)
735   PHOTOENGRAVERS AND LITHOGRAPHERS (6842, 7444, 7644)
736   TYPESETTERS AND COMPOSITORS (6841, 7642)
737   MISCELLANEOUS PRINTING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (6849, 7449, 7649)

    -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    textile, apparel, and furnishings machine operators-

738   WINDING AND TWISTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7451, 7651)
739   KNITTING, LOOPING, TAPING, AND WEAVING MACHINE
     OPERATORS (7452, 7652)
743   TEXTILE CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7654)
744   TEXTILE SEWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7655)
745   SHOE MACHINE OPERATORS (7656)
747   PRESSING MACHINE OPERATORS (7657)
748   LAUNDERING AND DRY CLEANING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (6855, 7658)
749   MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7459, 7659)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
     machine operators, assorted materials-

   (753) THROUGH (779) ARE RECODED TO: 62

753   CEMENTING AND GLUING MACHINE OPERATORS (7661)
754   PACKAGING AND FILLING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7462, 7662)
755   EXTRUDING AND FORMING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7463, 7663)
756   MIXING AND BLENDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7664)
757   SEPARATING, FILTERING, AND CLARIFYING MACHINE
     OPERATORS (7476, 7666, 7676))
758   COMPRESSING AND COMPACTING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7467, 7667)
759   PAINTING AND PAINT SPRAYING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7669)
763   ROASTING AND BAKING MACHINE OPERATORS, FOOD
     (7472, 7672)
764   WASHING, CLEANING, AND PICKLING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7673)
765   FOLDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7474, 7674)
766   FURNACE, KILN, AND OVEN OPERATORS, EXC. FOOD (7675)
768   CRUSHING AND GRINDING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (PT 7477, PT 7677)
769   SLICING AND CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7478, 7678)
773   MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS (PT 7479)
774   PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS MACHINE OPERATORS
     (6863, 6868, 7671)
777   MISCELLANEOUS MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C.
     (PT 7479,7665, 7679)
779   MACHINE OPERATORS, NOT SPECIFIED

-fabricators, assemblers, and hand working occupations-

   (783) THROUGH (795) ARE RECODED TO: 63

783   WELDERS AND CUTTERS (7332, 7532, 7714)
784   SOLDERERS AND BRAZERS (7333, 7533, 7717)
785   ASSEMBLERS (772,774)
786   HAND CUTTING AND TRIMMING OCCUPATIONS (7753)
787   HAND MOLDING, CASTING, AND FORMING OCCUPATIONS
    (7754, 7755)
789   HAND PAINTING, COATING, AND DECORATING OCCUPATIONS
    (7756)
793   HAND ENGRAVING AND PRINTING OCCUPATIONS (7757)
794   HAND GRINDING AND POLISHING OCCUPATIONS (7758)
795   MISCELLANEOUS HAND WORKING OCCUPATIONS (7759)

-production inspectors, testors, samplers, and weighers-

     (796) THROUGH (799) ARE RECODED TO: 64

796   PRODUCTION INSPECTORS, CHECKERS, AND EXAMINERS
    (782, 787)
797   PRODUCTION TESTERS (783)
798   PRODUCTION SAMPLERS AND WEIGHERS (784)
799   GRADERS AND SORTERS, EXCEPT AGRICULTURAL (785)

   Transportation and Material Moving Occupations
      ....
      -motor vehicle operators-

     (803) THROUGH (814) ARE RECODED TO: 65

803   SUPERVISORS, MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS (8111)
804   TRUCK DRIVERS, HEAVY (8212, 8213)
805   TRUCK DRIVERS, LIGHT (8214)
806   DRIVER-SALES WORKERS (8218)
808   BUS DRIVERS (8215)
809   TAXICAB DRIVERS AND CHAUFFEURS (8216)
813   PARKING LOT ATTENDANTS (874)
814   MOTOR TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (8219)

   Transportation Occupations, except Motor Vehicles
      ....
      -rail transportation occupations-

     (823) THROUGH (826) ARE RECODED TO: 66

823   RAILROAD CONDUCTORS AND YARDMASTERS (8113)
824   LOCOMOTIVE OPERATING OCCUPATIONS (8232)
825   RAILROAD BRAKE, SIGNAL, AND SWITCH OPERATORS (8233)
826   RAIL VEHICLE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (8239)

     -water transportation occupations-

(828) THROUGH (834) ARE RECODED TO: 66

828   SHIP CAPTAINS AND MATES, EXCEPT FISHING BOATS
       (PT 8241, 8242)
829   SAILORS AND DECKHANDS (8243)
833   MARINE ENGINEERS (8244)
834   BRIDGE, LOCK, AND LIGHTHOUSE TENDERS (8245)

       Material Moving Equipment Operators

       (843) THROUGH (859) ARE RECODED TO: 67

843   SUPERVISORS, MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
       (812)
844   OPERATING ENGINEERS (8312)
845   LONGSHORE EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (8313)
848   HOIST AND WINCH OPERATORS (8314)
849   CRANE AND TOWER OPERATORS (8315)
853   EXCAVATING AND LOADING MACHINE OPERATORS (8316)
855   GRADER, DOZER, AND SCRAPER OPERATORS (8317)
856   INDUSTRIAL TRUCK AND TRACTOR EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
       (8318)
859   MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
       (8319)

   Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers

       (863) THROUGH (873) ARE RECODED TO: 68

863   SUPERVISORS; HANDLERS, EQUIPMENT CLEANERS, AND
       LABORERS, N.E.C. (85)
864   HELPERS, MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS (863)

       HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION AND EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS

865   HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION TRADES (8641-8645, 8648)
866   HELPERS, SURVEYOR (8646)
867   HELPERS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (865)
869   CONSTRUCTION LABORERS (871)
873   PRODUCTION HELPERS (861, 862)

       Freight, Stock, and Material Handlers

       (875) THROUGH (883) ARE RECODED TO: 69

875   GARBAGE COLLECTORS (8722)
876   STEVEDORES (8723)
877   STOCK HANDLERS AND BAGGERS (8724)
878   MACHINE FEEDERS AND OFFBEARERS (8725)
883   FREIGHT, STOCK, AND MATERIAL HANDLERS, N.E.C.
       (8726)

```
---------------------------------------------------------

        (885) THROUGH (889) ARE RECODED TO: 70

 885   GARAGE AND SERVICE STATION RELATED OCCUPATIONS
       (873)
 887   VEHICLE WASHERS AND EQUIPMENT CLEANERS (875)
 888   HAND PACKERS AND PACKAGERS (8761)
 889   LABORERS, EXCEPT CONSTRUCTION (8769)
---------------------------------------------------------

           (900) IS RECODED TO: 71

 900   CURRENT MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES
       (NOT A CENSUS CODE)
---------------------------------------------------------

           (999) IS RECODED TO: 90

 999   OCCUPATION NOT REPORTED (CODE USED WHEN
       NOT-REPORTED CASES ARE NOT ALLOCATED)
```

II. 1990 Census 0ccupation codes

The full 3-digit 1990 Census Occupation Code was used to
code the occupation of respondents. In order to minimize
the amount of highly specific information released about
respondents, the full occupation code has been recoded to a
71 category code, which is based on the occupation code
sub-headings in the Census Code.

In the code description that follows, the full 1990 Census
Code is presented. At the beginning of each recoded
section, the statement "(XXX) THROUGH (YYY) ARE RECODED TO
(ZZ)" indicates the code values to which the specific
occupations have been recoded. Numbers in parentheses
following the occupation categories are the U.S. Department
of Commerce's 1980 Standard Occupational Classification code
equivalents. The abbreviation "pt" means "part" and
"N.E.C." means "not elsewhere classified".

   MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS

      Executive, Administrative, and Managerial

        (003) THROUGH (022) ARE RECODED TO: 01

 003   LEGISLATORS (111)
 004   CHIEF EXECUTIVES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS, PUBLIC
       ADMINISTRATION (112)

005   ADMINISTRATORS AND OFFICIALS, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (1132-1139)
006   ADMINISTRATORS, PROTECTIVE SERVICES (1131)
007   FINANCIAL MANAGERS (122)
008   PERSONNEL AND LABOR RELATIONS MANAGERS (123)
009   PURCHASING MANAGERS (124)
013   MANAGERS, MARKETING, ADVERTISING, AND PUBLIC RELATIONS (125)
014   ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATION AND RELATED FIELDS (128)
015   MANAGERS, MEDICINE AND HEALTH (131)
016   POSTMASTERS AND MAIL SUPERINTENDENTS (1344)
017   MANAGERS, FOOD SERVING AND LODGING ESTABLISHMENTS (1351)
018   MANAGERS, PROPERTIES AND REAL ESTATE (1353)
019   FUNERAL DIRECTORS (PT 1359)
021   MANAGERS, SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, N.E.C. (127, 1352, 1354, PT 1359)
022   MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, N.E.C. (121, 126, 132-1343, 136-139)

     Management-Related Occupations

   (023) THROUGH (037) ARE RECODED TO: 02

023   ACCOUNTANTS AND AUDITORS (1412)
024   UNDERWRITERS (1414)
025   OTHER FINANCIAL OFFICERS (1415, 1419)
026   MANAGEMENT ANALYSTS (142)
027   PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND LABOR RELATIONS SPECIALISTS (143)
028   PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, FARM PRODUCTS (1443)
029   BUYERS, WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE, EXCEPT FARM PRODUCTS (1442)
033   PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, N.E.C. (1449)
034   BUSINESS AND PROMOTION AGENTS (145)
035   CONSTRUCTION INSPECTORS (1472)
036   INSPECTORS AND COMPLIANCE OFFICERS, EXC. CONSTRUCTION (1473)
037   MANAGEMENT RELATED OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (149)

     Professional Specialty Occupations
          ....
     - engineers, architects and surveyors -

   (043) THROUGH (063) ARE RECODED TO: 03

043   ARCHITECTS (161)

     ENGINEERS

044   AEROSPACE ENGINEERS (1622)
045   METALLURGICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERS (1623)
046   MINING ENGINEERS (1624)
047   PETROLEUM ENGINEERS (1625)

```
048   CHEMICAL ENGINEERS (1626)
049   NUCLEAR ENGINEERS (1627)
053   CIVIL ENGINEERS (1628)
054   AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERS (1632)
055   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERS (1633, 1636)
056   INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS (1634)
057   MECHANICAL ENGINEERS (1635)
058   MARINE ENGINEERS AND NAVAL ARCHITECTS (1637)
059   ENGINEERS, N.E.C. (1639)
063   SURVEYORS AND MAPPING SCIENTISTS (164)
-------------------------------------------------------------

       - mathematical and computer scientists -

      (064) THROUGH (068) ARE RECODED TO: 04

064   COMPUTER SYSTEMS ANALYSTS AND SCIENTISTS (171)
065   OPERATIONS AND SYSTEMS RESEARCHERS AND ANALYSTS
      (172)
066   ACTUARIES (1732)
067   STATISTICIANS (1733)
068   MATHEMATICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1739)
-------------------------------------------------------------

         - natural scientists -

      (069) THROUGH (083) ARE RECODED TO: 05

069   PHYSICISTS AND ASTRONOMERS (1842, 1843)
073   CHEMISTS, EXCEPT BIOCHEMISTS (1845)
074   ATMOSPHERIC AND SPACE SCIENTISTS (1846)
075   GEOLOGISTS AND GEODESISTS (1847)
076   PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1849)
077   AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENTISTS (1853)
078   BIOLOGICAL AND LIFE SCIENTISTS (1854)
079   FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION SCIENTISTS (1852)
083   MEDICAL SCIENTISTS (1855)
-------------------------------------------------------------

        - health diagnosing occupations -

      (084) THROUGH (089) ARE RECODED TO: 06

084   PHYSICIANS (261)
085   DENTISTS (262)
086   VETERINARIANS (27)
087   OPTOMETRISTS (281)
088   PODIATRISTS (283)
089   HEALTH DIAGNOSING PRACTITIONERS, N.E.C. (289)
-------------------------------------------------------------

     - health assessment and treating occupations -

      (095) THROUGH (106) ARE RECODED TO: 07
```

```
095   REGISTERED NURSES (29)
096   PHARMACISTS (301)
097   DIETITIANS (302)

      THERAPISTS

098   INHALATION THERAPISTS (3031)
099   OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS (3032)
103   PHYSICAL THERAPISTS (3033)
104   SPEECH THERAPISTS (3034)
105   THERAPISTS, N.E.C. (3039)
106   PHYSICIANS' ASSISTANTS (304)
-------------------------------------------------------------

        - teachers, postsecondary -

      (113) THROUGH (154) ARE RECODED TO: 08

113   EARTH, ENVIRONMENTAL AND MARINE SCIENCE TEACHERS
      (2212)
114   BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2213)
115   CHEMISTRY TEACHERS (2214)
116   PHYSICS TEACHERS (2215)
117   NATURAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2216)
118   PSYCHOLOGY TEACHERS (2217)
119   ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2218)
123   HISTORY TEACHERS (2222)
124   POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2223)
125   SOCIOLOGY TEACHERS (2224)
126   SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2225)
127   ENGINEERING TEACHERS (2226)
128   MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2227)
129   COMPUTER SCIENCE TEACHERS (2228)
133   MEDICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2231)
134   HEALTH SPECIALTIES TEACHERS (2232)
135   BUSINESS, COMMERCE, AND MARKETING TEACHERS (2233)
136   AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY TEACHERS (2234)
137   ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC TEACHERS (2235)
138   PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (2236)
139   EDUCATION TEACHERS (2237)
143   ENGLISH TEACHERS (2238)
144   FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (2242)
145   LAW TEACHERS (2243)
146   SOCIAL WORK TEACHERS (2244)
147   THEOLOGY TEACHERS (2245)
148   TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL TEACHERS (2246)
149   HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2247)
153   TEACHERS, POSTSECONDARY, N.E.C. (2249)
154   POSTSECONDARY TEACHERS, SUBJECT NOT SPECIFIED
-------------------------------------------------------------

        - teachers, except postsecondary -
```

(155) THROUGH (165) ARE RECODED TO: 09

155   TEACHERS, PREKINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN (231)
156   TEACHERS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (232)
157   TEACHERS, SECONDARY SCHOOL (233)
158   TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION (235)
159   TEACHERS, N.E.C. (236,239)
163   COUNSELORS, EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL (24)

     LIBRARIANS, ARCHIVISTS, AND CURATORS

164   LIBRARIANS (251)
165   ARCHIVISTS AND CURATORS (252)

   - social scientist and urban planners -

   (166) THROUGH (173) ARE RECODED TO: 10

166   ECONOMISTS (1912)
167   PSYCHOLOGISTS (1915)
168   SOCIOLOGISTS (1916)
169   SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1913, 1914, 1919)
173   URBAN PLANNERS (192)

   - social, recreation, and religious workers -

   (174) THROUGH (177) ARE RECODED TO: 11

174   SOCIAL WORKERS (2032)
175   RECREATION WORKERS (2033)
176   CLERGY (2042)
177   RELIGIOUS WORKERS, N.E.C. (2049)

     - lawyers and judges -

   (178) THROUGH (179) ARE RECODED TO: 12

178   LAWYERS (211)
179   JUDGES (212)

   - writers, artists, entertainers, and athletes -

   (183) THROUGH (199) ARE RECODED TO: 13

183   AUTHORS (321)
184   TECHNICAL WRITERS (398)
185   DESIGNERS (322)
186   MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS (323)
187   ACTORS AND DIRECTORS (324)
188   PAINTERS, SCULPTORS, CRAFT-ARTISTS, AND ARTIST

PRINTMAKERS (325)
189   PHOTOGRAPHERS (326)
193   DANCERS (327)
194   ARTISTS, PERFORMERS, AND RELATED WORKERS, N.E.C.
      (328, 329)
195   EDITORS AND REPORTERS (331)
197   PUBLIC RELATIONS SPECIALISTS (332)
198   ANNOUNCERS (333)
199   ATHLETES (34)

     TECHNICIANS AND RELATED SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS

        Health Technologists and Technicians

        (203) THROUGH (208) ARE RECODED TO: 14

203   CLINICAL LABORATORY TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS
      (362)
204   DENTAL HYGIENISTS (363)
205   HEALTH RECORD TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS (364)
206   RADIOLOGIC TECHNICIANS (365)
207   LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES (366)
208   HEALTH TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (369)

     Technologists and Technicians, except Health
              ....
 - engineering and related technologists and technicians -

        (213) THROUGH (218) ARE RECODED TO: 15

213   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC TECHNICIANS (3711)
214   INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS (3712)
215   MECHANICAL ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS (3713)
216   ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3719)
217   DRAFTING OCCUPATIONS (372)
218   SURVEYING AND MAPPING TECHNICIANS (373)

          - science technicians -

        (223) THROUGH (225) ARE RECODED TO: 16

223   BIOLOGICAL TECHNICIANS (382)
224   CHEMICAL TECHNICIANS (3831)
225   SCIENCE TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3832, 3833, 384, 389)

 - technicians, except health, engineering, and science -

        (226) THROUGH (235) ARE RECODED TO: 17

226   AIRPLANE PILOTS AND NAVIGATORS (825)

227 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (392)
228 BROADCAST EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (393)
229 COMPUTER PROGRAMMERS (3971, 3972)
233 TOOL PROGRAMMERS, NUMERICAL CONTROL (3974)
234 LEGAL ASSISTANTS (396)
235 TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (399)

SALES OCCUPATIONS

Supervisors and Proprietors

(243) IS RECODED TO: 18

243 SUPERVISORS AND PROPRIETORS, SALES OCCUPATIONS (40)

Sales Representatives, Finance and Business Services

(253) THROUGH (257) ARE RECODED TO: 18

253 INSURANCE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4122)
254 REAL ESTATE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4123)
255 SECURITIES AND FINANCIAL SERVICES SALES OCCUPATIONS
     (4124)
256 ADVERTISING AND RELATED SALES OCCUPATIONS (4153)
257 SALES OCCUPATIONS, OTHER BUSINESS SERVICES (4152)

Sales Representatives, Commodities except Retail

(258) THROUGH (259) ARE RECODED TO: 19

258 SALES ENGINEERS (421)
259 SALES REPRESENTATIVES, MINING, MANUFACTURING, AND
     WHOLESALE (423, 424)

Sales Workers, Retail and Personal Services

(263) THROUGH (278) ARE RECODED TO: 20

263 SALES WORKERS, MOTOR VEHICLES AND BOATS
     (4342, 4344)
264 SALES WORKERS, APPAREL (4346)
265 SALES WORKERS, SHOES (4351)
266 SALES WORKERS, FURNITURE AND HOME FURNISHINGS
     (4348)
267 SALES WORKERS; RADIO, TELEVISION, HI-FI, AND
     APPLIANCES (4343, 4352)
268 SALES WORKERS, HARDWARE AND BUILDING SUPPLIES
     (4353)
269 SALES WORKERS, PARTS (4367)
274 SALES WORKERS, OTHER COMMODITIES (4345, 4347, 4354,
     4356, 4359, 4362, 4369)

275   SALES COUNTER CLERKS (4363)
276   CASHIERS (4364)
277   STREET AND DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES WORKERS (4366)
278   NEWS VENDORS (4365)

          Sales Related Occupations

     (283) THROUGH (285) ARE RECODED TO: 21

283   DEMONSTRATORS, PROMOTERS AND MODELS, SALES (445)
284   AUCTIONEERS(447)
285   SALES SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (444, 446, 449)

  ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, (incl. Clerical supervisors)

          Clerical Supervisors

     (303) THROUGH (307) ARE RECODED TO: 22

303   SUPERVISORS, GENERAL OFFICE (4511, 4513, 4514, 4516, 4519, 4529)
304   SUPERVISORS, COMPUTER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4512)
305   SUPERVISORS, FINANCIAL RECORDS PROCESSING (4521)
306   CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OPERATORS (4523)
307   SUPERVISORS; DISTRIBUTION, SCHEDULING, AND
      ADJUSTING CLERKS (4522, 4524-4528)

          Computer Equipment Operators

     (308) THROUGH (309) ARE RECODED TO: 23

308   COMPUTER OPERATORS (4612)
309   PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4613)

      Secretaries, Stenographers, and Typists

     (313) THROUGH (315) ARE RECODED TO: 24

313   SECRETARIES (4622)
314   STENOGRAPHERS (4623)
315   TYPISTS (4624)

          Information Clerks

     (316) THROUGH (323) ARE RECODED TO: 25

316   INTERVIEWERS (4642)
317   HOTEL CLERKS (4643)
318   TRANSPORTATION TICKET AND RESERVATION AGENTS (4644)
319   RECEPTIONISTS (4645)

323   INFORMATION CLERKS, N.E.C. (4649)

   Records Processing Occupations, except Financial

      (325) THROUGH (336) ARE RECODED TO: 26

325   CLASSIFIED-AD CLERKS (4662)
326   CORRESPONDENCE CLERKS (4663)
327   ORDER CLERKS (4664)
328   PERSONNEL CLERKS, EXCEPT PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING
   (4692)
329   LIBRARY CLERKS (4694)
335   FILE CLERKS (4696)
336   RECORDS CLERKS (4699)

   Financial Records Processing Occupations

      (337) THROUGH (344) ARE RECODED TO: 27

337   BOOKKEEPERS, ACCOUNTING, AND AUDITING CLERKS (4712)
338   PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING CLERKS (4713)
339   BILLING CLERKS (4715)
343   COST AND RATE CLERKS (4716)
344   BILLING, POSTING, AND CALCULATING MACHINE OPERATORS
   (4718)

   Duplicating, Mail and Other Office Machine Operators

      (345) THROUGH (347) ARE RECODED TO: 28

345   DUPLICATING MACHINE OPERATORS (4722)
346   MAIL PREPARING AND PAPER HANDLING MACHINE OPERATORS
   (4723)
347   OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4729)

   Communications Equipment Operators

      (348) THROUGH (353) ARE RECODED TO: 29

348   TELEPHONE OPERATORS (4732)
353   COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4733, 4739)

   Mail and Message Distributing Occupations

      (354) THROUGH (357) ARE RECODED TO: 30

354   POSTAL CLERKS, EXC. MAIL CARRIERS (4742)
355   MAIL CARRIERS, POSTAL SERVICE (4743)
356   MAIL CLERKS, EXC. POSTAL SERVICE (4744)

357   MESSENGERS (4745)

Material Recording, Scheduling, and Distributing Clerks

    (359) THROUGH (374) ARE RECODED TO: 31

359   DISPATCHERS (4751)
363   PRODUCTION COORDINATORS (4752)
364   TRAFFIC, SHIPPING, AND RECEIVING CLERKS (4753)
365   STOCK AND INVENTORY CLERKS (4754)
366   METER READERS (4755)
368   WEIGHERS, MEASURERS, CHECKERS, AND SAMPLERS (4756, 4757)
373   EXPEDITERS (4758)
374   MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING, AND DISTRIBUTING
      CLERKS, N.E.C. (4759)

       Adjusters and Investigators

    (375) THROUGH (378) ARE RECODED TO: 32

375   INSURANCE ADJUSTERS, EXAMINERS, AND INVESTIGATORS
      (4782)
376   INVESTIGATORS AND ADJUSTERS, EXCEPT INSURANCE
      (4783)
377   ELIGIBILITY CLERKS, SOCIAL WELFARE (4784)
378   BILL AND ACCOUNT COLLECTORS (4786)

   Miscellaneous Administrative Support Occupations

    (379) THROUGH (389) ARE RECODED TO: 33

379   GENERAL OFFICE CLERKS (463)
383   BANK TELLERS (4791)
384   PROOFREADERS (4792)
385   DATA-ENTRY KEYERS (4793)
386   STATISTICAL CLERKS (4794)
387   TEACHERS' AIDES (4795)
389   ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (4787,
      4799)

          SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

       Private Household Occupations

    (403) THROUGH (407) ARE RECODED TO: 34

403   LAUNDERERS AND IRONERS (503)
404   COOKS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (504)
405   HOUSEKEEPERS AND BUTLERS (505)
406   CHILD CARE WORKERS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (506)

407   PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD CLEANERS AND SERVANTS
       (502, 507, 509)

            Protective Service Occupations
                ....
        -supervisors, protective service occupations-

            (413) THROUGH (415) ARE RECODED TO: 35

413   SUPERVISORS, FIREFIGHTING AND FIRE PREVENTION
       OCCUPATIONS (5111)
414   SUPERVISORS, POLICE AND DETECTIVES (5112)
415   SUPERVISORS, GUARDS (5113)

        -firefighting and fire prevention occupations-

            (416) THROUGH (417) ARE RECODED TO: 35

416   FIRE INSPECTION AND FIRE PREVENTION OCCUPATIONS
       (5122)
417   FIREFIGHTING OCCUPATIONS (5123)

            -police and detectives-

            (418) THROUGH (424) ARE RECODED TO: 35

418   POLICE AND DETECTIVES, PUBLIC SERVICE (5132)
423   SHERIFFS, BAILIFFS, AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT
       OFFICERS (5134)
424   CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION OFFICERS (5133)

            -guards-

            (425) THROUGH (427) ARE RECODED TO: 35

425   CROSSING GUARDS (5142)
426   GUARDS AND POLICE, EXCEPT PUBLIC SERVICE (5144)
427   PROTECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5149)

    Service Occupations, except Protective and Household
                ....
        -food preparation and service occupations-

            (433) THROUGH (444) ARE RECODED TO: 36

433   SUPERVISORS, FOOD PREPARATION AND SERVICE
       OCCUPATIONS (5211)
434   BARTENDERS (5212)
435   WAITERS AND WAITRESSES (5213)

436   COOKS (5214, 5215)
438   FOOD COUNTER, FOUNTAIN AND RELATED OCCUPATIONS
      (5216)
439   KITCHEN WORKERS, FOOD PREPARATION (5217)
443   WAITERS'/WAITRESSES' ASSISTANTS (5218)
444   MISCELLANEOUS FOOD PREPARATION OCCUPATIONS (5219)

        -health service occupations-

      (445) THROUGH (447) ARE RECODED TO: 37

445   DENTAL ASSISTANTS (5232)
446   HEALTH AIDES, EXCEPT NURSING (5233)
447   NURSING AIDES, ORDERLIES, AND ATTENDANTS (5236)

-cleaning and building service occupations, exc. household-

      (448) THROUGH (455) ARE RECODED TO: 38

448   SUPERVISORS, CLEANING AND BUILDING SERVICE WORKKERS
      (5241)
449   MAIDS AND HOUSEMEN (5242, 5249)
453   JANITORS AND CLEANERS (5244)
454   ELEVATOR OPERATORS (5245)
455   PEST CONTROL OCCUPATIONS (5246)

        -personal service occupations-

      (456) THROUGH (469) ARE RECODED TO: 39

456   SUPERVISORS, PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS (5251)
457   BARBERS (5252)
458   HAIRDRESSERS AND COSMETOLOGISTS (5253)
459   ATTENDANTS, AMUSEMENT AND RECREATION FACILITIES
      (5254)
461   GUIDES (5255)
462   USHERS (5256)
463   PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ATTENDANTS (5257)
464   BAGGAGE PORTERS AND BELLHOPS (5262)
465   WELFARE SERVICE AIDES (5263)
466   FAMILY CHILD CARE PROVIDERS (PT 5264)
467   EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHER'S ASSISTANTS (PT 5264)
468   CHILD CARE WORKERS (PT 5264)
469   PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5258, 5269)

   FARMING, FORESTRY, AND FISHING OCCUPATIONS

        Farm Operators and Managers

      (473) THROUGH (476) ARE RECODED TO: 40

473   FARMERS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5512-5514)
474   HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMERS (5515)
475   MANAGERS, FARMS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5522-5524)
476   MANAGERS, HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMS (5525)

Other Agricultural and Related Occupations
        ....
      -farm occupations, except managerial-

      (477) THROUGH (484) ARE RECODED TO: 41

477   SUPERVISORS, FARM WORKERS (5611)
479   FARM WORKERS (5612-5617)
483   MARINE LIFE CULTIVATION WORKERS (5618)
484   NURSERY WORKERS (5619)

      -related agricultural occupations-

      (485) THROUGH (489) ARE RECODED TO: 42

485   SUPERVISORS, RELATED AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS
      (5621)
486   GROUNDSKEEPERS AND GARDENERS, EXCEPT FARM (5622)
487   ANIMAL CARETAKERS, EXCEPT FARM (5624)
488   GRADERS AND SORTERS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5625)
489   INSPECTORS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5627)

      -forestry and logging occupations-

      (494) THROUGH (496) ARE RECODED TO: 43

494   SUPERVISORS, FORESTRY AND LOGGING WORKERS (571)
495   FORESTRY WORKERS, EXCEPT LOGGING (572)
496   TIMBER CUTTING AND LOGGING OCCUPATIONS (573, 579)

      -fishers, hunters, and trappers-

      (497) THROUGH (499) ARE RECODED TO: 43

497   CAPTAINS AND OTHER OFFICERS, FISHING VESSELS
      (PT 8241)
498   FISHERS (583)
499   HUNTERS AND TRAPPERS (584)

PRECISION PRODUCTION, CRAFT, AND REPAIR OCCUPATIONS

        Mechanics and Repairers
          ....

-mechanics and repairers supervisors-

    (503) IS RECODED TO: 44

503   SUPERVISORS, MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS (60)

-mechanics and repairers, vehicle and mobile equipment-

    (505) THROUGH (517) ARE RECODED TO: 44

505   AUTOMOBILE MECHANICS (PT 6111)
506   AUTOMOBILE MECHANIC APPRENTICES (PT 6111)
507   BUS, TRUCK, AND STATIONARY ENGINE MECHANICS (6112)
508   AIRCRAFT ENGINE MECHANICS (6113)
509   SMALL ENGINE REPAIRERS (6114)
514   AUTOMOBILE BODY AND RELATED REPAIRERS (6115)
515   AIRCRAFT MECHANICS, EXCEPT ENGINE (6116)
516   HEAVY EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6117)
517   FARM EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6118)

   -mechanics and repairers, except
   vehicle and mobile equipment-

    (518) THROUGH (534) ARE RECODED TO: 45

518   INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY REPAIRERS (613)
519   MACHINERY MAINTENANCE OCCUPATIONS (614)

   ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS

523   ELECTRONIC REPAIRERS, COMMUNICATIONS AND INDUSTRIAL
    EQUIPMENT (6151, 6153, 6155)
525   DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6154)
526   HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE AND POWER TOOL REPAIRERS (6156)
527   TELEPHONE LINE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6157)
529   TELEPHONE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6158)
533   MISCELLANEOUS ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT
    EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6152, 6159)
534   HEATING, AIR CONDITIONING, AND REFRIGERATION
    MECHANICS (616)

   -miscellaneous mechanics and repairers

    (535) THROUGH (549) ARE RECODED TO: 46

535   CAMERA, WATCH, AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENT REPAIRERS
    (6171, 6172)
536   LOCKSMITHS AND SAFE REPAIRERS (6173)
538   OFFICE MACHINE REPAIRERS (6174)
539   MECHANICAL CONTROLS AND VALVE REPAIRERS (6175)

543 ELEVATOR INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6176)
544 MILLWRIGHTS (6178)
547 SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS, N.E.C.
     (6177, 6179)
549 NOT SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS

          Construction Trades
          ....
     -supervisors, construction occupations-

     (553) THROUGH (558) ARE RECODED TO: 47

553 SUPERVISORS; BRICKMASONS, STONEMASONS, AND TILE
     SETTERS (6312)
554 SUPERVISORS, CARPENTERS AND RELATED WORKERS (6313)
555 SUPERVISORS, ELECTRICIANS AND POWER TRANSMISSION
     INSTALLERS (6314)
556 SUPERVISORS; PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS, AND PLASTERERS
     (6315)
557 SUPERVISORS; PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND
     STEAMFITTERS (6316)
558 SUPERVISORS, N.E.C. (6311, 6318)

     -construction trades, except supervisors-

     (563) THROUGH (599) ARE RECODED TO: 48

563 BRICKMASONS AND STONEMASONS, (PT 6412, PT 6413)
564 BRICKMASON AND STONEMASON APPRENTICES
     (PT 6412, PT 6413)
565 TILE SETTERS, HARD AND SOFT (6414, PT 6462)
566 CARPET INSTALLERS (PT 6462)
567 CARPENTERS (PT 6422)
569 CARPENTER APPRENTICES (PT 6422)
573 DRYWALL INSTALLERS (6424)
575 ELECTRICIANS (PT 6432)
576 ELECTRICIAN APPRENTICES (PT 6432)
577 ELECTRICAL POWER INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6433)
579 PAINTERS, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE (6442)
583 PAPERHANGERS (6443)
584 PLASTERERS (6444)
585 PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND STEAMFITTERS (PT 645)
587 PLUMBER, PIPEFITTER, AND STEAMFITTER APPRENTICES
     (PT 645)
588 CONCRETE AND TERRAZZO FINISHERS (6463)
589 GLAZIERS (6464)
593 INSULATION WORKERS (6465)
594 PAVING, SURFACING, AND TAMPING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
     (6466)
595 ROOFERS (6468)
596 SHEETMETAL DUCT INSTALLERS (6472)

597 STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS (6473)
598 DRILLERS, EARTH (6474)
599 CONSTRUCTION TRADES, N.E.C. (6467, 6475, 6476,
     6479)

        Extractive Occupations

     (613) THROUGH (617) ARE RECODED TO: 49

613 SUPERVISORS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (632)
614 DRILLERS, OIL WELL (652)
615 EXPLOSIVES WORKERS (653)
616 MINING MACHINE OPERATORS (654)
617 MINING OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (656)

     Precision Production Occupations
            ....
     -production occupation supervisors-

        (628) IS RECODED TO: 50

628 SUPERVISORS, PRODUCTION OCCUPATIONS (67, 71)

       -precision metalworking occupations-

     (634) THROUGH (655) ARE RECODED TO: 50

634 TOOL AND DIE MAKERS (PT 6811)
635 TOOL AND DIE MAKER APPRENTICES (PT 6811)
636 PRECISION ASSEMBLERS, METAL (6812)
637 MACHINISTS (PT 6813)
639 MACHINIST APPRENTICES (PT 6813)
643 BOILERMAKERS (6814)
644 PRECISION GRINDERS, FITTERS, AND TOOL SHARPENERS
     (6816)
645 PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, METAL (6817)
646 LAY-OUT WORKERS (6821)
647 PRECIOUS STONES AND METALS WORKERS (JEWELERS)
     (6822, 6866)
649 ENGRAVERS, METAL (6823)
653 SHEET METAL WORKERS (PT 6824)
654 SHEET METAL WORKER APPRENTICES (PT 6824)
655 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION METAL WORKERS (6829)

       -precision woodworking occupations-

     (656) THROUGH (659) ARE RECODED TO: 51

656 PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, WOOD (6831)

657 CABINET MAKERS AND BENCH CARPENTERS (6832)
658 FURNITURE AND WOOD FINISHERS (6835)
659 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WOODWORKERS (6839)

-precision textile, apparel, and
  furnishings machine workers-

(666) THROUGH (674) ARE RECODED TO: 52

666 DRESSMAKERS (PT 6852, PT 7752)
667 TAILORS (PT 6852)
668 UPHOLSTERERS (6853)
669 SHOE REPAIRERS (6854)
674 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION APPAREL AND FABRIC WORKERS
    (6856, 6859, PT 7752)

-precision workers, assorted materials-

(675) THROUGH (684) ARE RECODED TO: 53

675 HAND MOLDERS AND SHAPERS, EXCEPT JEWELERS (6861)
676 PATTERNMAKERS, LAY-OUT WORKERS, AND CUTTERS (6862)
677 OPTICAL GOODS WORKERS (6864, PT 7477, PT 7677)
678 DENTAL LABORATORY AND MEDICAL APPLIANCE TECHNICIANS
    (6865)
679 BOOKBINDERS (6844)
683 ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ASSEMBLERS
    (6867)
684 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WORKERS, N.E.C. (6869)

-precision food production occupations-

(686) THROUGH (688) ARE RECODED TO: 54

686 BUTCHERS AND MEAT CUTTERS (6871)
687 BAKERS (6872)
688 FOOD BATCHMAKERS (6873, 6879)

-precision inspectors, testers and related workers-

(689) THROUGH (693) ARE RECODED TO: 55

689 INSPECTORS, TESTERS, AND GRADERS (6881, 828)
693 ADJUSTERS AND CALIBRATORS (6882)

Plant and System Operators

(694) THROUGH (699) ARE RECODED TO: 56

694   WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT OPERATORS (691)
695   POWER PLANT OPERATORS (PT 693)
696   STATIONARY ENGINEERS (PT 693, 7668)
699   MISCELLANEOUS PLANT AND SYSTEM OPERATORS (692, 694,
      695, 696)

          OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS

   Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors
                 ....
   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
   metalworking and plastic working machine operators-

       (703) THROUGH (717) ARE RECODED TO: 57

703   LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE SET-UP OPERATORS (7312)
704   LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE OPERATORS (7512)
705   MILLING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS (7313, 7513)
706   PUNCHING AND STAMPING PRESS MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7314, 7317, 7514, 7517)
707   ROLLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7316, 7516)
708   DRILLING AND BORING MACHINE OPERATORS (7318, 7518)
709   GRINDING, ABRADING, BUFFING, AND POLISHING MACHINE
      OPERATORS (7322, 7324, 7522)
713   FORGING MACHINE OPERATORS (7319, 7519)
714   NUMERICAL CONTROL MACHINE OPERATORS (7326)
715   MISCELLANEOUS METAL, PLASTIC, STONE, AND GLASS
      WORKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7329, 7529)
717   FABRICATING MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (7339, 7539)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
   metal and plastic processing machine operators-

       (719) THROUGH (725) ARE RECODED TO: 58

719   MOLDING AND CASTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7315, 7342,
      7515, 7542)
723   METAL PLATING MACHINE OPERATORS (7343, 7543)
724   HEAT TREATING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (7344, 7544)
725   MISCELLANEOUS METAL AND PLASTIC PROCESSING MACHINE
      OPERATORS (7349, 7549)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
        woodworking machine operators-

       (726) THROUGH (733) ARE RECODED TO: 59

726   WOOD LATHE, ROUTING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7431, 7432, 7631, 7632)
727   SAWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7433, 7633)
728   SHAPING AND JOINING MACHINE OPERATORS (7435, 7635)

729   NAILING AND TACKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7636)
733   MISCELLANEOUS WOODWORKING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7434, 7439, 7634, 7639)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
       printing machine operators-

    (734) THROUGH (737) ARE RECODED TO: 60

734   PRINTING PRESS OPERATORS (7443, 7643)
735   PHOTOENGRAVERS AND LITHOGRAPHERS (6842, 7444, 7644)
736   TYPESETTERS AND COMPOSITORS (6841, 7642)
737   MISCELLANEOUS PRINTING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (6849, 7449, 7649)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  textile, apparel, and furnishings machine operators-

    (738) THROUGH (749) ARE RECODED TO: 61

738   WINDING AND TWISTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7451, 7651)
739   KNITTING, LOOPING, TAPING, AND WEAVING MACHINE
     OPERATORS (7452, 7652)
743   TEXTILE CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7654)
744   TEXTILE SEWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7655)
745   SHOE MACHINE OPERATORS (7656)
747   PRESSING MACHINE OPERATORS (7657)
748   LAUNDERING AND DRY CLEANING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (6855, 7658)
749   MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7459, 7659)

   -machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    machine operators, assorted materials-

    (753) THROUGH (779) ARE RECODED TO: 62

753   CEMENTING AND GLUING MACHINE OPERATORS (7661)
754   PACKAGING AND FILLING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7462, 7662)
755   EXTRUDING AND FORMING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7463, 7663)
756   MIXING AND BLENDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7664)
757   SEPARATING, FILTERING, AND CLARIFYING MACHINE
     OPERATORS (7476, 7666, 7676))
758   COMPRESSING AND COMPACTING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7467, 7667)
759   PAINTING AND PAINT SPRAYING MACHINE OPERATORS
     (7669)
763   ROASTING AND BAKING MACHINE OPERATORS, FOOD
     (7472, 7672)

764   WASHING, CLEANING, AND PICKLING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (7673)
765   FOLDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7474, 7674)
766   FURNACE, KILN, AND OVEN OPERATORS, EXC. FOOD (7675)
768   CRUSHING AND GRINDING MACHINE OPERATORS
      (PT 7477, PT 7677)
769   SLICING AND CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7478, 7678)
773   MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS (PT 7479)
774   PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS MACHINE OPERATORS
      (6863, 6868, 7671)
777   MISCELLANEOUS MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C.
      (PT 7479,7665, 7679)
779   MACHINE OPERATORS, NOT SPECIFIED

-fabricators, assemblers, and hand working occupations-

      (783) THROUGH (795) ARE RECODED TO: 63

783   WELDERS AND CUTTERS (7332, 7532, 7714)
784   SOLDERERS AND BRAZERS (7333, 7533, 7717)
785   ASSEMBLERS (772,774)
786   HAND CUTTING AND TRIMMING OCCUPATIONS (7753)
787   HAND MOLDING, CASTING, AND FORMING OCCUPATIONS
      (7754, 7755)
789   HAND PAINTING, COATING, AND DECORATING OCCUPATIONS
      (7756)
793   HAND ENGRAVING AND PRINTING OCCUPATIONS (7757)
795   MISCELLANEOUS HAND WORKING OCCUPATIONS (7759)

-production inspectors, testors, samplers, and weighers-

      (796) THROUGH (799) ARE RECODED TO: 64

796   PRODUCTION INSPECTORS, CHECKERS, AND EXAMINERS
      (782, 787)
797   PRODUCTION TESTERS (783)
798   PRODUCTION SAMPLERS AND WEIGHERS (784)
799   GRADERS AND SORTERS, EXCEPT AGRICULTURAL (785)

      Transportation and Material Moving Occupations
            ....
          -motor vehicle operators-

      (803) THROUGH (814) ARE RECODED TO: 65

803   SUPERVISORS, MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS (8111)
804   TRUCK DRIVERS (8212-8214)
806   DRIVER-SALES WORKERS (8218)
808   BUS DRIVERS (8215)
809   TAXICAB DRIVERS AND CHAUFFEURS (8216)
813   PARKING LOT ATTENDANTS (874)

814   MOTOR TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (8219)

  Transportation Occupations, except Motor Vehicles
            ....
        -rail transportation occupations-

      (823) THROUGH (826) ARE RECODED TO: 66

823   RAILROAD CONDUCTORS AND YARDMASTERS (8113)
824   LOCOMOTIVE OPERATING OCCUPATIONS (8232)
825   RAILROAD BRAKE, SIGNAL, AND SWITCH OPERATORS (8233)
826   RAIL VEHICLE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (8239)

        -water transportation occupations-

      (828) THROUGH (834) ARE RECODED TO: 66

828   SHIP CAPTAINS AND MATES, EXCEPT FISHING BOATS
      (PT 8241, 8242)
829   SAILORS AND DECKHANDS (8243)
833   MARINE ENGINEERS (8244)
834   BRIDGE, LOCK, AND LIGHTHOUSE TENDERS (8245)

      Material Moving Equipment Operators

      (843) THROUGH (859) ARE RECODED TO: 67

843   SUPERVISORS, MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
      (812)
844   OPERATING ENGINEERS (8312)
845   LONGSHORE EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (8313)
848   HOIST AND WINCH OPERATORS (8314)
849   CRANE AND TOWER OPERATORS (8315)
853   EXCAVATING AND LOADING MACHINE OPERATORS (8316)
855   GRADER, DOZER, AND SCRAPER OPERATORS (8317)
856   INDUSTRIAL TRUCK AND TRACTOR EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
      (8318)
859   MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
      (8319)

  Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers

      (864) THROUGH (873) ARE RECODED TO: 68

864   SUPERVISORS; HANDLERS, EQUIPMENT CLEANERS, AND
      LABORERS, N.E.C. (85)
865   HELPERS, MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS (863)

   HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION AND EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS

```
866  HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION TRADES (8641-8645, 8648)
867  HELPERS, SURVEYOR (8646)
868  HELPERS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (865)
869  CONSTRUCTION LABORERS (871)
873  PRODUCTION HELPERS (861, 862)
```

Freight, Stock, and Material Handlers

(875) THROUGH (883) ARE RECODED TO: 69

```
875  GARBAGE COLLECTORS (8722)
876  STEVEDORES (8723)
877  STOCK HANDLERS AND BAGGERS (8724)
878  MACHINE FEEDERS AND OFFBEARERS (8725)
883  FREIGHT, STOCK, AND MATERIAL HANDLERS, N.E.C.
     (8726)
```
----

(885) THROUGH (889) ARE RECODED TO: 70

```
885  GARAGE AND SERVICE STATION RELATED OCCUPATIONS
     (873)
887  VEHICLE WASHERS AND EQUIPMENT CLEANERS (875)
888  HAND PACKERS AND PACKAGERS (8761)
889  LABORERS, EXCEPT CONSTRUCTION (8769)
```
----

(903) THROUGH (905) ARE RECODED TO: 71

```
903  COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS
904  NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND OTHER ENLISTED PERSONNEL
905  MILITARY OCCUPATION, RANK NOT SPECIFIED
```
----

(999) IS RECODED TO: 99

```
999  NA
```


>> CENSUS OCCUPATION 71 CATEGORIES

01. Executive, administrative, and managerial
02. Management-related occupations
03. Engineers, architects, surveyors
04. Mathematical and computer scientists
05. Natural scientists
06. Health diagnosing occupations
07. Health assessment and treating occupations
08. Teachers, postsecondary
09. Teachers, except postsecondary
10. Social scientist and urban planners

11. Social, recreation, and religious workers
12. Lawyers and judges
13. Writers, artists, entertainers, and athletes
14. Health technologists and technicians
15. Engineering and related technologists and technicians
16. Science technicians
17. Technicians, except health, engineering, and science
18. Sales occupation supervisors and proprietors; sales representatives, finance and business services
19. Sales representatives, commodities except retail
20. Sales workers, retail and personal services
21. Sales related occupations
22. Clerical supervisors
23. Computer equipment operators
24. Secretaries, stenographers, and typists
25. Information clerks
26. Records processing occupations, except financial
27. Financial records processing occupations
28. Duplicating, mail and other office machine operators
29. Communications equipment operators
30. Mail and message distributing occupations
31. Material recording, scheduling, and distributing clerks
32. Adjusters and investigators
33. Miscellaneous administrative support occupations
34. Private household occupations
35. Protective service occupations
36. Food preparation and service occupations
37. Health service occupations
38. Cleaning and building service occupations, exc. household
39. Personal service occupations
40. Farm operators and managers
41. Farm occupations, except managerial
42. Related agricultural occupations
43. Forestry and logging occupations; fishers, hunters, and trappers
44. Mechanics and repairers supervisors; mechanics and repairers, vehicle and mobile equipment
45. Mechanics and repairers, except vehicle and mobile equipment
46. Miscellaneous mechanics and repairers
47. Supervisors, construction occupations
48. Construction trades, except supervisors
49. Extractive occupations
50. Production occupation supervisors; precision metalworking occupations
51. Precision woodworking occupations
52. Precision textile, apparel, and furnishings machine workers
53. Precision workers, assorted materials
54. Precision food production occupations
55. Precision inspectors, testers and related workers-

56. Plant and system operators
57. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    metalworking and plastic working machine operators
58. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    metal and plastic processing machine operators
59. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    woodworking machine operators
60. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    printing machine operators
61. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    textile, apparel, and furnishings machine
    operators
62. Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
    machine operators, assorted materials
63. Fabricators, assemblers, and hand working
    occupations-
64. Production inspectors, testers, samplers, and
    weighers-
65. Motor vehicle operators
66. Rail transportation occupations; water
    transportation occupations
67. Material moving equipment operators
68. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers
69. Freight, stock, and material handlers
70. Laborers, except construction
71. Current member of the armed forces

>> WORK STATUS

WORK STATUS VCF0116

ALL YEARS (1972 and later) EXC. 2002:
Rs who were housewives or students but who were also presently
working more than 20 hrs. per week were considered "working now."
If the student/housewife was working less than 20 hrs per week,
s/he has been coded 7 or 8.

RETIRED AND DISABLED PERSONS 1972-1978:
If R volunteered that he/she was currently working but indicated
that his/her current job was unrelated to his/her prior job
(before retirement/disablement), then R was considered "retired"
or "disabled" in these years and was only asked about past
employment; however, if R volunteered that he/she was currently
working but indicated that his/her current job was related to
his/her prior job then R was considered "working now" and was
asked only about current employment. [Note: questions determining
the relationship between past and current employment were not
specifically coded in the original study data but were represented
in the study's summary variable.]

RETIRED AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED PERSONS 1980 and later (exc. 2002):

Retirees were included in "working now" status if working at
least 20 hours per week. In 1984-1986, information whether a
retired or disabled R was currently employed was obtained only if
volunteered by the respondent; in 1982 and 1988-later (except
2002), the retired and disabled were asked if they were currently
working for pay, and, if so, the "working now" series of questions
were administered to determine number of hours. In 1980 the
retired were asked if they were currently working for pay and,
if so, whether they were working more than 20 hours per week.

2002 FRESH CROSS:
In 2002, a summary variable was produced for the combined sample
of panel and fresh cross cases and this variable has been recoded
from the summary as follows:
coded 1: working now; working now and retired; working now and
homemaker; working now and student; working how, retired, and
homemaker; working now, homemaker, and student
coded 2: temporarily laid off; temporarily laid off and homemaker
coded 4: unemployed; unemployed and retired; unemployed and
homemaker
coded 5: retired; retired and permanently disabled; retired
and homemaker; retired and student; retired, homemaker, and
student
coded 6: permanently disabled; unemployed and permanently disabled
coded 7: homemaker
coded 8: student; homemaker and student

WORK STATUS VCF0118

HOMEMAKERS/STUDENTS 1972 and later:
Rs who were housewives or students but who were also presently
working more than 20 hours per week were considered "employed."
If the student/housewife was working less than 20 hrs per week,
s/he has been coded 4 or 5.

RETIRED AND DISABLED PERSONS 1972-1978:
If R volunteered presently working but his/her current job was
unre-lated to his/her prior job before retirement/disablement,
then R has been coded as "retired" (code 3) or "disabled" (code 2);
however, if R's current job was related to his/her prior job,
s/he has been coded as still "employed" (code 1).

RETIRED PERSONS 1980 and later:
Retirees were included in the "employed" status if working at
least 20 hours per week.

PERMANENTLY DISABLED PERSONS, 1980:
Those categorized as permanently disabled were not considered
working (code 2). If a disabled person volunteered that they
were working, they were coded in "employed."

PERMANENTLY DISABLED PERSONS 1982 and later:

The permanently disabled were considered "employed" (not "perman-
ently disabled") if presently working at least 20 hours per week.

1970 NOTE:
Those who identified themselves as "employed" appear in code 1.
Those who identified selves as "student" or "housewife" have been
coded as such, even if they also had a job. The retired were not
asked about current employment.

1968 NOTE:
Those who identified themselves as "employed" appear in code 1.
Those who identified selves as "student" or "housewife" have been
coded as such, even if they also had a job--unless the student was
a full-time worker during the day and a student at night, in which
case R has been coded 1.

1952-1964 NOTE:
Except for 1952, if R was a housewife who also worked part time,
then R was not coded "housewife" but was considered "employed."
In the same years (1956-1964), if R was a student who worked in the
daytime (full or part time) but attended school at night, then R
was considered "employed;" if R attended school during the day (full
or part time), then R was considered a "student" (code 5). In 1952,
only full-time employment was used to code Rs as employed (code 1).
Consequently, students or housewives from the 1952 study who also
worked part time appear in codes 4 or 5.

'TEMPORARILY LAID OFF' NOTE:
'Temporarily laid off' appeared as a separate category in original
data only since 1972. In most previous years, references to layoff
did not distinguish between permanent layoff (unemployed) and
temporary layoff. 'Temporarily laid off' has been recoded to code 2
here in order to obtain as much consistency as possible with earlier
years' general layoff usage.

MISSING DATA NOTE:
The 1954, 1962, and 1966 (occupation) variables have not been used
in this set since they only described Rs who were household heads.

>> PRESTIGE SCORES

        I. DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE SCALES 1976-1982
       II. 1984 DUNCAN S.E.I.
      III. OCCUPATION S.E.S. SCORES 1996-1974

>> I. DUNCAN S.E.I. AND NORC PRESTIGE SCALES 1976-1982

    THIS NOTE IS USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH VARIABLES WHICH IDENTIFY
    OCCUPATION.

THE DUNCAN S.E.I AND NORC PRESTIGE SCALES WERE DERIVED USING U.S.
CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES: 1970 Census occupation codes for
1976-1982 and 1980 Census occupation codes for 1984 (see part 2, p.1F).

FOR 1976-1982 S.E.I. AND NORC SCORES, THERE IS ONE (1) IMPLIED
DECIMAL IN THE RIGHT-MOST COLUMN BELOW AND IN THE DATA.

(categories appear in ascending order of 1970 U.S. Census occupation codes)

```
1970   | DUNCAN  |  NORC
U.S.   | SEI     | PRESTIGE
CENSUS | 1976-   | 1976-
OCCUP. | 1982    | 1982
```

PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1976-1982
--
```
001    769      560    accountants
002    853      667    architects
```

Computer Specialists
```
003    650      506  computer programmers
004    650      506  computer systems analysts
005    650      506  computer specialists
```

Engineers
```
006    870      711  aeronautical and astronautical engineers
010    899      672  chemical engineers
011    840      678  civil engineers
012    840      694  electrical and electronic engineers
013    855      556  industrial engineers
014    802      621  mechanical engineers
015    831      584  metallurgical and materials engineers
020    850      616  mining engineers
021    810      571  petroleum engineers
022    870      506  sales engineers
023    869      670  engineers
```

```
024    830      539  farm management advisors
025    480      539  foresters and conservationists
026    830      539  home management advisors
```

Lawyers and Judges
```
030    930      757 judges
031    923      751 lawyers
```

Librarians, Archivists, and Curators
```
032    600      546 librarians
033    746      596 archivists and curators
```

Mathematical Specialists
```
034    810      554 actuaries
035    800      650 mathematicians
036    810      554 statisticians
```

Life and Physical Scientists

042	800	558	agricultural scientists
043	620	470	atmospheric and space scientists
044	800	677	biological scientists
045	794	673	chemists
051	800	672	geologists
052	800	672	marine scientists
053	800	738	physicists and astronomers
054	774	651	life and physical scientists

| 055 | 657 | 508 | operations and systems researchers and analysts |
| 056 | 824 | 552 | personnel and labor relations workers |

Physicians, Dentists, and Related Practitioners

061	750	600	chiropractors
062	960	736	dentists
063	790	620	optometrists
064	814	603	pharmacists
065	921	812	physicians, medical and osteopathic
071	580	367	podiatrists
072	780	597	veterinarians
073	580	367	health practitioners

Nurses, Dieticians, and Therapists

074	390	521	dietitians
075	443	601	registered nurses
076	589	385	therapists

Health Technologists and Technicians

080	480	610	clinical laboratory technologists and technicians
081	480	610	dental hygienists
082	600	546	health record technologists and technicians
083	480	610	radiologic technologists and technicians
084	480	610	therapy assistants
085	552	511	health technologists and technicians

Religious Workers

| 086 | 520 | 690 | clergymen |
| 090 | 571 | 546 | religious workers |

Social Scientists

091	743	535	economists
092	810	714	political scientists
093	810	714	psychologists
094	810	714	sociologists
095	650	506	urban and regional planners
096	810	656	social scientists

Social and Recreation Workers

| 100 | 640 | 524 | social workers |
| 101 | 670 | 486 | recreation workers |

Teachers, College and University

102	840	783	agriculture teachers
103	840	783	atmospheric, earth, marine, and space teachers
104	840	783	biology teachers
105	840	783	chemistry teachers
110	840	783	physics teachers
111	840	783	engineering teachers
112	840	783	mathematics teachers
113	840	783	health specialties teachers
114	840	783	psychology teachers
115	840	783	business and commerce teachers
116	840	783	economics teachers
120	840	783	history teachers
121	840	783	sociology teachers
122	840	783	social science teachers
123	556	486	art, drama, and music teachers
124	640	532	coaches and physical education teachers
125	840	783	education teachers
126	840	783	english teachers
130	840	783	foreign language teachers
131	720	532	home economics teachers
132	840	783	law teachers
133	840	783	theology teachers
134	840	783	trade, industrial, and technical teachers
135	840	783	miscellaneous teachers, college and university
140	840	783	teachers, college and university, subject not specified

Teachers, except College and University

141	643	439	adult education teachers
142	714	592	elementary school teachers
143	720	561	prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers
144	705	601	secondary school teachers
145	577	749	teachers, except college and university

Engineering and Science Technicians

150	620	472	agriculture and biological technicians, except health
151	620	470	chemical technicians
152	670	561	draftsmen
153	620	515	electrical and electronic engineering technicians
154	640	494	industrial engineering technicians
155	620	470	mechanical engineering technicians
156	530	468	mathematical technicians
161	484	531	surveyors
162	620	470	engineering and science technicians

Technicians, except Health, and Engineering and Science

163	790	701	airplane pilots
164	690	428	air traffic controllers
165	603	519	embalmers
170	480	482	flight engineers

171	690	428	radio operators
172	620	470	tool programmers, numerical control
173	620	472	technicians
174	650	506	vocational and educational counselors

Writers, Artists, and Entertainers

175	600	550	actors
180	602	521	athletes and kindred workers
181	760	598	authors
182	450	376	dancers
183	704	565	designers
184	820	512	editors and reporters
185	520	460	musicians and composers
190	670	562	painters and sculptors
191	500	405	photographers
192	820	567	public relations men and publicity writers
193	650	506	radio and television announcers
194	454	412	writers, artists, and entertainers

195	650	506	research workers, not specified

MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, EXCEPT FARM, 1976-1982

201	588	538	assessors, controllers, and treasurers; local public administration
202	800	666	bank officers and financial managers
203	503	429	buyers and shippers, farm products
205	721	500	buyers, wholesale and retail trade
210	740	488	credit men
211	590	522	funeral directors
212	569	594	health administrators
213	575	396	construction inspectors, public administration
215	666	423	inspectors, except construction, public administration
216	320	383	managers and superintendents, building
220	731	560	office managers
221	499	567	officers, pilots, and pursers; ship
222	665	603	officials and administrators; public administration
223	600	484	officials of lodges, societies, and unions
224	608	583	postmasters and mail superintendents
225	748	464	purchasing agents and buyers
226	582	409	railroad conductors
230	381	389	restaurant, cafeteria and bar managers
231	698	478	sales managers and department heads, retail trade
233	746	542	sales managers, except retail trade
235	771	696	school administrators, college
240	717	616	school administrators, elementary and secondary
245	617	507	managers and administrators

SALES WORKERS 1976-1982

260	661	423	advertising agents and salesmen

261	400	319	auctioneers
262	381	306	demonstrators
264	129	202	hucksters and peddlers
265	660	468	insurance agents, brokers, and underwriters
266	270	154	newsboys
270	620	440	real estate agents and brokers
271	724	513	stock and bond salesmen
280	494	354	salesmen and sales clerks
281	650	491	sales representatives, manufacturing industries
282	609	399	sales representatives, wholesale trade
283	390	286	sales clerks, retail trade
284	390	286	salesmen, retail trade
285	522	354	salesmen of services and construction

CLERICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1976-1982

301	518	490	bank tellers
303	440	362	billing clerks
305	509	474	bookkeepers
310	439	310	cashiers
311	440	314	clerical assistants, social welfare
312	438	360	clerical supervisors
313	425	279	collectors, bill and account
314	440	362	counter clerks, except food
315	401	334	dispatchers and starters, vehicle
320	440	362	enumerators and interviewers
321	562	412	estimators and investigators
323	436	360	expediters and production controllers
325	440	308	file clerks
326	621	476	insurance adjusters, examiners, and investigators
330	431	397	library attendants and assistants
331	530	423	mail carriers, post office
332	433	355	mail handlers, except post office
333	282	A93	messengers and office boys
334	440	362	meter readers, utilities

Office Machine Operators

341	449	443	bookkeeping and billing machine operators
342	450	449	calculating machine operators
343	450	449	computer and peripheral equipment operators
344	450	449	duplicating machine operators
345	450	449	keypunch operators
350	450	449	tabulating machine operators
355	450	449	office machine operators
360	440	413	payroll and timekeeping clerks
361	446	424	postal clerks
362	440	362	proofreaders
363	678	430	real estate appraisers
364	440	389	receptionists

Secretaries

370	610	458	secretaries, legal
371	610	458	secretaries, medical

372	610	458	secretaries
374	241	299	shipping and receiving clerks
375	439	360	statistical clerks
376	610	433	stenographers
381	439	252	stock clerks and storekeepers
382	624	488	teacher aides, except school monitors
383	220	298	telegraph messengers
384	470	435	telegraph operators
385	450	404	telephone operators
390	598	354	ticket, station, and express agents
391	610	413	typists
392	418	354	weighers
394	437	365	miscellaneous clerical workers
395	440	362	not specified clerical workers

CRAFTSMEN AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1976-1982

401	216	325	automobile accessories installers
402	217	338	bakers
403	160	355	blacksmiths
404	326	306	boilermakers
405	380	314	bookbinders
410	270	357	brickmasons and stonemasons
411	320	408	brickmasons and stonemasons, apprentices
412	197	323	bulldozer operators
413	223	381	cabinetmakers
415	189	396	carpenters
416	310	408	carpenter apprentices
420	120	328	carpet installers
421	190	316	cement and concrete finishers
422	520	380	compositors and typesetters
423	400	408	printing trades apprentices, except pressmen
424	210	387	cranemen, derrickmen, and hoistmen
425	400	374	decorators and window dressers
426	480	610	dental laboratory technicians
430	440	492	electricians
431	370	408	electrician apprentices
433	490	392	electric power linemen and cablemen
434	550	380	electrotypers and stereotypers
435	470	412	engravers, except photoengravers
436	228	315	excavating, grading, and road machine operator; except bulldozer
440	174	318	floor layers, except tile setters
441	495	453	foremen
442	228	355	forgemen and hammermen
443	178	291	furniture and wood finishers
444	334	323	furriers
445	253	267	glaziers
446	217	353	heat treaters, annealers, and temperers
450	425	310	inspectors, scalers, and graders; log and lumber
452	410	313	inspectors
453	364	375	jewelers and watchmakers
454	335	464	job and die setters, metal

455	578	508	locomotive engineers
456	450	362	locomotive firemen
461	329	477	machinists
462	410	408	machinist apprentices

Mechanics and Repairmen

470	270	367	air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration
471	480	482	aircraft
472	190	367	automobile body repairmen
473	190	367	automobile mechanics
474	250	408	automobile mechanic apprentices
475	270	408	data processing machine repairmen
480	270	326	farm implement
481	266	328	heavy equipment mechanics, including diesel
482	270	326	household appliance and accessory installers and mechanics
483	100	304	loom fixers
484	359	338	office machine
485	360	350	radio and television
486	205	356	railroad and car shop
491	340	408	mechanic, except auto, apprentices
492	265	328	miscellaneous mechanics and repairmen
495	270	326	not specified mechanics and repairmen
501	190	252	millers; grain, flour, and feed
502	310	403	millwrights
503	120	391	molders, metal
504	330	408	molder apprentices
505	430	339	motion picture projectionists
506	390	514	opticians, and lens grinders and polishers
510	164	298	painters, construction and maintenance
511	290	408	painter apprentices
512	135	275	paperhangers
514	430	387	pattern and model makers, except paper
515	611	397	photoengravers and lithographers
516	380	320	piano and organ tuners and repairmen
520	250	332	plasterers
521	290	408	plasterer apprentices
522	340	406	plumbers and pipe fitters
523	330	408	plumber and pipe fitter apprentices
525	500	388	power station operators
530	456	391	pressmen and plate printers, printing
531	400	408	pressman apprentices
533	220	360	rollers and finishers, metal
534	151	315	roofers and slaters
535	330	368	sheetmetal workers and tinsmiths
536	330	408	sheetmetal apprentices
540	340	355	shipfitters
542	119	326	shoe repairmen
543	168	307	sign painters and letterers
545	452	329	stationary engineers
546	240	317	stone cutters and stone carvers
550	334	356	structural metal craftsmen
551	214	340	tailors
552	488	391	telephone installers and repairmen

554	490	392	telephone linemen and splicers
560	282	384	tile setters
561	492	423	tool or die makers
562	410	408	tool and die maker apprentices
563	212	299	upholsterers
571	346	408	specified craft apprentices
572	390	408	not specified apprentices
575	253	417	craftsmen and kindred workers

OPERATIVES, EXCEPT TRANSPORT, 1976-1982

601	320	284	asbestos and insulation workers
602	172	275	assemblers
603	110	321	blasters and powdermen
604	161	235	bottling and canning operatives
605	250	394	chainmen, rodmen, and axmen; surveying
610	184	361	checkers, examiners, and inspectors; manufacturing
611	168	207	clothing ironers and pressers
612	189	285	cutting operatives
613	224	310	dressmakers and seamstresses, except factory
614	216	262	drillers, earth
615	244	363	dry wall installers and lathers
620	620	250	dyers
621	187	235	filers, polishers, sanders, and buffers
622	181	329	furnacemen, smeltermen, and pourers
623	179	212	garage workers and gas station attendants
624	166	326	graders and sorters, manufacturing
625	137	245	produce graders and packers, except factory and farm
626	290	329	heaters, metal
630	150	182	laundry and dry cleaning operatives
631	288	320	meat cutters and butchers, except manufacturing
633	162	235	meat cutters and butchers, manufacturing
634	180	194	meat wrappers, retail trade
635	197	302	metal platers
636	460	334	milliners
640	165	264	mine operatives
641	173	273	mixing operatives
642	150	242	oilers and greasers, except auto
643	181	195	packers and wrappers, except meat and produce
644	181	288	painters, manufactured articles
645	412	355	photographic process workers

Precision Machine Operatives

650	220	318	drill press operatives
651	219	190	grinding machine operatives
652	216	319	lathe and milling machine operatives
653	209	311	precision machine operatives
656	195	303	punch and stamping press operatives
660	206	315	riveters and fasteners
661	160	337	sailors and deckhands
662	049	276	sawyers

663 182 251 sewers and stitchers
664 092 316 shoemaking machine operatives
665 244 361 solderers
666 166 317 stationary firemen

Textile Operatives
670 033 289 carding, lapping, and combing operatives
671 210 294 knitters, loopers, and toppers
672 041 282 spinners, twisters, and winders
673 059 251 weavers
674 086 288 textile operatives
--
680 240 401 welders and flame cutters
681 217 336 winding operatives
690 190 285 machine operatives, miscellaneous specified
692 193 293 machine operatives, not specified
694 188 289 miscellaneous operatives
695 195 291 not specified operatives

TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPERATIVES, 1976-1982

701 240 368 boatmen and canalmen
703 240 324 bus drivers
704 325 280 conductors and motormen, urban rail transit
705 310 283 deliverymen and routemen
706 168 284 fork lift and tow motor operatives
710 030 272 motormen; mine, factory, logging camp, etc.
711 188 220 parking attendants
712 420 347 railroad brakemen
713 440 328 railroad switchmen
714 100 215 taxicab drivers and chauffeurs
715 151 321 truck drivers

LABORERS, EXCEPT FARM, 1976-1982

740 175 303 animal caretakers, except farm
750 230 000 carpenters' helpers
751 071 174 construction laborers, except carpenters'
          helpers
752 303 000 fishermen and oystermen
753 089 190 freight and material handlers
754 060 173 garbage collectors
755 109 221 gardeners and groundskeepers, except farm
760 110 244 longshoremen and stevedores
761 041 259 lumbermen, raftsmen, and woodchoppers
762 173 207 stock handlers
763 080 122 teamsters
764 086 185 vehicle washers and equipment cleaners
770 083 203 warehousemen
780 082 191 miscellaneous laborers
785 083 175 not specified laborers

FARMERS AND FARM MANAGERS, 1976-1982

801   140   407 farmers (owners and tenants)
802   360   437 farm managers

FARM LABORERS AND FARM FOREMEN, 1976-1982

821   200   350 farm foremen
822   063   188 farm laborers, wage workers
823   170   185 farm laborers, unpaid family workers
824   220   268 farm service laborers, self-employed

SERVICE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD, 1976-1982

Cleaning Service Workers
901   116   141 chambermaids and maids, except private household
902   098   174 cleaners and charwomen
903   125   193 janitors and sextons

Food Service Workers
910   190   199 bartenders
911   110   144 busboys
912   150   264 cooks, except private household
913   110   218 dishwashers
914   170   154 food counter and fountain workers
915   160   203 waiters
916   110   208 food service workers, except private household

Health Service Workers
921   380   478 dental assistants
922   294   405 health aides, except nursing
923   510   451 health trainees
924   370   233 lay midwives
925   135   364 nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants
926   220   419 practical nurses

Personal Service Workers
931   310   364 airline stewardesses
932   195   164 attendants, recreation and amusement
933   288   225 attendants, personal service
934   079   175 baggage porters and bellhops
935   170   379 barbers
940   300   221 boarding and lodging house keepers
941   080   093 bootblacks
942   282   241 child care workers, except private household
943   100   209 elevator operators
944   170   332 hairdressers and cosmetologists
945   310   408 personal service apprentices
950   310   364 housekeepers, except private household
952   260   141 school monitors
953   250   149 ushers, recreation and amusement
954   110   144 welfare service aides

Protective Service Workers
960   175   245 crossing guards and bridge tenders
961   370   438 firemen, fire protection

```
962    182    223  guards and watchmen
963    210    458  marshals and constables
964    404    477  policemen and detectives
965    340    550  sheriffs and bailiffs
```

PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WORKERS, 1976-1982

```
980    070    229  child care workers, private household
981    070    180  cooks, private household
982    186    247  housekeepers, private household
983    120    176  laundresses, private household
984    070    180  maids and servants, private household
```

>> II. 1984 DUNCAN S.E.I.

   NOTE: Indicated decimal point is implied (not in data)

   (categories appear in ascending order of 1980 U.S. Census
    occupation codes)

```
1980   | DUNCAN
U.S.   | SEI
CENSUS | (TSEI)
OCCUP. |  1984
```

MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS, 1984

   Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Occupations
```
003    57.09   Legislators
004    57.09   chief executives and general administrators, public
                administration
005    54.35   administrators and officials, public administration
006    35.23   administrators, protective services
007    58.55   financial managers
008    59.64   personnel and labor relations managers
009    48.97   purchasing managers
013    57.93   managers, marketing, advertising, and public
                relations
014    82.44   administrators, education and related fields
015    61.54   managers, medicine and health
016    41.60   managers, properties and real estate
017    39.84   postmasters and mail superintendents
018    60.47   funeral directors
019    47.26   managers and administrators, n.e.c.
```

   Management Related Occupations
```
023    64.76   accountants and auditors
024    54.09   underwriters
025    61.62   other financial officers
```

026	70.00	management analysts
027	59.80	personnel, training, and labor relations specialists
028	34.62	purchasing agents and buyers, farm products
029	45.80	buyers, wholesale and retail trade, except farm products
033	54.48	purchasing agents and buyers, n.e.c.
034	50.48	business and promotion agents
035	36.38	construction inspectors
036	43.68	inspectors and compliance officers, exc. construction
037	51.96	management related occupations, n.e.c.

Engineers, Architects, and Surveyors

043	79.72	architects
044	83.53	aerospace engineers
045	79.23	metallurgical and materials engineers
046	75.49	mining engineers
047	82.32	petroleum engineers
048	87.14	chemical engineers
049	83.02	nuclear engineers
053	76.87	civil engineers
054	78.99	agricultural engineers
055	78.97	electrical and electronic engineers
056	70.64	industrial engineers
057	76.71	mechanical engineers
058	77.57	marine engineers and naval architects
059	76.41	engineers, n.e.c.
063	39.43	surveyors and mapping scientists

Mathematical and Computer Scientists

064	73.06	computer systems analysts and scientists
065	64.94	operations and systems researchers and analysts
066	80.37	actuaries
067	65.12	statisticians
068	84.39	mathematical scientists, n.e.c.

Natural Scientists

069	87.00	physicists and astronomers
073	77.76	chemists, except biochemists
074	74.58	atmospheric and space scientists
075	86.65	geologists and geodesists
076	80.05	physical scientists, n.e.c.
077	68.44	agricultural and food scientists
078	77.32	biological and life scientists
079	49.57	forestry and conservation scientists
083	76.73	medical scientists

Health Diagnosing Occupations

084	88.28	physicians
085	89.57	dentists
086	86.60	veterinarians
087	85.73	optometrists
088	82.89	podiatrists
089	79.58	health diagnosing practitioners, n.e.c.

Health Assessment and Treating Occupations

095	46.40	registered nurses
096	81.10	pharmacists
097	43.38	dieticians

Therapists

098	59.94	inhalation therapists
099	59.94	occupational therapists
103	59.94	physical therapists
104	59.94	speech therapists
105	59.94	therapists, n.e.c.
106	58.82	physicians' assistants

Teachers, Postsecondary

113	85.04	earth, environmental and marine science teachers
114	83.80	biological science teachers
115	85.03	chemistry teachers
116	84.22	physics teachers
117	81.93	natural science teachers, n.e.c.
118	85.53	psychology teachers
119	87.11	economics teachers
123	83.61	history teachers
124	84.80	political science teachers
125	82.28	sociology teachers
126	85.04	social science teachers, n.e.c
127	84.86	engineering teachers
128	82.46	mathematical science teachers
129	82.46	computer science teachers
133	81.61	medical science teachers
134	80.90	health specialties teachers
135	82.91	business, commerce, and marketing teachers
136	85.71	agricultural and forestry teachers
137	79.91	art, drama, and music teachers
138	81.43	physical education teachers
139	86.20	education teachers
143	80.81	english teachers
144	78.97	foreign language teachers
145	90.45	law teachers
146	85.04	social work teachers
147	81.10	theology teachers
148	68.84	trade and industrial teachers
149	73.13	home economics teachers
153	81.93	teachers, postsecondary, n.e.c.
154	77.13	postsecondary teachers, subject not specified

Teachers, except Postsecondary

155	58.51	teachers, prekindergarten and kindergarten
156	70.88	teachers, elementary school
157	75.14	teachers, secondary school
158	51.64	teachers, special education
159	52.99	teachers, n.e.c.
163	77.34	counselors, educational and vocational

Librarians, Archivists, and Curators

| 164 | 65.46 | librarians |
| 165 | 61.22 | archivists and curators |

Social Scientists and Urban Planners
166	78.27	economists
167	82.48	psychologists
168	78.33	sociologists
169	73.88	social scientists, n.e.c.
173	79.63	urban planners

Social, Recreation, and Religious Workers
174	65.71	social workers
175	54.12	recreation workers
176	66.03	clergy
177	57.08	religious workers, n.e.c.

Lawyers and Judges
| 178 | 88.42 | lawyers |
| 179 | 76.60 | judges |

Writers, Artists, Entertainers, and Athletes
183	71.43	authors
184	59.58	technical writers
185	48.80	designers
186	45.69	musicians and composers
187	51.80	actors and directors
188	54.42	painters, sculptors, craft-artists, and artist printmakers
189	42.86	photographers
193	29.82	dancers
194	55.67	artists, performers, and related workers, n.e.c.
195	67.27	editors and reporters
197	67.26	public relations specialists
198	55.39	announcers
199	48.90	athletes

Health Technologists and Technicians
203	54.96	clinical laboratory technologists and technicians
204	67.25	dental hygienists
205	50.75	health record technologists and technicians
206	39.20	radiologic technicians
207	25.21	licensed practical nurses
208	44.63	health technologists and technicians, n.e.c.

TECHNICAL, SALES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, 1984

Technologists and Technicians, Engineering and Related
213	45.65	electrical and electronic technicians
214	45.21	industrial engineering technicians
215	49.33	mechanical engineering technicians
216	45.33	engineering technicians, n.e.c.
217	48.48	drafting occupations
218	39.43	surveying and mapping technicians

Science Technicians

223	39.10	biological technicians
224	50.04	chemical technicians
225	46.14	science technicians, n.e.c.

Technicians, except Health, Engineering, and Science

226	67.55	airplane pilots and navigators
227	50.11	air traffic controllers
228	34.71	broadcast equipment operators
229	66.05	computer programmers
233	58.60	tool programmers, numerical control
234	41.79	legal assistants
235	51.22	technicians, n.e.c.

Sales Occupations

243	48.10	supervisors and proprietors, sales occupations

Sales Representatives, Finance and Business Services

253	53.43	insurance sales occupations
254	52.01	real estate sales occupations
255	71.38	securities and financial services sales occupations
256	58.71	advertising and related sales occupations
257	46.25	sales occupations, other business services

Sales Representatives, Commodities except Retail

258	78.16	sales engineers
259	50.01	sales representatives, mining, manufacturing, and wholesale
263	34.54	sales workers, motor vehicles and boats
264	25.37	sales workers, apparel
265	25.37	sales workers, shoes
266	31.98	sales workers, furniture and home furnishings
267	32.68	sales workers; radio, television, hi-fi, and appliances
268	29.03	sales workers, hardware and building supplies
269	39.12	sales workers, parts
274	26.49	sales workers, other commodities
275	25.83	sales counter clerks
276	21.40	cashiers
277	28.60	street and door-to-door sales workers
278	19.81	news vendors

Sales Related Occupations

283	25.69	demonstrators, promoters and models, sales
284	34.40	auctioneers
285	25.37	sales support occupations, n.e.c.

Administrative Support Occupations, including Clerical
     - supervisors, administrative support occupations:

303	37.07	Supervisors, general office
304	39.51	supervisors, computer equipment operators

305	36.87	Supervisors, financial records processing
306	25.53	chief communications operators
307	30.18	supervisors; distribution, scheduling, and adjusting clerks

- computer equipment operators:

| 308 | 36.84 | computer operators |
| 309 | 23.60 | peripheral equipment operators |

- secretaries, stenographers, and typists:

313	34.73	secretaries
314	29.94	stenographers
315	25.22	typists

- information clerks:

316	36.20	interviewers
317	25.38	hotel clerks
318	39.08	transportation ticket and reservation agents
319	29.00	receptionists
323	32.72	information clerks, n.e.c.

- records processing occupations, except financial:

325	25.38	classified-ad clerks
326	32.93	correspondence clerks
327	28.92	order clerks
328	31.75	personnel clerks, except payroll and timekeeping
329	44.80	library clerks
335	24.98	file clerks
336	31.90	records clerks

- financial records processing occupations:

337	30.43	bookkeepers, accounting, and auditing clerks
338	27.38	payroll and timekeeping clerks
339	24.72	billing clerks
343	32.44	cost and rate clerks
344	23.73	billing, posting, and calculating machine operators

- duplicating, mail and other office machine operators:

345	26.26	duplicating machine operators
346	23.73	mail preparing and paper handling machine operators
347	23.97	office machine operators, n.e.c.

- communications equipment operators:

348	21.89	telephone operators
349	28.48	telegraphers
353	25.19	communications equipment operators, n.e.c.

- mail and message distributing occupations:

354	30.25	postal clerks, exc. Mail carriers
355	27.84	mail carriers, postal service
356	26.16	mail clerks, exc. Postal service
357	24.40	messengers

- material recording, scheduling, and distributing clerks, n.e.c.:

359	30.70	dispatchers
363	34.48	production coordinators
364	23.07	traffic, shipping, and receiving clerks
365	25.23	stock and inventory clerks
366	23.88	meter readers
368	24.01	weighers, measurers, and checkers
369	27.74	samplers
373	35.97	expediters

374	32.93	material recording, scheduling, and distributing clerks, n.e.c.

- adjusters and investigators:

375	55.78	insurance adjusters, examiners, and investigators
376	46.27	investigators and adjusters, except insurance
377	34.75	eligibility clerks, social welfare
378	35.41	bill and account collectors

- miscellaneous administrative support occupations:

379	28.92	general office clerks
383	29.33	bank tellers
384	35.25	proofreaders
385	23.33	data-entry keyers
386	31.26	statistical clerks
387	31.57	teachers' aides
389	32.41	administrative support occupations, n.e.c.

SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

Private Household Occupations

403	15.62	launderers and ironers
404	15.33	cooks, private household
405	15.38	housekeepers and butlers
406	17.98	child care workers, private household
407	14.83	private household cleaners and servants

Protective Service Occupations

- supervisors, protective service occupations:

413	32.72	supervisors, firefighting and fire prevention occupations
414	37.78	supervisors, police and detectives
415	30.29	supervisors, guards

- firefighting and fire prevention occupations:

416	41.07	fire inspection and fire prevention occupations
417	32.83	firefighting occupations

- police and detectives:

418	38.01	police and detectives, public service
423	33.37	Sheriffs, bailiffs, and other law enforcement officers
424	23.61	Correctional institution officers

- guards:

425	16.72	crossing guards
426	24.17	guards and police, except public service
427	28.76	protective service occupations, n.e.c.

Service Occupations, except Protective and Household

- food preparation and service occupations:

433	20.61	supervisors, food preparation and service occupations
434	23.96	bartenders
435	18.88	waiters and waitresses
436	17.54	cooks, except short order
437	17.52	short-order cooks
438	20.80	food counter, fountain and related occupations
439	17.75	kitchen workers, food preparation
443	19.33	waiters'/waitresses' assistants

444   18.33   miscellaneous food preparation occupations
          - health service occupations:
445   27.15   dental assistants
446   25.96   health aides, except nursing
447   23.58   nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants

Cleaning and Building Service Occupations, except Household
448   20.79   supervisors, cleaning and building service workers
449   15.71   maids and housemen
453   18.12   janitors and cleaners
454   16.78   elevator operators
455   19.30   pest control occupations

Personal Service Occupations
456   28.43   supervisors, personal service occupations
457   20.43   barbers
458   19.10   hairdressers and cosmetologists
459   28.91   attendants, amusement and recreation facilities
463   26.33   guides
464   24.59   ushers
465   45.70   public transportation attendants
466   23.22   baggage porters and bellhops
467   27.07   welfare service aides
468   23.55   child care workers, except private household
469   28.38   personal service occupations, n.e.c.

FARM, FORESTRY AND FISHING OCCUPATIONS, 1984

Farm Operators and Managers
473   23.81   farmers, except horticultural
474   23.27   horticultural specialty farmers
475   34.76   managers, farms, except horticultural
476   48.48   managers, horticultural specialty farms

Other Agricultural and Related Occupations
          - farm occupations, except managerial:
477   25.66   supervisors, farm workers
479   17.09   farm workers
483   19.88   marine life cultivation workers
484   16.88   nursery workers
          - related agricultural occupations:
485   26.25   supervisors, related agricultural occupations
486   19.23   groundskeepers and gardeners, except farm
487   23.00   animal caretakers, except farm
488   16.77   graders and sorters, agricultural products
489   21.31   inspectors, agricultural products
          - forestry and logging occupations:
494   33.33   supervisors, forestry and logging workers
495   36.20   forestry workers, except logging
496   18.03   timber cutting and logging occupations
          - fishers, hunters, and trappers:
497   32.03   captains and other officers, fishing vessels
498   22.40   fishers
499   20.65   hunters and trappers

PRECISION PRODUCTION, CRAFT, AND REPAIR OCCUPATIONS, 1984

Mechanics and Repairers
503   31.45   supervisors, mechanics and repairers

Mechanics and Repairers, except Supervisors
          - vehicle and mobile equipment mechanics and repairers:
505   20.95   automobile mechanics
506   20.95   automobile mechanic apprentices
507   21.83   bus, truck, and stationary engine mechanics
508   30.85   aircraft engine mechanics
509   24.83   small engine repairers
514   21.73   automobile body and related repairers
515   30.78   aircraft mechanics, except engine
516   22.52   heavy equipment mechanics
517   20.29   farm equipment mechanics
518   22.49   industrial machinery repairers
519   19.94   machinery maintenance occupations
          - electrical and electronic equipment repairers:
523   28.95   electronic repairers, communications and industrial
                  equipment
525   48.82   data processing equipment repairers
526   24.26   household appliance and power tool repairers
527   27.86   telephone line installers and repairers
529   32.59   telephone installers and repairers
533   26.75   miscellaneous electrical and electronic equipment
                  repairers
534   26.38   heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration
                  mechanics
535   27.41   camera, watch, and musical instrument repairers
536   24.83   locksmiths and safe repairers
538   32.76   office machine repairers
539   24.23   mechanical controls and valve repairers
543   23.64   elevator installers and repairers
544   25.54   millwrights
547   23.52   specified mechanics and repairers, n.e.c.
549   25.50   not specified mechanics and repairers

Construction Trades
          - supervisors, construction occupations:
553   22.63   supervisors; brickmasons, stonemasons, and tile
                  setters
554   22.86   supervisors, carpenters and related workers
555   30.91   supervisors, electricians and power transmission
                  installers
556   20.86   supervisors; painters, paperhangers, and plasterers
557   27.42   supervisors; plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters
558   41.73   supervisors, n.e.c.
          - construction trades, except supervisors:
563   22.62   brickmasons and stonemasons,

564	22.62	brickmason and stonemason apprentices
565	22.69	tile setters, hard and soft
566	23.06	carpet installers
567	22.58	carpenters
569	21.31	carpenter apprentices
573	23.68	drywall installers
575	31.05	electricians
576	31.04	electrician apprentices
577	28.16	electrical power installers and repairers
579	20.79	painters, construction and maintenance
583	23.40	paperhangers
584	21.55	plasterers
585	27.23	plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters
587	27.24	plumber, pipefitter, and steamfitter apprentices
588	21.30	concrete and terrazzo finishers
589	24.55	glaziers
593	28.01	insulation workers
594	21.62	paving, surfacing, and tamping equipment operators
595	19.76	roofers
596	26.12	sheetmetal duct installers
597	27.91	structural metal workers
598	21.42	drillers, earth
599	20.56	construction trades, n.e.c.

Extractive Occupations

613	38.59	supervisors, extractive occupations
614	20.74	drillers, oil well
615	19.96	explosives workers
616	20.24	mining machine operators
617	20.24	mining occupations, n.e.c.

Precision Production Occupations

| 633 | 33.83 | supervisors, production occupations |

Precision metal working occupations

634	31.95	tool and die makers
635	32.61	tool and die maker apprentices
636	17.87	precision assemblers, metal
637	24.44	machinists
639	24.49	machinist apprentices
643	25.51	boilermakers
644	20.26	precision grinders, fitters, and tool sharpeners
645	31.23	patternmakers and model makers, metal
646	24.02	lay-out workers
647	25.50	precious stones and metals workers
649	27.09	engravers, metal
653	26.26	sheet metal workers
654	26.12	sheet metal worker apprentices
655	32.61	miscellaneous precision metal workers

Precision Woodworking Occupations

656	30.62	patternmakers and model makers, wood
657	20.91	cabinet makers and bench carpenters
658	19.75	furniture and wood finishers

659   23.76   miscellaneous precision woodworkers

PRECISION PRODUCTION, CRAFT, AND REPAIR OCCUPATIONS, 1984

Precision Textile, Apparel, and Furnishings Machine Workers
666   18.42   dressmakers
667   19.10   tailors
668   18.09   upholsterers
669   18.20   shoe repairers
673   16.81   apparel and fabric patternmakers
674   20.60   miscellaneous precision apparel and fabric workers

Precision Workers, Assorted Materials
675   19.80   hand molders and shapers, except jewelers
676   37.96   patternmakers, lay-out workers, and cutters
677   29.02   optical goods workers
678   32.58   dental laboratory and medical appliance technicians
679   19.86   bookbinders
683   17.71   electrical and electronic equipment assemblers
684   21.86   miscellaneous precision workers, n.e.c.

Precision Food Production Occupations
686   21.17   butchers and meat cutters
687   19.25   bakers
688   18.86   food batchmakers

Precision Inspectors, Testers, and Related Workers
689   23.82   inspectors, testers, and graders
693   17.70   adjusters and calibrators

Plant and System Operators
694   26.81   water and sewage treatment plant operators
695   32.87   power plant operators
696   28.26   stationary engineers
699   21.57   miscellaneous plant and system operators

OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS, 1984

Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors
        - machine operators and tenders, except precision
          metalworking and plastic working machine operators:
703   22.71   lathe and turning machine set-up operators
704   22.09   lathe and turning machine operators
705   21.86   milling and planing machine operators
706   17.63   punching and stamping press machine operators
707   23.20   rolling machine operators
708   19.35   drilling and boring machine operators
709   19.49   grinding, abrading, buffing, and polishing machine
               operators
713   21.04   forging machine operators
714   19.30   numerical control machine operators
715   20.77   miscellaneous metal, plastic, stone, and glass
                  working machine operators

717	17.72	fabricating machine operators, n.e.c.

- metal and plastic processing machine operators:

719	18.75	molding and casting machine operators
723	19.85	metal plating machine operators
724	22.47	heat treating equipment operators
725	18.79	miscellaneous metal and plastic processing machine operators

- woodworking machine operators:

726	21.22	wood lathe, routing and planing machine operators
727	16.62	sawing machine operators
728	18.95	shaping and joining machine operators
729	15.93	nailing and tacking machine operators
733	19.16	miscellaneous woodworking machine operators

- printing machine operators:

734	26.48	printing machine operators
735	31.44	photoengravers and lithographers
736	28.10	typesetters and compositors
737	26.35	miscellaneous printing machine operators

- textile, apparel, and furnishings machine operators

738	13.98	winding and twisting machine operators
739	14.85	knitting, looping, taping, and weaving machine operators
743	17.99	textile cutting machine operators
744	14.53	textile sewing machine operators
745	14.97	shoe machine operators
747	14.74	pressing machine operators
748	16.87	laundering and dry cleaning machine operators
749	15.26	miscellaneous textile machine operators

- machine operators, assorted materials:

753	18.83	Cementing and gluing machine operators
754	17.58	Packaging and filling machine operators
755	18.86	Extruding and forming machine operators
756	18.95	Mixing and blending machine operators
757	19.74	Separating, filtering, and clarifying machine operators
758	18.62	Compressing and compacting machine operators
759	18.41	Painting and paint spraying machine operators
763	19.16	Roasting and baking machine operators, food
764	18.76	Washing, cleaning, and pickling machine operators

- machine operators, assorted materials:

765	18.88	folding machine operators
766	20.62	furnace, kiln, and oven operators, exc. Food
768	18.88	crushing and grinding machine operators
769	17.95	slicing and cutting machine operators
773	32.75	motion picture projectionists
774	29.19	photographic process machine operators
777	18.70	miscellaneous machine operators, n.e.c.
779	19.37	machine operators, not specified

Fabricators, Assemblers, and Hand Working Occupations

783	20.66	welders and cutters
784	15.95	solderers and brazers
785	17.88	assemblers
786	18.77	hand cutting and trimming occupations

787   19.24   hand molding, casting, and forming occupations
789   24.13   hand painting, coating, and decorating occupations
793   19.04   hand engraving and printing occupations
794   21.21   hand grinding and polishing occupations
795   19.23   miscellaneous hand working occupations

Production Inspectors, Testers, Samplers, and Weighers

796   22.03   production inspectors, checkers, and examiners
797   21.50   production testers
798   18.85   production samplers and weighers
799   16.22   graders and sorters, except agricultural

Transportation and Material Moving Occupations
- motor vehicle operators:

803   35.40   supervisors, motor vehicle operators
804   21.10   truck drivers, heavy
805   23.07   truck drivers, light
806   23.20   driver-sales workers
808   21.47   bus drivers
809   22.46   taxicab drivers and chauffeurs
813   23.11   parking lot attendants
814   21.10   motor transportation occupations, n.e.c.
- transportation occupations, except motor vehicles rail
transportation occupations:
823   36.47   railroad conductors and yardmasters
824   31.23   locomotive operating occupations
825   26.15   railroad brake, signal, and switch operators
826   25.09   rail vehicle operators, n.e.c.
- water transportation occupations:
828   33.25   ship captains and mates, except fishing boats
829   21.71   sailors and deckhands
833   23.89   marine engineers
834   16.72   bridge, lock, and lighthouse tenders
- material moving equipment operators:
843   33.18   supervisors, material moving equipment operators
844   21.72   operating engineers
845   22.62   longshore equipment operators
848   21.11   hoist and winch operators
849   21.98   crane and tower operators
853   21.62   excavating and loading machine operators
855   20.50   grader, dozer, and scraper operators
856   18.29   industrial truck and tractor equipment operators
859   19.52   miscellaneous material moving equipment operators

Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers

863   34.81   supervisors; handlers, equipment cleaners, and
                      laborers, n.e.c.
864   19.32   helpers, mechanics and repairers

Helpers, Construction and Extractive Occupations

865   18.51   helpers, construction trades
866   27.10   helpers, surveyor
867   20.79   helpers, extractive occupations

| 869 | 18.46 | construction laborers |
| 873 | 19.05 | production helpers |

Freight, Stock, and Material Handlers

875	17.24	garbage collectors
876	22.62	stevedores
877	19.97	stock handlers and baggers
878	18.03	machine feeders and offbearers
883	19.56	freight, stock, and material handlers, n.e.c.
885	19.73	garage and service station related occupations
887	17.24	vehicle washers and equipment cleaners
888	16.11	hand packers and packagers
889	18.81	laborers, except construction

>> III. OCCUPATION S.E.S. SCORES 1996-1974

DUNCAN SES SCORES FROM THE 1966-1974 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES
WERE DERIVED USING THE 1960 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES.
THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR OCCUPATION CODES WHICH APPEAR HERE
ARE BASED ON THE 1960 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES AND CORRESPOND
CLOSELY.

POL | DUNCAN
BEH | SES   * asterisked scores: see note at end (p.12)
OCC |

PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1966-1974

101	78	accountants and auditors
150	60	actors
102	79	airplane pilots and navigators
103	90	architects
151	67	artists and art teachers
152	52	athletes
153	76	authors
105	75	chiropractors
106	52	clergymen
107	84	college presidents, professors and instructors (N.E.C.)
154	45	dancers and dancing teachers
108	96	dentists
109	73	designers
110	39	dieticians and nutritionists
111	67	draftsmen
112	82	editors and reporters

ENGINEERS, TECHNICAL

113	87	aeronautical engineers
114	90	chemical engineers
115	84	civil engineers
116	84	electrical engineers
117	86	industrial engineers
118	82	mechanical engineers

119	82	metallurgical engineers and metallurgists
120	85	mining engineers
121	87	engineers (N.E.C. or NA which above)

155	31	entertainers (N.E.C.)
122	83	farm and home management advisors
123	48	foresters and conservationists
124	59	funeral directors and embalmers
125	93	lawyers and judges
126	60	librarians
156	52	musicians and music teachers

NATURAL SCIENTISTS

104	79	chemists
127	80	other natural scientists
128	46	nurses, professional
129	51	nurses, student professional
130	79	optometrists
131	96	osteopaths

132	84	personnel and labor relations workers
133	82	pharmacists
134	50	photographers
135	92	physicians and surgeons
157	82*	public relations men and publicity writers
136	69	radio operators
137	67	recreation and group workers
138	56	religious workers
139	64	social and welfare workers (except group)
140	81	social scientists
158	64	sports instructors and officials
141	48	surveyors
142	72	teachers (N.E.C.)
143	48	technicians, medical and dental
144	62*	technicians, electrical, electronic, and other engineering and physical sciences
145	62	technicians (N.E.C.)
146	58	therapists and healers (N.E.C.)
147	78	veterinarians
160	65	professional, technical, and kindred workers (N.E.C.)

MANAGERS, OFFICIALS, AND PROPRIETORS, EXCEPT FARM, 1966-1974

201	72	buyers and department heads, store
202	33	buyers and shippers, farm products
203	58	conductors, railroad
204	74	credit men
205	50	floormen and floor managers, store
206	63	inspectors, public administration (NA which below)
207	72	federal public administration and postal service
208	54	state public administration
209	56	local public administration

210	32	managers and superintendents, building
211	54	officers, pilots, pursers, and engineers, ship (other than navy or coast guard)
212	66	officials and administrators (N.E.C.), public administration (NA which below)
213	84	federal public administration and postal service
214	66	state public administration
215	54	local public administration
216	58	officials, lodge, society, union, etc.
217	60	postmasters
218	77	purchasing agents and buyers (N.E.C.)

SALARIED (including NA if salaried)

220	60	construction
221	79	manufacturing
222	71	transportation
223	76	communications, and utilities and sanitary services
224	70	wholesale trade

RETAIL TRADE

230	50	food and dairy products stores (including milk retailing)
231	68	general merchandise and limited price variety stores
232	69	apparel and accessories stores (including shoe stores)
233	68	furniture, house furnishings, household equipment stores
234	65	motor vehicles and accessories retailing
235	31	gasoline service stations
236	59*	drug stores
237	39	eating and drinking places
238	64	hardware, farm implement, and building material retailing
239	59	other retail trade

240	85	banking and other finance
241	84	insurance and real estate
242	80	business services
243	47	automobile repair services and garages
244	53	miscellaneous repair services
245	50	personal services
246	62	all other industries (including NA which above)

MANAGERS, OFFICIALS, AND PROPRIETORS (N.E.C.) --
SELF-EMPLOYED, 1966-1974

250	51	construction
251	61	manufacturing
252	43	transportation
253	44	communications, and utilities and sanitary services
254	59	wholesale trade

RETAIL TRADE--SELF EMPLOYED

260	33	food and dairy products stores (including milk retailing)
261	47	general merchandise and limited price variety stores
262	65	apparel and accessories stores (including shoe stores)
263	59	furniture, house furnishings, household equipment stores
264	70	motor vehicles and accessories retailing
265	33	gasoline service stations
266	37	eating and drinking places
267	61	hardware, farm implement, and building material
268	49	retailing, other retail trade
269	85	banking and other finance
270	76	insurance and real estate
271	67	business services
272	36	automobile repair services and garages
273	34	miscellaneous repair services
274	41	personal services
275	49	all other industries (including NA which above)

CLERICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1966-1974

301	68	agents (N.E.C.)
302	44	attendants and assistants, library
303	38	attendants, physician's and dentist's office
304	25	baggagemen, transportation
305	52	bank tellers
306	51	bookkeepers
307	44	cashiers
308	39	collectors, bill and account
309	40	dispatchers and starters, vehicles
310	67	express messengers and railway mail clerks
311	44*	file clerks
312	62*	insurance adjusters, examiners, and investigators
313	53	mail carriers
314	28	messengers and office boys
315	45	office machine operators
316	44*	payroll and timekeeping clerks
317	44*	postal clerks
318	44*	receptionists
319	61*	secretaries
320	22	shipping and receiving clerks
321	61	stenographers
322	44*	stock clerks and storekeepers
323	22	telegraph messengers
324	47	telegraph operators
325	45	telephone operators
326	60	ticket, station, and express agents
327	61*	typists
328	44	clerical and kindred workers (N.E.C.)

SALES WORKERS, 1966-1974

350	66	advertising agents and salesmen
351	40	auctioneers
352	35	demonstrators
353	08	hucksters and peddlers
354	66	insurance agents, brokers, and underwriters
355	27	newsboys
356	62	real estate agents and brokers
380	73	stock and bond salesmen

SALESMEN AND SALES CLERKS (N.E.C.)

360	65	manufacturing
361	61	wholesale trade
370	39	retail trade
390	50	other industries (including NA type)

CRAFTSMEN, FOREMEN, AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1966-1974

401	22	bakers
402	16	blacksmiths
403	33	boilermakers
404	39	bookbinders
405	27	brickmasons, stonemasons, and tile setters
406	23	cabinetmakers
407	19	carpenters
408	19	cement and concrete finishers
409	52	compositors and typesetters
410	21	cranemen, derrickmen, and hoistmen
411	40	decorators and window dressers
412	44	electricians
413	55	electrotypers and stereotypers
414	47	engravers (except photoengravers)
415	24	excavating, grading, and road machinery operators foremen (N.E.C.)
416	40	construction

MANUFACTURING

417	54	metal industries
418	60	machinery, including electrical
419	66	transportation equipment
420	41	other durable goods
421	39	textiles, textile products, and apparel
422	53	other nondurable goods (including manufacturing NA type)
423	36	railroads and railway express service
424	45	transportation (except railroad)
425	56	communications, and utilities and sanitary services
426	44	other industries (including NA type)

427	23	forgemen and hammermen
428	39	furriers

429	26	glaziers
430	22	heat treaters, annealers, and temperers
431	23	inspectors, scalers, and graders, log and lumber inspectors (N.E.C.)
432	46	construction
433	41	railroads and railway express service
434	45	transportation (except railroad, communications and other utilities and sanitary services)
435	38	other industries (including NA type)
436	36	jewelers, watchmakers, goldsmiths, and silversmiths
437	28	job setters, metal
438	49	linemen and servicemen, telegraph, telephone, and power
439	58	locomotive engineers
440	45	locomotive firemen
441	10	loom fixers
442	33	machinists

MECHANICS AND REPAIRMEN

443	27*	airconditioning, heating, and refrigeration
444	48	airplane
445	19	automobile
446	36	office machine
447	36	radio and television
448	23	railroad and car shop
449	27	other types of mechanics and repairmen (including NA type)
450	19	millers, grain, flour, feed, etc.
451	31	millwrights
452	12	molders, metal
453	43	motion picture projectionists
454	39	opticians, and lens grinders and polishers
455	16	painters, construction and maintenance
456	10	paperhangers
457	44	pattern and model makers (except paper)
458	64	photoengravers and lithographers
459	38	piano and organ tuners and repairmen
460	25	plasterers
461	34	plumbers and pipe fitters
462	49	pressmen and plate printers, printing
463	22	rollers and roll hands, metal
464	15	roofers and slaters
465	12	shoemakers and repairers (except factory)
466	47	stationary engineers
467	25	stone cutters and stone carvers
468	34	structural metal workers
469	23	tailors and tailoresses
470	33	tinsmiths, coppersmiths, and sheet metal workers
471	50	toolmakers, and die makers and setters
472	22	upholsterers
473	32	craftsmen and kindred workers (N.E.C.)

OPERATIVES AND KINDRED WORKERS, 1966-1974

APPRENTICES

501	25	auto mechanics
502	32	bricklayers and masons
503	31	carpenters
504	37	electricians
505	41	machinists and toolmakers
506	34	mechanics (except auto)
507	33	plumbers and pipe fitters
508	29	building trades (N.E.C.)
509	33	metalworking trades (N.E.C.)
510	40	printing trades
511	31	other specified trades
512	39	apprentices, NA type
513	32	asbestos and insulation workers
514	17	assemblers
515	19	attendants, auto service and parking
516	11	blasters and powdermen
517	24	boatmen, canalmen, and lock keepers
518	42	brakemen, railroad
519	24	bus drivers
520	25	chainmen, rodmen, and axmen, surveying
521	17*	checkers, examiners, and inspectors, manufacturing
522	30	conductors, bus and street railway
523	32	deliverymen and routemen
524	23	dressmakers and seamstresses (except factory)
525	12	dyers
526	22	filers, grinders, and polishers, metal
527	10	fruit, nut, and vegetable graders and packers, (except factory)
528	18	furnacemen, smeltermen, and pourers
529	17*	graders and sorters, manufacturing
530	29	heaters, metal
531	21*	knitters, loopers, and toppers, textile
532	15	laundry and dry cleaning operatives
533	29	meat cutters (except slaughter and packing house)
534	46	milliners
535	10	mine operatives and laborers (N.E.C. or NA which below)
536	02	coal mining
537	38	crude petroleum and natural gas extraction
538	12	mining and quarrying (except fuel)
539	03	motormen, mine, factory, logging camp, etc.
540	34	motormen, street, subway, and elevated railway
541	15	oilers and greasers (except auto)
542	18*	packers and wrappers (N.E.C.)
543	18	painters (except construction and maintenance)
544	42	photographic process workers
545	50	power station operators
546	16	sailors and deck hands
547	05	sawyers
548	17*	sewers and stitchers, manufacturing
549	05	spinners, textile

550	17	stationary firemen
551	44	switchmen, railroad
552	10	taxicab drivers and chauffeurs
553	15	truck and tractor drivers
554	06	weavers, textile
555	24	welders and flame-cutters

MANUFACTURING, DURABLE GOODS: OPERATIVES, 1966-1974

LUMBER AND WOOD PRODUCTS (except furniture)

560	07	sawmills, planing mills, and mill work
560	09	miscellaneous wood products (including NA type)
560	09	furniture and fixtures
560	17	stone, clay, and glass products (NA which below)
560	23	glass and glass products
560	10	cement, and concrete, gypsum, and plaster products
560	10	structural clay products
560	21	pottery and related products
560	15	misc. nonmetallic mineral and stone products

METAL INDUSTRIES

560	17	blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling and finishing mills
560	12	other primary iron and steel industries
560	15	primary nonferrous industries
560	16	cutlery, handtools, and other hardware
560	16	fabricated structural metal products
560	15	miscellaneous fabricated metal products
560	14	not specified metal industries (NA which above)
560	22	machinery, except electrical (NA which below)
560	21	farm machinery and equipment
560	31	office, computing, and accounting machines
560	22	miscellaneous machinery
560	26	electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies
560	23	transportation equipment (NA which below)
560	21	motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment
560	34	aircraft and parts
560	16	ship and boat building and repairing
560	23	railroad and misc. transportation equipment
560	29	professional and photographic equipment and watches (NA which below)
560	23	professional equipment and supplies
560	40	photographic equipment and supplies
560	28	watches, clocks, and clockwork-operated devices
560	16	miscellaneous manufacturing industries (either durable or nondurable goods)

MANUFACTURING, NONDURABLE GOODS: OPERATIVES, 1966-1974

FOOD AND KINDRED PRODUCTS

560	16	meat products
560	22	dairy products
560	09	canning and preserving fruits, vegetables, and sea foods
560	14	grain-mill products
560	15	bakery products
560	12	confectionery and related products
560	19	beverage industries
560	11	misc. food preparations and kindred products
560	19	not specified food industries (NA which above)
560	02	tobacco manufactures
560	06	textile mill products (NA which below)
560	21	knitting mills
560	08	dyeing and finishing textiles (except wool and knit goods)
560	14	floor coverings, except hard surface
560	02	yarn, thread, and fabric mills
560	10	miscellaneous textile mill products
560	21	apparel and other fabricated textile products (NA which below)
560	22	apparel and accessories
560	17	miscellaneous fabricated textile products
560	19	paper and allied products (NA which below)
560	19	pulp, paper, and paper board mills
560	17	paperboard containers and boxes
560	19	miscellaneous paper and pulp products
560	31	printing, publishing, and allied industries
560	20	chemicals and allied products (NA which below)
560	09	synthetic fibers
560	26	drugs and medicines
560	15	paints, varnishes, and related products
560	23	misc. chemicals and allied products
560	51	petroleum and coal products (NA which below)
560	56	petroleum refining
560	14	miscellaneous petroleum and coal products
560	22	rubber and misc. plastic products
560	16	leather and leather products (NA which below)
560	10	leather: tanned, curried, and finished
560	09	footwear, except rubber
560	14	leather products, except footwear
560	16	not specified manufacturing industry (manufacturing, NA which above) nonmanufacturing industries (incl. NA type)
556	18	construction
560	15	railroads and railway express service
560	23	transportation (except railroad)
560	21	communications, and utilities and sanitary services
560	17	wholesale and retail trade
560	19	business and repair service
560	11	personal services
560	17	public administration

560	18	not specified nonmanufacturing industries (nonmanufacturing, NA which above)
560	20	all other industries (including NA whether manufacturing or nonmanufacturing)

PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WORKERS, 1966-1974

650	07*	baby sitters, private household
651	19	housekeepers, private household (NA which below)
653	10	living in
652	21	living out
654	12	laundresses, private household (NA which below)
656	99	living in
655	12	living out
657	07	private household workers (N.E.C.) (NA which below)
659	12	living in
658	06	living out

SERVICE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD, 1966-1974

660	13	attendants, hospital and other institutions
661	26	attendants, professional and personal service (N.E.C.)
662	19	attendants, recreation and amusement
663	17	barbers
664	19	bartenders
666	30	boarding and lodging housekeepers
665	08	bootblacks
667	11*	chambermaids and maids (except private household)
668	10	charwomen and cleaners
669	15	cooks (except private household)
670	17	counter and fountain workers
671	10	elevator operators
678	17*	hairdressers and cosmetologists
672	31	housekeepers and stewards (except private household)
673	09	janitors and sextons
674	11*	kitchen workers (N.E.C.) (Except private household)
675	37	midwives
676	04	porters
677	22	practical nurses

PROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS

610	37	firemen, fire protection
611	18	guards, watchmen, and doorkeepers
612	21	marshals and constables
613	39	policemen and detectives (NA which below)
614	36	private
615	40	public
616	34	sheriffs and bailiffs
617	17	watchmen (crossing) and bridge tenders
679	25	ushers, recreation and amusement
680	16	waiters and waitresses
681	11	service workers (except private household) (N.E.C.)

LABORERS, EXCEPT FARM AND MINE, 1966-1974

720	07*	carpenters' helpers (except logging and mining)
721	10	fishermen and oystermen
722	08	garage laborers, and car washers and greasers
723	11	gardeners (except farm) and groundskeepers
724	11	longshoremen and stevedores
725	04	lumbermen, raftsmen, and wood choppers
726	08	teamsters
727	09*	truck drivers' helpers
728	08*	warehousemen (N.E.C.)

MANUFACTURING, DURABLE GOODS: LABORERS

730	03	sawmills, planing mills, and mill work
730	02	miscellaneous wood products (including NA types)
730	05	furniture and fixtures
730	07	stone, clay, and glass products (NA which below)
730	14	glass and glass products
730	05	cement, and concrete, gypsum, and plaster products
730	05	structural clay products
730	07	pottery and related products
730	05	misc. nonmetallic mineral and stone products metal industries
730	09	blast furnaces, steel works, rolling and finishing mills
730	04	other primary iron and steel industries
730	06	primary nonferrous industries
730	07*	cutlery, hand tools, and other hardware
730	07*	fabricated structural metal products
730	10*	misc. fabricated metal products
730	09	not specified metal industries (NA which above)
730	11	machinery, except electrical (NA which below)
730	14	farm machinery and equipment
730	17	office, computing, and accounting machines
730	10	miscellaneous machinery
730	14	electrical machinery, equipment and supplies
730	11	transportation equipment (NA which below)
730	13	motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment
730	15	aircraft and parts
730	02	ship and boatbuilding and repairing
730	08	railroad and misc. transportation equipment
730	11	professional and photographic equipment, and watches (NA which below)
730	10	professional equipment and supplies
730	16	photographic equipment and supplies
730	11	watches, clocks, and clockwork-operated devices
730	12	miscellaneous manufacturing industries (either durable or nondurable goods)

- FOOD AND KINDRED PRODUCTS

730	08	meat products

730	13	dairy products
730	06	canning and preserving fruits, vegetables, and sea foods
730	06	grain-mill products
730	10	bakery products
730	10	confectionery and related products
730	16	beverage industries
730	05	misc. food preparations and kindred products
730	14	not specified food industries (NA which above)
730	00	tobacco manufactures
730	03	textile mill products (NA which below)
730	04	knitting mills
730	09	dyeing and finishing textiles (except wool and knit goods)
730	14	floor coverings (except hard surface)
730	01	yarn, thread, and fabric mills
730	06	misc. textile mill products
730	09	apparel, other fabricated textile products (NA which below)
730	11	apparel and accessories
730	06	misc. fabricated textile products
730	00	paper and allied products (NA which below)
730	06	pulp, paper, and paperboard mills
730	10	paperboard containers and boxes
730	08	miscellaneous paper and pulp products
730	23	printing, publishing, and allied industries
730	08	chemicals and allied products (NA which below)
730	04	synthetic fibers
730	22	drugs and medicines
730	08	paints, varnishes, and related product
730	08	miscellaneous chemicals and allied products
730	22	petroleum and coal products (NA which below)
730	26	petroleum refining
730	03	miscellaneous petroleum and coal products
730	12	rubber and miscellaneous plastic products
730	06	leather and leather products (NA which below)
730	02	leather: tanned, curried and finished
730	10	footwear (except rubber)
730	12	leather products (except footwear)
730	08	not specified manufacturing industries

NONMANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES: LABORERS

729	07	construction
730	03	railroads and railway express service
730	09	transportation (except railroad)
730	06	communications, and utilities and sanitary services
730	12	wholesale and retail trade
730	09	business and repair services
730	05	personal services
730	07	public administration
730	07	not specified nonmanufacturing industries (nonmanufacturing, NA which)
730	06	all other industries (including NA whether

manufacturing or nonmanufacturing)

FARMERS AND FARM MANAGERS, 1966-1974

810	14	farmers (farm owners)
820	14	farmers (tenants and sharecroppers)
830	14	farmers (NA which type)
840	36	farm managers

FARM LABORERS AND FOREMEN, 1966-1974

850	20	farm foremen
710	06	farm laborers, wage workers
711	17	farm laborers, unpaid family workers
712	22	farm service laborers, self-employed

*   Duncan SES scores for new or different categories in the 1960 Census
    Bureau Occupational Classification which 'had to be assumed on the
    basis of a closely analogous occupation or industry title.' The Census
    SES scores for these categories were derived from the scores for the
    general categories to which they belong.

>> RELIGION

    I.   RELIGION 1960-1988,2002
    II. RELIGION 1990 AND LATER (EXC.2002)
    III. 2002 RELIGION NOTE

>> I. RELIGION 1960-1988,2002

PROTESTANT, GENERAL: 100. Protestant, no denomination given
                        101. Non-denominational Protestant church
                        102. Community church (no denominational basis)

PROTESTANT,
REFORMATION ERA: 110. Presbyterian
                        111. Lutheran (exc. Missouri Synod [see 141] or
                            AME [see 121])
                        112. Congregational
                        113. Evangelical and Reformed
                        114. Reformed, Dutch Reformed or Christian Reformed
                        115. United Church of Christ (NOT Church of Christ
                            [see 136])
                        116. Episcopalian, Anglican, Church of England

PROTESTANT, PIETISTIC: 120. Methodist (exc. Free Methodist [see 132])
                        121. African Methodist Episcopal (AME)

122. United Brethren; Evangelical Brethren
123. Baptist (exc. Southern Baptist [140] or any
    of: Primitive, Free Will Missionary,
    Fundamentalist or Gospel Baptist [138])
124. Disciples of Christ
125. 'Christian'
126. Mennonite; Amish
127. Church of the Brethren

PROTESTANT,
NEO-FUNDAMENTALIST   130. United Missionary; Protestant Missionary
    131. Church of God; Holiness
    132. Nazarene; Free Methodist
    133. Church of God in Christ
    134. Plymouth Brethren
    135. Pentecostal; Assembly of God
    136. Church of Christ
    137. Salvation Army
    138. Primitive, Free Will, Missionary Fundamentalist,
      and Gospel Baptist
    139. Seventh Day Adventist
    140. Southern Baptist
    141. Missouri Synod Lutheran
    149. Other fundamentalists

NON-TRADITIONAL
CHRISTIAN: 150. Christian Scientist
    151. Spiritualist
    152. Mormon Latter-Day Saints (LDS)
    153. Unitarian; Universalist
    154. Jehovah's Witness
    155. Quaker
    156. Unity

CATHOLIC: 200. Roman Catholic

JEWISH: 300. Jewish

EASTERN ORTHODOX: 710. Greek Orthodox
    711. Russian Orthodox
    712. Rumanian Orthodox
    713. Serbian Orthodox
    719. Other Eastern Orthodox

NON-CHRISTIANS,
OTHER THAN JEWISH: 720. Muslim, Mohammedan
    721. Buddhist
    722. Hindu
    723. Bahai
    729. Other non-Judeo-Christian religions
    790. Other religions, including religious/ ethical

cults

NON-BELIEVERS: 800. Agnostics, Atheists

missing data: 996. Refused
                       998. DK; none; no preference
                       999. NA

>> II. RELIGION 1990 AND LATER

By 1988 NES had become aware that the evolution of the American religious
scene had made the Religion Code in use at the time inadequate. Two main
criticisms were leveled against it: 1) there weren't separate codes for some
of the fastest growing denominations in the last twenty years; and 2) groups
with different characteristics along political dimensions were lumped under
the same heading. A group of scholars headed by David Leege from the
University of Notre Dame developed and then tested (in the 1989 NES Pilot)
an entirely new coding scheme which was adopted in 1990. Note that this new
set of codes has coding added for different affiliations within the major
mainline Protestant denominations, and the Pentecostal, Holiness,
fundamentalist and evangelical Protestant denominations have been reworked
almost entirely.

The listing below of 1990-later religion codes includes a rough
"translation table" for comparison with the 1960-1988 master codes and is
designed to help analysts doing comparisons across years. However, the very
nature of those problems which the new code was designed to address makes any
translation between the two coding schemes extremely dubious (for a complete
discussion of the development of the 1990 Code please see: Leege, D., Wald,
K. & Kellstedt L., 'Religion and Politics: A report on Measures of
Religiosity in the 1989 NES Pilot Study').   In the second column is the
1990-later code; in the first column is the 1960-1988 code which would have
been assigned to the same given response; blanks in the first column mean
that there is no specific category associated with this response in the
1960-1988 codes. Note that in some cases without indication of 1960-1988
equivalent (blank), it is nonetheless clear from context what 1960-1988
code number probably would have been assigned to a particular response [for
example, "Norwegian Lutheran"--115 in 1990-1992-- would certainly have been
coded 111 "Lutheran not further specified" in 1960-1988], but in other
instances it is not apparent how responses coded in 1990 and later would have
been coded in 1960-1988 coding scheme.

 NOTE: The following additions and changes to the full set of religious
        denomination codes (years 1990 and later) have been made:

        Year   Codes   Change made
        ----   ----------------------- -----------
        1990   151 (Congreg. Christian)   new number (155)

```
1994        111,186,234,262,276     added
1996        240                     added
1998        263,264,524,725,726,727   added
```

```
              1990-                NFS = 'not further specified'
1988:   later:
```

GENERAL PROTESTANT
```
100    010. Protestant, no denomination given
101    020. Non-denominational Protestant
102    030. Community church
040    040. Inter-denominational Protestant
       099. Christian (NFS); "just Christian"
```

ADVENTIST
```
139    100. 7th Day Adventist
       102. Fundamentalist Adventists (Worldwide CHurch of God) [1990 only]
       109. Adventist (NFS)
```

ANGLICAN
```
116    110. Episcopalian; Anglican
       111. Independent Anglican, Episcopalian
```

BAPTIST
```
       120. American Baptist Association
       121. American Baptist Churches U.S.A. (inaccurately known as
              "Northern Baptist")
       122. Baptist Bible Fellowship
       123. Baptist General Conference
       124. Baptist Missionary Association of America
       125. Conservative Baptist Association of America
       126. General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (G.A.R.B.)
138    127. National Association of Free Will Baptists (United Free Will
              Baptist Church)
138    128. Primitive Baptists
       129. National Baptist Convention in the U.S.A.*
       130. National Baptist Convention of America*
       131. National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.*
       132. Progressive National Baptist Convention*
       133. United Free-Will Baptist Church [1990 only]
       134. Reformed Baptist (Calvinist)
140    135. Southern Baptist Convention
       147. Fundamental Baptist (no denom. ties)
       148. Local (independent) Baptist churches with no denominational
              ties or links to a national fellowship
123    149. Baptist (NFS)
```

CONGREGATIONAL
```
112,   150. United Church of Christ (includes Congregational, Evangelical
113,        and Reformed)
115
       155. Congregational Christian
```

EUROPEAN FREE CHURCH (ANABAPTISTS)

160. Church of the Brethren
127   161. Brethren (NFS)
126   162. Mennonite Church
163. Moravian Church
126   164. Old Order Amish
155   165. Quakers (Friends)
166. Evangelical Covenant Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)
167. Evangelical Free Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)
168. Brethren in Christ
170. Mennonite Brethren

HOLINESS

180. Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)
131   181. Church of God (Anderson, IN)
132   182. Church of the Nazarene
132   183. Free Methodist Church
137   184. Salvation Army
185. Wesleyan Church
186. Church of God of Findlay, OH
199. Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R
     Pentecostal or Charismatic

INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST

134   200. Plymouth Brethren
201. Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America
149   219. Independent-Fundamentalist (NFS)

LUTHERAN

220. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (formerly Lutheran
     Church in America and The American Lutheran Church); ELCA
141   221. Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod; LC-MS
222. Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; WELS
223. Other Conservative Lutheran
224. Lutheran Free Church; Association of Free Lutheran Churches; AFLC
111   229. Lutheran (NFS)

METHODIST

122   230. United Methodist Church; Evangelical United Brethren
121   231. African Methodist Episcopal Church
232. African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
233. Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
234. Primitive Methodist

240. Congregational Methodist (Fundamentalist)
120   249. Methodist (NFS)

PENTECOSTAL

135   250. Assemblies of God
131   251. Church of God (Cleveland, TN)
252. Church of God (Huntsville, AL)
253. International Church of the Four Square Gospel
254. Pentecostal Church of God

255. Pentecostal Holiness Church
256. United Pentecostal Church International
131   257. Church of God in Christ (incl. NA whether 258)
133   258. Church of God in Christ (International)
260. Church of God of the Apostolic Faith
261. Church of God in Prophecy
262. Vineyard Fellowship
263. Open Bible Standard Churches
264. Full Gospel
267. Apostolic Pentecostal
268. Spanish Pentecostal
135   269. Pentecostal (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R
Pentecostal or Charismatic

PRESBYTERIAN
270. Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
271. Cumberland Presbyterian Church
272. Presbyterian Church in American (PCA)
275. Evangelical Presbyterian
276. Reformed Presbyterian (NFS)
110   279. Presbyterian (NFS)

REFORMED
114   280. Christian Reformed Church (inaccurately known as "Dutch
Reformed")
281. Reformed Church in America
282. Free Hungarian Reformed Church
289. Reformed (NFS)

RESTORATIONIST
124,125 290. Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
291. Christian Churches and Churches of Christ
136   292. Churches of Christ; "Church of Christ" (NFS)
293. Christian Congregation

NON-TRADITIONAL PROTESTANTS
150   300. Christian Scientists
152   301. Mormons; Latter Day Saints
151   302. Spiritualists
153   303. Unitarian; Universalist
154   304. Jehovah's Witnesses
156   305. Unity; Unity Church; Christ Church Unity
306. Fundamentalist Adventist (Worldwide Church of God)
308. Religious science; science of mind (not Scientology or Christian Science)
309. Non-traditional Protestant (NFS)

ROMAN CATHOLIC
200   400. Roman Catholic

300   JEWISH
500. Jewish, no preference
501. Orthodox
502. Conservative

503. Reformed
        524. Jewish, other
        650. Messianic Judaism; Jews for Jesus

        695. More than 1 major religion (e.g., Christian, Jewish, Muslim etc.)

            EASTERN ORTHODOX (GREEK RITE CATHOLIC)
700   700. Greek Rite Catholic
710   701. Greek Orthodox
711   702. Russian Orthodox
712   703. Rumanian Orthodox
713   704. Serbian Orthodox
        705. Syrian Orthodox
        706. Armenian Orthodox
        707. Georgian Orthodox
        708. Ukranian Orthodox
719   719. Eastern Orthodox (NFS)

            NON-CHRISTIAN/NON-JEWISH
720   720. Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam
721   721. Buddhist
722   722. Hindu
723   723. Bahai
        724. American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)
        725. New Age
        726. Wicca (Wiccan)
        727. Pagan

729   729. Other non-Christian/non-Jewish
        750. Scientology [added 2000]
790   790. Religious/ethical cults

            MIX OF MAJOR RELIGIONS

        795. More than 1 major religion (e.g., Christian, Jewish,
            Moslem, etc.) [added 2000]

            OTHER/NO RELIGION/MISSING DATA
800   800. Agnostics
800   801. Atheists

998   997. Other

>> III. 2002 RELIGION NOTE

The recoding of 2002 summary relgious affiliation data to VCF0129
produced some categories among Protestants that are less finely
distinguished than previously, as follows:

VCF0129   V023138a 2002 SUMMARY CATEGORY
- 101   00.   Non-denominational Christian
- 123   01.   Baptist (no 138,140)
- 116   02.   Episcopalian/anglican/church of England
- 111   03.   Lutheran (no 141,121)
- 120   04.   Methodist (no 132)
- 100   05.   Just Protestant; Protestant DK/RF/NA denomination; other Protestant
- 110   06.   Presbyterian
- 114   07.   Reformed
- 122   08.   Brethren
- 122   09.   Evangelical United Brethren
- 100   10.   Christian or Just Christian
- 790   11.   Christian Scientist
- 136   12.   Church (Or Churches) of Christ
- 115   13.   United Church of Christ
- 124   14   Disciples of Christ
- 131   15.   Church of God
- 135   16.   Assembly of God
- 112   17.   Congregationalist
- 131   18.   Holiness
- 135   19.   Pentecostal
- 155   20.   Friends, Quaker; Anabaptist; Mennonite (no 126)
- 719   21.   Orthodox, E.g. Greek, Russian {SPECIFY}
- 101   22.   Non-denominational - Protestant
- 152   23.   Mormons
- 154   24.   Jehovah's Witnesses
- 152   25.   Latter Day Saints
- 156   26.   Unitarian/universalist
- 139   27.   Seventh day Adventist
- 100   30.   Christian NA denomination
- 200   32.   Roman Catholic
- 721   35.   Buddhist
- 300   40.   Jewish
- 722   45.   Hindu
- 720   55.   Muslim/Islam
- 790   65.   Native American
- 790   77.   Other {SPECIFY}
- 998   80.   None incl. agnostic/atheist (in 2000, includes cases of Rs who said they did not attend church and who then answered 'No' when asked if they thought of themselves as part of a church or denomination)
- 998   88.   Don't know
- 999   89.   Refused
- 999   99.   NA
- 999   INAP.   R refused or NA whether attends church (2000)

>> STATE AND COUNTRY CODES

United States:

NEW ENGLAND:

101 Connecticut
102 Maine
103 Massachusetts
104 New Hampshire
105 Rhode Island
106 Vermont
109 general mention of area; 2 or more
    states in New England

MIDDLE ATLANTIC:
111 Delaware
112 New Jersey
113 New York
114 Pennsylvania
118 general mention of area; 2 or more
    states in Middle Atlantic
119 'east;' mention of states in both
    New England and Middle Atlantic

EAST NORTH CENTRAL:
121 Illinois
122 Indiana
123 Michigan
124 Ohio
125 Wisconsin
129 general mention of area; 2 or more
    states in East North Central

WEST NORTH CENTRAL:
131 Iowa
132 Kansas
133 Minnesota
134 Missouri
135 Nebraska
136 North Dakota
137 South Dakota
138 general mention of area; 2 or more
    states in West North Central
139 'midwest;' mention of states in both
    East North Central and West North Central

SOLID SOUTH:
140 Virginia
141 Alabama
142 Arkansas
143 Florida
144 Georgia
145 Louisiana
146 Mississippi
147 North Carolina
148 South Carolina
149 Texas
157 general mention of area; 2 or more
    states in Solid South

BORDER STATES:
151 Kentucky
152 Maryland
153 Oklahoma
154 Tennessee
155 Washington D.C.
156 West Virginia
158 general mention of area; 2 or more
   states in Border States
159 'south;' mention of states in both
   Solid South and Border States

MOUNTAIN STATES:
161 Arizona
162 Colorado
163 Idaho
164 Montana
165 Nevada
166 New Mexico
167 Utah
168 Wyoming
169 general mention of area; 2 or more
   states in Mountain States

PACIFIC STATES:
171 California
172 Oregon
173 Washington
178 general mention of area; 2 or more
states in Pacific States
179 'west;' mention of states in both
Mountain and Pacific States

EXTERNAL STATES AND TERRITORIES:
180 Alaska
181 Hawaii
182 Puerto Rico
183 American Samoa, Guam
184 Panama Canal Zone
185 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
186 Virgin Islands
187 Other U.S. dependencies

OTHER U.S. CODES:
191 Northeast and South
   (New England/Middle Atlantic AND Solid
   South/Border States)
192 Northeast and Midwest
   (New England/Middle Atlantic AND East
   North Central/West North Central States)
194 West and Midwest
   (Mountain/Pacific AND East North Central/West

North Central States)
195 West and South
     (Mountain/Pacific AND Solid South/Border States)
196 Midwest and South
     (East North Central/West North Central AND Solid
     South/Border States)
198 3 or more regions (NA if lived in one region more
     than others)
199 United States, NA which states; American Indian

Western Hemisphere:

  NORTH AMERICA (other than U.S.):
     201 Combination: Canada, Mexico and/or Central America
     207 Canada: Anglo-Saxon ancestry
     208 Canada: French ancestry
     209 Canada: other or NA ancestry
     219 Mexico

  CENTRAL AMERICA:
     229 Central America

  WEST INDIES:
     231 Barbados
     233 Cuba
     234 Dominican Republic
     235 Haiti
     236 Jamaica
     237 Trinidad and Tobago
     238 Lesser Antilles (except Virgin Islands and
          Netherlands Antilles)
     239 West Indies/'Caribbean (except Puerto Rico and
          Virgin Islands), 2 or more countries

  SOUTH AMERICA:
     259 South America: 1 or more countries

Europe:

  BRITISH ISLES:
     301 England
     302 Ireland (South or NA which)
     303 Scotland
     304 Wales
     305 North Ireland (Ulster)
     306 Scot-Irish
     308 United Kingdom, Great Britain
     309 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
          in the British Isles

  WESTERN EUROPE:
     310 Austria

311 Belgium
312 France
313 West Germany (Federal Republic of Germany)
314 East Germany (German Democratic Republic)
315 Germany, NA east or West
316 Luxembourg
317 Netherlands; Holland
318 Switzerland
319 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Western Europe

SCANDINAVIA:
321 Denmark
322 Finland
323 Norway
324 Sweden
325 Iceland
328 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Scandinavia
329 2 or more countries in Western Europe/
     Scandinavia/British Isles

EASTERN EUROPE:
331 Czechoslovakia
332 Estonia
333 Hungary
334 Latvia
335 Lithuania
336 Poland
337 U.S.S.R. (Russia)
338 Ukraine
339 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Eastern Europe

BALKAN COUNTRIES:
341 Albania
342 Bulgaria
343 Greece
344 Rumania
345 Yugoslavia
348 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Balkans
349 2 or more countries in Eastern Europe/Balkans

MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES:
351 Italy
352 Portugal
353 Spain
354 Malta or Gozo
399 general mention of 'Europe.' 2 or more countries
     of Europe in different areas

Asia (exc. Near East):

401 Afghanistan
404 India
406 Pakistan
428 Southeast Asia: Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Burma,
     Philippines, Indonesia
431 China (mainland)
434 Taiwan, Formosa
451 Japan
452 Korea (North or South)
499 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Asia

Near East:
501 Egypt (U.A.R.)
502 Iran
503 Iraq
504 Israel, Palestine
505 Jordan
506 Lebanon
507 Saudi Arabia
508 Syria
509 Turkey
599 general mention of area; 2 or more countries
     in Near East

Africa:
655 South Africa
699 any African country other than South Africa or
     Egypt (U.A.R.)

Oceania:
704 Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania
705 South Pacific islands (exc. 704)

Other:
997 Combinations not codeable elsewhere

998 DK
999 NA
000 INAP, question not asked

FIPS STATE CODES

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
4. Arizona
5. Arkansas
6. California
8. Colorado

9. Connecticut
10. Delaware
11. Washington DC
12. Florida
13. Georgia
15. Hawaii
16. Idaho
17. Illinois
18. Indiana
19. Iowa
20. Kansas
21. Kentucky
22. Louisiana
23. Maine
24. Maryland
25. Massachusetts
26. Michigan
27. Minnesota
28. Mississippi
29. Missouri
30. Montana
31. Nebraska
32. Nevada
33. New Hampshire
34. New Jersey
35. New Mexico
36. New York
37. North Carolina
38. North Dakota
39. Ohio
40. Oklahoma
41. Oregon
42. Pennsylvania
44. Rhode Island
45. South Carolina
46. South Dakota
47. Tennessee
48. Texas
49. Utah
50. Vermont
51. Virginia
53. Washington
54. West Virginia
55. Wisconsin
56. Wyoming

>> COUNTY CODES (PART I)

    I. 1956-1960 PSU-COUNTY CODES (VCF0170a)
   II. 1964-1976 SAMPLING PSU-COUNTY CODES (VCF0170b)
 III. 1968-1982 ICPSR COUNTY CODES   (VCF0170c)
 IV. 1970,1978-1998 FIPS COUNTY CODES   (VCF0170d)

BALTIMORE, MD.

   0191. BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE CITY, MD.
   0091. TRACT B14 (AT WEST CITY LIMITS), BALTIMORE COUNTY,
          MD.

BOSTON, MASS.

   0211. BOSTON, SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASS.
   0011. TRACT MC 123 (WALTHAM), MIDDLESEX CO.
   0011. TRACT MC 120 (WALTHAM), MIDDLESEX CO.
   0011. TRACT MC 88 (WOBURN), MIDDLESEX CO.
   0011. TRACT MC 106 (WATERTOWN), MIDDLESEX CO.
   0011. TRACT MC 138 (WAYLAND), MIDDLESEX CO.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

   0141. CHICAGO, COOK COUNTY, ILL.
   1041. EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILL.
   1043. TRACT LI-3 (S. OF GARY, IND.), LAKE COUNTY,
          INDIANA
   1043. TRACT LI-1 (S. EDGE OF HAMMOND, IND.) LAKE COUNTY,
          INDIANA
   1041. TRACT WM-5 (WILMETTE), COOK CO., ILL.
   1042. ELGIN, KANE (SMALL PART IN COOK), ILL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO

   0251. CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA CO., O.
   0051. TRACT MH-1 (MAPLE HEIGHTS, S. OF CITY), CUYAHOGA
          CO., O.
   0051. TRACT UH-1 (UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, E. OF CITY)
          CUYAHOGA CO., O.

DETROIT, MICH.

   0241. DETROIT, WAYNE CO., MICH.
   0041. DEARBORN, WAYNE CO., MICH.
   0042. TRACT 863A (ROYAL OAK TWP.), OAKLAND CO., MICH.
   0042. TRACT 848 (FERNDALE), OAKLAND CO., MICH.
   0042. TRACT 926 (SOUTHFIELD TWP.), OAKLAND CO., MICH.

LOS ANGELES, CAL.

   0171. LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES CO., CAL.
   0071. ALHAMBRA, LOS ANGELES CO., CAL.
   0071. GLENDALE, LOS ANGELES CO., CAL.
   0071. TRACT 549A (BETWEEN N. COVINA AND POMONA), L.A.

CO., CAL.
0071. TRACT 464B (BETWEEN EL MONTE AND W. COVINA), L.A. CO., CAL.
0071. TRACT 334 (SIGNAL HILL, SURROUNDED BY LONG BEACH), L.A. CO., CAL.
0071. TRACT 529A (S. OF COMPTON), L.A. CO.
0071. TRACTS 465A AND 467C (BETWEEN ALHAMBRA AND EL MONTE), L.A. CO., CAL.
0071. TRACT 483 (S. OF ALHAMBRA), L.A. CO.
0072. ORANGE CITY, ORANGE CO., CAL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

0111. BRONX, BRONX CO., N.Y.
0121. BROOKLYN, KINGS CO., N.Y.
0131. MANHATTAN, NEW YORK CO., N.Y.
0112. QUEENS, QUEENS CO., N.Y.
0132. RICHMOND, RICHMOND CO., N.Y.
1011. GLEN COVE CITY (LONG ISLAND), NAUSSAU CO., N.Y.
1011. N. HEMPSTEAD TOWN (LONG ISLAND), NAUSSAU CO., N.Y.
1012. TRACT TUC-48 (TUCKAHOE) (NEXT TO YONKERS), WESTCHESTER CO., N.Y.
1012. TRACT WHP-91 (WHITE PLAINS), WESTCHESTER
1012. YONKERS, WESTCHESTER CO., N.Y.
1013. STAMFORD, CONN., FAIRFIELD CO., CONN.

NEW JERSEY

1021. ELIZABETH, N.J., UNION CO., N.J.
1022. JERSEY CITY, HUDSON CO., N.J.
1023. MILBURN TWP., ESSEX CO. (W. OF NEWARK) NEW JERSEY
1024. N. ARLINGTON BORO, (N. OF NEWARK), BERGEN CO., N.J.
1021. WESTFIELD TOWN (UNION CO., N.J.)

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

0221. PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO., PA.
0021. CHESTER, DELAWARE CO., PA.
0021. TRACT D14 (UPPER DARBY TWP.), DELAWARE CO., PA.
0021. TRACT D7 (UPPER DARBY TWP.), DELAWARE CO., PA.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

0231. PITTSBURGH, ALLEGHENY CO., PA.
0031. TRACT 50 (COLLIER TWP. S.W. OF CITY) ALLEGHENY CO., PA.
0031. TRACT 267 (TURTLE CREEK, S.E. OF CITY) ALLEGHENY CO., PA.
0031. TRACT 291 (WILKINSBURG, E. OF CITY), ALLEGHENY CO. PA.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

0261. ST. LOUIS, ST. LOUIS CO., MO.
0062. E. ST. LOUIS, ST. CLAIR CO., ILLINOIS
0061. TRACT SLC-9 (AROUND KINLOCH, N. OF CITY), ST. LOUIS CO., MO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

0271. SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO CO., CAL.
0272. OAKLAND, ALAMEDA CO., CAL.
1071. ALAMEDA, ALAMEDA CO., CAL.
1071. WASHINGTON TWP. (IN ALAMEDA CO.), CAL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

0181. WASHINGTON, D.C. (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)
0081. BRENTWOOD TOWN (NE SIDE OF CITY), PRINCE GEORGE'S CO., MARYLAND
0082. FALLS CHURCH DIST., PART (FAIRFAX CO.) VIRGINIA

OTHER AREAS

0641. ADAIR, MISSOURI
0761. BARRON, WISCONSIN
0451. BLACK HAWK, IOWA
0452. BUCHANAN, IOWA
0501. BOYD, KENTUCKY
0502. GREENUP, KENTUCKY
0461. BUTLER, OHIO
0462. WARREN, OHIO
0791. CLARK, ARKANSAS
0611. CORTLAND, NEW YORK
0751. CRAWFORD, IOWA
0601. E. CARROLL, LOUISIANA
0691. ERATH, TEXAS
0331. FAIRFIELD, CONNECTICUT
0481. FORSYTH, NORTH CAROLINA
0482. STOKES, NORTH CAROLINA
0841. FRANKLIN, NEBRASKA
0441. GENESEE, MICHIGAN
0881. GWINNETT, GEORGIA
0381. HARRIS, TEXAS
0341. HENNEPIN, MINNESOTA
0343. RAMSEY, MINNESOTA
0981. HICKMAN, TENNESSEE
0871. IDAHO, IDAHO
0991. JEFF DAVIS, GEORGIA
0391. JEFFERSON, KENTUCKY
0561. KNOX, OHIO
0681. LEON, FLORIDA
0411. LUZERNE, PENNSYLVANIA
0351. MARION, INDIANA
0671. MERCED, CALIFORNIA
0551. MINNEHAHA, SOUTH DAKOTA
0553. TURNER, SOUTH DAKOTA

```
0741.  MITCHELL, KANSAS
0401.  MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA
0402.  ELMORE, ALABAMA
0781.  MUHLENBERG, KENTUCKY
0511.  NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
0311.  ONONDAGA, NEW YORK
0661.  PAGE, IOWA
0471.  PIERCE, WASHINGTON
0591.  PITT, NORTH CAROLINA
0361.  MONTGOMERY, OHIO
0571.  PUEBLO, COLORADO
0301.  PULASKI, ARKANSAS
0303.  SALINE, ARKANSAS
0891.  PULASKI, VIRGINIA
0421.  RENSSELAER, NEW YORK
0491.  RICHLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA
0492.  LEXINGTON, SOUTH CAROLINA
0541.  ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN
0542.  MACOMB, MICHIGAN
0651.  ST. JOSEPH, MICHIGAN
0371.  SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
0771.  SOCORRO, NEW MEXICO
0531.  SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY
0621.  SUSQUEHANNA, PENNSYLVANIA
0581.  TAYLOR, TEXAS
0582.  JONES, TEXAS
0851.  TRAVERSE, MINNESOTA
0801.  WALTHALL, MISSISSIPPI
0901.  WATAUGA, NORTH CAROLINA
0521.  WESTMORELAND, PENNSYLVANIA
0321.  WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS
0701.  SARASOTA, FLORIDA
0702.  MANATEE, FLORIDA
```

>> COUNTY CODES (PART II)

 II. 1964-1976 SAMPLING PSU-COUNTY CODES (VCF0170b)

```
SAMPLING
 COUNTY
 CODE    STATE          COUNTY
--------  --------------  ------------
  001    CALIFORNIA     LOS ANGELES
  002    CALIFORNIA     ORANGE
  003    LOUISIANA      ACADIA
  004    GEORGIA        CLAYTON
  005    TENNESSEE      BLEDSOE
  006    WEST VIRGINIA   KANAWHA
  007    MICHIGAN       LAPEER
```

```
008   TEXAS         FORT BEND
009   INDIANA       MORGAN
010   ARKANSAS      SALINE
011   CALIFORNIA    SAN FRANCISCO
012   CALIFORNIA    ALAMEDA
013   CALIFORNIA    SAN MATEO
014   CALIFORNIA    CONTRA COSTA
015   GEORGIA       LOWNDES
016   ALABAMA       ELMORE
017   ILLINOIS      RANDOLPH
018   UTAH          DAVIS
019   MISSISSIPPI   SIMPSON
020   PENNSYLVANIA  SNYDER
021   MICHIGAN      MONROE
022   CALIFORNIA    SOLANO
101   ILLINOIS      COOK
102   ILLINOIS      LAKE
103   ILLINOIS      LAKE
104   INDIANA       PORTER
105   ILLINOIS      DUPAGE
111   ILLINOIS      COOK
121   OHIO          CUYAHOGA
122   OHIO          LAKE
131   MICHIGAN      WAYNE
132   MICHIGAN      OAKLAND
133   MICHIGAN      MACOMB
141   MISSOURI      ST. LOUIS CITY
142   MISSOURI      ST. LOUIS COU
143   ILLINOIS      ST. CLAIR
144   ILLINOIS      MADISON
201   NEW YORK      BRONX
202   NEW YORK      QUEENS
211   NEW YORK      KINGS
221   NEW YORK      NEW YORK
231   NEW YORK      RICHMOND
232   NEW YORK      NASSAU
233   NEW YORK      SUFFOLK
234   NEW YORK      WESTCHESTER
235   NEW YORK      ROCKLAND
241   NEW JERSEY    HUDSON
242   NEW JERSEY    ESSEX
243   NEW JERSEY    BERGEN
244   NEW JERSEY    UNION
245   NEW JERSEY    PASSAIC
246   NEW JERSEY    MORRIS
271   MASSACHUSETTS  SUFFOLK
272   MASSACHUSETTS  MIDDLESEX (PART)
273   MASSACHUSETTS  NORFOLK (PART)
281   PENNSYLVANIA   PHILADELPHIA
282   PENNSYLVANIA   MONTGOMERY
283   PENNSYLVANIA   BUCKS
284   NEW JERSEY     CAMDEN
291   PENNSYLVANIA   ALLEGHENY
292   PENNSYLVANIA   BEAVER
```

293	PENNSYLVANIA	WASHINGTON
294	PENNSYLVANIA	WESTMORELAND
301	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE CIT
302	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE COU
303	MARYLAND	ANNE ARUNDEL
311	WASH D.C.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
312	VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON
313	MARYLAND	MONTGOMERY
314	VIRGINIA	FAIRFAX
341	MISSISSIPPI	WALTHALL
351	NORTH CAROLINA	FORSYTH
352	NORTH CAROLINA	STOKES
361	TEXAS	HARRIS
371	GEORGIA	FULTON
372	GEORGIA	CLAYTON
373	GEORGIA	COBB
374	GEORGIA	DE KALB
375	GEORGIA	GWINNETT
381	KENTUCKY	JEFFERSON
391	FLORIDA	DADE
401	OKLAHOMA	TULSA
402	OKLAHOMA	OSAGE
403	OKLAHOMA	CREEK
411	VIRGINIA	RICHMOND
412	VIRGINIA	CHESTERFIELD
413	VIRGINIA	HENRICO
421	ARKANSAS	PULASKI
431	TEXAS	TAYLOR
432	TEXAS	JONES
441	ALABAMA	MONTGOMERY
451	SOUTH CAROLINA	RICHLAND
452	SOUTH CAROLINA	LEXINGTON
461	FLORIDA	ORANGE
462	FLORIDA	SEMINOLE
471	KENTUCKY	FAYETTE
481	FLORIDA	SARASOTA
482	FLORIDA	MANATEE
491	NORTH CAROLINA	PITT
501	VIRGINIA	PULASKI
511	ARKANSAS	MISSISSIPPI
521	TEXAS	ERATH
531	ARKANSAS	CLARK
541	LOUISIANA	EAST CARROLL
551	MISSISSIPPI	RANKIN
561	KENTUCKY	MUHLENBERG
571	TENNESSEE	HICKMAN
581	NORTH CAROLINA	WATAUGA
591	NORTH CAROLINA	CURRITUCK
601	NEBRASKA	FRANKLIN
611	MISSOURI	STODDARD
621	IOWA	CRAWFORD
631	INDIANA	MARSHALL
641	MICHIGAN	ST. JOSEPH
651	MISSOURI	ADAIR

```
661   ILLINOIS      LOGAN
671   OHIO          KNOX
681   OHIO          HANCOCK
691   WISCONSIN     SHEBOYGAN
701   SOUTH DAKOTA  MINNEHAHA
711   OHIO          BUTLER
721   IOWA          BLACK HAWK
731   MICHIGAN      GENESEE
741   OHIO          LUCAS
751   OHIO          MONTGOMERY
752   OHIO          MIAMI
753   OHIO          GREENE
761   INDIANA       MARION
771   MINNESOTA     HENNEPIN
772   MINNESOTA     RAMSEY
773   MINNESOTA     ANOKA
774   MINNESOTA     DAKOTA
775   MINNESOTA     WASHINGTON
801   CALIFORNIA    SAN DIEGO
802   CALIFORNIA    SAN BERNARDIN
803   CALIFORNIA    RIVERSIDE
811   WASHINGTON    KING
812   WASHINGTON    SNOHOMISH
821   UTAH          SALT LAKE
831   ARIZONA       MARICOPA
841   CALIFORNIA    SANTA CLARA
851   OREGON        LANE
861   WASHINGTON    WHATCOM
871   CALIFORNIA    TULARE
881   COLORADO      LOGAN
891   CALIFORNIA    PLUMAS
892   CALIFORNIA    SIERRA
901   PENNSYLVANIA  SUSQUEHANNA
911   MAINE         YORK
921   NEW YORK      ULSTER
931   PENNSYLVANIA  LYCOMING
941   CONNECTICUT   NEW LONDON
951   PENNSYLVANIA  LUZERNE
961   NEW JERSEY    MERCER
971   CONNECTICUT   FAIRFIELD
972   CONNECTICUT   NEW HAVEN
981   MASSACHUSETTS WORCESTER
991   NEW YORK      ONONDAGA
992   NEW YORK      OSWEGO
993   NEW YORK      MADISON
```

>> COUNTY CODES (PART III)

III. 1968-1982 ICPSR COUNTY CODES   (VCF0170c)

Note: documentation for 49041 is not found
       in codebook documentation for individual studies.

```
ICPSR
COUNTY
CODE   STATE          COUNTY
-----  -------------  ---------

01001  CONNECTICUT    FAIRFIELD
01006  CONNECTICUT    NEW LONDON
02016  MAINE          YORK
03009  MASSACHUSETTS  MIDDLESEX
03011  MASSACHUSETTS  NORFOLK
03012  MASSACHUSETTS  PLYMOUTH
03013  MASSACHUSETTS  SUFFOLK
03014  MASSACHUSETTS  WORCESTER
11002  DELAWARE       NEW CASTLE
12002  NEW JERSEY     BERGEN
12003  NEW JERSEY     BURLINGTON
12004  NEW JERSEY     CAMDEN
12007  NEW JERSEY     ESSEX
12009  NEW JERSEY     HUDSON
12011  NEW JERSEY     MERCER
12012  NEW JERSEY     MIDDLESEX
12014  NEW JERSEY     MORRIS
12016  NEW JERSEY     PASSAIC
12018  NEW JERSEY     SOMERSET
12020  NEW JERSEY     UNION
13003  NEW YORK       BRONX
13014  NEW YORK       DUTCHESS
13015  NEW YORK       ERIE
13024  NEW YORK       KINGS
13027  NEW YORK       MADISON
13030  NEW YORK       NASSAU
13031  NEW YORK       NEW YORK
13034  NEW YORK       ONONDAGA
13038  NEW YORK       OSWEGO
13041  NEW YORK       QUEENS
13043  NEW YORK       RICHMOND
13044  NEW YORK       ROCKLAND
13052  NEW YORK       SUFFOLK
13056  NEW YORK       ULSTER
13060  NEW YORK       WESTCHESTER
14002  PENNSYLVANIA   ALLEGHENY
14015  PENNSYLVANIA   CHESTER
14025  PENNSYLVANIA   ERIE
14040  PENNSYLVANIA   LUZERNE
14041  PENNSYLVANIA   LYCOMING
14046  PENNSYLVANIA   MONTGOMERY
14051  PENNSYLVANIA   PHILADELPHIA
14055  PENNSYLVANIA   SNYDER
14058  PENNSYLVANIA   SUSQUEHANNA
14063  PENNSYLVANIA   WASHINGTON
14065  PENNSYLVANIA   WESTMORELAND
```

```
21016  ILLINOIS      COOK
21022  ILLINOIS      DUPAGE
21037  ILLINOIS      HENRY
21045  ILLINOIS      KANE
21049  ILLINOIS      LAKE
21054  ILLINOIS      LOGAN
21060  ILLINOIS      MADISON
21079  ILLINOIS      RANDOLPH
21081  ILLINOIS      ROCK ISLAND
21082  ILLINOIS      ST. CLAIR
22010  INDIANA       CLARK
22020  INDIANA       ELKHART
22022  INDIANA       FLOYD
22030  INDIANA       HANCOCK
22045  INDIANA       LAKE
22049  INDIANA       MARION
22050  INDIANA       MARSHALL
22055  INDIANA       MORGAN
22064  INDIANA       PORTER
23025  MICHIGAN      GENESEE
23044  MICHIGAN      LAPEER
23050  MICHIGAN      MACOMB
23058  MICHIGAN      MONROE
23063  MICHIGAN      OAKLAND
23075  MICHIGAN      ST. JOSEPH
23082  MICHIGAN      WAYNE
24009  OHIO          BUTLER
24018  OHIO          CUYAHOGA
24028  OHIO          GEAUGA
24029  OHIO          GREENE
24032  OHIO          HANCOCK
24042  OHIO          KNOX
24043  OHIO          LAKE
24048  OHIO          LUCAS
24057  OHIO          MONTGOMERY
25041  WISCONSIN     MILWAUKEE
25060  WISCONSIN     SHEBOYGAN
31007  IOWA          BLACK HAWK
31024  IOWA          CRAWFORD
32059  KANSAS        MARSHALL
33002  MINNESOTA     ANOKA
33027  MINNESOTA     HENNEPIN
33062  MINNESOTA     RAMSEY
33082  MINNESOTA     WASHINGTON
34001  MISSOURI      ADAIR
34050  MISSOURI      JEFFERSON
34092  MISSOURI      ST. CHARLES
34095  MISSOURI      ST. LOUIS COUNTY
34096  MISSOURI      ST. LOUIS CITY
34104  MISSOURI      STODDARD
35031  NEBRASKA      FRANKLIN
37049  SOUTH DAKOTA  MINNEHAHA
40021  VIRGINIA      CHESTERFIELD
40029  VIRGINIA      FAIRFAX
```

40043	VIRGINIA	HENRICO
40075	VIRGINIA	PULASKI
40122	VIRGINIA	RICHMOND CITY
41026	ALABAMA	ELMORE
41045	ALABAMA	MADISON
41051	ALABAMA	MONTGOMERY
42010	ARKANSAS	CLARK
42047	ARKANSAS	MISSISSIPPI
42060	ARKANSAS	PULASKI
42063	ARKANSAS	SALINE
43013	FLORIDA	DADE
43041	FLORIDA	MANATEE
43048	FLORIDA	ORANGE
43058	FLORIDA	SARASOTA
43059	FLORIDA	SEMINOLE
44025	GEORGIA	CHATHAM
44031	GEORGIA	CLAYTON
44044	GEORGIA	DE KALB
44050	GEORGIA	ECHOLS
44060	GEORGIA	FULTON
44067	GEORGIA	GWINNET
44092	GEORGIA	LOWNDES
45001	LOUISIANA	ACADIA
45018	LOUISIANA	EAST CARROLL
45026	LOUISIANA	JEFFERSON PARISH
46061	MISSISSIPPI	RANKIN
46064	MISSISSIPPI	SIMPSON
47027	NORTH CAROLINA	CURRITUCK
47029	NORTH CAROLINA	DAVIDSON
47074	NORTH CAROLINA	PITT
47095	NORTH CAROLINA	WATAUGA
48032	SOUTH CAROLINA	LEXINGTON
48040	SOUTH CAROLINA	RICHLAND
49041	TEXAS	COKE
49061	TEXAS	DENTON
49072	TEXAS	ERATH
49079	TEXAS	FORT BEND
49101	TEXAS	HARRIS
49127	TEXAS	JONES
49146	TEXAS	LIBERTY
49170	TEXAS	MONTGOMERY
49221	TEXAS	TAYLOR
49227	TEXAS	TRAVIS
51034	KENTUCKY	FAYETTE
51056	KENTUCKY	JEFFERSON
51089	KENTUCKY	MUHLENBERG
52002	MARYLAND	ANNE ARUNDEL
52003	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE COUNTY
52004	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE CITY
52013	MARYLAND	HARFORD
52016	MARYLAND	MONTGOMERY
52017	MARYLAND	PRINCE GEORGE'S
53019	OKLAHOMA	CREEK
53057	OKLAHOMA	OSAGE

```
53072 OKLAHOMA      TULSA
54004 TENNESSEE     BLEDSOE
54041 TENNESSEE     HICKMAN
54079 TENNESEEE     SHELBY
55001 WASH D.C.     D.C.
56020 WEST VIRGINIA  KANAWHA
61007 ARIZONA       MARICOPA
62016 COLORADO      DENVER
62038 COLORADO      LOGAN
67006 UTAH          DAVIS
67018 UTAH          SALT LAKE
68007 WYOMING       FREMONT
71001 CALIFORNIA    ALAMEDA
71007 CALIFORNIA    CONTRA COSTA
71015 CALIFORNIA    KERN
71019 CALIFORNIA    LOS ANGELES
71028 CALIFORNIA    NAPA
71030 CALIFORNIA    ORANGE
71032 CALIFORNIA    PLUMAS
71033 CALIFORNIA    RIVERSIDE
71034 CALIFORNIA    SACRAMENTO
71036 CALIFORNIA    SAN BERNARDINO
71037 CALIFORNIA    SAN DIEGO
71038 CALIFORNIA    SAN FRANCISCO
71041 CALIFORNIA    SAN MATEO
71043 CALIFORNIA    SANTA CLARA
71046 CALIFORNIA    SIERRA
71048 CALIFORNIA    SOLANO
71054 CALIFORNIA    TULARE
72020 OREGON        LANE
73017 WASHINGTON    KING
73031 WASHINGTON    SNOHOMISH
73037 WASHINGTON    WHATCOM
```

>> COUNTY CODES (PART IV)

IV. 1970,1978-1998 FIPS COUNTY CODES   (VCF0170d)

   First 2 digits correspond to FIPS state code.

   01   ALABAMA FIPS COUNTY CODES
   ....

```
01001 AUTAUGA              01003 BALDWIN
01005 BARBOUR              01007 BIBB
01009 BLOUNT               01011 BULLOCK
01013 BUTLER               01015 CALHOUN
01017 CHAMBERS             01019 CHEROKEE
01021 CHILTON              01023 CHOCTAW
01025 CLARKE               01027 CLAY
```

01029 CLEBURNE   01031 COFFEE
01033 COLBERT   01035 CONECUH
01037 COOSA   01039 COVINGTON
01041 CRENSHAW   01043 CULLMAN
01045 DALE   01047 DALLAS
01049 DE KALB   01051 ELMORE
01053 ESCAMBIA   01055 ETOWAH
01057 FAYETTE   01059 FRANKLIN
01061 GENEVA   01063 GREENE
01065 HALE   01067 HENRY
01069 HOUSTON   01071 JACKSON
01073 JEFFERSON   01075 LAMAR
01077 LAUDERDALE   01079 LAWRENCE
01081 LEE   01083 LIMESTONE
01085 LOWNDES   01087 MACON
01089 MADISON   01091 MARENGO
01093 MARION   01095 MARSHALL
01097 MOBILE   01099 MONROE
01101 MONTGOMERY   01103 MORGAN
01105 PERRY   01107 PICKENS
01109 PIKE   01111 RANDOLPH
01113 RUSSELL   01115 ST CLAIR
01117 SHELBY   01119 SUMTER
01121 TALLADEGA   01123 TALLAPOOSA
01125 TUSCALOOSA   01127 WALKER
01129 WASHINGTON   01131 WILCOX
01133 WINSTON

02   ALASKA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....
                    02010 ALEUTIAN ISLANDS
02020 ANCHORAGE   02030 ANGOON
02040 BARROW   02050 BETHEL
02060 BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH   02070 BRISTOL BAY DIVISION
02080 CORDOVA-MC CARTHY   02090 FAIRBANKS
02100 HAINES   02110 JUNEAU
02120 KENAI-COOK INLET   02130 KETCHIKAN
02140 KOBUK   02150 KODIAK
02160 KUSKOKWIM   02170 MATANUSKA-SUSITNA
02180 NOME   02190 OUTER KETCHIKAN
02200 PRINCE OF WALES   02210 SEWARD
02220 SITKA   02230 SKAGWAY-YAKUTAT
02240 SOUTHEAST FAIRBANKS   02250 UPPER YUKON
02260 VALDEZ-CHITINA-WHITTIER   02270 WADE HAMPTON
02280 WRANGELL-PETERSBURG   02290 YUKON-KOYUKUK

04   ARIZONA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

04001 APACHE   04003 COCHISE
04005 COCONINO   04007 GILA
04009 GRAHAM   04011 GREENLEE
04013 MARICOPA   04015 MOHAVE
04017 NAVAJO   04019 PIMA

04021 PINAL   04023 SANTA CRUZ
04025 YAVAPAI   04027 YUMA

05   ARKANSAS FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

05001 ARKANSAS   05003 ASHLEY
05005 BAXTER   05007 BENTON
05009 BOONE   05011 BRADLEY
05013 CALHOUN   05015 CARROLL
05017 CHICOT   05019 CLARK
05021 CLAY   05023 CLEBURNE
05025 CLEVELAND   05027 COLUMBIA
05029 CONWAY   05031 CRAIGHEAD
05033 CRAWFORD   05035 CRITTENDEN
05037 CROSS   05039 DALLAS
05041 DESHA   05043 DREW
05045 FAULKNER   05047 FRANKLIN
05049 FULTON   05051 GARLAND
05053 GRANT   05055 GREENE
05057 HEMPSTEAD   05059 HOT SPRING
05061 HOWARD   05063 INDEPENDENCE
05065 IZARD   05067 JACKSON
05069 JEFFERSON   05071 JOHNSON
05073 LAFAYETTE   05075 LAWRENCE
05077 LEE   05079 LINCOLN
05081 LITTLE RIVER
05083 LOGAN   05085 LONOKE
05087 MADISON   05089 MARION
05091 MILLER   05093 MISSISSIPPI
05095 MONROE   05097 MONTGOMERY
05099 NEVADA   05101 NEWTON
05103 OUACHITA   05105 PERRY
05107 PHILLIPS   05109 PIKE
05111 POINSETT   05113 POLK
05115 POPE   05117 PRAIRIE
05119 PULASKI   05121 RANDOLPH
05123 ST FRANCIS   05125 SALINE
05127 SCOTT   05129 SEARCY
05131 SEBASTIAN   05133 SEVIER
05135 SHARP   05137 STONE
05139 UNION   05141 VAN BUREN
05143 WASHINGTON   05145 WHITE
05147 WOODRUFF   05149 YELL

06   CALIFORNIA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

06001 ALAMEDA   06003 ALPINE
06005 AMADOR   06007 BUTTE
06009 CALAVERAS   06011 COLUSA
06013 CONTRA COSTA   06015 DEL NORTE
06017 EL DORADO   06019 FRESNO
06021 GLENN   06023 HUMBOLDT

06025 IMPERIAL	06027 INYO
06029 KERN	06031 KINGS
06033 LAKE	06035 LASSEN
06037 LOS ANGELES	06039 MADERA
06041 MARIN	06043 MARIPOSA
06045 MENDOCINO	06047 MERCED
06049 MODOC	06051 MONO
06053 MONTEREY	06055 NAPA
06057 NEVADA	06059 ORANGE
06061 PLACER	06063 PLUMAS
06065 RIVERSIDE	06067 SACRAMENTO
06069 SAN BENITO	06071 SAN BERNARDINO
06073 SAN DIEGO	06075 SAN FRANCISCO
06077 SAN JOAQUIN	06079 SAN LUIS OBISPO
06081 SAN MATEO	06083 SANTA BARBARA
06085 SANTA CLARA	06087 SANTA CRUZ
06089 SHASTA	06091 SIERRA
06093 SISKIYOU	06095 SOLANO
06097 SONOMA	06099 STANISLAUS
06101 SUTTER	06103 TEHAMA
06105 TRINITY	06107 TULARE
06109 TUOLUMNE	06111 VENTURA
06113 YOLO	06115 YUBA

08   COLORADO FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

08001 ADAMS	08003 ALAMOSA
08005 ARAPAHOE	08007 ARCHULETA
08009 BACA	08011 BENT
08013 BOULDER	08015 CHAFFEE
08017 CHEYENNE	08019 CLEAR CREEK
08021 CONEJOS	08023 COSTILLA
08025 CROWLEY	08027 CUSTER
08029 DELTA	08031 DENVER
08033 DOLORES	08035 DOUGLAS
08037 EAGLE	08039 ELBERT
08041 EL PASO	08043 FREMONT
08045 GARFIELD	08047 GILPIN
08049 GRAND	08051 GUNNISON
08053 HINSDALE	08055 HUERFANO
08057 JACKSON	08059 JEFFERSON
08061 KIOWA	08063 KIT CARSON
08065 LAKE	08067 LA PLATA
08069 LARIMER	08071 LAS ANIMAS
08073 LINCOLN	08075 LOGAN
08077 MESA	08079 MINERAL
08081 MOFFAT	08083 MONTEZUMA
08085 MONTROSE	08087 MORGAN
08089 OTERO	08091 OURAY
08093 PARK	08095 PHILLIPS
08097 PITKIN	08099 PROWERS
08101 PUEBLO	08103 RIO BLANCO
08105 RIO GRANDE	08107 ROUTT

```
08109 SAGUACHE              08111 SAN JUAN
08113 SAN MIGUEL            08115 SEDGWICK
08117 SUMMIT                08119 TELLER
08121 WASHINGTON            08123 WELD
08125 YUMA
```

09   CONNECTICUT FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

```
                        09001 FAIRFIELD
09003 HARTFORD             09005 LITCHFIELD
09007 MIDDLESEX            09009 NEW HAVEN
09011 NEW LONDON           09013 TOLLAND
09015 WINDHAM
```

10   DELAWARE FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

```
                     10001 KENT
10003 NEW CASTLE           10005 SUSSEX
```

11   WASHINGTON DC FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

11001 WASHINGTON DC

12   FLORIDA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

```
                     12001 ALACHUA
12003 BAKER                12005 BAY
12007 BRADFORD             12009 BREVARD
12011 BROWARD              12013 CALHOUN
12015 CHARLOTTE            12017 CITRUS
12019 CLAY                 12021 COLLIER
12023 COLUMBIA             12025 DADE
12027 DE SOTO              12029 DIXIE
12031 DUVAL                12033 ESCAMBIA
12035 FLAGLER              12037 FRANKLIN
12039 GADSDEN              12041 GILCHRIST
12043 GLADES               12045 GULF
12047 HAMILTON             12049 HARDEE
12051 HENDRY               12053 HERNANDO
12055 HIGHLANDS            12057 HILLSBOROUGH
12059 HOLMES               12061 INDIAN RIVER
12063 JACKSON              12065 JEFFERSON
12067 LAFAYETTE            12069 LAKE
12071 LEE                  12073 LEON
12075 LEVY                 12077 LIBERTY
12079 MADISON              12081 MANATEE
12083 MARION               12085 MARTIN
12087 MONROE               12089 NASSAU
12091 OKALOOSA             12093 OKEECHOBEE
12095 ORANGE               12097 OSCEOLA
12099 PALM BEACH           12101 PASCO
12103 PINELLAS             12105 POLK
12107 PUTNAM               12109 ST JOHNS
```

12111 ST LUCIE	12113 SANTA ROSA
12115 SARASOTA	12117 SEMINOLE
12119 SUMTER	12121 SUWANNEE
12123 TAYLOR	12125 UNION
12127 VOLUSIA	12129 WAKULLA
12131 WALTON	12133 WASHINGTON

13   GEORGIA FIPS COUNTY CODES
······························

13001 APPLING	13003 ATKINSON
13005 BACON	13007 BAKER
13009 BALDWIN	13011 BANKS
13013 BARROW	13015 BARTOW
13017 BEN HILL	13019 BERRIEN
13021 BIBB	13023 BLECKLEY
13025 BRANTLEY	13027 BROOKS
13029 BRYAN	13031 BULLOCH
13033 BURKE	13035 BUTTS
13037 CALHOUN	13039 CAMDEN
13043 CANDLER	13045 CARROLL
13047 CATOOSA	13049 CHARLTON
13051 CHATHAM	13053 CHATTAHOOCHEE
13055 CHATTOOGA	13057 CHEROKEE
13059 CLARKE	13061 CLAY
13063 CLAYTON	13065 CLINCH
13067 COBB	13069 COFFEE
13071 COLQUITT	13073 COLUMBIA
13075 COOK	13077 COWETA
13079 CRAWFORD	13081 CRISP
13083 DADE	13085 DAWSON
13087 DECATUR	13089 DE KALB
13091 DODGE	13093 DOOLY
13095 DOUGHERTY	13097 DOUGLAS
13099 EARLY	13101 ECHOLS
13103 EFFINGHAM	13105 ELBERT
13107 EMANUEL	13109 EVANS
13111 FANNIN	13113 FAYETTE
13115 FLOYD	13117 FORSYTH
13119 FRANKLIN	13121 FULTON
13123 GILMER	13125 GLASCOCK
13127 GLYNN	13129 GORDON
13131 GRADY	13133 GREENE
13135 GWINNETT	13137 HABERSHAM
13139 HALL	13141 HANCOCK
13143 HARALSON	13145 HARRIS
13147 HART	13149 HEARD
13151 HENRY	13153 HOUSTON
13155 IRWIN	13157 JACKSON
13159 JASPER	13161 JEFF DAVIS
13163 JEFFERSON	13165 JENKINS
13167 JOHNSON	13169 JONES
13171 LAMAR	13173 LANIER
13175 LAURENS	13177 LEE

13179 LIBERTY	13181 LINCOLN
13183 LONG	13185 LOWNDES
13187 LUMPKIN	13189 MC DUFFIE
13191 MC INTOSH	13193 MACON
13195 MADISON	13197 MARION
13199 MERIWETHER	13201 MILLER
13205 MITCHELL	13207 MONROE
13209 MONTGOMERY	13211 MORGAN
13213 MURRAY	13215 MUSCOGEE
13217 NEWTON	13219 OCONEE
13221 OGLETHORPE	13223 PAULDING
13225 PEACH	13227 PICKENS
13229 PIERCE	13231 PIKE
13233 POLK	13235 PULASKI
13237 PUTNAM	13239 QUITMAN
13241 RABUN	13243 RANDOLPH
13245 RICHMOND	13247 ROCKDALE
13249 SCHLEY	13251 SCREVEN
13253 SEMINOLE	13255 SPALDING
13257 STEPHENS	13259 STEWART
13261 SUMTER	13263 TALBOT
13265 TALIAFERRO	13267 TATTNALL
13269 TAYLOR	13271 TELFAIR
13273 TERRELL	13275 THOMAS
13277 TIFT	13279 TOOMBS
13281 TOWNS	13283 TREUTLEN
13285 TROUP	13287 TURNER
13289 TWIGGS	13291 UNION
13293 UPSON	13295 WALKER
13297 WALTON	13299 WARE
13301 WARREN	13303 WASHINGTON
13305 WAYNE	13307 WEBSTER
13309 WHEELER	13311 WHITE
13313 WHITFIELD	13315 WILCOX
13317 WILKES	13319 WILKINSON
13321 WORTH	

15   HAWAII FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

15001 HAWAII	15003 HONOLULU
15007 KAUAI	15009 MAUI

16   IDAHO FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

16001 ADA	16003 ADAMS
16005 BANNOCK	16007 BEAR LAKE
16009 BENEWAH	16011 BINGHAM
16013 BLAINE	16015 BOISE
16017 BONNER	16019 BONNEVILLE
16021 BOUNDARY	16023 BUTTE
16025 CAMAS	16027 CANYON
16029 CARIBOU	16031 CASSIA

16033 CLARK	16035 CLEARWATER
16037 CUSTER	16039 ELMORE
16041 FRANKLIN	16043 FREMONT
16045 GEM	16047 GOODING
16049 IDAHO	16051 JEFFERSON
16053 JEROME	16055 KOOTENAI
16057 LATAH	16059 LEMHI
16061 LEWIS	16063 LINCOLN
16065 MADISON	16067 MINIDOKA
16069 NEZ PERCE	16071 ONEIDA
16073 OWYHEE	16075 PAYETTE
16077 POWER	16079 SHOSHONE
16081 TETON	16083 TWIN FALLS
16085 VALLEY	16087 WASHINGTON

17   ILLINOIS FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

17001 ADAMS	17003 ALEXANDER
17005 BOND	17007 BOONE
17009 BROWN	17011 BUREAU
17013 CALHOUN	17015 CARROLL
17017 CASS	17019 CHAMPAIGN
17021 CHRISTIAN	17023 CLARK
17025 CLAY	17027 CLINTON
17029 COLES	17031 COOK
17033 CRAWFORD	17035 CUMBERLAND
17037 DE KALB	17039 DE WITT
17041 DOUGLAS	17043 DU PAGE
17045 EDGAR	17047 EDWARDS
17049 EFFINGHAM	17051 FAYETTE
17053 FORD	17055 FRANKLIN
17057 FULTON	17059 GALLATIN
17061 GREENE	17063 GRUNDY
17065 HAMILTON	17067 HANCOCK
17069 HARDIN	17071 HENDERSON
17073 HENRY	17075 IROQUOIS
17077 JACKSON	17079 JASPER
17081 JEFFERSON	17083 JERSEY
17085 JO DAVIESS	17087 JOHNSON
17089 KANE	17091 KANKAKEE
17093 KENDALL	17095 KNOX
17097 LAKE	17099 LA SALLE
17101 LAWRENCE	17103 LEE
17105 LIVINGSTON	17107 LOGAN
17109 MC DONOUGH	17111 MC HENRY
17113 MC LEAN	17115 MACON
17117 MACOUPIN	17119 MADISON
17121 MARION	17123 MARSHALL
17125 MASON	17127 MASSAC
17129 MENARD	17131 MERCER
17133 MONROE	17135 MONTGOMERY
17137 MORGAN	17139 MOULTRIE
17141 OGLE	17143 PEORIA

17145 PERRY	17147 PIATT
17149 PIKE	17151 POPE
17153 PULASKI	17155 PUTNAM
17157 RANDOLPH	17159 RICHLAND
17161 ROCK ISLAND	17163 ST CLAIR
17165 SALINE	17167 SANGAMON
17169 SCHUYLER	17171 SCOTT
17173 SHELBY	17175 STARK
17177 STEPHENSON	17179 TAZEWELL
17181 UNION	17183 VERMILION
17185 WABASH	17187 WARREN
17189 WASHINGTON	17191 WAYNE
17193 WHITE	17195 WHITESIDE
17197 WILL	17199 WILLIAMSON
17201 WINNEBAGO	17203 WOODFORD

18   INDIANA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

	18001 ADAMS
18003 ALLEN	18005 BARTHOLOMEW
18007 BENTON	18009 BLACKFORD
18011 BOONE	18013 BROWN
18015 CARROLL	18017 CASS
18019 CLARK	18021 CLAY
18023 CLINTON	18025 CRAWFORD
18027 DAVIESS	18029 DEARBORN
18031 DECATUR	18033 DE KALB
18035 DELAWARE	18037 DUBOIS
18039 ELKHART	18041 FAYETTE
18043 FLOYD	18045 FOUNTAIN
18047 FRANKLIN	18049 FULTON
18051 GIBSON	18053 GRANT
18055 GREENE	18057 HAMILTON
18059 HANCOCK	18061 HARRISON
18063 HENDRICKS	18065 HENRY
18067 HOWARD	18069 HUNTINGTON
18071 JACKSON	18073 JASPER
18075 JAY	18077 JEFFERSON
18079 JENNINGS	18081 JOHNSON
18083 KNOX	18085 KOSCIUSKO
18087 LAGRANGE	18089 LAKE
18091 LA PORTE	18093 LAWRENCE
18095 MADISON	18097 MARION
18099 MARSHALL	18101 MARTIN
18103 MIAMI	18105 MONROE
18107 MONTGOMERY	18109 MORGAN
18111 NEWTON	18113 NOBLE
18115 OHIO	18117 ORANGE
18119 OWEN	18121 PARKE
18123 PERRY	18125 PIKE
18127 PORTER	18129 POSEY
18131 PULASKI	18133 PUTNAM
18135 RANDOLPH	18137 RIPLEY
18139 RUSH	18141 ST JOSEPH

18143 SCOTT   18145 SHELBY
18147 SPENCER   18149 STARKE
18151 STEUBEN   18153 SULLIVAN
18155 SWITZERLAND   18157 TIPPECANOE
18159 TIPTON   18161 UNION
18163 VANDERBURGH   18165 VERMILLION
18167 VIGO   18169 WABASH
18171 WARREN   18173 WARRICK
18175 WASHINGTON   18177 WAYNE
18179 WELLS   18181 WHITE
18183 WHITLEY

19   IOWA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

19001 ADAIR
19003 ADAMS   19005 ALLAMAKEE
19007 APPANOOSE   19009 AUDUBON
19011 BENTON   19013 BLACK HAWK
19015 BOONE   19017 BREMER
19019 BUCHANAN   19021 BUENA VISTA
19023 BUTLER   19025 CALHOUN
19027 CARROLL   19029 CASS
19031 CEDAR   19033 CERRO GORDO
19035 CHEROKEE   19037 CHICKASAW
19039 CLARKE   19041 CLAY
19043 CLAYTON   19045 CLINTON
19047 CRAWFORD   19049 DALLAS
19051 DAVIS   19053 DECATUR
19055 DELAWARE   19057 DES MOINES
19059 DICKINSON   19061 DUBUQUE
19063 EMMET   19065 FAYETTE
19067 FLOYD   19069 FRANKLIN
19071 FREMONT   19073 GREENE
19075 GRUNDY   19077 GUTHRIE
19079 HAMILTON   19081 HANCOCK
19083 HARDIN   19085 HARRISON
19087 HENRY   19089 HOWARD
19091 HUMBOLDT   19093 IDA
19095 IOWA   19097 JACKSON
19099 JASPER   19101 JEFFERSON
19103 JOHNSON   19105 JONES
19107 KEOKUK   19109 KOSSUTH
19111 LEE   19113 LINN
19115 LOUISA   19117 LUCAS
19119 LYON   19121 MADISON
19123 MAHASKA   19125 MARION
19127 MARSHALL   19129 MILLS
19131 MITCHELL   19133 MONONA
19135 MONROE   19137 MONTGOMERY
19139 MUSCATINE   19141 O BRIEN
19143 OSCEOLA   19145 PAGE
19147 PALO ALTO   19149 PLYMOUTH
19151 POCAHONTAS   19153 POLK
19155 POTTAWATTAMIE   19157 POWESHIEK

19159 RINGGOLD	19161 SAC
19163 SCOTT	19165 SHELBY
19167 SIOUX	19169 STORY
19171 TAMA	19173 TAYLOR
19175 UNION	19177 VAN BUREN
19179 WAPELLO	19181 WARREN
19183 WASHINGTON	19185 WAYNE
19187 WEBSTER	19189 WINNEBAGO
19191 WINNESHIEK	19193 WOODBURY
19195 WORTH	19197 WRIGHT

20   KANSAS FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

20001 ALLEN	20003 ANDERSON
20005 ATCHISON	20007 BARBER
20009 BARTON	20011 BOURBON
20013 BROWN	20015 BUTLER
20017 CHASE	20019 CHAUTAUQUA
20021 CHEROKEE	20023 CHEYENNE
20025 CLARK	20027 CLAY
20029 CLOUD	20031 COFFEY
20033 COMANCHE	20035 COWLEY
20037 CRAWFORD	20039 DECATUR
20041 DICKINSON	20043 DONIPHAN
20045 DOUGLAS	20047 EDWARDS
20049 ELK	20051 ELLIS
20053 ELLSWORTH	20055 FINNEY
20057 FORD	20059 FRANKLIN
20061 GEARY	20063 GOVE
20065 GRAHAM	20067 GRANT
20069 GRAY	20071 GREELEY
20073 GREENWOOD	20075 HAMILTON
20077 HARPER	20079 HARVEY
20081 HASKELL	20083 HODGEMAN
20085 JACKSON	20087 JEFFERSON
20089 JEWELL	20091 JOHNSON
20093 KEARNY	20095 KINGMAN
20097 KIOWA	20099 LABETTE
20101 LANE	20103 LEAVENWORTH
20105 LINCOLN	20107 LINN
20109 LOGAN	20111 LYON
20113 MC PHERSON	20115 MARION
20117 MARSHALL	20119 MEADE
20121 MIAMI	20123 MITCHELL
20125 MONTGOMERY	20127 MORRIS
20129 MORTON	20131 NEMAHA
20133 NEOSHO	20135 NESS
20137 NORTON	20139 OSAGE
20141 OSBORNE	20143 OTTAWA
20145 PAWNEE	20147 PHILLIPS
20149 POTTAWATOMIE	20151 PRATT
20153 RAWLINS	20155 RENO
20157 REPUBLIC	20159 RICE

20161 RILEY   20163 ROOKS
20165 RUSH   20167 RUSSELL
20169 SALINE   20171 SCOTT
20173 SEDGWICK   20175 SEWARD
20177 SHAWNEE   20179 SHERIDAN
20181 SHERMAN   20183 SMITH
20185 STAFFORD   20187 STANTON
20189 STEVENS   20191 SUMNER
20193 THOMAS   20195 TREGO
20197 WABAUNSEE   20199 WALLACE
20201 WASHINGTON   20203 WICHITA
20205 WILSON   20207 WOODSON
20209 WYANDOTTE

21   KENTUCKY FIPS COUNTY CODES

....
                    21001 ADAIR
21003 ALLEN   21005 ANDERSON
21007 BALLARD   21009 BARREN
21011 BATH   21013 BELL
21015 BOONE   21017 BOURBON
21019 BOYD   21021 BOYLE
21023 BRACKEN   21025 BREATHITT
21027 BRECKINRIDGE   21029 BULLITT
21031 BUTLER   21033 CALDWELL
21035 CALLOWAY   21037 CAMPBELL
21039 CARLISLE   21041 CARROLL
21043 CARTER   21045 CASEY
21047 CHRISTIAN   21049 CLARK
21051 CLAY   21053 CLINTON
21055 CRITTENDEN   21057 CUMBERLAND
21059 DAVIESS   21061 EDMONSON
21063 ELLIOTT   21065 ESTILL
21067 FAYETTE   21069 FLEMING
21071 FLOYD   21073 FRANKLIN
21075 FULTON   21077 GALLATIN
21079 GARRARD   21081 GRANT
21083 GRAVES   21085 GRAYSON
21087 GREEN   21089 GREENUP
21091 HANCOCK   21093 HARDIN
21095 HARLAN   21097 HARRISON
21099 HART   21101 HENDERSON
21103 HENRY   21105 HICKMAN
21107 HOPKINS   21109 JACKSON
21111 JEFFERSON   21113 JESSAMINE
21115 JOHNSON   21117 KENTON
21119 KNOTT   21121 KNOX
21123 LARUE   21125 LAUREL
21127 LAWRENCE   21129 LEE
21131 LESLIE   21133 LETCHER
21135 LEWIS   21137 LINCOLN
21139 LIVINGSTON   21141 LOGAN
21143 LYON   21145 MC CRACKEN
21147 MC CREARY   21149 MC LEAN

21151 MADISON   21153 MAGOFFIN
21155 MARION   21157 MARSHALL
21159 MARTIN   21161 MASON
21163 MEADE   21165 MENIFEE
21167 MERCER   21169 METCALFE
21171 MONROE   21173 MONTGOMERY
21175 MORGAN   21177 MUHLENBERG
21179 NELSON   21181 NICHOLAS
21183 OHIO   21185 OLDHAM
21187 OWEN   21189 OWSLEY
21191 PENDLETON   21193 PERRY
21195 PIKE   21197 POWELL
21199 PULASKI   21201 ROBERTSON
21203 ROCKCASTLE   21205 ROWAN
21207 RUSSELL   21209 SCOTT
21211 SHELBY   21213 SIMPSON
21215 SPENCER   21217 TAYLOR
21219 TODD   21221 TRIGG
21223 TRIMBLE   21225 UNION
21227 WARREN   21229 WASHINGTON
21231 WAYNE   21233 WEBSTER
21235 WHITLEY   21237 WOLFE
21239 WOODFORD

22   LOUISIANA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                    22001 ACADIA
22003 ALLEN   22005 ASCENSION
22007 ASSUMPTION   22009 AVOYELLES
22011 BEAUREGARD   22013 BIENVILLE
22015 BOSSIER   22017 CADDO
22019 CALCASIEU   22021 CALDWELL
22023 CAMERON   22025 CATAHOULA
22027 CLAIBORNE   22029 CONCORDIA
22031 DE SOTO   22033 EAST BATON ROUGE
22035 EAST CARROLL   22037 EAST FELICIANA
22039 EVANGELINE   22041 FRANKLIN
22043 GRANT   22045 IBERIA
22047 IBERVILLE   22049 JACKSON
22051 JEFFERSON   22053 JEFFERSON DAVIS
22055 LAFAYETTE   22057 LAFOURCHE
22059 LA SALLE   22061 LINCOLN
22063 LIVINGSTON   22065 MADISON
22067 MOREHOUSE   22069 NATCHITOCHES
22071 ORLEANS   22073 OUACHITA
22075 PLAQUEMINES   22077 POINTE COUPEE
22079 RAPIDES   22081 RED RIVER
22083 RICHLAND   22085 SABINE
22087 ST BERNARD   22089 ST CHARLES
22091 ST HELENA   22093 ST JAMES
22095 ST JOHN THE BAPTIST   22097 ST LANDRY
22099 ST MARTIN   22101 ST MARY
22103 ST TAMMANY   22105 TANGIPAHOA
22107 TENSAS   22109 TERREBONNE

22111 UNION   22113 VERMILION
22115 VERNON   22117 WASHINGTON
22119 WEBSTER   22121 WEST BATON ROUGE
22123 WEST CARROLL   22125 WEST FELICIANA
22127 WINN

23   MAINE FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

            23001 ANDROSCOGGIN
23003 AROOSTOOK   23005 CUMBERLAND
23007 FRANKLIN   23009 HANCOCK
23011 KENNEBEC   23013 KNOX
23015 LINCOLN   23017 OXFORD
23019 PENOBSCOT   23021 PISCATAQUIS
23023 SAGADAHOC   23025 SOMERSET
23027 WALDO   23029 WASHINGTON
23031 YORK

24   MARYLAND FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

            24001 ALLEGANY
24003 ANNE ARUNDEL   24005 BALTIMORE
24009 CALVERT   24011 CAROLINE
24013 CARROLL   24015 CECIL
24017 CHARLES   24019 DORCHESTER
24021 FREDERICK   24023 GARRETT
24025 HARFORD   24027 HOWARD
24029 KENT   24031 MONTGOMERY
24033 PRINCE GEORGES   24035 QUEEN ANNES
24037 ST MARYS   24039 SOMERSET
24041 TALBOT   24043 WASHINGTON
24045 WICOMICO   24047 WORCESTER
24510 BALTIMORE CITY

25   MASSACHUSETTS FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

            25001 BARNSTABLE
25003 BERKSHIRE   25005 BRISTOL
25007 DUKES   25009 ESSEX
25011 FRANKLIN   25013 HAMPDEN
25015 HAMPSHIRE   25017 MIDDLESEX
25019 NANTUCKET   25021 NORFOLK
25023 PLYMOUTH   25025 SUFFOLK
25027 WORCESTER

26   MICHIGAN FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

            26001 ALCONA
26003 ALGER   26005 ALLEGAN
26007 ALPENA   26009 ANTRIM
26011 ARENAC   26013 BARAGA
26015 BARRY   26017 BAY
26019 BENZIE   26021 BERRIEN
26023 BRANCH   26025 CALHOUN

26027 CASS	26029 CHARLEVOIX
26031 CHEBOYGAN	26033 CHIPPEWA
26035 CLARE	26037 CLINTON
26039 CRAWFORD	26041 DELTA
26043 DICKINSON	26045 EATON
26047 EMMET	26049 GENESEE
26051 GLADWIN	26053 GOGEBIC
26055 GRAND TRAVERSE	26057 GRATIOT
26059 HILLSDALE	26061 HOUGHTON
26063 HURON	26065 INGHAM
26067 IONIA	26069 IOSCO
26071 IRON	26073 ISABELLA
26075 JACKSON	26077 KALAMAZOO
26079 KALKASKA	26081 KENT
26083 KEWEENAW	26085 LAKE
26087 LAPEER	26089 LEELANAU
26091 LENAWEE	26093 LIVINGSTON
26095 LUCE	26097 MACKINAC
26099 MACOMB	26101 MANISTEE
26103 MARQUETTE	26105 MASON
26107 MECOSTA	26109 MENOMINEE
26111 MIDLAND	26113 MISSAUKEE
26115 MONROE	26117 MONTCALM
26119 MONTMORENCY	26121 MUSKEGON
26123 NEWAYGO	26125 OAKLAND
26127 OCEANA	26129 OGEMAW
26131 ONTONAGON	26133 OSCEOLA
26135 OSCODA	26137 OTSEGO
26139 OTTAWA	26141 PRESQUE ISLE
26143 ROSCOMMON	26145 SAGINAW
26147 ST CLAIR	26149 ST JOSEPH
26151 SANILAC	26153 SCHOOLCRAFT
26155 SHIAWASSEE	26157 TUSCOLA
26159 VAN BUREN	26161 WASHTENAW
26163 WAYNE	26165 WEXFORD

27   MINNESOTA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

	27001 AITKIN
27003 ANOKA	27005 BECKER
27007 BELTRAMI	27009 BENTON
27011 BIG STONE	27013 BLUE EARTH
27015 BROWN	27017 CARLTON
27019 CARVER	27021 CASS
27023 CHIPPEWA	27025 CHISAGO
27027 CLAY	27029 CLEARWATER
27031 COOK	27033 COTTONWOOD
27035 CROW WING	27037 DAKOTA
27039 DODGE	27041 DOUGLAS
27043 FARIBAULT	27045 FILLMORE
27047 FREEBORN	27049 GOODHUE
27051 GRANT	27053 HENNEPIN
27055 HOUSTON	27057 HUBBARD
27059 ISANTI	27061 ITASCA

27063 JACKSON	27065 KANABEC
27067 KANDIYOHI	27069 KITTSON
27071 KOOCHICHING	27073 LAC QUI PARLE
27075 LAKE	27077 LAKE OF THE WOODS
27079 LE SUEUR	27081 LINCOLN
27083 LYON	27085 MC LEOD
27087 MAHNOMEN	27089 MARSHALL
27091 MARTIN	27093 MEEKER
27095 MILLE LACS	27097 MORRISON
27099 MOWER	27101 MURRAY
27103 NICOLLET	27105 NOBLES
27107 NORMAN	27109 OLMSTED
27111 OTTER TAIL	27113 PENNINGTON
27115 PINE	27117 PIPESTONE
27119 POLK	27121 POPE
27123 RAMSEY	27125 RED LAKE
27127 REDWOOD	27129 RENVILLE
27131 RICE	27133 ROCK
27135 ROSEAU	27137 ST LOUIS
27139 SCOTT	27141 SHERBURNE
27143 SIBLEY	27145 STEARNS
27147 STEELE	27149 STEVENS
27151 SWIFT	27153 TODD
27155 TRAVERSE	27157 WABASHA
27159 WADENA	27161 WASECA
27163 WASHINGTON	27165 WATONWAN
27167 WILKIN	27169 WINONA
27171 WRIGHT	27173 YELLOW MEDICINE

28   MISSISSIPPI FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

28001 ADAMS	28003 ALCORN
28005 AMITE	28007 ATTALA
28009 BENTON	28011 BOLIVAR
28013 CALHOUN	28015 CARROLL
28017 CHICKASAW	28019 CHOCTAW
28021 CLAIBORNE	28023 CLARKE
28025 CLAY	28027 COAHOMA
28029 COPIAH	28031 COVINGTON
28033 DE SOTO	28035 FORREST
28037 FRANKLIN	28039 GEORGE
28041 GREENE	28043 GRENADA
28045 HANCOCK	28047 HARRISON
28049 HINDS	28051 HOLMES
28053 HUMPHREYS	28055 ISSAQUENA
28057 ITAWAMBA	28059 JACKSON
28061 JASPER	28063 JEFFERSON
28065 JEFFERSON DAVIS	28067 JONES
28069 KEMPER	28071 LAFAYETTE
28073 LAMAR	28075 LAUDERDALE
28077 LAWRENCE	28079 LEAKE
28081 LEE	28083 LEFLORE
28085 LINCOLN	28087 LOWNDES

28089 MADISON	28091 MARION
28093 MARSHALL	28095 MONROE
28097 MONTGOMERY	28099 NESHOBA
28101 NEWTON	28103 NOXUBEE
28105 OKTIBBEHA	28107 PANOLA
28109 PEARL RIVER	28111 PERRY
28113 PIKE	28115 PONTOTOC
28117 PRENTISS	28119 QUITMAN
28121 RANKIN	28123 SCOTT
28125 SHARKEY	28127 SIMPSON
28129 SMITH	28131 STONE
28133 SUNFLOWER	28135 TALLAHATCHIE
28137 TATE	28139 TIPPAH
28141 TISHOMINGO	28143 TUNICA
28145 UNION	28147 WALTHALL
28149 WARREN	28151 WASHINGTON
28153 WAYNE	28155 WEBSTER
28157 WILKINSON	28159 WINSTON
28161 YALOBUSHA	28163 YAZOO

29   MISSOURI FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

29001 ADAIR	29003 ANDREW
29005 ATCHISON	29007 AUDRAIN
29009 BARRY	29011 BARTON
29013 BATES	29015 BENTON
29017 BOLLINGER	29019 BOONE
29021 BUCHANAN	29023 BUTLER
29025 CALDWELL	29027 CALLAWAY
29029 CAMDEN	29031 CAPE GIRARDEAU
29033 CARROLL	29035 CARTER
29037 CASS	29039 CEDAR
29041 CHARITON	29043 CHRISTIAN
29045 CLARK	29047 CLAY
29049 CLINTON	29051 COLE
29053 COOPER	29055 CRAWFORD
29057 DADE	29059 DALLAS
29061 DAVIESS	29063 DE KALB
29065 DENT	29067 DOUGLAS
29069 DUNKLIN	29071 FRANKLIN
29073 GASCONADE	29075 GENTRY
29077 GREENE	29079 GRUNDY
29081 HARRISON	29083 HENRY
29085 HICKORY	29087 HOLT
29089 HOWARD	29091 HOWELL
29093 IRON	29095 JACKSON
29097 JASPER	29099 JEFFERSON
29101 JOHNSON	29103 KNOX
29105 LACLEDE	29107 LAFAYETTE
29109 LAWRENCE	29111 LEWIS
29113 LINCOLN	29115 LINN
29117 LIVINGSTON	29119 MC DONALD
29121 MACON	29123 MADISON

29125 MARIES   29127 MARION
29129 MERCER   29131 MILLER
29133 MISSISSIPPI   29135 MONITEAU
29139 MONTGOMERY   29141 MORGAN
29143 NEW MADRID   29145 NEWTON
29147 NODAWAY   29149 OREGON
29151 OSAGE   29153 OZARK
29155 PEMISCOT   29157 PERRY
29159 PETTIS   29161 PHELPS
29163 PIKE   29165 PLATTE
29167 POLK   29169 PULASKI
29171 PUTNAM   29173 RALLS
29175 RANDOLPH   29177 RAY
29179 REYNOLDS   29181 RIPLEY
29183 ST CHARLES   29185 ST CLAIR
29187 ST FRANCOIS   29189 ST LOUIS
29193 STE GENEVIEVE   29195 SALINE
29197 SCHUYLER   29199 SCOTLAND
29201 SCOTT   29203 SHANNON
29205 SHELBY   29207 STODDARD
29209 STONE   29211 SULLIVAN
29213 TANEY   29215 TEXAS
29217 VERNON   29219 WARREN
29221 WASHINGTON   29223 WAYNE
29225 WEBSTER   29227 WORTH
29229 WRIGHT   29510 ST LOUIS CITY

30   MONTANA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

30001 BEAVERHEAD   30003 BIG HORN
30005 BLAINE   30007 BROADWATER
30009 CARBON   30011 CARTER
30013 CASCADE   30015 CHOUTEAU
30017 CUSTER   30019 DANIELS
30021 DAWSON   30023 DEER LODGE
30025 FALLON   30027 FERGUS
30029 FLATHEAD   30031 GALLATIN
30033 GARFIELD   30035 GLACIER
30037 GOLDEN VALLEY   30039 GRANITE
30041 HILL   30043 JEFFERSON
30045 JUDITH BASIN   30047 LAKE
30049 LEWIS AND CLARK   30051 LIBERTY
30053 LINCOLN   30055 MC CONE
30057 MADISON   30059 MEAGHER
30061 MINERAL   30063 MISSOULA
30065 MUSSELSHELL   30067 PARK
30069 PETROLEUM   30071 PHILLIPS
30073 PONDERA   30075 POWDER RIVER
30077 POWELL   30079 PRAIRIE
30081 RAVALLI   30083 RICHLAND
30085 ROOSEVELT   30087 ROSEBUD
30089 SANDERS   30091 SHERIDAN
30093 SILVER BOW   30095 STILLWATER

30097 SWEET GRASS   30099 TETON
30101 TOOLE   30103 TREASURE
30105 VALLEY   30107 WHEATLAND
30109 WIBAUX   30111 YELLOWSTONE
30113 YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

31   NEBRASKA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

31001 ADAMS

31003 ANTELOPE	31005 ARTHUR
31007 BANNER	31009 BLAINE
31011 BOONE	31013 BOX BUTTE
31015 BOYD	31017 BROWN
31019 BUFFALO	31021 BURT
31023 BUTLER	31025 CASS
31027 CEDAR	31029 CHASE
31031 CHERRY	31033 CHEYENNE
31035 CLAY	31037 COLFAX
31039 CUMING	31041 CUSTER
31043 DAKOTA	31045 DAWES
31047 DAWSON	31049 DEUEL
31051 DIXON	31053 DODGE
31055 DOUGLAS	31057 DUNDY
31059 FILLMORE	31061 FRANKLIN
31063 FRONTIER	31065 FURNAS
31067 GAGE	31069 GARDEN
31071 GARFIELD	31073 GOSPER
31075 GRANT	31077 GREELEY
31079 HALL	31081 HAMILTON
31083 HARLAN	31085 HAYES
31087 HITCHCOCK	31089 HOLT
31091 HOOKER	31093 HOWARD
31095 JEFFERSON	31097 JOHNSON
31099 KEARNEY	31101 KEITH
31103 KEYA PAHA	31105 KIMBALL
31107 KNOX	31109 LANCASTER
31111 LINCOLN	31113 LOGAN
31115 LOUP	31117 MC PHERSON
31119 MADISON	31121 MERRICK
31123 MORRILL	31125 NANCE
31127 NEMAHA	31129 NUCKOLLS
31131 OTOE	31133 PAWNEE
31135 PERKINS	31137 PHELPS
31139 PIERCE	31141 PLATTE
31143 POLK	31145 RED WILLOW
31147 RICHARDSON	31149 ROCK
31151 SALINE	31153 SARPY
31155 SAUNDERS	31157 SCOTTS BLUFF
31159 SEWARD	31161 SHERIDAN
31163 SHERMAN	31165 SIOUX
31167 STANTON	31169 THAYER
31171 THOMAS	31173 THURSTON
31175 VALLEY	31177 WASHINGTON
31179 WAYNE	31181 WEBSTER

31183 WHEELER   31185 YORK

32   NEVADA
....

32001 CHURCHILL   32003 CLARK
32005 DOUGLAS   32007 ELKO
32009 ESMERALDA   32011 EUREKA
32013 HUMBOLDT   32015 LANDER
32017 LINCOLN   32019 LYON
32021 MINERAL   32023 NYE
32027 PERSHING   32029 STOREY
32031 WASHOE   32033 WHITE PINE
32510 CARSON CITY

33   NEW HAMPSHIRE FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                        33001 BELKNAP
33003 CARROLL   33005 CHESHIRE
33007 COOS   33009 GRAFTON
33011 HILLSBOROUGH   33013 MERRIMACK
33015 ROCKINGHAM   33017 STRAFFORD
33019 SULLIVAN

34   NEW JERSEY FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                        34001 ATLANTIC
34003 BERGEN   34005 BURLINGTON
34007 CAMDEN   34009 CAPE MAY
34011 CUMBERLAND   34013 ESSEX
34015 GLOUCESTER   34017 HUDSON
34019 HUNTERDON   34021 MERCER
34023 MIDDLESEX   34025 MONMOUTH
34027 MORRIS   34029 OCEAN
34031 PASSAIC   34033 SALEM
34035 SOMERSET   34037 SUSSEX
34039 UNION   34041 WARREN

35   NEW MEXICO FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                        35001 BERNALILLO
35003 CATRON   35005 CHAVES
35007 COLFAX   35009 CURRY
35011 DE BACA   35013 DONA ANA
35015 EDDY   35017 GRANT
35019 GUADALUPE   35021 HARDING
35023 HIDALGO   35025 LEA
35027 LINCOLN   35028 LOS ALAMOS
35029 LUNA   35031 MC KINLEY
35033 MORA   35035 OTERO
35037 QUAY   35039 RIO ARRIBA
35041 ROOSEVELT   35043 SANDOVAL
35045 SAN JUAN   35047 SAN MIGUEL
35049 SANTA FE   35051 SIERRA

35053 SOCORRO   35055 TAOS
35057 TORRANCE   35059 UNION
35061 VALENCIA

36   NEW YORK FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

                   36001 ALBANY
36003 ALLEGANY   36005 BRONX
36007 BROOME   36009 CATTARAUGUS
36011 CAYUGA   36013 CHAUTAUQUA
36015 CHEMUNG   36017 CHENANGO
36019 CLINTON   36021 COLUMBIA
36023 CORTLAND   36025 DELAWARE
36027 DUTCHESS   36029 ERIE
36031 ESSEX   36033 FRANKLIN
36035 FULTON   36037 GENESEE
36039 GREENE   36041 HAMILTON
36043 HERKIMER   36045 JEFFERSON
36047 KINGS   36049 LEWIS
36051 LIVINGSTON   36053 MADISON
36055 MONROE   36057 MONTGOMERY
36059 NASSAU   36061 NEW YORK
36063 NIAGARA   36065 ONEIDA
36067 ONONDAGA   36069 ONTARIO
36071 ORANGE   36073 ORLEANS
36075 OSWEGO   36077 OTSEGO
36079 PUTNAM   36081 QUEENS
36083 RENSSELAER   36085 RICHMOND
36087 ROCKLAND   36089 ST LAWRENCE
36091 SARATOGA   36093 SCHENECTADY
36095 SCHOHARIE   36097 SCHUYLER
36099 SENECA   36101 STEUBEN
36103 SUFFOLK   36105 SULLIVAN
36107 TIOGA   36109 TOMPKINS
36111 ULSTER   36113 WARREN
36115 WASHINGTON   36117 WAYNE
36119 WESTCHESTER   36121 WYOMING
36123 YATES

37   NORTH CAROLINA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

                   37001 ALAMANCE
37003 ALEXANDER   37005 ALLEGHANY
37007 ANSON   37009 ASHE
37011 AVERY   37013 BEAUFORT
37015 BERTIE   37017 BLADEN
37019 BRUNSWICK   37021 BUNCOMBE
37023 BURKE   37025 CABARRUS
37027 CALDWELL   37029 CAMDEN
37031 CARTERET   37033 CASWELL
37035 CATAWBA   37037 CHATHAM
37039 CHEROKEE   37041 CHOWAN
37043 CLAY   37045 CLEVELAND
37047 COLUMBUS   37049 CRAVEN

37051 CUMBERLAND   37053 CURRITUCK
37055 DARE   37057 DAVIDSON
37059 DAVIE   37061 DUPLIN
37063 DURHAM   37065 EDGECOMBE
37067 FORSYTH   37069 FRANKLIN
37071 GASTON   37073 GATES
37075 GRAHAM   37077 GRANVILLE
37079 GREENE   37081 GUILFORD
37083 HALIFAX   37085 HARNETT
37087 HAYWOOD   37089 HENDERSON
37091 HERTFORD   37093 HOKE
37095 HYDE   37097 IREDELL
37099 JACKSON   37101 JOHNSTON
37103 JONES   37105 LEE
37107 LENOIR   37109 LINCOLN
37111 MC DOWELL   37113 MACON
37115 MADISON   37117 MARTIN
37119 MECKLENBURG   37121 MITCHELL
37123 MONTGOMERY   37125 MOORE
37127 NASH   37129 NEW HANOVER
37131 NORTHAMPTON   37133 ONSLOW
37135 ORANGE   37137 PAMLICO
37139 PASQUOTANK   37141 PENDER
37143 PERQUIMANS   37145 PERSON
37147 PITT   37149 POLK
37151 RANDOLPH   37153 RICHMOND
37155 ROBESON   37157 ROCKINGHAM
37159 ROWAN   37161 RUTHERFORD
37163 SAMPSON   37165 SCOTLAND
37167 STANLY   37169 STOKES
37171 SURRY   37173 SWAIN
37175 TRANSYLVANIA   37177 TYRRELL
37179 UNION   37181 VANCE
37183 WAKE   37185 WARREN
37187 WASHINGTON   37189 WATAUGA
37191 WAYNE   37193 WILKES
37195 WILSON   37197 YADKIN
37199 YANCEY

 38   NORTH DAKOTA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                38001 ADAMS
38003 BARNES   38005 BENSON
38007 BILLINGS   38009 BOTTINEAU
38011 BOWMAN   38013 BURKE
38015 BURLEIGH   38017 CASS
38019 CAVALIER   38021 DICKEY
38023 DIVIDE   38025 DUNN
38027 EDDY   38029 EMMONS
38031 FOSTER   38033 GOLDEN VALLEY
38035 GRAND FORKS   38037 GRANT
38039 GRIGGS   38041 HETTINGER
38043 KIDDER   38045 LA MOURE
38047 LOGAN   38049 MC HENRY

38051 MC INTOSH   38053 MC KENZIE
38055 MC LEAN   38057 MERCER
38059 MORTON   38061 MOUNTRAIL
38063 NELSON   38065 OLIVER
38067 PEMBINA   38069 PIERCE
38071 RAMSEY   38073 RANSOM
38075 RENVILLE   38077 RICHLAND
38079 ROLETTE   38081 SARGENT
38083 SHERIDAN   38085 SIOUX
38087 SLOPE   38089 STARK
38091 STEELE   38093 STUTSMAN
38095 TOWNER   38097 TRAILL
38099 WALSH   38101 WARD
38103 WELLS   38105 WILLIAMS

39   OHIO FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

39001 ADAMS
39003 ALLEN   39005 ASHLAND
39007 ASHTABULA   39009 ATHENS
39011 AUGLAIZE   39013 BELMONT
39015 BROWN   39017 BUTLER
39019 CARROLL   39021 CHAMPAIGN
39023 CLARK   39025 CLERMONT
39027 CLINTON   39029 COLUMBIANA
39031 COSHOCTON   39033 CRAWFORD
39035 CUYAHOGA   39037 DARKE
39039 DEFIANCE   39041 DELAWARE
39043 ERIE   39045 FAIRFIELD
39047 FAYETTE   39049 FRANKLIN
39051 FULTON   39053 GALLIA
39055 GEAUGA   39057 GREENE
39059 GUERNSEY   39061 HAMILTON
39063 HANCOCK   39065 HARDIN
39067 HARRISON   39069 HENRY
39071 HIGHLAND   39073 HOCKING
39075 HOLMES   39077 HURON
39079 JACKSON   39081 JEFFERSON
39083 KNOX   39085 LAKE
39087 LAWRENCE   39089 LICKING
39091 LOGAN   39093 LORAIN
39095 LUCAS   39097 MADISON
39099 MAHONING   39101 MARION
39103 MEDINA   39105 MEIGS
39107 MERCER   39109 MIAMI
39111 MONROE   39113 MONTGOMERY
39115 MORGAN   39117 MORROW
39119 MUSKINGUM   39121 NOBLE
39123 OTTAWA   39125 PAULDING
39127 PERRY   39129 PICKAWAY
39131 PIKE   39133 PORTAGE
39135 PREBLE   39137 PUTNAM
39139 RICHLAND   39141 ROSS

39143 SANDUSKY	39145 SCIOTO
39147 SENECA	39149 SHELBY
39151 STARK	39153 SUMMIT
39155 TRUMBULL	39157 TUSCARAWAS
39159 UNION	39161 VAN WERT
39163 VINTON	39165 WARREN
39167 WASHINGTON	39169 WAYNE
39171 WILLIAMS	39173 WOOD
39175 WYANDOT	

40   OKLAHOMA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

	40001 ADAIR
40003 ALFALFA	40005 ATOKA
40007 BEAVER	40009 BECKHAM
40011 BLAINE	40013 BRYAN
40015 CADDO	40017 CANADIAN
40019 CARTER	40021 CHEROKEE
40023 CHOCTAW	40025 CIMARRON
40027 CLEVELAND	40029 COAL
40031 COMANCHE	40033 COTTON
40035 CRAIG	40037 CREEK
40039 CUSTER	40041 DELAWARE
40043 DEWEY	40045 ELLIS
40047 GARFIELD	40049 GARVIN
40051 GRADY	40053 GRANT
40055 GREER	40057 HARMON
40059 HARPER	40061 HASKELL
40063 HUGHES	40065 JACKSON
40067 JEFFERSON	40069 JOHNSTON
40071 KAY	40073 KINGFISHER
40075 KIOWA	40077 LATIMER
40079 LE FLORE	40081 LINCOLN
40083 LOGAN	40085 LOVE
40087 MC CLAIN	40089 MC CURTAIN
40091 MC INTOSH	40093 MAJOR
40095 MARSHALL	40097 MAYES
40099 MURRAY	40101 MUSKOGEE
40103 NOBLE	40105 NOWATA
40107 OKFUSKEE	40109 OKLAHOMA
40111 OKMULGEE	40113 OSAGE
40115 OTTAWA	40117 PAWNEE
40119 PAYNE	40121 PITTSBURG
40123 PONTOTOC	40125 POTTAWATOMIE
40127 PUSHMATAHA	40129 ROGER MILLS
40131 ROGERS	40133 SEMINOLE
40135 SEQUOYAH	40137 STEPHENS
40139 TEXAS	40141 TILLMAN
40143 TULSA	40145 WAGONER
40147 WASHINGTON	40149 WASHITA
40151 WOODS	40153 WOODWARD

41   OREGON FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

41001 BAKER	41003 BENTON
41005 CLACKAMAS	41007 CLATSOP
41009 COLUMBIA	41011 COOS
41013 CROOK	41015 CURRY
41017 DESCHUTES	41019 DOUGLAS
41021 GILLIAM	41023 GRANT
41025 HARNEY	41027 HOOD RIVER
41029 JACKSON	41031 JEFFERSON
41033 JOSEPHINE	41035 KLAMATH
41037 LAKE	41039 LANE
41041 LINCOLN	41043 LINN
41045 MALHEUR	41047 MARION
41049 MORROW	41051 MULTNOMAH
41053 POLK	41055 SHERMAN
41057 TILLAMOOK	41059 UMATILLA
41061 UNION	41063 WALLOWA
41065 WASCO	41067 WASHINGTON
41069 WHEELER	41071 YAMHILL

42   PENNSYLVANIA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

	42001 ADAMS
42003 ALLEGHENY	42005 ARMSTRONG
42007 BEAVER	42009 BEDFORD
42011 BERKS	42013 BLAIR
42015 BRADFORD	42017 BUCKS
42019 BUTLER	42021 CAMBRIA
42023 CAMERON	42025 CARBON
42027 CENTRE	42029 CHESTER
42031 CLARION	42033 CLEARFIELD
42035 CLINTON	42037 COLUMBIA
42039 CRAWFORD	42041 CUMBERLAND
42043 DAUPHIN	42045 DELAWARE
42047 ELK	42049 ERIE
42051 FAYETTE	42053 FOREST
42055 FRANKLIN	42057 FULTON
42059 GREENE	42061 HUNTINGDON
42063 INDIANA	42065 JEFFERSON
42067 JUNIATA	42069 LACKAWANNA
42071 LANCASTER	42073 LAWRENCE
42075 LEBANON	42077 LEHIGH
42079 LUZERNE	42081 LYCOMING
42083 MC KEAN	42085 MERCER
42087 MIFFLIN	42089 MONROE
42091 MONTGOMERY	42093 MONTOUR
42095 NORTHAMPTON	42097 NORTHUMBERLAND
42099 PERRY	42101 PHILADELPHIA
42103 PIKE	42105 POTTER
42107 SCHUYLKILL	42109 SNYDER
42111 SOMERSET	42113 SULLIVAN
42115 SUSQUEHANNA	42117 TIOGA
42119 UNION	42121 VENANGO
42123 WARREN	42125 WASHINGTON

42127 WAYNE   42129 WESTMORELAND
42131 WYOMING   42133 YORK

44   RHODE ISLAND FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

44001 BRISTOL   44003 KENT
44005 NEWPORT   44007 PROVIDENCE
44009 WASHINGTON

45   SOUTH CAROLINA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                     45001 ABBEVILLE
45003 AIKEN   45005 ALLENDALE
45007 ANDERSON   45009 BAMBERG
45011 BARNWELL   45013 BEAUFORT
45015 BERKELEY   45017 CALHOUN
45019 CHARLESTON   45021 CHEROKEE
45023 CHESTER   45025 CHESTERFIELD
45027 CLARENDON   45029 COLLETON
45031 DARLINGTON   45033 DILLON
45035 DORCHESTER   45037 EDGEFIELD
45039 FAIRFIELD   45041 FLORENCE
45043 GEORGETOWN   45045 GREENVILLE
45047 GREENWOOD   45049 HAMPTON
45051 HORRY   45053 JASPER
45055 KERSHAW   45057 LANCASTER
45059 LAURENS   45061 LEE
45063 LEXINGTON   45065 MCCORMICK
45067 MARION   45069 MARLBORO
45071 NEWBERRY   45073 OCONEE
45075 ORANGEBURG   45077 PICKENS
45079 RICHLAND   45081 SALUDA
45083 SPARTANBURG   45085 SUMTER
45087 UNION   45089 WILLIAMSBURG
45091 YORK

46   SOUTH DAKOTA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....
                     46003 AURORA
46005 BEADLE   46007 BENNETT
46009 BON HOMME   46011 BROOKINGS
46013 BROWN   46015 BRULE
46017 BUFFALO   46019 BUTTE
46021 CAMPBELL   46023 CHARLES MIX
46025 CLARK   46027 CLAY
46029 CODINGTON   46031 CORSON
46033 CUSTER   46035 DAVISON
46037 DAY   46039 DEUEL
46041 DEWEY   46043 DOUGLAS
46045 EDMUNDS   46047 FALL RIVER
46049 FAULK   46051 GRANT
46053 GREGORY   46055 HAAKON
46057 HAMLIN   46059 HAND

46061 HANSON	46063 HARDING
46065 HUGHES	46067 HUTCHINSON
46069 HYDE	46071 JACKSON
46073 JERAULD	46075 JONES
46077 KINGSBURY	46079 LAKE
46081 LAWRENCE	46083 LINCOLN
46085 LYMAN	46087 MC COOK
46089 MC PHERSON	46091 MARSHALL
46093 MEADE	46095 MELLETTE
46097 MINER	46099 MINNEHAHA
46101 MOODY	46103 PENNINGTON
46105 PERKINS	46107 POTTER
46109 ROBERTS	46111 SANBORN
46113 SHANNON	46115 SPINK
46117 STANLEY	46119 SULLY
46121 TODD	46123 TRIPP
46125 TURNER	46127 UNION
46129 WALWORTH	46131 WASHABAUGH
46135 YANKTON	46137 ZIEBACH

47 TENNESSEE FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

47001 ANDERSON	47003 BEDFORD
47005 BENTON	47007 BLEDSOE
47009 BLOUNT	47011 BRADLEY
47013 CAMPBELL	47015 CANNON
47017 CARROLL	47019 CARTER
47021 CHEATHAM	47023 CHESTER
47025 CLAIBORNE	47027 CLAY
47029 COCKE	47031 COFFEE
47033 CROCKETT	47035 CUMBERLAND
47037 DAVIDSON	47039 DECATUR
47041 DE KALB	47043 DICKSON
47045 DYER	47047 FAYETTE
47049 FENTRESS	47051 FRANKLIN
47053 GIBSON	47055 GILES
47057 GRAINGER	47059 GREENE
47061 GRUNDY	47063 HAMBLEN
47065 HAMILTON	47067 HANCOCK
47069 HARDEMAN	47071 HARDIN
47073 HAWKINS	47075 HAYWOOD
47077 HENDERSON	47079 HENRY
47081 HICKMAN	47083 HOUSTON
47085 HUMPHREYS	47087 JACKSON
47089 JEFFERSON	47091 JOHNSON
47093 KNOX	47095 LAKE
47097 LAUDERDALE	47099 LAWRENCE
47101 LEWIS	47103 LINCOLN
47105 LOUDON	47107 MC MINN
47109 MC NAIRY	47111 MACON
47113 MADISON	47115 MARION
47117 MARSHALL	47119 MAURY
47121 MEIGS	47123 MONROE

47125 MONTGOMERY	47127 MOORE
47129 MORGAN	47131 OBION
47133 OVERTON	47135 PERRY
47137 PICKETT	47139 POLK
47141 PUTNAM	47143 RHEA
47145 ROANE	47147 ROBERTSON
47149 RUTHERFORD	47151 SCOTT
47153 SEQUATCHIE	47155 SEVIER
47157 SHELBY	47159 SMITH
47161 STEWART	47163 SULLIVAN
47165 SUMNER	47167 TIPTON
47169 TROUSDALE	47171 UNICOI
47173 UNION	47175 VAN BUREN
47177 WARREN	47179 WASHINGTON
47181 WAYNE	47183 WEAKLEY
47185 WHITE	47187 WILLIAMSON
47189 WILSON	

48   TEXAS FIPS COUNTY CODES

································

48001 ANDERSON

48003 ANDREWS	48005 ANGELINA
48007 ARANSAS	48009 ARCHER
48011 ARMSTRONG	48013 ATASCOSA
48015 AUSTIN	48017 BAILEY
48019 BANDERA	48021 BASTROP
48023 BAYLOR	48025 BEE
48027 BELL	48029 BEXAR
48031 BLANCO	48033 BORDEN
48035 BOSQUE	48037 BOWIE
48039 BRAZORIA	48041 BRAZOS
48043 BREWSTER	48045 BRISCOE
48047 BROOKS	48049 BROWN
48051 BURLESON	48053 BURNET
48055 CALDWELL	48057 CALHOUN
48059 CALLAHAN	48061 CAMERON
48063 CAMP	48065 CARSON
48067 CASS	48069 CASTRO
48071 CHAMBERS	48073 CHEROKEE
48075 CHILDRESS	48077 CLAY
48079 COCHRAN	48081 COKE
48083 COLEMAN	48085 COLLIN
48087 COLLINGSWORTH	48089 COLORADO
48091 COMAL	48093 COMANCHE
48095 CONCHO	48097 COOKE
48099 CORYELL	48101 COTTLE
48103 CRANE	48105 CROCKETT
48107 CROSBY	48109 CULBERSON
48111 DALLAM	48113 DALLAS
48115 DAWSON	48117 DEAF SMITH
48119 DELTA	48121 DENTON
48123 DE WITT	48125 DICKENS
48127 DIMMIT	48129 DONLEY
48131 DUVAL	48133 EASTLAND

48135 ECTOR	48137 EDWARDS
48139 ELLIS	48141 EL PASO
48143 ERATH	48145 FALLS
48147 FANNIN	48149 FAYETTE
48151 FISHER	48153 FLOYD
48155 FOARD	48157 FORT BEND
48159 FRANKLIN	48161 FREESTONE
48163 FRIO	48165 GAINES
48167 GALVESTON	48169 GARZA
48171 GILLESPIE	48173 GLASSCOCK
48175 GOLIAD	48177 GONZALES
48179 GRAY	48181 GRAYSON
48183 GREGG	48185 GRIMES
48187 GUADALUPE	48189 HALE
48191 HALL	48193 HAMILTON
48195 HANSFORD	48197 HARDEMAN
48199 HARDIN	48201 HARRIS
48203 HARRISON	48205 HARTLEY
48207 HASKELL	48209 HAYS
48211 HEMPHILL	48213 HENDERSON
48215 HIDALGO	48217 HILL
48219 HOCKLEY	48221 HOOD
48223 HOPKINS	48225 HOUSTON
48227 HOWARD	48229 HUDSPETH
48231 HUNT	48233 HUTCHINSON
48235 IRION	48237 JACK
48239 JACKSON	48241 JASPER
48243 JEFF DAVIS	48245 JEFFERSON
48247 JIM HOGG	48249 JIM WELLS
48251 JOHNSON	48253 JONES
48255 KARNES	48257 KAUFMAN
48259 KENDALL	48261 KENEDY
48263 KENT	48265 KERR
48267 KIMBLE	48269 KING
48271 KINNEY	48273 KLEBERG
48275 KNOX	48277 LAMAR
48279 LAMB	48281 LAMPASAS
48283 LA SALLE	48285 LAVACA
48287 LEE	48289 LEON
48291 LIBERTY	48293 LIMESTONE
48295 LIPSCOMB	48297 LIVE OAK
48299 LLANO	48301 LOVING
48303 LUBBOCK	48305 LYNN
48307 MC CULLOCH	48309 MC LENNAN
48311 MC MULLEN	48313 MADISON
48315 MARION	48317 MARTIN
48319 MASON	48321 MATAGORDA
48323 MAVERICK	48325 MEDINA
48327 MENARD	48329 MIDLAND
48331 MILAM	48333 MILLS
48335 MITCHELL	48337 MONTAGUE
48339 MONTGOMERY	48341 MOORE
48343 MORRIS	48345 MOTLEY
48347 NACOGDOCHES	48349 NAVARRO

48351 NEWTON	48353 NOLAN
48355 NUECES	48357 OCHILTREE
48359 OLDHAM	48361 ORANGE
48363 PALO PINTO	48365 PANOLA
48367 PARKER	48369 PARMER
48371 PECOS	48373 POLK
48375 POTTER	48377 PRESIDIO
48379 RAINS	48381 RANDALL
48383 REAGAN	48385 REAL
48387 RED RIVER	48389 REEVES
48391 REFUGIO	48393 ROBERTS
48395 ROBERTSON	48397 ROCKWALL
48399 RUNNELS	48401 RUSK
48403 SABINE	48405 SAN AUGUSTINE
48407 SAN JACINTO	48409 SAN PATRICIO
48411 SAN SABA	48413 SCHLEICHER
48415 SCURRY	48417 SHACKELFORD
48419 SHELBY	48421 SHERMAN
48423 SMITH	48425 SOMERVELL
48427 STARR	48429 STEPHENS
48431 STERLING	48433 STONEWALL
48435 SUTTON	48437 SWISHER
48439 TARRANT	48441 TAYLOR
48443 TERRELL	48445 TERRY
48447 THROCKMORTON	48449 TITUS
48451 TOM GREEN	48453 TRAVIS
48455 TRINITY	48457 TYLER
48459 UPSHUR	48461 UPTON
48463 UVALDE	48465 VAL VERDE
48467 VAN ZANDT	48469 VICTORIA
48471 WALKER	48473 WALLER
48475 WARD	48477 WASHINGTON
48479 WEBB	48481 WHARTON
48483 WHEELER	48485 WICHITA
48487 WILBARGER	48489 WILLACY
48491 WILLIAMSON	48493 WILSON
48495 WINKLER	48497 WISE
48499 WOOD	48501 YOAKUM
48503 YOUNG	48505 ZAPATA
48507 ZAVALA	

49   UTAH FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

	49001 BEAVER
49003 BOX ELDER	49005 CACHE
49007 CARBON	49009 DAGGETT
49011 DAVIS	49013 DUCHESNE
49015 EMERY	49017 GARFIELD
49019 GRAND	49021 IRON
49023 JUAB	49025 KANE
49027 MILLARD	49029 MORGAN
49031 PIUTE	49033 RICH
49035 SALT LAKE	49037 SAN JUAN
49039 SANPETE	49041 SEVIER

49043 SUMMIT	49045 TOOELE
49047 UINTAH	49049 UTAH
49051 WASATCH	49053 WASHINGTON
49055 WAYNE	49057 WEBER

50   VERMONT FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

50001 ADDISON	50003 BENNINGTON
50005 CALEDONIA	50007 CHITTENDEN
50009 ESSEX	50011 FRANKLIN
50013 GRAND ISLE	50015 LAMOILLE
50017 ORANGE	50019 ORLEANS
50021 RUTLAND	50023 WASHINGTON
50025 WINDHAM	50027 WINDSOR

51   VIRGINIA FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

51001 ACCOMACK	51003 ALBEMARLE
51005 ALLEGHANY	51007 AMELIA
51009 AMHERST	51011 APPOMATTOX
51013 ARLINGTON	51015 AUGUSTA
51017 BATH	51019 BEDFORD
51021 BLAND	51023 BOTETOURT
51025 BRUNSWICK	51027 BUCHANAN
51029 BUCKINGHAM	51031 CAMPBELL
51033 CAROLINE	51035 CARROLL
51036 CHARLES CITY	51037 CHARLOTTE
51041 CHESTERFIELD	51043 CLARKE
51045 CRAIG	51047 CULPEPER
51049 CUMBERLAND	51051 DICKENSON
51053 DINWIDDIE	51057 ESSEX
51059 FAIRFAX	51061 FAUQUIER
51063 FLOYD	51065 FLUVANNA
51067 FRANKLIN	51069 FREDERICK
51071 GILES	51073 GLOUCESTER
51075 GOOCHLAND	51077 GRAYSON
51079 GREENE	51081 GREENSVILLE
51083 HALIFAX	51085 HANOVER
51087 HENRICO	51089 HENRY
51091 HIGHLAND	51093 ISLE OF WIGHT
51095 JAMES CITY	51097 KING AND QUEEN
51099 KING GEORGE	51101 KING WILLIAM
51103 LANCASTER	51105 LEE
51107 LOUDOUN	51109 LOUISA
51111 LUNENBERG	51113 MADISON
51115 MATHEWS	51117 MECKLENBURG
51119 MIDDLESEX	51121 MONTGOMERY
51123 NANSEMOND	51125 NELSON
51127 NEW KENT	51131 NORTHAMPTON
51133 NORTHUMBERLAND	51135 NOTTOWAY
51137 ORANGE	51139 PAGE
51141 PATRICK	51143 PITTSYLVANIA

51145 POWHATAN	51147 PRINCE EDWARD
51149 PRINCE GEORGE	51153 PRINCE WILLIAM
51155 PULASKI	51157 RAPPAHANNOCK
51159 RICHMOND	51161 ROANOKE
51163 ROCKBRIDGE	51165 ROCKINGHAM
51167 RUSSELL	51169 SCOTT
51171 SHENANDOAH	51173 SMYTH
51175 SOUTHAMPTON	51177 SPOTSYLVANIA
51179 STAFFORD	51181 SURRY
51183 SUSSEX	51185 TAZEWELL
51187 WARREN	51191 WASHINGTON
51193 WESTMORELAND	51195 WISE
51197 WYTHE	51199 YORK
51510 ALEXANDRIA CITY	51515 BEDFORD CITY
51520 BRISTOL CITY	51530 BUENA VISTA CITY
51540 CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY	51550 CHESAPEAKE CITY
51560 CLIFTON FORGE CITY	51570 COLONIAL HEIGHTS CITY
51580 COVINGTON CITY	51590 DANVILLE CITY
51595 EMPORIA CITY	51600 FAIRFAX CITY
51610 FALLS CHURCH CITY	51620 FRANKLIN CITY
51630 FREDERICKSBURG CITY	51640 GALAX CITY
51650 HAMPTON CITY	51660 HARRISONBURG CITY
51670 HOPEWELL CITY	51678 LEXINGTON CITY
51680 LYNCHBURG CITY	51690 MARTINSVILLE CITY
51700 NEWPORT NEWS CITY	51710 NORFOLK CITY
51720 NORTON CITY	51730 PETERSBURG CITY
51740 PORTSMOUTH CITY	51750 RADFORD CITY
51760 RICHMOND CITY	51770 ROANOKE CITY
51775 SALEM CITY	51780 SOUTH BOSTON CITY
51790 STAUNTON CITY	51800 SUFFOLK CITY
51810 VIRGINIA BEACH CITY	51820 WAYNESBORO CITY
51830 WILLIAMSBURG CITY	51840 WINCHESTER CITY

53   WASHINGTON FIPS COUNTY CODES

....

53001 ADAMS
53003 ASOTIN	53005 BENTON
53007 CHELAN	53009 CLALLAM
53011 CLARK	53013 COLUMBIA
53015 COWLITZ	53017 DOUGLAS
53019 FERRY	53021 FRANKLIN
53023 GARFIELD	53025 GRANT
53027 GRAYS HARBOR	53029 ISLAND
53031 JEFFERSON	53033 KING
53035 KITSAP	53037 KITTITAS
53039 KLICKITAT	53041 LEWIS
53043 LINCOLN	53045 MASON
53047 OKANOGAN	53049 PACIFIC
53051 PEND OREILLE	53053 PIERCE
53055 SAN JUAN	53057 SKAGIT
53059 SKAMANIA	53061 SNOHOMISH
53063 SPOKANE	53065 STEVENS
53067 THURSTON	53069 WAHKIAKUM

53071 WALLA WALLA   53073 WHATCOM
53075 WHITMAN   53077 YAKIMA

54   WEST VIRGINIA FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

54001 BARBOUR   54003 BERKELEY
54005 BOONE   54007 BRAXTON
54009 BROOKE   54011 CABELL
54013 CALHOUN   54015 CLAY
54017 DODDRIDGE   54019 FAYETTE
54021 GILMER   54023 GRANT
54025 GREENBRIER   54027 HAMPSHIRE
54029 HANCOCK   54031 HARDY
54033 HARRISON   54035 JACKSON
54037 JEFFERSON   54039 KANAWHA
54041 LEWIS   54043 LINCOLN
54045 LOGAN   54047 MC DOWELL
54049 MARION   54051 MARSHALL
54053 MASON   54055 MERCER
54057 MINERAL   54059 MINGO
54061 MONONGALIA   54063 MONROE
54065 MORGAN   54067 NICHOLAS
54069 OHIO   54071 PENDLETON
54073 PLEASANTS   54075 POCAHONTAS
54077 PRESTON   54079 PUTNAM
54081 RALEIGH   54083 RANDOLPH
54085 RITCHIE   54087 ROANE
54089 SUMMERS   54091 TAYLOR
54093 TUCKER   54095 TYLER
54097 UPSHUR   54099 WAYNE
54101 WEBSTER   54103 WETZEL
54105 WIRT   54107 WOOD
54109 WYOMING

55   WISCONSIN FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

55001 ADAMS   55003 ASHLAND
55005 BARRON   55007 BAYFIELD
55009 BROWN   55011 BUFFALO
55013 BURNETT   55015 CALUMET
55017 CHIPPEWA   55019 CLARK
55021 COLUMBIA   55023 CRAWFORD
55025 DANE   55027 DODGE
55029 DOOR   55031 DOUGLAS
55033 DUNN   55035 EAU CLAIRE
55037 FLORENCE   55039 FOND DU LAC
55041 FOREST   55043 GRANT
55045 GREEN   55047 GREEN LAKE
55049 IOWA   55051 IRON
55053 JACKSON   55055 JEFFERSON
55057 JUNEAU   55059 KENOSHA
55061 KEWAUNEE   55063 LA CROSSE

55065 LAFAYETTE	55067 LANGLADE
55069 LINCOLN	55071 MANITOWOC
55073 MARATHON	55075 MARINETTE
55077 MARQUETTE	55078 MENOMINEE
55079 MILWAUKEE	55081 MONROE
55083 OCONTO	55085 ONEIDA
55087 OUTAGAMIE	55089 OZAUKEE
55091 PEPIN	55093 PIERCE
55095 POLK	55097 PORTAGE
55099 PRICE	55101 RACINE
55103 RICHLAND	55105 ROCK
55107 RUSK	55109 ST CROIX
55111 SAUK	55113 SAWYER
55115 SHAWANO	55117 SHEBOYGAN
55119 TAYLOR	55121 TREMPEALEAU
55123 VERNON	55125 VILAS
55127 WALWORTH	55129 WASHBURN
55131 WASHINGTON	55133 WAUKESHA
55135 WAUPACA	55137 WAUSHARA
55139 WINNEBAGO	55141 WOOD

56   WYOMING FIPS COUNTY CODES
....

56001 ALBANY	56003 BIG HORN
56005 CAMPBELL	56007 CARBON
56009 CONVERSE	56011 CROOK
56013 FREMONT	56015 GOSHEN
56017 HOT SPRINGS	56019 JOHNSON
56021 LARAMIE	56023 LINCOLN
56025 NATRONA	56027 NIOBRARA
56029 PARK	56031 PLATTE
56033 SHERIDAN	56035 SUBLETTE
56037 SWEETWATER	56039 TETON
56041 UINTA	56043 WASHAKIE
56045 WESTON	

>> PRESIDENTIAL VOTE DECISION (for VCF0712)

In 1952-1964, code categories were exactly as here. Beginning in 1968,
code categories in studies included the codes appearing in this
variable with additions of further descriptive text, together with
additional code categories (recoded here):
1968: Addition of category: "when Johnson announced the bombing halt"
(recoded to 5). Added to code 1 text: "I voted for Wallace, as soon as
Wallace announced." Added to code 2 was text: "knew after Robert Kennedy's
death" and "I knew I was going to vote for Wallace before
the conventions." 1972: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories:
"when Eagleton was dropped from the ticket" (recoded to 4), "when
Kissinger announced that peace was at hand" (recoded to 5), and
"when Wallace was shot/ dropped out of race" (recoded to 4).
Also add to original code 4 was text: "R says only July or later."
1976: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "during

the primaries; 5-8 months; after primary" (recoded to 2), "after the first debate; the playboy interview; 5-7 weeks" (recoded to 4), "after the second debate; Ford's East European statement; 3-4 weeks" (recoded to 4), "the last few days of the campaign" (recoded to 5), and "other" (recoded to MD). Also added to original code 1 was text: "before the primaries; 9 months or more." Also added to original code 2 was text: "months before, long time before, early, quite a bit before election." Also added to original code 3 was text: "4 months," "3 months." Also added to original code 5 was text: "after the third debate."

1980: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks before the election" (recoded to 4), "one month; 3 weeks; October" (recoded to 4), "during/after the primaries; several months; 5-8 months" (recoded to 2), and "other" (recoded to MD). Code 1 also included text: "before the primaries; 9 months or more." Code 2 also included text: "months before, early on, long time, quite a bit before the election." Also added to original code 3 was text: "4 months; July" and "3 months; August." Also added to original code 4 was text: "2 months; a couple of months; September" and "one month; three weeks; October."

1984: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks before the election" (recoded to 4), "one month; 3 weeks; October; after the first Reagan-Mondale debate" (recoded to 4), "during /after the primaries; several months; 5-8 months" (recoded to 2), "after Ferraro-Bush debate" (recoded to 4), and "other" (recoded to MD). Code 1 also included text: "before the primaries; 9 months or more." Code 2 also included text: "months before, early on, long time, quite a bit before the election." Also added to original code 3 was text: "4 months; July" and "3 months; August." Also added to original code 4 were text: "2 months; a couple of months; September" and "one month; three weeks; October."

1988: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks before the election; after the first presidential debate" (recoded to 4), "one months; 3 weeks; October; after the second presidential debate"(recoded to 4), "during/after the primaries; several months; 5-8 months" (recoded to 2), "after the vice-presidential debate" (recoded to 4), and, "other" (recoded to or more." Code 2 also included text: "months before, early on, long time, quite a bit before the election." Also added to original code 3 was text: "4 months; July" and "3 months; August." Also added to original code 4 were: "2 months; a couple of months; September" and "one month; three weeks; October."

1992: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks before the election" (recoded to 4); "1 month; 3 weeks; October; after the presidential debates; when Perot re-entered the race" (recoded to 4); "in the last few days of the campaign; the last part of it" (recoded to 5); "during/after the primaries; several months; 5-8 months" (recoded to 2); "after the vice-presidential debate" (recoded to 4). Code 1 also included the text: "before the convention/nomination (no mention of Bush, Clinton or Perot); before the primaries; 9 months or more." Code 2 also included the text: "before the convention because of Bush's Clinton's or Perot's candidacy; 'months before;' 'early on;'

'long time/quite a bit before the election.'" Code 3 also
included the text: "3 months; August; 4 months; July; when Perot
dropped out of the race." Code 4 also included: "during the
campaign (NFS); 2 months; 'a couple of months;' September."
1996: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks
before the election" (recoded to 4); "1 month; 3 weeks; October;
after the presidential debates; "in the last few days of the
campaign; the last part of it" (recoded to 5); "during/after the
primaries (not codeable in 2); several months; 5-8 months"
(recoded to 2); "after the vice-presidential debate" (recoded
to 4). Code 1 also included the text: "before the convention/
nomination (no mention of Clinton, Dole or Perot); before the
primaries; 9 months or more." Code 2 also included the text:
"before the convention because of Clinton's, Dole's or Perot's
candidacy; 'months before;' 'early on;' 'long time/ quite a bit
before the election.'" Code 3 also included the text: "3 months;
July; a few months; 2-3 months." Code 4 also included: "during
the campaign (NFS); 2 months; 'a couple of months;' September."
2000: Codes were the same, with the addition of categories: "5-7 weeks
before the election" (recoded to 4); "1 month; 3 weeks; October;
after the presidential debates; "in the last few days of the
campaign; the last part of it" (recoded to 5); "during/after the
primaries (not codeable in 2); several months; 5-8 months"
(recoded to 2); "after the vice-presidential debate" (recoded
to 4). Code 1 also included the text: "before the convention/
nomination (no mention of Gore, Bush or Buchanan); before the
primaries; 9 months or more." Code 2 also included the text:
"before the convention because of Bush's/Gore's/Buchanan's
candidacy; 'months before;' 'early on;' 'long time/quite a bit
before the election.'" Code 3 also included the text: "3 months;
July; a few months; 2-3 months." Code 4 also included: "during
the campaign (NFS); 2 months; 'a couple of months;' September."

>> MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM NOTE

GENERAL NOTES:

FOR ALL YEARS SINCE 1960 WHICH UTILIZED THE 'MOST IMPORTANT
PROBLEM' QUESTION, THE MAJOR GROUPINGS AND THEIR RECODES TO CUMULATIVE
DATA FILE VARIABLE V875 (with some exceptions) ARE AS FOLLOW:

CDF V875	Original Codes	Subject grouping
9	1-99	social welfare
1	100-149	agriculture
6	150-199	natural resources
5	200-299	labor
8	300-349	race 1960-1972
	300-319	race 1974-1990
7	350-399	public order 1960-1972
	320-399	public order 1974-1990

2	400-499	economic/business
3	500-799	foreign affairs & national defense
4	800-899	functioning of government

In years 1960-1972 continuity of coding during successive years was not maintained. Beginning in 1974, however, a set of codes was created which was reused each following year without renumbering or dropping of codes: the only changes made to the 1974-based set of codes until 1988 were, where need arose, expansions of individual code texts and insertion of additional codes (e.g. for 'new' issues). In 1988 this set of 1974-based codes underwent comprehensive review [see part 2].

Part 1 below covers years 1960-1972. During 1960-1966, code numbering was generally mutually exclusive between study years. Beginning in 1968, some previous codes (number and/or text) were reused.

I. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1960 - 1972
II. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1974 - LATER

>> I. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1960 - 1972

001-099, 760 SOCIAL WELFARE   coded 9

Note: 1966 and 1970 cases coded 0 in the 1966 and 1970 datasets have
      been recoded to 1 in Cumulative Data File variable VCF0876.

000. 1966: Population increase; birth control; unwed mothers <N=1>
000. 1970: Population increase; birth control <N=6>

001. 1964: Birth control <N=1>
001. 1968: Population increase; birth control <N=1>

005. 1972: Population increase; birth control <N=9>

010. 1966: Unemployment; unemployment compensation; job retraining;
   aid for depressed economic areas, small businesses, etc. <N=17>
010. 1968: Unemployment; unemployment compensation; job retraining;
   aid for depressed economic areas, small businesses, etc. <N=19>
010. 1970: Unemployment; unemployment compensation; job retraining;
   aid for depressed economic areas, small businesses, etc. <N=53>
010. 1972: Unemployment; unemployment compensation; job retraining; aid
   for depressed economic areas, small businesses, etc. <N=41>

011. 1964: Employment, unemployment   <N=75>

012. 1960: Unemployment   <N=122>

020. 1966: Aid to education; financial assistance to schools and
colleges; improved school materials; better teachers <N=16>
020. 1968: Aid to education; financial assistance to schools and/or
colleges; improved school materials; better teachers <N=18>
020. 1970: Aid to education; financial assistance to schools
and/or colleges; improved school materials; better teachers; education
<N=20>
020. 1972: Aid to education; financial assistance to schools and/or
colleges; improved school materials; better teachers; education <N=7>

021. 1964: Schools, aid to education <N=25>
021. 1968: Aid to parochial schools, private schools (specifically) <N=0>

022. 1960: Schools--improvements wanted, better teachers needed,
more schools. Education needs--general or specific <N=26>

030. 1966: Assistance to the aged; Social Security; medicare for
aged <N=27>
030. 1968: Assistance to the aged; Social Security <N=15>
030. 1970: Assistance to the aged; Social Security; (no mention
of medicare for aged)   <N=24>

030. 1972: Assistance to aged; Social Security; (no mention of
medicare for aged)<N=4>

031. 1964: The aged, Social Security (no mention of medical care) <N=52>

032. 1960: The aged--aid to old folks, old-age pensions (no mention
of medical care) <N=40>

033. 1964: Medical care for the aged, Medicare <N=63>
033. 1968: Medical care for the aged, Medicare (specifically) <N=4>
033. 1970: Medical care for the aged, Medicare <N=0>
033. 1972: Medical care for the aged, Medicare <N=0>

034. 1960: Medical care for aged <N=29>

040. 1966: Health problems; quality, cost of medical care;
medical research; training of doctors and other health personnel;
more and better hospitals; mental health <N=2>
040. 1968: Health problems; quality, cost of medical care; medical
research; training of doctors and other health personnel; more
and better hospitals <N=2>
040. 1970: Health problems; quality, cost of medical care; medical
research; training of doctors and other health personnel; more
and better hospitals <N=6>
040. 1972: Health problems; quality, cost of medical care; medical
research; training of doctors and other health personnel; more
and better hospitals <N=1>

041. 1960: Medical care (general), i.e. for groups other than the
aged <N=12>
041. 1964: Medical care (general), e.g. mental health, for groups

other than aged <N=7>

042. 1960: Mental health--need more mental care <N=1>
042. 1968: Mental health <N=0>
042. 1970: Mental health <N=0>
042. 1972: Mental health <N=1>

050. 1966: Housing, slums, urban blight, urban renewal, planning;
     demonstration cities (include general reference to urban
     problems) <N=13>
050. 1968: Housing, slums, ghettos, urban blight, urban renewal,
     planning; demonstration cities (include general reference to
     urban problems) <N=22>
050. 1970: Housing, slums, ghettos, urban blight, urban renewal,
     planning; demonstration cities (include general reference to
     urban problems); playgrounds <N=23>
050. 1972: Housing, slums, ghettos, urban blight, urban renewal,
     planning; demonstration cities (include general reference to
     urban problems); playgrounds <N=3>

051. 1964: Housing, urban renewal, slum clearance <N=7>

052. 1960: Housing <N=10>

060. 1966: Poverty; poor, underprivileged people; welfare payments;
     rent subsidies (include general reference to anti-poverty programs,
     Great Society)   <N=53>

060. 1968: Poverty; poor, underprivileged people; welfare programs (such
     as ADC); welfare payments; rent subsidies (include general reference
     to anti-poverty programs, Great Society) <N=67>
060. 1970: Poverty; poor, underprivileged people; welfare programs (such
     as ADC); welfare payments; rent subsidies (include general reference to
     anti-poverty programs, Great Society) <N=100>
060. 1972: Poverty; poor, underprivileged people; welfare programs (such
     as ADC); welfare payments; rent subsidies (include general reference to
     anti-poverty programs, Great Society) <N=28>

061. 1964: Poverty program, e.g. depressed economic areas, poor,
     underprivileged people <N=58>

062. 1966: Assistance to Negroes--housing, education, etc. <N=0>
062. 1968: Assistance to Negroes particularly--housing, education, jobs,
     etc .<N=18>
062. 1970: Assistance to Negroes particularly--housing, education, jobs,
     etc. <N=1>
062. 1972: Assistance to Negroes particularly--housing, education, jobs,
     etc. <N=1>

063. 1968: Assistance to other minority groups-- Indians,
     Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, etc.-- or to minority groups in
     general <N=3>
063. 1970: Assistance to other minority groups-- Indians,
     Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, etc. <N=0>

063. 1972: Assistance to other minority groups-- Indians,
     Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, etc. <N=0>

064. 1968: Assistance to needy children, any youth (specifically) <N=1>

070. 1968: Administration of social welfare programs; coddling the
     poor, etc. <N=7>

080. 1964: Pro-con. For modification of social welfare programs. Help the
     needy but not those who can help themselves <N=3>

090. 1960: Other welfare items, vague references to welfare <N=6>
090. 1964: Other welfare items, vague reference to welfare <N=5>
090. 1966: Other social welfare problems; vague references to welfare
     <N=3>
090. 1968: Other social welfare problems; vague references to welfare;
     two or more specific welfare problems mentioned together <N=3>
090. 1970: Other social welfare problems; vague references to welfare
     <N=10>
090. 1972: Other social welfare problems; vague references to welfare
     <N=12>

091. 1960: Combination of above items <N=11>
091. 1964: Combination of above items <N=13>

760. 1966: More benefits for veterans <N=1>
760. 1968: More benefits for veterans <N=1>
760. 1970: More benefits for veterans <N=0>
760. 1972: More benefits for veterans <N=0>

        100-149,181,190 AGRICULTURAL   coded 1
   _____

100. 1964: Farm economics; subsidies, crop payments, soil bank <N=16>
100. 1966: Farm economics; subsidies, crop payments, soil bank   <N=1>
100. 1968: Farm economics; subsidies, crop payments, soil bank <N=12>
100. 1970: Farm economics; subsidies, crop payments, soil bank   <N=4>
100. 1972: Farm economics; subsidies, crop payments, soil bank   <N=0>

101. 1960: Favors subsidies, crop payments--higher parity, farmer has
     right to fair return   <N=17>

102. 1960: Oppose subsidies--supply and demand should rule, high cost of
     farm program <N=11>

103. 1960: Favor soil bank--present farm program should be extended <N=2>

104. 1960: Oppose soil bank--go back to old farm program <N=5>

105. 1960: Favors production restrictions, i.e.bushel allotment <N=1>

110. 1964: Non-economic references to farm program, e.g. freedom for the
     farmer <N=4>
110. 1966: Non-economic references to farm program, e.g. freedom for the

farmer <N=1>
110. 1968: Non-economic references to farm program, e.g. freedom for the
    farmer <N=1>
110. 1970: Non-economic references to farm program, e.g. freedom for the
    farmer <N=2>
110. 1972: Non-economic references to farm program, e.g. freedom for the
    farmer <N=0>

111. 1960: Freedom for farmers--in choosing what they wish to raise -
    non-economic objection to program <N=7>

120. 1960: Surplus food disposal <N=7>
120. 1964: Surplus food disposal <N=1>
120. 1966: Surplus food disposal <N=0>
120. 1968: Surplus food disposal <N=0>
120. 1970: Surplus food disposal <N=0>
120. 1972: Surplus food disposal <N=0>

130. 1966: General references to farm problems <N=3>
130. 1968: General references to farm problems <N=1>
130. 1970: General references to farm problems <N=8>
130. 1972: General references to farm problems <N=0>

131. 1960: General reference to farm problem, surpluses, farmers
    in trouble <N=45>

140. 1966: Farm labor supply; shortage of migrant labor <N=0>
140. 1968: Farm labor supply; shortage of migrant labor <N=0>
140. 1970: Farm labor supply; shortage of migrant labor <N=0>
140. 1972: Farm labor supply; shortage of migrant labor <N=0>

181. 1964: General reference to farm problems <N=6>

190. 1960: Other specific items [farm] <N=10>
190. 1964: Other farm problems <N=3>
190. 1966: Other agricultural and natural resources problems <N=0>
190. 1968: Other agricultural and natural resources problems <N=0>
190. 1970: Other agricultural and natural resources problems <N=0>
190. 1972: Other agricultural and natural resources problems <N=1>

    150-199 exc.181,190 NATURAL RESOURCES   coded 6
    _____

150. 1966: Conservation of natural resources: forests, parks, wildlife,
    minerals; prevention of water, air pollution <N=4>
150. 1968: Conservation of natural resources: forests, parks, wildlife,
    minerals   <N=1>
150. 1970: Conservation of natural resources: forests, parks, wildlife,
    minerals; ecology problems <N=9>
150. 1972: Conservation of natural resources: forests, parks, wildlife,
    minerals; ecology problems <N=6>

151. 1964: Conservation, irrigation, highways, waste of natural resources
    <N=4>

152. 1960: Conservation, natural resources, reclamation <N=2>
152. 1968: Prevention of water, air pollution <N=2>
152. 1970: Prevention of water, air pollution; pollution; environmental
    problems <N=63>
152. 1972: Prevention of water, air pollution; pollution; environmental
    problems <N=21>

160. 1966: Development of natural resources; harbors, dams, canals,
    irrigation, flood control, navigation; location, mining, stockpiling
    of minerals; water power, atomic power <N=1>
160. 1968: Development of natural resources; harbors, dams, canals,
    irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location, mining,
    stockpiling of minerals; water power, atomic power <N=0>
160. 1970: Development of natural resources; harbors, dams, canals,
    irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location, mining,
    stockpiling of minerals; water power, atomic power <N=0>
160. 1972: Development of natural resources; harbors, dams, canals,
    irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location, mining,
    stockpiling of minerals; water power, atomic power <N=0>

170. 1966: Beautification of highways, cities, etc. <N=0>
170. 1968: Beautification of highways, cities, etc. <N=0>
170. 1970: Beautification of highways, cities, etc. <N=0>
170. 1972: Beautification of highways, cities, etc. <N=0>

180. 1966: General references to natural resources <N=0>
180. 1968: General references to natural resources <N=0>
180. 1970: General references to natural resources <N=0>
180. 1972: General references to natural resources <N=0>

200-299 LABOR   coded 5

200. 1966: Protection of workers from unions; right to work laws;
    democracy in unions; elimination of racketeers, Communists in
    unions; financial accountability of union officials <N=0>
200. 1968: Protection of workers from unions; right to work laws;
    democracy in unions; elimination of racketeers, Communists in
    unions; financial accountability of union officials; anti-union
    legislation <N=0>
200. 1970: Protection of workers from unions; right to work laws;
    democracy in unions; elimination of racketeers, Communists
    in unions; financial accountability of union officials;
    anti-union legislation <N=2>
200. 1972: Protection of workers from unions; right to work laws;
    democracy in unions; elimination of racketeers, Communists in
    unions; financial accountability of union officials;
    anti-union legislation <N=0>

201. 1964: Racketeering in unions--no indication R responds
    negatively to all union activity <N=0>

202. 1960: Racketeers spoiling union name--no indication R responds

negatively to all union activity <N=0>

210. 1964: Union/management relations, e.g., free collective bargaining,
     favors (opposes) government mediation or arbitration of disputes <N=2>

211. 1960: Improvement of union-management relations--improve negotiation
     procedures, let collective bargaining function freely. Favor government
     mediation and arbitration of disputes <N=0>

212. 1960: Government should stay out of union-management affairs.
     Government either too pro-labor or pro-business <N=1>

213. 1966: Arbitration of labor-management disputes; control of strikes;
     prevention of strikes in essential industries
213. 1968: Arbitration of labor-management disputes; control of strikes;
     prevention of strikes in essential industries (include any reference
     to specific strikes or striking groups)<N=2>
213. 1970: Arbitration of labor-management disputes; control of strikes;
     prevention of strikes in essential industries (include any reference
     to specific strikes or striking groups)<N=3>
213. 1972: Arbitration of labor-management disputes; control of strikes;
     prevention of strikes in essential industries (include any reference to
     specific strikes or striking groups)<N=0>

220. 1964: Labor legislation, e.g. Taft-Hartley, minimum wage, right to
     work laws<N=2>

221. 1960: Favor pro-labor legislation--repeal taft-Hartley, raise minimum
     wage, enforce minimum wage, higher wages <N=23>

222. 1966: Support of unions vis-a-vis employers; freedom to strike;
     permission for closed shop <N=2>
222. 1968: Support of unions vis-a-vis employers; freedom to strike;
     permission for closed shop; pro-union legislation <N=1>
222. 1970: Support of unions vis-a-vis employers; freedom to strike;
     permission for closed shop; pro-union legislation <N=0>
222. 1972: Support of unions vis-a-vis employers; freedom to strike;
     permission for closed shop; pro-union legislation <N=0>

223. 1966: Increase in minimum wage; expansion of minimum wage coverage;
     improvements in wages <N=9>

224. 1966: Government wage guidelines <N=4>

225. 1968: Protection of migrant laborers <N=0>
225. 1970: Protection of migrant laborers <N=0>
225. 1972: Protection of migrant laborers <N=0>

230. 1968: Government wage guidelines; union wage increases <N=1>
230. 1970: Government wage guidelines; union wage increases <N=1>
230. 1972: Government wage guidelines; union wage increases <N=0>

231. 1968: Increase in minimum wage; expansion of minimum wage coverage;
     improvements in wages <N=4>

231. 1970: Increase in minimum wage; expansion of minimum wage coverage; improvements in wages <N=3>
231. 1972: Increase in minimum wage; expansion of minimum wage coverage; improvements in wages <N=1>

240. 1964: Strength of unions, e.g. too powerful, too weak <N=4>

241. 1960: Oppose union and labor interests--unions getting too strong, crooks for leaders (i.e.,Hoffa), need more control on unions <N=4>

280. 1964: General references to union/management problems <N=1>

290. 1960: Other specific items. Vague labor or union problem reference <N=9>
290. 1964: Other references to labor problems <N=1>
290. 1966: Other references to labor problems <N=1>
290. 1968: Other references to labor problems <N=0>
290. 1970: Other references to labor problems <N=4>
290. 1972: Other references to labor problems <N=0>

291. 1966: Protection of migrant labor from exploitation <N=0>

300-349,390 (390: 1960 &1964 only) RACE coded 8

_____

300. 1966: Protection (expansion) of Negro civil rights; school, housing integration, fair employment practices; right to vote; fair treatment by police <N=13>
300. 1968: Protection (expansion) of Negro civil rights; school, housing integration, fair employment practices; right to vote; fair treatment by police <N=36>
300. 1970: Protection (expansion) of Negro civil rights; school, housing integration, fair employment practices; right to vote; fair treatment by police <N=8>
300. 1972: Protection (expansion) of Negro civil rights; pro-busing; school, housing integration, fair employment practices; right to vote; fair treatment by police<N=3>

301. 1964: Pro-integration, civil rights, e.g. in schools, in employment, in housing. Enforce the Civil Rights Bill (Law) <N=107>

302. 1960: Pro-integration-- anti discrimination in schools, employment, etc.<N=27>

303. 1968: Protection (expansion) of civil rights of other (or all) minority groups   <N=5>
303. 1970: Protection (expansion) of civil rights of other (or all) minority groups <N=4>
303. 1972: Protection (expansion) of civil rights of other (or all) minority groups<N=3>

310. 1966: Protection of white majority; prevention of race mixing; right to choose own neighbors; right to discriminate in employment <N=0>

310. 1968: Protection of white majority; prevention of race mixing; maintenance of segregated schools; no busing; right to choose own neighbors; right to discriminate in employment <N=14>
310. 1970: Protection of white majority; prevention of race mixing; maintenance of segregated schools; no busing; right to choose own neighbors; right to discriminate in employment <N=11>
310. 1972: Protection of white majority; prevention of race mixing; maintenance of segregated schools; no busing; right to choose own neighbors; right to discriminate in employment<N=10>

311. 1964: Anti-integration, civil rights, e.g. favors discrimination in schools, in employment, in housing, dislikes Civil Righst Bill (Law) <N=44>

312. 1960: Anti-integration-- pro discrimination in schools, employment, etc.<N=43>

320. 1964: Pro-con on integration, e.g. integrate in some, but not other areas. Favors integration of schools but opposes busing of children or pairing of schools <N=31>

321. 1960: Pro-con on integration. Integrate in some areas, not others. <N=8>

330. 1964: Government (Supreme Court) should stay out of civil rights (non-specific) <N=5>

340. 1966: Civil rights, racial problems (general or vague reference in which R's personal perspective is unclear) <N=81>

340. 1968: Civil rights, racial problems (general or vague reference in which R's personal perspective is unclear or pro-con) <N=80>
340. 1970: Civil rights, racial problems (general or vague reference in which R's personal perspective is unclear or pro-con) <N=50>
340. 1972: Civil rights, racial problems (general or vague reference in which R's personal perspective is unclear or pro-con); busing, NA R's perspective <N=49>

341. 1964: Civil rights, settle the race problems, NA stand on integration, vague references to problems <N=69>

390. 1960: Other references. <racial integration and discrimination> Integration problem -- vague reference <N=29>
390. 1964: Other specific references to civil rights <N=3>

  350-399 exc.390 (1960 &1964 only) PUBLIC ORDER   coded 7

---

350. 1966: Protection of civil liberties, rights of accused, freedom of speech, etc. <N=1>
350. 1968: Protection of civil liberties, rights of accused, freedom of speech, etc. (includes coddling criminals, prevention of police brutality, etc.) <N=5>
350. 1970: Protection of civil liberties, rights of accused, freedom of

speech, etc. (includes coddling criminals, etc.) <N=2>

350. 1972: Protection of civil liberties, rights of accused, freedom of
    speech, etc. (includes coddling criminals, etc.) <N=3>

359. 1970: Campus disorders, disturbances and riots on college campuses
    (any school) <N=42>
359. 1972: Campus disorders, disturbances and riots on college campuses
    (any school) <N=1>

360. 1966: Public disorder; crime, violence, trouble in the streets;
    juvenile delinquency; bombings; riots; demonstrations, NA what kind
    <N=20>
360. 1968: General reference to public disorder, law and order (NA if
    361, 362, 364) <N=125>
360. 1970: General reference to public disorder, law and order (NA if
    361,362,364); more law enforcement <N=38>

360. 1972: General reference to public disorder, law and order (NA if
    361,362,364); more law enforcement <N=14>

361. 1964: Public disorder, e.g. crime, delinquency, violence, trouble in
    the streets. Race riots, bombings <N=40>
361. 1968: (Negro) riots specifically <N=52>
361. 1970: (Negro) riots specifically <N=29>
361. 1972: (Negro) riots specifically <N=2>

362. 1960: Crime, delinquency <N=1>
362. 1968: War protests, demonstrators specifically <N=14>
362. 1970: War protests, demonstrators specifically <N=2>
362. 1972: War protests, demonstrators specifically <N=0>

363. 1966: Narcotics control; drug addiction; pep pills, LSD, etc. <N=0>
363. 1968: Narcotics control; drug addiction; pep pills, LSD, etc.<N=2>
363. 1970: Narcotics control; drug addiction; pep pills, LSD, marijuana,
    etc.<N=53>
363. 1972: Narcotics control; drug addiction; pep pills, LSD,
    marijuana, etc.<N=58>

364. 1966: Problems of young people; e.g. drinking, discipline, mixed up
    thinking <N=7>
364. 1968: Crime, violence, trouble in the streets, juvenile delinquency
    specifically <N=42>
364. 1970: Violence, trouble in the streets, juvenile delinquency
    specifically, bombings <N=10>
364. 1972: Violence, trouble in the streets, juvenile delinquency
    specifically, bombings <N=3>

365. 1966: Licensing, control of guns, other weapons <N=0>
365. 1968: Licensing, control of guns, other weapons <N=2>
365. 1970: Licensing, control of guns, other weapons <N=0>
365. 1972: Licensing, control of guns, other weapons <N=1>

366. 1970: Crime (general) <N=59>

366. 1972: Crime (general) <N=45>

370. 1966: Control of right-wing extremists, American Nazis, Minutemen,
     etc.<N=0>
370. 1968: Control of right-wing extremists, American Nazis, Minutemen,
     etc.<N=0>
370. 1970: Control of right-wing extremists, American Nazis, Minutemen,
     etc.<N=0>
370. 1972: Control of right-wing extremists, American Nazis, Minutemen,
     etc.<N=0>

371. 1966: Control of left-wing extremists, Communists, subversives;
     internal Communist threat <N=1>
371. 1968: Control of left-wing extremists, Communists, subversives;
     internal Communist threat <N=17>
371. 1970: Control of left-wing extremists, Communists, subversives;
     internal Communist threat <N=3>
371. 1972: Control of left-wing extremists, Communists, subversives;
     internal Communist threat <N=10>

371. 1968: Control of extremists, radicals (general reference or reference
     to both right-wing and left-wing extremists)

380. 1966: Moral, religious decay of nation (general) <N=7>
380. 1968: Moral, religious decay of nation (general) <N=9>
380. 1970: Moral, religious decay of nation (general) <N=10>
380. 1972: Moral, religious decay of nation (general) <N=33>

381. 1964: Prayers in public schools, Supreme Court decision <N=4>

382. 1966: School prayers (specifically) <N=2>
382. 1968: School prayers (specifically) <N=1>
382. 1970: School prayers (specifically) <N=2>
382. 1972: School prayers (specifically) <N=0>

383. 1968: Problems of young people; e.g. drinking, sexual freedom,
     discipline, mixed up thinking, hippies <N=11>
383. 1970: Problems of young people; e.g. drinking, sexual freedom,
     discipline, mixed up thinking, hippies; communication with
     young; generation gap <N=31>
383. 1972: Problems of young people; e.g. drinking, sexual freedom,
     discipline, mixed up thinking, hippies; communication with young;
     generation gap <N=17>

384. 1970: Revolutionary ideas, approaches, etc. (responses not covered by
     370, 371) <N=3>

384. 1972: Revolutionary ideas, approaches, etc. (responses not covered
     by 370, 371) <N=1>

390. 1966: Other racial and public order problems <N=0>
390. 1968: Other racial and public order problems <N=2>
390. 1970: Other racial and public order problems <N=2>
390. 1972: Other racial and public order problems <N=6>

391. 1960: Puerto Rican problem <N=0>
391. 1964: Puerto-Rican problem <N=0>
391. 1972: Hijacking <N=1>

   400-499,550 exc.491 (550: 1968 only) ECONOMIC & BUSINESS   coded 2
   _____

400. 1966: Inflation, high prices, high cost of living; government price
     guidelines <N=80>
400. 1968: Inflation, high prices, high cost of living <N=27>
400. 1970: Inflation, high prices, high cost of living <N=83>
400. 1972: Inflation, high prices, high cost of living <N=131>

401. 1960: Inflation, high cost of living. Money too cheap. <N=45>

402. 1964: Inflation, high cost of living <N=10>

403. 1968: Government price guideline <N=0>
403. 1970: Government price guideline or controls <N=3>
403. 1972: Government price guideline or controls <N=2>

404. 1968: Rent control <N=1>

405. 1972: General statement of wage and price controls <N=0>

410. 1964: Taxes, e.g. too high, unfair <N=39>

411. 1966: Taxation; fair structure <N=42>
411. 1968: Taxation; fair tax structure <N=34>
411. 1970: Taxation; fair tax structure <N=42>
411. 1972: Taxation; fair tax structure <N=23>

412. 1960: High taxes <N=45>

413. 1960: Unfair taxes   <N=7>

420. 1966: National economy; economic growth; prosperity; prevention
     of recession, depression <N=4>
420. 1968: National economy; economic growth; prosperity; prevention of
     recession, depression <N=5>
420. 1970: National economy; economic growth; prosperity; prevention of
     recession, depression, general references to economy <N=39>
420. 1972: National economy; economic growth; prosperity; prevention of
     recession, depression, general references to economy <N=44>

421. 1964: National economy. Depression-prosperity. Economic growth
     (or lack of) <N=6>

422. 1960: National economy, (multiple specific responses) recession,
     depression. Prosperity. <N=15>

430. 1964: Fiscal policy, monetary policy, e.g. government spending,
     balanced budget, government waste, national debt <N=26>

431. 1960: Fiscal policy--government spending, balanced budget, government waste <N=25>

432. 1966: Government spending; national debt; balancing the budget <N=44>
432. 1968: Government spending; national debt; balancing the budget <N=24>
432. 1970: Government spending; national debt; balancing the budget <N=10>
432. 1972: Government spending; national debt; balancing the budget <N=10>

433. 1966: Gold outflow; control foreign investments, tourism <N=3>
433. 1968: Gold outflow; control foreign investments, tourism, imports <N=2>
433. 1970: Gold outflow; control foreign investments, tourism, imports <N=0>
433. 1972: Gold outflow; control foreign investments, tourism, imports <N=2>

434. 1960: Artificial government economic boosters opposed-- defense production, etc.<N=1>

435. 1966: Tight money market; interest rates <N=1>
435. 1968: Tight money market; interest rates <N=1>
435. 1970: Tight money market; interest rates <N=2>
435. 1972: Tight money market; interest rates <N=0>

440. 1960: Small business needs help--tax relief, government controls, etc. <N=0>

441. 1966: Protection of small business from discount houses, chains, large corporations; fair trade laws; anti-trust laws <N=0>
441. 1968: Protection of small business from discount houses, chains, large corporations; fair trade laws; anti-trust laws <N=1>
441. 1970: Protection of small business from discount houses, chains, large corporations; fair trade laws; anti-trust laws <N=1>
441. 1972: Protection of small business from discount houses, chains, large corporations; fair trade laws; anti-trust laws <N=0>

442. 1960: Private enterprise, business (general--not limited to small business as in 440) <N=2>

450. 1966: Control of business (profits); stifling of individual initiative, free enterprise; trend toward socialism <N=2>
450. 1968: Control of business (profits); stifling of individual initiative, free enterprise; trend toward socialism <N=1>
450. 1970: Control of business (profits); stifling of individual initiative, free enterprise; trend toward socialism <N=0>
450. 1972: Control of business (profits); stifling of individual initiative, free enterprise; trend toward socialism <N=1>

451. 1964: Government control of business, (stifling of) individual initiative <N=3>

452. 1968: Regulation of inter-state commerce, transportation, and communication; air travel, railways, television, etc. <N=0>
452. 1970: Regulation of inter-state commerce, transportation, and communication; air travel, railways, television, etc.; control of content of the media <N=1>
452. 1972: Regulation of inter-state commerce, transportation, and communication; air travel, railways, television, etc.; control of content of the media <N=0>

460. 1964: Tariff, immigration policy. Importation, exportation of goods and/or labor <N=12>

461. 1966: Tariff rates; protection of American business from foreign competition <N=1>
461. 1968: Tariff rates; protection of American business from foreign competition (see also 550) <N=0>
461. 1970: Tariff rates; protection of American business from foreign competition <N=4>
461. 1972: Tariff rates; protection of American business from foreign competition <N=1>

462. 1966: Immigration policies <N=0>
462. 1968: Immigration policies <N=0>
462. 1970: Immigration policies <N=1>
462. 1972: Immigration policies <N=0>

470. 1968: Protection of the consumer; truth in labeling, packaging, lending; control of medicines, poisons, harmful products; insurance <N=0>
470. 1970: Protection of the consumer; truth in labeling, packaging, lending; control of medicines, poisons, harmful products; insurance <N=1>
470. 1972: Protection of the consumer; truth in labeling, packaging, lending; control of medicines, poisons, harmful products; insurance <N=0>

471. 1968: Auto, highway, airplane safety <N=0>
471. 1970: Auto, highway, airplane safety <N=1>
471. 1972: Auto, highway, airplane safety <N=0>

480. 1966: Expansion of highways; mass transportation problems <N=1>
480. 1968: Expansion of highways; mass transportation problems <N=1>
480. 1970: Expansion of highways; mass transportation problems <N=0>
480. 1972: Expansion of highways; mass transportation problems <N=0>

490. 1960: Other economic <N=1>
490. 1966: Other economic problems, including general reference to situation <N=1>
490. 1968: Other economic problems (including general reference to economic situation) <N=0>
490. 1970: Other economic problems <N=4>

490. 1972: Other economic problems <N=1>

492. 1966: Protection of the consumer; trust in labeling, packaging,
    lending; control of medicines, poisons, harmful products; insurance
    <N=0>

493. 1966: Auto, highway, airplane safety <N=0>

494. 1966: Regulation of inter-state commerce, transportation and
    communication: air travel, railways, television, etc. <N=1>

550. 1968: Expansion of world trade; reciprocal trade agreements (see also
    461) <N=0>

 500-799 exc.550 (1968 only),760 FOREIGN AFFAIRS & NATIONAL DEFENSE coded 3
_____

500. 1964: Viet Nam <N=124>
500. 1966: Vietnam; "the war" <N=581>
500. 1968: Vietnam; "the war" <N=654>
500. 1970: Vietnam; "the war;" Indochina, Cambodia <N=424>
500. 1972: Vietnam; "the war;" Indochina, Cambodia; POWs, MIAs; Paris
    peace negotiations <N=269>

510. 1964: Cuba <N=34>
510. 1966: Cuba <N=0>
510. 1968: Cuba <N=1>
510. 1970: Cuba <N=0>
510. 1972: Cuba <N=0>

511. 1960: Cuban situation threatens peace (singled out from other trouble
    spots). Communists in back yard, too close. Castro mentioned as
    trouble-maker. Communists spreading all over. General external
    menace. <N=8>
511. 1968: Czechoslovakia <N=1>
511. 1970: Czechoslovakia <N=0>

512. 1960: Cuban situation (singled out from other trouble spots).
    Communists in back yard, too close. Castro mentioned as trouble-maker.
    Communists spreading all over. General external menace. ['peace' not
    mentioned] <N=49>
512. 1968: Prevention of Russian (Communist) expansion <N=3>
512. 1970: Prevention of Russian (Communist) expansion <N=0>
512. 1972: Prevention of Russian (Communist) expansion <N=0>

513. 1968: Korea, Pueblo <N=4>
513. 1970: Korea, Pueblo <N=0>

520. 1964: Trouble spots in general. More than one mentioned   <N=7>

521. 1964: Other trouble spots, e.g. SE Asia, Congo, Berlin, Laos, Cyprus,
    Malaysia <N=5>

522. 1960: Trouble spots threatening peace-- Congo, Berlin, Middle East, Formosa etc.<N=4>

523. 1960: Trouble spots, Berlin, Middle East, Congo, Formosa, etc. Communists spreading all over. General external communist menace ['peace' not mentioned]<N=21>

524. 1966: Middle East --Israel, Jordan <N=0>
524. 1968: Middle East --Israel, Jordan, Egypt <N=2>
524. 1970: Middle East --Israel, Jordan, Egypt <N=2>
524. 1972: Middle East --Israel, Jordan, Egypt <N=0>

525. 1966: Rhodesia <N=0>
525. 1968: Rhodesia <N=0>
525. 1970: Rhodesia <N=0>
525. 1972: Rhodesia <N=0>

526. 1966: Other specific trouble spots <N=0>
526. 1968: Nigerian civil war <N=0>
526. 1970: Nigerian civil war <N=0>

529. 1968: Other specific trouble spots or two or more trouble spots mentioned together <N=1>
529. 1970: Other specific trouble spots <N=0>
529. 1972: Other specific trouble spots <N=0>

530. 1966: Firmness in foreign policy; maintenance of position of military strength <N=1>
530. 1968: Firmness in foreign policy; maintenance of position of military strength <N=5>
530. 1970: Firmness in foreign policy; maintenance of position of military strength <N=0>
530. 1972: Firmness in foreign policy; maintenance of position of military strength <N=0>

531. 1964: Maintain position of strength, e.g. take firm stand, clear, strong foreign policy (no specific area named) <N=34>

532. 1960: Position of strength--best guarantor of peace. Higher defense spending to keep ahead of Russia. Maintain firm stand against Russia and other communist nations. Call their bluff. <N=21>

533. 1960: Position of strength best-- higher defense spending to keep ahead of Russia. Maintain firm stand against Russia and other communist nations. Call their bluff ['peace' not mentioned] <N=141>

540. 1966: Extent of foreign involvement, committment (general mention); military assistance <N=12>
540. 1968: Extent of foreign involvement, committment (general mention); military assistance <N=12>
540. 1970: Extent of foreign involvement, committment (general mention); military assistance <N=8>
540. 1972: Extent of foreign involvement, committment (general mention);

military assistance <N=5>

550. 1964: Isolation, less involvement, e.g. mind our own business, let other countries take care of themselves (no specific area mentioned) <N=5>

551. 1960: Peace through isolation, less involvement--less foreign aid, bring boys back home, let other countries take care of themselves <N=10>

551. 1968: Trading with U.S. enemies; trading with countries which trade with U.S. enemies <N=2>

552. 1960: Isolation, less involvement--less foreign aid, bring boys back home, let other countries take care of themselves ['peace' not mentioned] <N=29>

560. 1960: Peace through more involvement in world affairs--general or vague belief that increased involvement, more foreign aid, better relations can bring peace <N=12>

561. 1960: More involvement in world affairs-- more foreign aid, better relations ['peace' not mentioned] <N=73>

570. 1966: Foreign economic aid program <N=13>
570. 1968: Foreign economic aid program <N=19>
570. 1970: Foreign economic aid program <N=8>
570. 1972: Foreign economic aid program <N=3>

571. 1964: Foreign aid, e.g. too much, too little, wrong type, doesn't get to the poor people <N=41>

580. 1966: Prevention of war, establishment of peace (general mention) <N=13>
580. 1968: Prevention of war, establishment of peace (general mention) <N=7>
580. 1970: Prevention of war, establishment of peace (general mention) <N=18>
580. 1972: Prevention of war, establishment of peace (general mention) <N=30>

581. 1960: Negotiation toward peace--talk to the Russians. Meet Communists half way. Work through the U.N. Settle 'trouble spots' in the U.N. <N=54>

582. 1960: Negotiation--talk to the Russians. Meet Communists half way. Work through the U.N. Settle 'trouble spots' in the U.N. ['peace' not mentioned]<N=45>

583. 1964: Negotiate settlements, meet others half-way (no specific area named) <N=5>

590. 1964: Total victory as goal, threaten war, no compromise or negotiations. (No specific area named) <N=1>

591. 1960: Aggressive policy--toward Russia, communists. Preventive or defensive war if necessary. Get tough. Drop the bomb. Other similar ways of keeping the peace. <N=18>

592. 1960: Aggressive policy--toward Russia, communists. Preventive or defensive war if necessary. Get tough. Drop the bomb, etc. ['peace' not mentioned]<N=15>

600. 1966: Relations with the United Nations; support for the United Nations <N=0>
600. 1968: Relations with the United Nations; support for the United Nations<N=2>
600. 1970: Relations with the United Nations; support for the United Nations<N=0>
600. 1972: Relations with the United Nations; support for the United Nations<N=0>

601. 1964: Position of U.S. in UN, strength of UN <N=5>

610. 1964: Relations with Russia, cold war, relations with Eastern European communist satellites, e.g. increased trade <N=44>

611. 1966: Relations with Russia, Eastern Europe <N=2>
611. 1968: Peaceful relations with Russia, Eastern Europe, the communists <N=0>
611. 1970: Peaceful relations with Russia, Eastern Europe <N=0>
611. 1972: Peaceful relations with Russia, Eastern Europe <N=0>

612. 1960: Russia, cold war, communist problems and peace-- general mentions of these as problems with no statement of correct policy <N=13>

613. 1960: Russia, cold war, communist problems-- general mentions of these as problems with no statement of correct policy ['peace' not mentioned] <N=69>

620. 1966: Cold war; threat of external Communism <N=1>
620. 1968: Cold war; threat of external Communism <N=2>
620. 1970: Cold war; threat of external Communism <N=1>
620. 1972: Cold war; threat of external Communism <N=0>

621. 1966: Threat of Communism, NA whether threat is from external or internal Communism <N=7>

621. 1968: Threat of Communism, NA whether threat is from external or internal Communism (or both internal and external threat mentioned together) <N=3>
621. 1970: Threat of Communism, NA whether threat is from external or internal Communism <N=2>
621. 1972: Threat of Communism, NA whether threat is from external or internal Communism <N=6>

630. 1966: Relations with Communist China; support for United Nations seat for Communist China <N=1>

630. 1968: Peaceful relations with Communist China; support for United Nations seat for Communist China <N=0>
630. 1970: Peaceful relations with Communist China; support for United Nations seat for Communist China <N=0>
630. 1972: Peaceful relations with Communist China; support for legal recognition of Communist China <N=0>

631. 1964: Relations with Communist China <N=6>

640. 1964: Relations with South and Central America (excluding Cuba), Africa, Asia <N=4>

641. 1966: Relations with Latin American countries <N=0>
641. 1968: Good relations with Latin American countries; Alliance for Progress; Organization of American States <N=0>
641. 1970: Good relations with Latin American countries; Alliance for Progress <N=0>
641. 1972: Good relations with Latin American countries; Alliance for Progress<N=0>

642. 1966: Relations with African, Asian countries, developing areas <N=0>
642. 1968: Good relations with African, Asian countries, developing areas <N=0>
642. 1970: Good relations with African, Asian countries, developing areas <N=0>
642. 1972: Good relations with African, Asian countries, developing areas <N=0>

650. 1966: Relations with Western Europe; Great Britain, France, Germany, our allies; German rearmament, unification <N=0>
650. 1968: Good relations with Western Europe; Great Britain, France, Germany, our allies; NATO <N=0>
650. 1970: Good relations with Western Europe; Great Britain, France, Germany, our allies <N=0>
650. 1972: Good relations with Western Europe; Great Britain, France, Germany, our allies <N=0>

651. 1964: Relations with allies, e.g. France, Britain <N=4>

652. 1968: German rearmament <N=0>
652. 1970: German rearmament <N=0>
652. 1972: German rearmament <N=0>

653. 1968: German unification <N=0>
653. 1970: German unification <N=0>
653. 1972: German unification <N=0>

660. 1966: Obligation to take care of problems at home before helping foreign countries <N=9>
660. 1968: Obligation to take care of problems at home before helping foreign countries <N=23>
660. 1970: Obligation to take care of problems at home before helping foreign countries <N=35>

660. 1972: Obligation to take care of problems at home before helping
     foreign countries <N=2>

670. 1964: War-peace (general mention, so specific area named <N=59>

680. 1966: General mention of foreign relations, foreign affairs, prestige
     abroad <N=19>
680. 1968: General mention of foreign relations, foreign affairs, prestige
     abroad <N=7>
680. 1970: General mention of foreign relations, foreign affairs, prestige
     abroad <N=4>
680. 1972: General mention of foreign relations, foreign affairs, prestige
     abroad <N=9>

681. 1964: General mention of foreign affairs, foreign relations (no
     specific mention of area or method) <N=26>

682. 1960: General mention of foreign affairs, foreign relations, no
     content -- war problem, keep out of war, keep the peace <N=142>

683. 1960: General mention of foreign affairs, foreign relations-- no
     content ['peace' not mentioned] <N=115>

690. 1960: Other mentions--world trade, tariffs, dollar exchange values,
     etc. [actual mention of 'peace'] <N=6>
690. 1964: Other specific foreign affairs items <N=3>
690. 1966: Other specific foreign affairs items <N=1>
690. 1968: Other specific foreign affairs items <N=0>
690. 1970: Other specific foreign affairs items <N=1>
690. 1972: Other specific foreign affairs items <N=0>

691. 1960: Other mentions--world trade, tariffs, dollar exchange
     values, etc. (foreign service) ['peace' not mentioned] <N=20>

700. 1964: A-bomb and H-bomb testing, Test-Ban Treaty <N=14>

701. 1960: A-bomb and H-bomb testing should be continued-- can't
     fall behind <N=1>

702. 1960: Ban on A-bomb and H-bomb testing-- have enough, know enough
     <N=5>

710. 1966: Disarmament; ending of arms race; nuclear proliferation;
     extension of test-ban treaty <N=0>
710. 1968: Disarmament; ending of arms race; nuclear proliferation;
     extension of test-ban treaty <N=2>
710. 1970: Disarmament; ending of arms race; nuclear proliferation;
     extension of test-ban treaty <N=0>
710. 1972: Disarmament; ending of arms race; nuclear proliferation;
     extension of test-ban treaty <N=2>

711. 1964: Disarmament. Stop arms race <N=9>

712. 1960: Disarmament <N=25>

720. 1964: Threat of Communism, NA whether internal or external <N=21>

721. 1960: Internal threat of communism, internal security <N=13>

722. 1964: Internal threat of Communism <N=14>

730. 1966: Size, quality of armed forces <N=0>
730. 1968: Size, quality of armed forces <N=1>
730. 1970: Size, quality of armed forces <N=1>
730. 1972: Size, quality of armed forces; spending level <N=2>

731. 1960: General build-up of forces needed. Maintain military
     superiority <N=52>

732. 1964: General build up of forces needed <N=10>

733. 1966: Selective service system; universal conscription <N=4>
733. 1968: Selective service system; universal conscription; draft <N=5>
733. 1970: Selective service system; universal conscription; draft <N=1>
733. 1972: Selective service system; universal conscription; draft <N=0>

734. 1968: Influence of the military <N=0>
734. 1970: Influence of the military <N=1>
734. 1972: Influence of the military; civilian control of military;
     defense management <N=1>

740. 1966: Weapons development; missile program; scientific
     development; bomb testing <N=1>
740. 1968: Weapons development; missile program; scientific
     development; bomb testing<N=2>
740. 1970: Weapons development; missile program; scientific
     development; bomb testing<N=0>
740. 1972: Weapons development; missile program; scientific
     development; bomb testing<N=1>

741. 1964: Missile program, space race, scientific development,
     e.g. training of engineers and scientists <N=5>

742. 1960: Missile program-- lagging behind Russia's. Includes mention
     of space satellites <N=14>

743. 1960: Scientific development-- Russia's getting ahead, more
     scientists, more engineers, better training in schools than
     ours <N=4>

744. 1966: Space race <N=3>
744. 1968: Space race specifically <N=3>
744. 1970: Space race; any mention <N=5>
744. 1972: Space race; any mention <N=1>

750. 1960: Streamline services, unify services. Coordinate research
     and strategy. Cut down on costs through efficiency <N=3>

770. 1966: Morale of nation; patriotism; national spirit <N=0>
770. 1968: Morale of nation; patriotism; national spirit <N=2>
770. 1970: Morale of nation; patriotism; national spirit <N=2>
770. 1972: Morale of nation; patriotism; national spirit <N=4>

771. 1964: Morale of nation, e.g. national purpose, will <N=1>
771. 1972: Amnesty; desertion <N=0>

780. 1966: General mention of national defense <N=4>
780. 1968: General mention of national defense <N=0>
780. 1970: General mention of national defense <N=0>
780. 1972: General mention of national defense <N=2>

790. 1960: Other defense mentions <N=0>
790. 1964: Other specific national defense items <N=0>
790. 1966: Other specific national defense items <N=0>
790. 1968: Other specific national defense items <N=0>
790. 1970: Other specific national defense items <N=1>
790. 1972: Other specific national defense items <N=0>

800-899 FUNCTIONING OF GOVERNMENT   coded 4

_____

800. 1966: Honesty, morality, ethics in government; Baker, Jenkins,
    Estes cases <N=3>
800. 1968: Honesty, morality, ethics in government <N=5>
800. 1970: Honesty, morality, ethics in government <N=7>
800. 1972: Honesty, morality, ethics in government <N=8>

801. 1964: Graft, corruption in government. Morality, Baker, Jenkins
    <N=18>

810. 1966: Quality, efficiency of public employees, Civil Serice,
    government bureaucracy <N=4>
810. 1968: Quality, efficiency of public employees, diplomats, Civil
    Service, government bureaucracy <N=3>
810. 1970: Quality, efficiency of public employees, diplomats, Civil
    Service, government bureaucracy; cost of government <N=0>
810. 1972: Quality, efficiency of public employees, diplomats, Civil
    Service, government bureaucracy; cost of government <N=5>

811. 1966: Size of government bureaucracy, Civil Service; pervasiveness
    of Government controls <N=5>
811. 1968: Size of government bureaucracy, Civil Service <N=1>
811. 1970: Size of government bureaucracy, Civil Service <N=0>
811. 1972: Size of government bureaucracy, Civil Service <N=0>

812. 1968: Pervasiveness of government controls over the private
    citizen <N=0>
812. 1970: Pervasiveness of government controls over the private citizen;
    citizen-government relationship in general; communication between
    government and citizen <N=3>
812. 1972: Pervasiveness of government controls over the private citizen;
    citizen-government relationship in general; communication between

government and citizen <N=8>

813. 1968: Compensation of government employees, officials, congressmen,
     judges <N=0>
813. 1970: Compensation of government employees, officials, congressmen,
     judges <N=0>
813. 1972: Compensation of government employees, officials, congressmen,
     judges <N=0>

820. 1966: Government control of information; secrecy; news management
     <N=1>
820. 1968: Government control of information; secrecy; news management
     <N=0>
820. 1970: Government control of information; secrecy; news management
     <N=1>
820. 1972: Government control of information; secrecy; news management
     <N=1>

821. 1964: Government releases (too little) (too much) information. Too
     secretive. Too much publicity <N=2>

830. 1966: Wisdom, ability, general representativeness of political
     leaders, Congressmen, Supreme Court <N=7>
830. 1968: Wisdom, ability, general representativeness of political
     leaders, Congressmen, Supreme Court <N=1>
830. 1970: Wisdom, ability, general representativeness of political
     leaders, Congressmen, Supreme Court <N=6>
830. 1972: Wisdom, ability, general representativeness of political
     leaders, Congressmen, Supreme Court <N=5>

831. 1966: Government, politicians catering to minority groups; lack of
     devotion to general welfare, lack of service to all the
     people <N=5>
831. 1968: Government, politicians catering to minority groups; lack of
     devotion to general welfare, lack of service to all the
     people <N=1>
831. 1970: Government, politicians catering to minority groups; lack of
     devotion to general welfare, lack of service to all the people;
     lobbying; lobbyists <N=1>
831. 1972: Government, politicians catering to minority groups; lack of
     devotion to general welfare, lack of service to all the people;
     lobbying; lobbyists <N=3>

840. 1966: Specific problems of representation; apportionment;
     under-representation of cities, suburbs <N=0>
840. 1968: Specific problems of representation; apportionment;
     under-representation of cities, suburbs <N=0>
840. 1970: Specific problems of representation; apportionment;
     under-representation of cities, suburbs <N=1>
840. 1972: Specific problems of representation; apportionment;
     under-representation of cities, suburbs <N=0>

841. 1964: Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment, redistricting
     <N=0>

842. 1966: Fair election procedures; prevention of vote manipulation; curbing of political "bosses;" need for better politicians, political parties, electoral procedures, etc. <N=3>
842. 1968: Fair election procedures; prevention of vote manipulation; curbing of political "bosses;" need for better politicians, political parties, electoral procedures, etc. <N=0>
842. 1970: Fair election procedures; prevention of vote manipulation; curbing of political "bosses;" need for better politicians, political parties, electoral procedures, etc. <N=2>
842. 1972: Fair election procedures; prevention of vote manipulation; curbing of political "bosses;" need for better politicians, political parties, electoral procedures, etc. <N=1>

843. 1968: Lower voter age (specifically) <N=0>

850. 1966: Power of federal government; reduction in states rights; lack of strict interpretation of the Constitution <N=9>
850. 1968: Power of federal government vis-a-vis states; loss of states' rights <N=7>
850. 1970: Power of federal government vis-a-vis states; loss of states' rights <N=2>
850. 1972: Power of federal government vis-a-vis states; loss of states' rights <N=0>

851. 1964: States' rights vs. Federal control (general) <N=9>

852. 1960: Less centralization needed. More states' rights <N=4>

853. 1964: Positive statement about federal government involvement in problems in answer to V.51 (No specific content, but more forceful than DK or 'none'), e.g. "I don't feel they should have stayed out of any" [V51: Now, are there any problems at home or abroad that the government in Washington has gotten into that you think it should stay out of. This would include problems the President, the Congress, or the Supreme Court have tried to handle that you think they should have stayed out of] <N=1>

854. 1964: Negative statement about federal government involvement in problems in answer to V51 (No specific content, but more forceful than DK or 'all'), e.g. "They stick their nose into everything" [SEE ABOVE, CODE 853 FOR TEXT OF 1964 V51] <N=2>

860. 1966: Power of President; any anti-Johnson comments; references to quality, style, etc.<N=1>
860. 1968: Power of President; any anti-Johnson comments; references to quality, style, etc.<N=0>
860. 1970: Power of President; any anti-Nixon comments; references to quality, style, etc.<N=6>
860. 1972: Power of President; any anti-Nixon comments; references to quality, style, etc.<N=7>

870. 1966: Power of Congress <N=0>
870. 1968: Power of Congress <N=2>

870. 1970: Power of Congress <N=0>
870. 1972: Power of Congress <N=0>

871. 1964: References to Congress. Organization, procedure, power <N=0>

880. 1966: Power of Supreme Court <N=2>
880. 1968: Power of Supreme Court <N=6>
880. 1970: Power of Supreme Court <N=0>
880. 1972: Power of Supreme Court <N=0>

881. 1964: Power of Supreme Court (too great, should be curtailed) <N=6>

885. 1970: Power of government; NA what specifically <N=1>
885. 1972: Power of government; NA what specifically <N=1>

890. 1966: Other problems relating to the functioning of the
      government <N=2>
890. 1968: Other problems relating to the functioning of the
      government <N=0>
890. 1970: Other problems relating to the functioning of the
      government <N=7>
890. 1972: Other problems relating to the functioning of the
      government <N=7>

891. 1966 Compensation of government employees, government officials,
      congressmen <N=0>

        000,491,980,990-999 OTHER, MISSING DATA
      _____

491. 1960: Other domestic items <N=14>
491. 1964: Other domestic items <N=8>

980. 1968: General mention of domestic problems, problems at home (area of
      concern NA) <N=2>

990. 1960: Other   <N=5>
990. 1964: Other (items that do not fit any of the above subheadings)<N=6>
990. 1966: Other <N=6>
990. 1968: Other (items that do not fit any of the above) <N=6>
990. 1970: Other (items that do not fit any of the above) <N=3>
990. 1972: Other (items that do not fit any of the above) <N=15>

991. 1968: No problem mentioned; no second or third problem <N=28>
991. 1970: No problem mentioned; no second, third or fourth problem
      <N=13>

996. 1960: No mentions, DK <N=182>
996. 1964: No mentions, DK <N=285>

997. 1966: No problem mentioned, DK; no second or third problem <N=91>

998. 1968: DK <N=12>
998. 1970: DK <N=43>

998. 1972: DK <N=6>

999. 1960: NA <N=28>
999. 1964: NA <N=1>
999. 1966: NA <N=8>
999. 1968: NA <N=0>
999. 1970: NA <N=4>
999. 1972: NA <N=21>

000. 1972: INAP <N=1669>

>> II. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM 1974 - LATER

1974-BASED CODES: In 1974, a set of 'most important problem' codes was
created with a numbering scheme following 1960-1972 general groupings,
but specific codes were not necessarily related to individual codes from any
years 1960-1972. During years 1976-1986, some codes within this 1974-based set
were revised in text (usually augmented), and some codes were added when need
arose, but no categories were dropped.

1988 REVIEW OF CODES: In 1988, prior to the coding of that year's study
data, the existing set of 'most important problem' codes underwent a
comprehensive review, resulting in deletion of all categories with a history
of "too few mentions" since 1974. There was, as well, a rewording/revision of
many codes and combining of others. Since 1988, codes have been added or
revised/ augmented only where necessary to process data describing very
current issues.

'RETIRED CODES': Unless indicated differently (i.e., for merged codes),
individual categories NOT continued in 1988 ('retired') were terminated due to
"too few mentions." Note that the total number of mentions prior to 1988
(1974-1986 inclusive) appears in parentheses following the text of the
'retired' code.

CONTINUING CODES (not 'retired'): For codes unretired or new in 1988, a
code text not followed by a date in brackets indicates the 1988 version of the
code. The code may have been created at any time 1974-1988; if variations in
code text preceded the 1988 version, texts of earlier versions of code also
appear in parentheses. * indicates that the code was created in 1974. Codes
surviving the 1988 review which were created after 1974 have year of
origination in brackets [ ]. Any changes made to text after 1988 are noted
with date of change.

AGRICULTURE   (#100-149)   coded 1
_____

100. FARM ECONOMICS; payment for crops/price of feed/cost of farming
    (1974-1986: FARM ECONOMICS; general reference to payment for
    crops, price of feed, cost of farming, etc.; cattle kill) *

retired. 101. 1974-1986: Too much being paid to farmers for crops {not
            #400} (3) *

retired. 102. 1974-1986: Too little being paid to farmers for crops (not
            #400} \merged with #100\ (43) *

    103. SUBSIDIES/crop payments/government aid to farmers (1974-1986:
        FOR subsidies, crop payments/aid to farmers) *

retired. 104. 1974-1986: AGAINST subsidies/crop payments/aid to farmers (9) *
retired. 109. 1980-1986: Other specific references to farm economics
            {including mention of unfavorable economic
            consequences to farmers from grain embargo of grain
            sales/shipments to Russia} (43)
        1974-1978: Other specific references to farm economics *

    120. WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS; food shortages/starvation/famine (not #406
        or 407) (1974-1986: WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS; general reference to
        food shortages/starvation/famine {not #406,407}) *

retired. 121. 1974-1986: FOR surplus food disposal; providing food to other
            countries; food programs (19) *
retired. 122. 1974-1986: AGAINST surplus food disposal; shouldn't provide
            food to other countries; food programs (24) *
retired. 129. 1974-1986: Other specific references to surplus food
            distribution (4) *
retired. 145. 1974-1986: Other specific references to farm labor supply (1) *
retired. 147. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to NON-ECONOMIC FARM
            PROBLEMS/PROGRAMS {not dealing with economics} (3) *
retired. 148. 1974-1986: Generally FOR other specific farm/agricultural
            programs/legislation/expenditures (1) *
retired. 149. 1974-1986: Generally AGAINST other specific farm/agricultural
            programs/legislation/expenditure (1) *

    ECONOMIC & BUSINESS PROBLEMS   (#400-499)   coded 2
    _____

Note: If R mentions both "inflation" (#400) and rise in prices of
specific items (#407-409), code "inflation".   (SEE ALSO #496)

    400. INFLATION; rate of inflation; level of prices; cost of living
        (1974-1986: INFLATION; general reference to inflation; high
        prices; high cost of living) *

    401. WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS/GUIDELINES; freezing prices; control of
        business profits   (1974-1986: FOR wage and/or price
        guidelines; wage and/or price controls, freezing prices; control
        of business profits) *

retired. 402. 1974-1986: AGAINST wage and/or price controls; against control
            of business profits (6) *

403. High price of food, all mentions (exc. #100) *

404. High price of other specific items and services *

405. MINIMUM WAGE, any mention; any mention of wage levels
(1974-1986: MINIMUM WAGE, any mention) *

retired. 406. 1974-1986: SHORTAGES--gen. reference {exc.#120}, NA what;
phony shortages; people wasteful (22) *

407. FOOD SHORTAGES; economic aspects of food shortages, e.g., price
of sugar (other references, code #120) *

408. FUEL SHORTAGES; "energy crisis"; oil companies making excessive
profits; depressed condition of the oil industry (1974-1986:
Fuel shortages; "energy crisis"; oil companies making excessive
profits) *

retired. 409. 1974-1986: Other specific references to shortages (8) *

410. RECESSION, DEPRESSION; prosperity of the nation; economic
growth; GNP (1976-1986: RECESSION, DEPRESSION; general
reference, prosperity of the nation, economic growth) (1974:
RECESSION, DEPRESSION; general reference) *

411. MONETARY RESTRAINTS/CONTROLS; level of interest rates;
availability of money/the money supply (1974-1986: MONETARY
RESTRAINTS/CONTROLS; general reference to interest rates etc.) *

retired. 412. 1974-1986: FOR loosening monetary restraints; for lowering
interest rates \merged with #411\ (161) *
retired. 413. 1974-1986: AGAINST loosening of monetary restraints; high
interest rates (10) *
retired. 414. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} government spending; other
{specific} government stimulation of the economy,
e.g. work programs {not #412} (17) *

415. AGAINST (increased) government spending; balancing of the
(national) budget; against government stimulation of the
economy; the size of the budget deficit [1984] (1974-1982:
AGAINST {increased} government spending; balancing of the
{national} budget; against government stimulation of the
economy) *

416. TAXES; general reference to tax structure; tax surcharge (NA R's
direction); tax reform; other specific tax reference
(1974-1986: TAXES; general reference to tax structure; tax
surcharge {NA R's direction}; other specific tax reference) *

417. FOR tax cuts; against tax surcharge; for tax reform (1974-1986:
FOR tax cuts; against tax surcharge) *

418. AGAINST tax cuts; for tax surcharge; against tax reform
(1974-1986: AGAINST tax cuts; for tax surcharge) *

retired. 419. 1974-1986: Other specific references to recession/depression;
          other specific references to monetary/fiscal
          controls (36) *
retired. 420. 1974-1986: Construction/housing; all references to housing
          starts, construction costs, etc. (20) *
retired. 421. 1974-1986: Business profits are {too} high (6) *
retired. 422. 1974-1986: Business profits are not {too} high (2) *
retired. 423. 1974-1986: Prices are declining, wholesale or retail--any
          mention; optimistic economic indications (2) *

    424. PRODUCTIVITY of American industry; "giving a day's work for a
       day's pay"; revitalizing American industry (1980-1986:
       Increased productivity of American industry; "a day's work for
       a day's pay"; revitalize American industry

    425. STOCK MARKET/ GOLD PRICES; all references to gold prices, stock
       brokers, stock fluctuations, etc. *

retired. 426. 1974-1986: Gold outflow; control of foreign investments made
          by U.S. companies/citizens (10) *

    427. VALUE OF THE DOLLAR; strength/weakness of the dollar against
       other currencies (1976-1986: Devaluation of the dollar)

retired. 430. 1974-1986: Anti-trust laws; protection of small businesses;
          general reference to anti- trust laws/legislation
          (3) *
retired. 431. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} prosecution under anti-trust laws;
          protection of small businesses from discount houses,
          chains, large corporations; fair trade laws (4) *
retired. 432. 1974-1986: AGAINST prosecution under anti-trust laws;
          {additional} control of business, stifling of
          individual initiative/free enterprise (5) *

    433. Large businesses taking over small businesses *

retired. 434. 1974-1986: Small businesses holding their own (7) *

    440. Class oriented economic concerns--middle class, working class
       (pro); middle class getting squeezed [1976]

    441. Class oriented economic concerns--big business, monied interests
       (anti) too powerful [1976]

    442. Concern for inequitable distribution of wealth; gap between the
       rich and the poor; concentration of wealth in the hands of a few
       (1978-1986: Concern for inequitable distribution of wealth)

retired. 450. 1974-1986: Trend toward socialism; general reference--NA
          R's direction (11) *

    451. FOR the regulation of interstate commerce, transportation, air
       travel, railways, government auto safety regulations; in favor

of increased government regulation of business; mention of
problems caused by deregulation [1989] (1974-1988: For the
regulation of interstate commerce, transportation, air travel,
railways, government auto safety regulations; in favor of
increased government regulation of business) *

452. AGAINST (increased) regulation of interstate commerce,
transportation; AIR TRAVEL, RAILWAYS, etc. *

453. Solvency/stability/regulation/control of the nation's FINANCIAL
INSTITUTIONS [1988]. Savings and Loan scandal [1990]

retired. 454. 1974-1986: AGAINST the regulation of communication; control
of content of the media; control of media channels
(1) *
retired. 459. 1974-1986: Other specific references to government control,
trends toward socialism (12) *

460. IMMIGRATION POLICY; establishing limits on how many people from
any one nation can enter the U.S.; prohibiting specified types
of persons from entering the U.S. 1974-1986: IMMIGRATION
POLICY; general reference) *

retired. 461. 1974-1986: FOR immigration policy; against open immigration
merged with #460\ (80) *

463. Problems relating to the influx of political/economic refugees
(Cubans, Haitians, Mexicans, etc.) [1980]

retired. 469. 1974-1986: Other specific references to immigration
policies (17) *
retired. 470. 1974-1986: CONSUMER PROTECTION; general reference (3) *

retired. 471. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} consumer protection legislation;
truth in labeling, packaging, lending; control of
medicines; poisons, harmful products; no fault
insurance (2) *

retired. 475. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} auto, highway, airplane safety (3) *

retired. 476. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} auto, highway, airplane
safety (1) *

retired. 480. 1974-1986: MASS TRANSPORTATION; general reference (6) *
retired. 481. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} mass transportation; mass
transportation legislation/expenditures (5) *

retired. 483. 1978-1986: Control of public utilities; utility rates (12)

retired. 484. 1978-1986: Roads, highways, bridges; general unspecified
transportation (10)
retired. 489. 1974-1986: Other specific references to mass transportation
(1) *

retired. 490. 1974-1986: Other specific references to economic problems
\merged with #499\ (73) *

491. Economics--general; "Economics"--NFS [1980] (1974-1978: Economics--NFS)

492. International economics--general [1976]

493. U.S. foreign trade, balance of payments position; foreign oil dependency [1978] (1976: U.S. foreign trade, balance of payments position)

494. Control of FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S.; mention of foreigners buying U.S. assets (businesses, real estate, stocks, etc) [1990] (1988: Control of foreign investment in U.S.; limitation of foreign imports; restriction on foreign car products; general reference to problems of automobile industry; imposition of tariffs/reciprocal restrictions on foreign imports) (1982-1986: Control of foreign investment in U.S.; limitation of foreign imports; restriction on foreign car imports; general reference to problems of automobile industry) (1978-1980: Control of foreign investment in U.S.)

495. PROTECTION OF U.S. INDUSTRIES; imposition of tariffs/reciprocal restrictions on foreign imports; limitation of foreign imports; mention of problems in specific industries competing with foreign manufacturers [1990] (1974-1988: Other specific consumer protection problems.) *

496. THE ECONOMY--not further specified (code specific mention if R clarifies by saying "inflation", etc.; also see #400) [1980] [Note: category #496 was added due to the great increase in the number of unqualified responses of the "economy." Prior to 1980, such non-specific responses (fewer in number) were assumed to be references to the inflation problem and were coded as #400]

497. International competitiveness; outsourcing; loss of jobs to foreign competition; moving jobs abroad; modernizing plants/equipment/management techniques to meet foreign competition; matching the quality of foreign good. (1986: International competitiveness; outsourcing; loss of jobs to foreign competition; moving job abroad).

498. Mention of "twin problems" of a large national debt/budget deficit and unfavorable balance of trade/import-export ratio. [1988]

499. Other specific mention economic or business problems [1988]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS   (#500-599, 700-799 exc.760-769)   coded 3

500. FOREIGN RELATIONS/FOREIGN AFFAIRS; foreign policy/relations, prestige abroad (1974-1976: FOREIGN RELATIONS/FOREIGN AFFAIRS; general reference to foreign relations/affairs, prestige abroad) *

504. Relations with the Third World (no specific country or region mentioned) [1986]

505. Relations with WESTERN EUROPE; Great Britain, France, Germany; our allies (1974-1986: Relations with WESTERN EUROPE; Great Britain, France, Germany; our allies--general mention) *

retired. 506. 1974-1986: FOR better relations with Western Europe
                \merged with #505\ (10) *
retired. 507. 1974-1986: AGAINST better relations with Western
                Europe (1) *

retired. 509. 1974-1986: Other specific references to Western Europe (5)*

510. VIETNAM; general reference to "the war," Indochina, Cambodia; aid *

retired. 512. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} aid to Indochina, Vietnam,
                Cambodia (1) *
retired. 513. 1974-1986: CUBA; any references (8) *

514. Latin America, South America--any references; reference to war/situation in Nicaragua; U.S. support of the Contras (1986: Latin America, South America--any references {reference to war/situation in Nicaragua/Contras}) (1984: Latin America, South America--any references {reference to war/situation in Nicaragua}) (1974-1982: Latin America, South America--any references) *

515. Iran; mention of American hostages in Teheran; arms deal [1986] [Note: in 1986 and 1988, the response "Iran-Contra" was coded as #514,515 or two consecutive codes] (1980-1982: Iran; mention of American hostages in Teheran)

516. African countries; developing areas in Africa--any mention; U.S. response to apartheid in South Africa (1986: African countries; developing areas in Africa--any mention)

retired. 517. 1974-1986: Asian countries--any mention {not #510,520} (8) *

519. Other specific countries/areas/trouble spots (exc.#520-539) [1989] (1974-1988: Other foreign countries/areas/specific trouble spots {exc.#520-539}) *

retired. 520. 1974-1986: COMMUNIST CHINA; general reference (7) *
retired. 521. 1974-1986: FOR peaceful relations with Communist China;
                increased aid/trade with Communist China (5) *
retired. 522. 1974-1986: AGAINST a policy of peaceful relations with
                Communist China; against increased aid/trade with

Communist China (2) *

524. MIDDLE EAST-- support or aid to Israel/Arab states; Arab/Israeli
     conflict; Iran-Iraq war; hostages in Lebanon/Middle East. Iraqi
     aggression in the Persian Gulf [1990] (1989: MIDDLE EAST--
     support or aid to Israel/Arab states; Arab/Israeli conflict;
     Iran-Iraq war; hostages in Lebanon/Middle East) (1988: MIDDLE
     EAST-- support or aid to Israel/Arab states; Arab/Israeli
     conflict; Iran-Iraq war {not #525,526, or #527}) (1980-1986:
     MIDDLE EAST-- general reference, including Arab/Israeli conflict
     and Iran-Iraq war {not #525,526 or #527}) (1974-1978: MIDDLE
     EAST-- general reference, including Arab/Israeli conflict {not
     #525,526 or #527}) *

retired. 525. 1974-1986: Support of policy favoring ISRAEL; increased
               aid to Israel; against support of Arab states)
               \merged with #524\ (5) *

retired. 526. 1974-1986: Support of policy favoring ARAB STATES; increased
               aid to Arab states; against {increased} support of
               Israel \merged with #524\ (8) *
retired. 527. 1974-1986: Mention of other problems or specific country in
               the Middle East {not #524-526} \merged with #524\
               (47) *
retired. 529. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to Communist China (4) *

530. RUSSIA/Eastern Europe; relations with Russia/the Communist bloc;
     detente/trade/negotiations with Russia -- NA whether #531 or
     #532 (1974-1986: RUSSIA; general reference to Russia {USSR},
     Eastern Europe, detente) *

531. For PEACEFUL RELATIONS with Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe; for
     increased TRADE with Russia; talking/resuming negotiations with
     Russia on arms control/reduction (reaching/concluding a treaty
     is #711) [1984] (1974-1982: For PEACEFUL RELATIONS with
     Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe; for increased TRADE with
     Russia) *

532. Against policy of Detente with Russia; COLD WAR; threat of
     external Communism; need to oppose/be wary of Russia
     (1974-1986: AGAINST policy of Detente with Russia; COLD WAR;
     threat of external Communism) *

533. Prevention of Russian (Communist) expansion; mention of Soviet
     invasion and occupation of Afghanistan-- any reference;
     references to Soviet activity in Central America/Nicaragua)
     (1984-1986: Prevention of Russian {Communist} expansion;
     mention of Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan--any
     reference {1984--references to Soviet activity in Central
     America/Nicaragua}) (1980-1982: Prevention of Russian
     {Communist} expansion; mention of Soviet invasion and occupation
     of Afghanistan--any reference) (1974-1978: Prevention of
     Russian {Communist} expansion) *

539. Other specific references to Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe, etc.
(including changing site/boycotting 1980 Moscow Olympics);
threat of/preventing war with Russia (exc.#714) (1980-1982:
Other specific references to Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe, etc.
{including changing site/boycotting 1980 Moscow olympics})
(1974-1978: Other specific references to Russia/Detente/Eastern
Europe etc.) *

540. FIRMNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY; maintenance of position of
MILITARY/DIPLOMATIC STRENGTH (not #710-712) (1974-1986:
FIRMNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY; any reference to maintenance of
position of MILITARY/DIPLOMATIC STRENGTH {exc.#551; not
#710-712}) *

550. U.S. FOREIGN (MILITARY) INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENT, extent of
U.S. Foreign involvement; military assistance/aid (exc. #524)
(1974-1986: U.S. FOREIGN (MILITARY INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENT,
general reference to extent of U.S. foreign involvement;
MILITARY assistance/aid {exc.#510 and #524}) *

retired. 551. 1974-1986: FOR increased foreign {military} involvement;
for increased {military} committment {exc.
#525,526,540} (8) *

retired. 552. 1974-1986: AGAINST increased foreign involvement; against
increased {military} committment {exc.#512, 525,526}
\merged with #550\ (105) *
retired. 559. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to foreign military
involvement/committment (10) *

560. U.S. FOREIGN (ECONOMIC) INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENTS; extent of
U.S. {foreign} economic aid; "foreign aid" (1974-1986: U.S.
FOREIGN {ECONOMIC} INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENTS; general reference
to extent of U.S. {foreign} economic aid) *

retired. 561. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} U.S. economic involvement;
foreign economic aid programs; "foreign aid"
{exc.#520-529} (13) *

retired. 562. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} U.S. economic involvement;
foreign economic aid programs; "foreign aid" \merged
with #560\ (149) *
retired. 569. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to U.S. {economic}
foreign aid (18) *

570. Prevention of war; ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE; any reference *

retired. 580. 1974-1986: General reference to relation with the UNITED
NATIONS (3) *
retired. 582. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} support of United Nations (1) *

585. Obligation to TAKE CARE OF PROBLEMS AT HOME before helping
foreign countries *

retired. 590. 1974-1986: Other specific foreign affairs problems/items
\merged with #599\ (68) *

599. Other specific mention of foreign affairs problems [1988]

700. NATIONAL DEFENSE; defense budget; level of spending on defense
(1978-1986: NATIONAL DEFENSE; general reference; defense
budget) (1974-1976: NATIONAL DEFENSE; general reference) *

710. DISARMAMENT; general reference to ENDING OF THE ARMS RACE;
nuclear proliferation; test ban treaty (not #540); SALT; INF
treaty (1980-1986: DISARMAMENT; general reference to ENDING OF
THE ARMS RACE; nuclear proliferation; test ban treaty {not
#540}; SALT) (1974-1978: DISARMAMENT; general reference to
ENDING OF THE ARMS RACE; nuclear proliferation; test ban treaty
{not #540}) *

711. For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban treaty; support
toward ending of arms race; against (additional) expenditures on
military/arms development; SALT; SDI ("Star Wars"); INF treaty
(1986: For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban treaty;
support toward ending of arms race; against {additional}
expenditures on military/arms development; SALT; SDI {"Star
Wars"}) (1986: For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban
treaty; support toward ending of arms race; against {additional}
expenditures on military/arms development; SALT; SDI {"Star
Wars"}) (1980-1984: For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban
treaty; support toward ending of arms race; against {additional}
expenditures on military/arms development; SALT) (1974-1978:
For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban treaty; support
toward ending of arms race; against {additional} expenditures
on military/arms development) *

712. Against (increased) policy of DISARMAMENT; against test ban
treaty; for additional WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT; missile program;
scientific/technological development in weapons/strategy; atomic
bomb testing; increased DEFENSE BUDGET, increased arms
expenditure (not #540); SALT; increased pay for military
personnel; SDI ("Star Wars"); INF treaty (1986: Against
{increased} policy of DISARMAMENT; against test ban treaty; for
additional WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT; missile program; scientific/
technological development in weapons/strategy; atomic bomb
testing; increased DEFENSE BUDGET, increased arms expenditure
{not #540}; SALT; increased pay for military personnel; SDI
{"Star Wars"}) (1980-1984: Against {increased} policy of
DISARMAMENT; against test ban treaty; for additional WEAPONS
DEVELOPMENT; missile program; scientific/technological
development in weapons/strategy; atomic bomb testing; increased
DEFENSE BUDGET, increased arms expenditure {not #540}; SALT;
increased pay for military personnel) (1974-1978: Against
{increased} policy of DISARMAMENT; against test ban treaty;
for additional WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT; missile program; scientific/
technological development in weapons/strategy; atomic bomb
testing; increased DEFENSE BUDGET, increased arms expenditure

{not #540}) *

713. General or specific references to functioning and performance of
defense; waste, inefficiency (not codeable in #710-712) [1976]

714. Nuclear war; the threat of nuclear war [1984]

retired. 719. 1984-1986: Other specific references to the arms race/
disarmament; putting missiles in space \merged with
#710,711,714\ (42) 1974-1982: Other specific
references to the arms race/disarmament *

retired. 730. 1974-1986: General reference to THE DRAFT; selective service
system; universal conscription (5) *
retired. 731. 1974-1986: FOR reinstatement of the draft (10) *
retired. 732. 1974-1986: AGAINST reinstatement of the draft (1) *
retired. 734. 1974-1986: AMNESTY; general reference to amnesty for draft
dodgers/Ford's plan (2) *
retired. 736. 1974-1986: AGAINST amnesty for draft dodgers/Ford's plan (2) *

740. The space program; space race (not #711,712) [1986] (1974-1984:
SPACE RACE; any mention) *

750. MORALE OF NATION; Patriotism; National spirit; national unity;
greed, selfishness of people *

760-769: SEE code 9 (Social Welfare) EXCEPT: 765 (code 7)

retired. 770. 1974-1986: Influence of military; civilian control of military;
defense management--any mention (7) *

retired. 790. 1974-1986: Other specific national defense items \merged with
#799\ (15) *

799. Other specific mention of national defense problems [1988]

FUNCTIONING OF GOVERNMENT   (#800-899)   coded 4
_____

800. POWER OF THE (FEDERAL) GOVERNMENT; power of/control exercised
by the federal government (1974-1986: POWER OF THE {FEDERAL}
GOVERNMENT; general reference, NA specificity) *

retired. 801. 1986: GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INFORMATION; secrecy; news
management; over- classification of information--any
mention {renumbered from #805} (5, for #801/805)

retired. 805. 1974-1986: GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INFORMATION; secrecy; news
management; over- classification of
information--any mention (see above) *

810. (LACK OF) HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT; (LACK OF) ETHICS IN
GOVERNMENT--general reference (exc. #811) *

811. LACK OF PERSONAL ETHICS/morality of persons related to or part
    of government *

retired. 815. 1974-1986: {News} Media bias; slanting/twisting of the news
            (13) *
retired. 819. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to honesty/ethics
            in government (8) *

820. CAMPAIGN DONATIONS/PUBLIC FINANCING OF ELECTIONS; any mentions *

830. CONFIDENCE/TRUST in political leaders/system; wisdom, ability,
    responsiveness of political leaders; quality of leadership
    provided by political leaders (1974-1986: CONFIDENCE/TRUST in
    political leaders/system--general reference) *

retired. 831. 1974-1986: INCREASED confidence/trust in political leaders/
            system, wisdom, ability, general representativeness
            of political leaders, Congressmen, Supreme Court
            (6) *

retired. 832. 1974-1986: DECREASED confidence/trust in political leaders/
            system, little wisdom, ability, general
            representativeness of political leaders,
            Congressmen, Supreme Court; need for better
            politicians/political system \merged with #830\
            (171) *

833. QUALITY/EFFICIENCY of public employees, diplomats, civil
    service; SIZE OF THE GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY; COST OF
GOVERNMENT
    (1974-1986: QUALITY/EFFICIENCY; general reference to the
    quality of public employees, diplomats, civil service,
    GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY; COST OF GOVERNMENT) *

retired. 834. 1974-1986: INCREASED quality/efficiency of public employees,
            diplomats, civil service; need for large government
            bureaucracy; increase cost of government (3) *
retired. 835. 1974-1986: DECREASED quality/efficiency of public employees,
            diplomats, civil service; decrease government
            bureaucracy; decrease cost of government \merged
            with #833\ (33) *

836. COMPENSATION; all references to the compensation of government
    employees, officials, congressmen, judges, local politicians/
    bureaucrats *

837. Waste in government spending; keeping tabs on where money goes
    [1978]

838. Government BUDGET PRIORITIES are wrong; Congress/President is
    spending money in the wrong areas/not spending money on the
    right things [1990]

840. SIZE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT; the (large) size of government/civil service/bureaucracy; the number of government departments/ employees/programs (1974-1986: SIZE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT; gen. reference to the {large} size of government/civil service/ bureaucracy) *

retired. 841. 1974-1986: FOR a more powerful {federal} government; less state rights; increased centralism (1) *

retired. 842. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} power of the {federal} government; more states rights; federal government is too powerful vis a vis states \merged with #840\ (35) *

retired. 849. 1974-1986: Other specific references to the size of the government vis a vis states (3) *

retired. 850. 1974-1986: POWER OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE; power of the President -- general reference (5) *

retired. 851. 1974-1986: FOR {greater} Presidential power (2) *

retired. 852. 1974-1986: AGAINST {greater} Presidential power (1) *

853. POWER OF CONGRESS--general reference *

retired. 854. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} Congressional power; Congress should do more, take more initiative (5) *

retired. 855. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} Congressional power (4) *

856. POWER OF THE SUPREME COURT, all other references to the Supreme Court exc. #858 *

retired. 858. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} role by the Supreme Court (3) *

859. Other specific references to the (federal) balance of power *

862. FAIR ELECTION PROCEDURES; prevention of vote manipulation; curbing of political "bosses", smear campaigns *

869. Other specific references to problems of representation *

retired. 870. 1974-1986: CAPABILITY/OTHER QUALITIES {pertaining to the representativeness} OF POLITICAL LEADERS, Congressmen, judges {exc. Watergate} (38) *

retired. 871. 1974-1986: Government/politician catering to special/ pressure groups; lack of devotion to general welfare; LACK OF SERVICE TO ALL THE PEOPLE; lobbying; lobbyist (48) *

retired. 872. 1982-1986: PRESIDENT REAGAN; general reference to Reagan's style/quality (9) 1978-1980: PRESIDENT CARTER; general reference to Carter's style/quality 1974-1976: PRESIDENT FORD; general reference to Fords' style/quality *

retired. 873. 1982-1986: Pro-Reagan comments, complimentary comments

regarding quality & style of the president (8)
1978-1980: Pro-Carter comments, complimentary
comments regarding quality & style of the president
1974-1976: Pro-Ford comments, complimentary
comments regarding quality & style of the
president *

874. Lack of support for the President; any anti-President comments,
negative reference to the PRESIDENT's quality, style, etc.
(1982-1986: Lack of support for Reagan; any anti-Reagan
comments, negative reference to Reagan's quality, style, etc.)
(1978-1980: Lack of support for Carter; any anti-Carter
comments, negative reference to Reagan's quality, style, etc.)
(1974-1976: Lack of support for Ford; any anti-Ford comments,
negative reference to Reagan's quality, style, etc.) *

retired. 875. 1980-1986: Incumbent Congressman: mentions relating to
appraisals of incumbent's performance or experience
{including voting record, seniority, experience} (2)

retired. 876. 1980-1986: Mentions relating to candidate differences
rooted in personal qualities, party affiliations or
ideological problems (3)

878. Mention of a specific CANDIDATE or relative of a candidate --
NFS [1988]

retired. 879. 1974-1986: Other specific references to quality of
political leaders (9) *

retired. 880. 1974-1986: DEMOCRATIC LANDSLIDE; all references to unequal
representation of parties/constituents in Congress
(7) *

881. New president/administration getting started; other references
specific to the President [1980] (1978: New President/new
administration getting started) (1976: President Carter --new
administration getting started; other specific Carter mentions)

retired. 882. 1978-1986: Issues pertaining to the district economy; federal
spending in the district, in general or for specific
projects (15)

885. PUBLIC APATHY/disinterest--all references *

retired. 886. 1976-1986: Getting people {back} together; unity of our
people (35)
retired. 890. 1974-1986: Other specific issues relating to the functioning of
the government \merged with #899\ (82) *

887. Extending/protecting EQUAL RIGHTS, basic freedoms, human rights
of all citizens [1990]

899. Other specific mention of problems relating to the functioning

of government [1988]

LABOR PROBLEMS / UNION-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS: (#200-299)   coded 5
_____

   200. LABOR/UNION PROBLEMS; union practices; job security provided
        workers; job safety issues; working conditions (1974-1986:
        LABOR/UNION PROBLEMS; general reference to union practices) *

retired. 201. 1974-1986: ANTI-UNION; protection of workers from unions;
                right to work laws; democracy in unions; elimination
                of racketeers/ communists in unions; financial
                accountability of union officials; anti- union
                legislation (29) *

retired. 202. 1974-1986: SUPPORT OF UNIONS; vis a vis employers; freedom
                to strike; permission for closed shop; pro-union
                legislation (4) *

retired. 209. 1974-1986: Other specific references to labor/union problems
                (11) *

retired. 210. 1974-1986: {ARBITRATION OF} LABOR MANAGEMENT DISPUTES;
general
                reference to strikes/ walkouts, binding
                arbitration (14) *
retired. 211. 1974-1986: FOR arbitration of labor management disputes;
                central prevention of strikes/ binding arbitration
                (9) *
retired. 212. 1974-1986: AGAINST arbitration of labor management disputes; in
                favor of strikes {as tactic} (1) *
retired. 219. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to {arbitration of} labor
                management disputes (4) *

   220. Anti-union; unions too powerful [1976]

retired. 290. 1974-1986: Other specific references to labor problems (14) *

   299. Other specific mention of labor or union-management problems
        [1988]

   NATURAL RESOURCES   (#150-199)   coded 6

   _____

   150. CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES; conservation, ecology;
        protecting the environment/endangered species (1974-1986:
        CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES; general reference to
        conservation, ecology; the environment in general) *

   151. Controlling/REGULATING GROWTH or land development; banning
        further growth/development in crowded or ecologically sensitive
        areas; preserving natural areas [1990] (1974-1988: FOR

conservation programs; additional legislation for controlling
pollution, water and air; in favor of legislative solutions for
environmental problems) *

retired. 152. 1974-1986: AGAINST {additional or increased} conservation
programs; against legislation for controlling
water and air pollution; against legislative or
forced solutions for environmental problems (7) *

153. POLLUTION; clean air/water (1976-1986: Pollution {no specific
program mentioned, not codeable in #151,152}
154. Disposal of RADIOACTIVE/TOXIC waste (dumps, landfills)
(1982-1986: Disposal of radioactive waste {dumps, landfills})
(1980: Disposal of nuclear waste {dumps, landfills})

retired. 159. 1974-1986: Other specific references to conservation/ natural
resources {not #160-169} (38) *

160. DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES /ENERGY SOURCES; harbors, dams,
canals, irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation;
location, mining, stock-piling of minerals; water power, atomic
power; development of alternative sources of energy (includes
mentions of solar or nuclear power) (1980-1986: DEVELOPMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES; general reference to harbors, dams, canals,
irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location,
mining, stockpiling of minerals; water power, atomic power;
development of alternative sources of energy {includes mentions
of solar or nuclear power}) (1974-1978: DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL
RESOURCES; general reference to harbors, dams, canals,
irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location,
mining, stockpiling of minerals; water power, atomic power;
development of alternative sources of energy) *

retired. 161. 1980-1986: FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES {not #151};
need to develop alternative sources of energy
{mentions of solar or nuclear power} \merged with
#160\ (66)
1974-1978: FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES {not #151};
need to develop alternative sources of energy *

retired. 162. 1980-1986: AGAINST {additional or increased} DEVELOPMENT
OF NATURAL RESOURCES; high cost of development of
natural resources to the environment {not #152};
against programs to develop alternative sources of
energy {includes mentions of solar or nuclear
power} (13) 1974-1978: FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL
RESOURCES {not #151}; need to develop alternative
sources of energy *

retired. 169. 1974-1986: Other specific references to the development of
natural resources (7) *
retired. 190. 1974-1986: Other specific references to other natural
resources problems (6) *

199. Other specific mentions of agriculture or natural resources
problems [1988]

PUBLIC ORDER PROBLEMS   (#045,046, 320-399)   coded 7

_____

045. PRO-ABORTION; pro-choice; the right of a woman to control her
body (1974-1986: PRO-ABORTION) *

046. ANTI-ABORTION; pro-life; "abortion"--NFS (1974-1986:
ANTI-ABORTION) *

retired. 049. 1974-1986: Other specific references to abortion \merged with
#046\ (27) *

320. NARCOTICS; availability of drugs; extent of drug/alcohol
addiction in the U.S.; interdiction of drugs coming to the U.S.
from foreign countries; alcohol or drug related crime
(1974-1986: NARCOTICS; general reference to drugs; drug
addiction; pep pills, LSD, marijuana) *

retired. 321. 1974-1986: AGAINST use of narcotics, LSD, marijuana, alcohol,
etc. \merged with #320\ (90) *
retired. 329. 1974-1986: Other specific mention of narcotics/drugs/alcohol,
etc. \merged with #320\ (28) *

330. WOMEN'S RIGHTS; references to women's issues; economic equality
for women; ERA (1974-1986: WOMEN'S RIGHTS/LIBERATION; general
reference) *

retired. 331. 1974-1986: PRO women's rights/liberation; for ERA \merged
with #330\ (21) *
retired. 332. 1974-1986: ANTI women's rights/liberation; against ERA
\merged with #330\ (23) *
retired. 339. 1974-1986: Other specific references to women's rights/
liberation (11) *

340. CRIME/VIOLENCE; too much crime; streets aren't safe; mugging,
murder, shoplifting; drug related crime [1989] (1988:
CRIME/VIOLENCE; too much crime; streets aren't safe; mugging,
murder, shoplifting) (1974-1986: CRIME/VIOLENCE; general
reference to crime) *

retired. 341. 1974-1986: Too much crime; streets aren't safe; mugging,
murder, shoplifting \merged with #340\ (113) *

retired. 342. 1974-1986: JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; any mention {not #320-329,383}
(15) *
retired. 350. 1974-1986: CIVIL LIBERTIES; general reference to rights of
accused, freedom of speech, etc. (10) *
retired. 351. 1974-1986: FOR {expansion of} civil rights/rights of accused/
freedom of speech, etc. (6) *
retired. 352. 1974-1986: AGAINST {expansion of} civil rights/rights of

accused/freedom of speech, etc. (10) *

retired. 359. 1976-1986: General or specific references to human rights;
                "discrimination" {not codeable in #300-304, 330-339}
                (30)

360. LAW AND ORDER; respect for the law/police; support for the
     police; death penalty; tougher sentences for criminals; need for
     more prisons [1990] (1988: LAW AND ORDER; respect for the
     law/police; support for the police; death penalty) (1974-1986:
     LAW AND ORDER; general reference to law/police enforcement) *

retired. 361. 1986: FOR greater law/police enforcement; pro death penalty
                \merged with #360\ (62) 1974-1984: FOR greater
                law/police enforcement *
retired. 362. 1974-1986: AGAINST police brutality, police state, wiretapping,
                etc.; against death penalty (1) *
retired. 364. 1974-1986: Against STUDENT DISORDERS/DISTURBANCES; riots on
                campus (1) *

367. Against unregistered ownership of guns; legislative control of
     guns; "CONTROL OF GUNS"-NFS [1989] (1974-1988: Against
     unregistered ownership of guns; legislative control of guns;
     "CONTROL OF GUNS") *

368. For gun ownership; right to have guns; against gun control *

retired. 369. 1974-1986: Specific mention of "law and order" (10) *

370. EXTREMIST GROUPS/TERRORISTS; terrorist bombings/hostage-taking;
     political subversives; revolutionary ideas/approaches (1986:
     General mention of extremist groups; terrorists; terrorist
     bombings; political subversives; revolutionary ideas/approaches,
     NA direction) (1974-1984: General mention of extremist groups;
     terrorists; terrorist bombings; terrorist highjackings; political
     subversives; revolutionary ideas/approaches, NA direction) *

retired. 372. 1974-1986: Against extremist groups; terrorists; subversives
                {exc.#373,374} (16) *
retired. 373. 1974-1986: Against Arab terrorists; PLO (2) *
retired. 374. 1986: Terrorist hijacking; terrorist hostage-taking \merged
                with #370\ (29) 1974-1984: Terrorist hijacking *
retired. 379. 1974-1986: Other specific mention of terrorist groups/
                subversives (5) *

380. General mention of MORAL/RELIGIOUS DECAY (of nation); sex, bad
     language, adult themes on TV [1984] (1974-1982: General mention
     of MORAL/RELIGIOUS DECAY {of nation}) *

381. Family problems--divorce; proper treatment of children; decay of
     family (except #006) (1976-1986: Family problems--divorce;
     proper treatment of children; decay of family)

383. Problems of/with YOUNG PEOPLE; drug/alcohol abuse among young
     people; sexual attitudes; lack of values/discipline; mixed-up

thinking; lack of goals/ambition/sense of responsibility [1989]
(1974-1988: YOUNG PEOPLE {exc.#361}; general reference to
drinking {exc.#321}, sexual freedom, discipline, mixed-up
thinking, "hippies;" communication with young, etc.) *

384. Religion (too) mixed up in politics; prayer in school
(1984-1986: Religion {too} mixed up in politics)

retired. 390. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to public order problems
\merged with #399\ (96) *
retired. 395. 1974-1986: Control of {internal} communist threat; communists
(34) *

385. HOMOSEXUALITY; protecting civil rights of gays and lesbians;
accepting the lifestyle of homosexuals; granting homosexual
couples the same rights and benefits as heterosexual couples
[1992]

399. Other specific mention of racial or public order problems; other
mention of domestic issues [1988]
765. Allowing/accepting gays in the military [1992]

RACIAL PROBLEMS   (#300-304)   coded 8
_____

300. CIVIL RIGHTS/RACIAL PROBLEMS; programs to enable Blacks to gain
social/economic/educational/political equality; relations
between Blacks and whites (1974-1986: CIVIL RIGHTS/RACIAL
PROBLEMS; general or vague reference in which R's personal
perspective is unclear; NA R's perspective) *

retired. 301. 1974-1986: Protection of {expansion of} CIVIL RIGHTS OF BLACKS;
housing integration; fair employment practices;
right to vote; fair treatment by police (32) *

302. PROTECTION (expansion) OF WHITE MAJORITY; maintenance of
segregation; right to choose own neighborhood; right to
discriminate in employment *

retired. 303. 1974-1986: Protection {expansion} of civil rights to other
{or all} MINORITY GROUPS (12) *

304. Discrimination against whites; preferred treatment given to minorities *

retired. 310. 1974-1986: BUSING; general reference (31) *
retired. 311. 1974-1986: PRO-BUSING; school integration (13) *
retired. 312. 1974-1986: ANTI-BUSING; maintenance of segregated schools (6) *
retired. 317. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to civil rights/racial
problems (13) *

retired. 319. 1974-1986: AGAINST other specific programs/proposals/
legislation for {extending} civil rights (2) *

SOCIAL WELFARE   (#001-099,760-769 exc.045,046) coded 9
_____

001. General reference to domestic issues; repairing/maintaining
   nation's infrastructure (roads, bridges, dams, etc) (1974-1986:
   General reference to domestic issues) *

005. POPULATION; any mention of population increase; reference to
   over-population/birth control *

006. DAY CARE; child care [1988]

010. UNEMPLOYMENT; the number of people with jobs; unemployment
   rate/compensation; job retraining (1974-1986: UNEMPLOYMENT;
   general reference to employment/unemployment; compensation; job
   retraining, etc.) *

retired. 011. 1974-1986: FOR increased unemployment compensation; more or
               better job retraining; aid to depressed economic
               areas; government creation of jobs \merged with
               #010\ (186) *
retired. 012. 1974-1986: AGAINST increased unemployment compensation;
               less job retraining no government creation of jobs
               (8) *

013. CREATE JOBS/RECRUIT INDUSTRY in specific area/region/state
   [1988]

retired. 019. 1974-1986: Other specific references to employment/unemployment
               {not 200-299} (52) *

020. EDUCATION; financial assistance for schools/colleges/students;
   quality of education/the learning environment/teaching
   (1974-1986: EDUCATION; general reference to financial assistance
   for schools/colleges; quality of education) *

retired. 021. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} aid to education, financial
               assistance to schools and/or colleges; need for
               improved school materials; need for better
               teachers/education \merged with #020\ (102) *

retired. 022. 1974-1986: AGAINST aid to education (2) *
retired. 029. 1964-1986: Other specific references to education (49)*

030. AGED/ELDERLY; social security benefits; administration of social
   security; medical care for the aged; medicare benefits; insuring
   against catastrophic illness (1980-1986: AGED/ELDERLY; general
   reference to aged; Social Security; Medicare; medical care for
   the aged; administration of Social Security) (1974-1978:
   AGED/ELDERLY; general reference to aged; Social Security;
   Medicare; medical care for the aged) *

retired. 031. 1982-1986: FOR {increased} assistance to the aged; increased

Social Security; for government supported medical
care for the aged; "Medicare" \merged with #030\
(313)
1974-1980: FOR increased assistance to the aged; increased
Social Security; for government supported medical
care for the aged; "Medicare" *

retired. 032. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} assistance to the aged;
against additional Social Security; anti- "Medicare"
(13) *

035. Social Security won't be around in the future; paying into a
system which won't benefit me/them [1984]

retired. 039. 1974-1986: Other specific references to the aged (24) *

040. HEALTH PROBLEMS/COST OF MEDICAL CARE; quality of medical care;
medical research/training of doctors and other health personnel;
hospitals; National Health insurance program (1974-1986: HEALTH
PROBLEMS; general reference to quality of care; COST OF MEDICAL
CARE; medical research, training of doctors and other health
personnel; hospitals; National Health Insurance) *

retired. 041. 1974-1986: FOR increased {government supported} quality of
care more medical research and training of related
personnel; for National Health Insurance (48) *

retired. 042. 1974-1986: AGAINST {government} supported medical care,
National Health Insurance, etc. (3) *

retired. 043. 1974-1986: MENTAL HEALTH care facilities/problems--all
references (8) *

048. Other specific references to health problems; AIDS [1986]
(1974-1984: Other specific references to health problems) *

050. HOUSING; providing housing for the poor/homeless; ability of
young people to afford to buy homes/find homes to buy
(1974-1986: HOUSING; general reference {not #054}) *

retired. 051. 1974-1986: FOR {additional} legislation/expenditures on
housing {not #055} (25) *
retired. 052. 1974-1986: AGAINST {additional} legislation/expenditures
on housing (2) *
retired. 054. 1974-1986: URBAN RENEWAL/PLANNING; general reference to
ghettos, slums, urban blight; model cities programs;
include general reference to "urban problems" (9) *
retired. 055. 1974-1986: FOR urban renewal; model cities program; rent
subsidies, etc. (3) *
retired. 059. 1974-1986: Other specific reference to housing and urban
problems (15) *

060. POVERTY; aid to the poor/underprivileged people; help for the
(truly) needy; welfare programs (such as ADC); general reference

to anti-poverty programs; hunger/help for hungry people in the
U.S. (1984-1986: POVERTY; general reference to poor/
underprivileged people; welfare programs (such as ADC), general
reference to anti-poverty programs; hunger/hungry people in the
U.S.) (1974-1982: POVERTY; general reference to poor/
underprivileged people; welfare programs (such as ADC), general
reference to anti-poverty programs) *

retired. 061. 1984-1986: FOR {additional} welfare assistance {for help,
education/jobs for the poor} {exc.#063}; give {more}
aid to hungry people in U.S. \merged with #060\
(221)
1974-1982: FOR {additional} welfare assistance {for help,
education/jobs for the poor} {exc.#063} *
retired. 062. 1974-1986: AGAINST {additional} welfare assistance {exc.#064}
(55) *
retired. 063. 1974-1986: FOR {additional} welfare assistance SPECIFICALLY TO
BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS (4) *
retired. 064. 1974-1986: AGAINST {additional} welfare assistance SPECIFICALLY
TO BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS; INDIANS,
MEXICAN-AMERICANS, CHICANOS, PUERTO RICANS, etc.
(9) *
retired. 069. 1974-1986: Other specific references to poverty (38) *

090. SOCIAL WELFARE PROBLEMS; "welfare"--NFS (1974-1986: SOCIAL
WELFARE PROBLEMS; vague or general reference to other social
welfare problems {exc.#091,092} or other specific reference;
"welfare") *

091. For general or other social welfare programs; "we need to help
people more" *

092. Against general or other social welfare programs; "too many give
away programs for the people who don't deserve it" *

099. Other specific mentions of social welfare problems [1988]

760. BENEFITS FOR VETERANS; general reference *

retired. 761. 1974-1986: FOR {increased} benefits for veterans (11) *
retired. 762. 1974-1986: AGAINST {increased} benefits for veterans (1) *
retired. 769. 1974-1986: Other specific references to benefits for veterans
(5) *

OTHER   (#000,950-959, 995-999) coded 0, 97-99

_____

retired. 950. 1974-1986: WATERGATE/TAPES; general reference to Watergate
{exc. #951} (33) * {to 97} retired. 951. 1974-1986:
AGAINST government allocation of time/money for
Watergate issues; trial too much time spent on
Watergate (9) * {to 97}

retired. 959. 1974-1986: Other specific Watergate mentions (3) * {to 97}

Note: Cases coded 997 in original study datasets have been
     recoded to 990 in Cumulative Data File variable VCF0877.

   995. "There were no issues"; "there were no issues, just party
        politics" [1978] (to 00)

   996. "There was no campaign in my district" [1978] (to 00)

   997. Other specific mentions of important problems * (to 97)

   998. DK * (to 98)

   999. NA * (to 99)

   000. Inap, no further mention; no problems * (to 00)

>> STATES AND PARTIES OF ELECTIONS/CANDIDATES

Years below are included if valid data are included for that
year in variables relevant to the race/candidate type.

STATES WITH NO GUBERNATORIAL RACE:

1952: AL, CA, CT, GA, ID, KY, LA, MD, MS, NJ, NY, OR, PA, SC, VA
1958: FL, IL, IN, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, NJ, VA, WA
1964: AL, CA, CO, CT, GA, KY, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, NJ, NY, OH, OK,
       OR, PA, SC, TN, VA
1966: IL, IN, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, NJ, UT, VA, WA
1968: AL, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, NE,
       NJ, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, VA
1970: IL, IN, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, NJ, UT, VA, WA
1972: AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS,
       NE, NJ, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, VA, WI
1974: IL, IN, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, NJ, UT, VA, WA, WV
1976: AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN,
       MS, NE, NJ, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WI
1978: DE, IN, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, NJ, UT, VA, WA, WV
1980: AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME,
       MI, MN, MS, NE, NJ, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WI,
       WY
1986: IN, LA, NC, NJ, VA, WA, WV
1990: IN, MO, NC, NJ, VA, WA, WV
1994: IN, LA, MO, NJ, NC, UT, VA, WA, WV
1998: IN, MO, NJ, VT, VA, WA

STATES WITH NO PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY/ CAUCUS:

1972: AZ, AR, CO, CT, GA, IA, KY, LA, ME, MN, MS, MO, SC, TX, UT,
    VA, WA
1976: AZ, CO, CT, IA, LA, ME, MN, MS, MO, OK, SC, UT, VA
1980: AZ, CO, DE, IA, ME, MN, MO, OK, UT, VA, WA, WY
1988: none
1992: none

States with SENATE race:

1978 - AL, AR, CO, DE, GA, IA, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC,
    NE, NJ, OK, OR, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
1980 - AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD,
    MO, NC, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, VT, WA, WI
1982 - AZ, CA, CT, FL, IN, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, NE, NJ, NY, OH,
    PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV
1984 - AL, AR, CO, GA, IA, IL, KS, MA, MI, MN, NC, NH, NJ, OR, TN, TX,
    VA, WV, WY
1986 - AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, MO, NC,
    NH, NY, OH, OR, PA, WA, WI
1988 - CA, CT, FL, IN, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, NJ, NY, OH, PA, TN, TX, VA,
    WA, WI, WV, WY
1990 - CA, CT, FL, MD, MO, NY, OH, PA, WI, WA
1992 - AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, MO, NC,
    NH, NY, OH, OR, PA, SC, WA, WI
1994 - AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, KS, MA, MD, MI, MN, NE,
    NH, NY, OH, OR, PA, SD, TN, TX, WI, WY
1996 - AL, AR, CO, GA, IL, IA, KS, LA, MA, MI, MN, MS, NE, NH, NJ, NM,
    NC, OK, OR, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
1998 - AL, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IL, IN, MD, MO, NH, NY, OH, OR,
    PA, UT, WA, WI
2000 - AZ, CA, CT, DE, FL, GA, IN, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE,
    NV, NJ, NM, NY, ND, OH, PA, RI, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI,
    WY
2002 - AL, AK, AR, CO, DE, GA, ID, IL, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MI, MN,
    MS, MO, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NC, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA,
    WV, WY

The parties of the named senators with term not up are as follow:

1978 Dem: AL, AR, CO, GA, IA, IL, KY, LA, MA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC,
      NE, NJ, SC, TN, TX, WV
   Rep: DE, KS, OK, OR, WY
   Ind: AZ

1980 Dem: AL, AR, AZ, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, NY, OH, OK, WA, WI
   Rep: CA, CO, CT, IA, IL, IN, KS, MO, NC, OR, PA, SC, UT

1982 Dem: CA, CT, MA, MI, MO, NE, NJ, WV
   Rep: AZ, FL, IN, MD, ME, MN, MS, NY, PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI

1986 Dem: AL, AZ, AR, FL, GA, IA, IL, LA, MD, NY, OH, WI
   Rep: CA, CO, CT, IN, KS, MO, NC, NH, OR, PA, WA

1988 Dem: CA, CT, FL, MA, MD, MI, NJ, NY, OH, TN, WA, WV

Rep: IN, MN, MO, PA, TX, VA, WI, WY

1990 Dem: AL, AR, CO, GA, IL, MA, MI, NC, NJ, TN, TX, VA, WV
  Rep: IA, IN, KS, MN, NH, OR, WY

1992 Dem: AL, AZ, AR, CT, GA, IL, IA, LA, MD, NY, OH, PA, WI
  Rep: CO, FL, IN, KS, MO, NH, NC, OR, WA

1994 Dem: CA, CT, FL, MA, MD, MI, MN, NE, NJ, OH, WA, WI, WV
  Rep: AZ, IN, MO, NY, OK, PA, TX, UT, VA, WY

If there was no senate race in state AND no post IW, then 999 (no post) has been coded.

The parties of the first senators named are as follow:

1978 Democratic: AZ, CA, CT, FL, IN, MD, MO, NY, OH, WA, WI
  Republican: PA, UT

1980 Democratic: DE, MA, ME, MI, MS, NE, NJ, TN, TX, WV
  Republican: MN, WY
  Independent: VA

1982 Democratic: AL, AR, CO, GA, KY, LA, OK
  Republican: IA, IL, NC, OR, SC, SD

1986 Democratic: MA, MI, NJ, TN, WV
  Republican: MN, TX, VA, WY

1988 Democratic: AL, AR, CO, GA, IA, IL
  Republican: KS, NH, NC, OR

1990 Democratic: CA, CT, FL, MD, NY, OH, WA, WI
  Republican: MO, PA

1992 Democratic: MA, MI, NE, NJ, TN, TX, VA, WV
  Republican: MN, WY

1994 Democratic: AL, AR, GA, IA, IL, LA, SD
  Republican: CO, KS, KY, NH, OR

The parties of the second senators named are as follow:

1978 Democratic: FL, OH, WA, WI
  Republican: AZ, CA, CT, IN, MD, MO, NY, PA, UT

1980 Democratic: MA, MI, NE, NJ, WV
  Republican: DE, ME, MN, MS, TN, TX, VA, WY

1982 Democratic: AR, IL, KY, LA, SC
  Republican: AL, CO, GA, IA, NC, OK, OR, SD

1986 Democratic: MA, MI, NJ, TN, TX, WV
  Republican: MN, VA, WY

1988 Democratic: AL, AR, GA, IL, NC
   Republican: CO, IA, KS, NH, OR

1990 Democratic: CT, MD, OH
   Republican: CA, FL, MO, NY, PA, WA, WI

1992 Democratic: MA, MI, MN, NE, NJ, TN, WV
   Republican: TX, VA, WY

1994 Democratic: AL, AR, CO, IL, KY, LA
   Republican: GA, IA, KS, NH, OR, SD

>>1952-1968 PARTY-CANDIDATE MASTER CODES

Note:
1952-1968 Variables providing collapsed codes have been
collapsed as follows:

01. 1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090
02. 1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190
03. 1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291
04. 1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399
05. 1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499
06. 1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599
07. 1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692
08. 1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799
09. 1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890
10. 1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999
21. 0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091,
    8010-8090,9011-9132
22. 0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296,
    8100-8297,9133-9292
23. 0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391,
    8302-8391,9304-9391
24. 0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409,
    8401-8409,9403-9413
25. 0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599,
    8410-8599,9415-9599
26. 0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699,
    8600-8699,9601-9699
27. 0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799,
    6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799,
    8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,9790-9799
28. 0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789,
    8780-8789,9782-9789
29. 0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896,
    8800-8896,9800-9890
30. 0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999,
    8900-8999,9901-9986

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

11.
Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good
president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocre (1968)
12.
Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)
13.
Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with
responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (unspecified) (1968)
21.
No military experience (1968)
30.
Unsuccessful record, was a poor governor (1968)
40.
Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)
50.
Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)
70.
Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)
81.
Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)
90.
Other experience and ability (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

100.
Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)
110.
Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)
120.
Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating
(1968)
132.
Colorless, uninspiring (1968)
133.
People don't have confidence in him (1968)
134.
Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in
America, cause race war, civil war (1968)
135.
Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)
140.
Not a (skilled) politician (1968)
141.
A politician, too much in politics (1968)
142.
Tells people what they want to hear (1968)
150.
Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)
160.
R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of
things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any answers (1968)

170.
Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)
180.
Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)
181.
Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)
182.
Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power (other than Congress) (1968)
190.
Other <leadership abilities> (1968)
200.
Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na sense) (1968)
201.
Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)
210.
Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)
220.
Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)
221.
Will be bad for the country (1968)
231.
Poorly informed, doesn't understand the problems facing us (1968)
232.
Unrealistic, not down to earth, too idealistic (1968)
233.
Not sensible, doesn't know what he's talking about, doesn't know much (1968)
234.
Narrow-minded (1968)
240.
Stupid, not intelligent enough, not educated (1968)
251.
Irreligious (1968)
272.
Negative comments about making wife governor (1968)
281.
Won't work hard enough, part-time president (1968)
290.
Other <personal qualifications> (1968)
291.
Fanatic, unstable, dangerous (unspecified) (1968)
295.
Too dictatorial, craves power (1968)
297.
Demogogue or any reference tying Wallace to Hitler or to the Gestapo (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

304.
Don't like him as a person (1968)
305.
Doesn't have a nice personality (1968)
306.
Jokes too much (1968)
308.
Don't like his face (1968)
311.
Cold, aloof, doesn't have the people's interests at heart (1968)
312.
Not likable, people don't know him, doesn't get along with people
(1968)
330.
Insincere (1968)
340.
Undemocratic (non-partisan meaning) (1968)
351.
Poor speaker, doesn't speak well (see also 0841) (1968)
352.
Looks terrible on TV (1968)
363.
Not young enough, too old (1968)
365.
Bad age (unspecified) (1968)
370.
(Anti-intellectual response), too 'high-fallutin', can't understand him,
talks in circles, can't communicate to common people (1968)
371.
Not outspoken, won't take any stands, doesn't say anything (1968)
372.
Not courageous (unspecified) (1968)
380.
He's not well known (1968)
390.
Other (1968)
391.
Mention of region or state, e.g., he's a Southerner (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

403.
Doesn't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies
(1968)
404.
Don't know where he stands, position unclear, inconsistent (1968)
409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:

STAND ON DOMESTIC POLICIES

411.
Would handle domestic affairs poorly, lacks experience in
domestic affairs (1968)
413.
His domestic policy (unspecified) (1968)
415.
Will support (continue, would not change) Democratic (Johnson's)
domestic policies (1968)
416.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic
(Johnson's) domestic policies (1968)
420.
Socialistic - will bring too much government activity in economic
and social welfare (Social Security, medical care mentioned only
as examples), creeping socialism (1968)
447.
Will reduce government spending too much, won't increase
government spending (enough), over-emphasizes balancing the
budget (1968)
448.
Will raise taxes too much, keep high taxes, will increase
government spending (too much) (1968)
451.
Would bring worse times, depression, higher cost of living, less
employment (1968)
461.
Would give too much power to private enterprise, he's against big
government (1968)
471.
Liberal, more liberal than most Dems and/or Reps, too much of a
left-wing radical, extremist (see 0970-0979 for responses on cand.
stand on or connection with radicals, far right, etc. as opposed to
R's labeling the cand. with such terms) (1968)
472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals (1968)
474.
Candidate too much for social reform, social change (1968)
481.
Conservative, more conservative than most Dems and/or Reps,
too much of a right-wing radical, extremist (1968)
482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives (1968)
483.
Too radical, too extreme (na direction) (1968)
484.
Reactionary, against change (1968)
485.
Wallace is for 'states rights', for local control, local government
(1968)
490.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (na direction of
candidate's stand) (1968)

491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring government activity) (1968)
492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand as favoring priv. enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
500.
Stand on civil rights, integration, race, negro problem - na direction (1968)
510.
For civil rights, e.g., for desegregation, school integration, civil rights law (1968)
520.
Against civil rights, e.g., against desegregation, willing to go easy on desegregation and school integration, voting (1968)
532.
He is anti civil liberties, witch-hunting (1968)
541.
Farm policy (1968)
553.
Labor policy (1968)
570.
Law and order, hard line - na group reference (see 5570) (1968)
571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
574.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 571-573 (1968)
575.
Law and order cover for facist, dictatorial policies, would bring about (not stop our drift to) a facist state, police state (1968)
576.
Wallace against gun control, federal gun legislation, or gun control (na direction) (1968)
577.
Supreme Court - Wallace seen as too critical of (will change) decisions, members (not connected with school decisions - coded under civil rights) (1968)
580.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 5580) (1968)
581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
584.
Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 581-583 (1968)
585.

Wouldn't stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
587.
Defied federal laws in integration of Ala. U., showed disrespect for the law (1968)
590.
Other negative domestic policy reference (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as example - for all codes except 0682-0689) (1968)
593.
Stand on education (1968)
594.
Stand on medical care, e.g., Medicare, care for the aged (1968)
599.
Self-interest - any indication that R or his family would be injured by Wallace's domestic policies (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI: STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

601.
Doesn't know how to handle the world situation (unspecified which), military situation, doesn't know how to handle other countries, not enough experience abroad, countries don't respect him (1968)
603.
His foreign policy (unspecified) (1968)
605.
Will support (continue, would not change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
606.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
622.
Too isolationist, not interested enough in helping other countries, UN (1968)
660.
Would handle trouble spots poorly, would respond poorly to new foreign situation, future world crisis, general (1968)
661.
MidEast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)
662.
Red China - any comment (1968)
664.
Pueblo - any comment (1968)
666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
670.
Will lose prestige race with Russia, will lower America's prestige in world (1968)
681.

Warlike, too militaristic, will get us into (full-scale, nuclear) war (1968)
682.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) He won't get us out of Vietnam war, will get us into a bigger war, don't like his stand on Vietnam, unspecified (1968)
683.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as not representing a change (na direction) (1968)
687.
Unclear stand on Vietnam war (1968)
689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
690.
Other foreign policy reference (1968)
694.
Don't like stand on the draft (1968)
696.
Stand on atomic energy, use of atomic energy or hydrogen bomb (1968)
699.
Any tying of R's or his family's personal welfare to Wallace's foreign policy (draft, being called back into service, etc.) (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
DISLIKES WALLACE BECAUSE HE'S BAD FOR, WOULD NOT BE FAIR
TO, ETC. --

702.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special, privileged groups (1968)
703.
People like me, people like us (1968)
711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people' (1968)
712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the working man (1968)
720.
Labor, labor unions (na whether members or leaders) (1968)
722.
Labor union members (1968)
730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little) (1968)
732.
Big business, industry (1968)
740.
Small business or businessmen (specific reference to size) (1968)
750.
Middle class people, white collar workers (1968)
760.

Farmers (1968)
770.
Negroes (too good for whites) (1968)
771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
790.
Other (1968)
791.
Other minority groups (1968)
792.
Old people, the aged (1968)
793.
Veterans, servicemen (1968)
794.
Sectionalism (1968)
799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
DISLIKES WALLACE BECAUSE HE'S TOO GOOD FOR, ETC. --

781.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others (1968)
782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
(1968)
783.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street (1968)
787.
Negroes (1968)
788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
789.
Other (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI:
WALLACE AND POLITICAL PARTIES

800.
He's really a Democrat, I couldn't vote for a Democrat (1968)
810.
(Pro-established parties, anti-third party, two party system
response given in context of Wallace candidacy) e.g. - he's
destroying the two party system, third party would cause trouble in
two party democracy (1968)
820.
Not a real Democrat, not like most Democrats (1968)
830.
Don't like the men around him, his associates (1968)
841.
Don't like his speeches, campaign tactics (1968)
842.
Wallace too critical of opponents, runs them (other parties, other

people) down too much (1968)
860.
Don't like his V.P. selection, relationship to V.P. (1968)
870.
He can't win - afraid to waste vote, just hurt HHH or Nixon, don't want election thrown into House (1968)
890.
Other responses relating Wallace to party system or his party (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- ANTI: OTHER

901.
I just don't like him, don't like him at all (no specific content) (1968)
902.
I'm not voting for Wallace (1968)
903.
No - emphatic - to question on what like about candidate (1968)
913.
Wallace won't change policies of Johnson administration (1968)
930.
R influenced by other people (1968)
970.
Stand on, connection with extremism, radicals (unspecified) (1968)
971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
972.
Stand on, connection with the Ku Klux Klan (1968)
977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
985.
Don't like stand on immorality in country (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO: OTHER

9901.
'I just like him' (no specific content) (1968)
9913.
He'll bring a change (1968)
9970.
Stand on, connection with extremism, radicals (unspecified) (1968)
9971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
9972.
Stand on, connection with the Ku Klux Klan (1968)
9977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
9978.

Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
9979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
9985.
Like stand on immorality in country (1968)
9986.
Lesser of two (three) evils, couldn't vote for Nixon or Humphrey,
best available but not particularly happy with him (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
LIKES PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

1010.
Johnson (1960)
1020.
Kennedy (1958)
1021.
Kennedy, Robert (1968)
1022.
Kennedy, Ted (1968)
1030.
Truman
1040.
Roosevelt
1050.
Stevenson
1051.
McCarthy (1968)
1060.
Humphrey, good choice for nominee (1964)
1061.
Kefauver
1062.
Sparkman
1063.
Acheson
1064.
Russell
1065.
Daley, the mayor of Chicago (1968)
1066.
Muskie, good choice for nominee (1968)
1070.
Local and national Democratic leaders (1964)
1071.
Other national Democrats (Senators, Congressmen, etc.)
1072.
Local Democrat(s) (city, state, etc.)
1080.
Democrats have ((1958:) have always had) good leaders, young
leaders, experienced leaders, good men, like whole ticket
1081.
Democrats have good leaders, like leaders (1964)
1090.

Other; <people in party liked> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

1100.
(1952,1956,1958,1960 ONLY:) ((1956: Would give us an) Efficient administration, business-like administration, good administration, good government (domestic or na whether domestic or foreign); would provide an administration or government described as good, efficient, or businesslike (1964,1968 ONLY)

1110.
Would give us honest government, more honest than Republicans, reference to 'mess in Washington', won't play politics in running the government, ((1964 ONLY:) no) patronage

1111.
Honest government, more honest than Republicans, less corruption, graft, less use of patronage than under Republicans

1112.
Do a better job or good job of cleaning up the 'mess in Washington' than Republicans will do

1120.
Democrats would spend less money than Republicans, Democrats economy-minded, will balance budget, decrease national debt (1964)

1121.
Democrats spend less money than Republicans ((1952 ONLY:) would), Democrats economy-minded

1130.
((1952 ONLY:) A lot of) government spending is good for national economy, (such as during a depression); (1952 ONLY:) Dems will spend money when it is needed; Democrats would spend more money than Republicans (1956)

1140.
Dignified government, go at things without fuss. Act quietly, confidently (1956)

1150.
Democrats would keep big business out of the administration ((1956:) government)

1160.
They do a good job (1958)

1190.
Other; <government management> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY, GOVERNMENT PHILOSOPHY

1200.
Like their ideas. Like their policies (unspecified), their domestic policies (unspecified) (1958)

1201.
Like their ideas, new ideas, agree with [(1952,1956:) them (unspecified) / (1968:) their ideas, stands,etc. (all unspecified, na domestic or foreign]; likes their policies, stands (1968)

1202.
Like their domestic ideas, policies ((1952,1956 ONLY:) unspecified)
1210.
For government economic controls, need some planned economy;
(1952,1956,1958 ONLY:) price control, rent control, etc.; need
some control of private enterprise ((1964:) or business)
1220.
For government economic and/or social welfare activity ((1952,
1956, 1958 ONLY:) education, social security, housing, etc.);
government has to take care of things too big for states or private
enterprise (1964 ONLY)
1230.
For government activity (not clear as to whether economic controls
or welfare activity) - government [(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:)
has to / (1964,1968:) should] take care of things too big to be
handled by states or private enterprise ((1952,1956,1958,1960
ONLY:) code here if NA whether [(1952,1956:) 1210 or 1220 or NA
whether 1100 or 1230 / (1958,1960:) 1290 or 1200 or NA whether
1110 or 1210])
1240.
Humanistic;(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) interested in helping
people; puts human rights before property rights; human rights
(1968)
1250.
Favors social reforms, social change, progress, will change things
for the better, improve conditions; (1952, 1956, 1958, 1960
ONLY:) has done good things for country
1264.
(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) Socialism; Like their socialistic
philosophy(1958)
1270.
Liberal, like liberal Northern wing of party (1958)
1272.
Liberal
1273.
Like Northern wing of party (no mention of ideology, or influence or
control - see 1870s) (1968)
1274.
Like peace wing, McCarthy wing of party (1968)
1280.
Conservative, like Southern (conservative) wing of party, states'
rights, Dixiecrats (1958)
1282.
Conservative
1283.
Like Southern wing of party (no mention of ideology, or influence of
control - see 1870s) (1968)
1284.
Like states rights position (1968)
1290.
Other; <government activity, philosophy> (1960 ONLY)
1291.
[(1952, 1956 ONLY:) Attitude toward / (1964,1968:) Stand on]
communism ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) na whether domestic

or foreign)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS -(GEN.) WELFARE AND

ECONOMIC / (R SEES DEM. PTY AS FAVORING GOVT. ACTIVITY)
1300.
Likes stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours. Likes stand on Social Security, pensions (1958)
1301.
Likes stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours
1302.
Likes stand on Social Security, pensions
1303.
Like stand on welfare program, combination of 1300 series (1964)
1310.
Likes stand on aid to education
1320.
Likes stand on housing
1330.
Likes stand on [(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) national health
insurance (socialized medicine) / (1964,1968:) medical care e.g.,
Medicare, health insurance program, socialized medicine]; medical
care for aged (1960 ONLY)
1340.
Likes stand on fiscal policy, tight money, high interest, taxes (1960)
1341.
Likes stand on price, rent, wage control, fiscal policy (1958)
1342.
((1952, 1956 ONLY:) Approve) Bank policy; monetary policy,
interest rates, tight money, loans (1968)
1343.
Likes stand on price control
1344.
Likes stand on rent control
1345.
Likes stand on wage control
1346.
Likes Democratic tax policy, fair tax policy
1350.
Times are (would be) better under Democrats, Dems the party of
prosperity, Dems helped people in depression, would take care of
recession (1958)
1353.
Times are better under Democrats, ((1952 ONLY:) Democrats),
the party of prosperity, good times ((1956 ONLY:) now)
1360.
[(1952 ONLY:) Tried to / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) Democrats
would] do (did) something about inflation, high cost of living, high
prices
1370.
Democrats ((1964 ONLY:) good for employment -) (will) bring
higher wages, more jobs, better working conditions

1380.
[(1952 ONLY:) R likes / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) Democrats
would bring] high(er) prices ((1952 only:) under Democrats);
(including crops) (1958, 1960 ONLY); to producers (1968)
1390.
Like anti-poverty program, manpower retraining (1964)
1391.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party as
favoring government activity) (1968)
1392.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party favoring
private enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - OTHER

1400.
Stand on civil rights, integration, race problem (na direction) (1960)
1410.
[(1952 ONLY:) Likes stand favoring / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:)
Dems. would do more on] civil rights, FEPC, [(ALL YEARS
EXCEPT 1964:) anti- / (1964:) oppose] poll tax; desegregation
(1956); favor integration, civil rights law, segregation, etc. (1964)
1420.
[(1952 ONLY:) Likes stand opposed to / (1956,1958,1960:)
Democrats would do less on / (1964,1968:) Democrats less for]
civil rights ((1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) than Republicans);
((1952,1956 ONLY:) FEPC;(1952 ONLY:) prosegregation;
desegregation, anti-poll tax (1956 ONLY), etc.); (e.g., opposite of
1410 (1964))
1431.
Democrats have good stand on civil liberties, pro-civil liberties;
anti-McCarthyism (1958)
1434.
Democrats have good stand on domestic communism,
communists in government (na domestic or foreign) (1956)
1435.
Democrats have [(1952 ONLY:) taken care of domestic
communism, communists in government / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT
1952:) been (would be) better at handling communists in
government, domestic communism]
1440.
Like Democratic farm policy, price supports, other aid to farmers
(1958)
1441.
Like Democrat farm policy, general; other aid (1956 ONLY)
1442.
Approve of price support for farmers
1444.
Approve of other aid to farmers; likes soil bank, payments to
farmers (1956)
1451.
Like Democratic Labor party, position on right-to-work issues, on
Taft-Hartley (1958)

1453.
Like Democrat labor policy, general
1454.
Approve Democrat stand on Taft-Hartley
1455.
Would be less strikes if Democrats win, ((1958:) better) handling
of strikes (1956)
1460.
Approve ((1958:) Democratic) stand on conservation, public power
(TVA, REA, St. Lawrence Seaway, (1952, 1956 ONLY:) Tidelands
Oil); highways, public works (1960)
1461.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
1470.
Law and order, R sees party as following a tough or hard line but
group reference is unclear or not mentioned, also code here when
na which line (hard or soft) R sees party following ('Hard' refers to
such phrases as 'enforce the law', 'end or stop riots,
demontrations', etc. and 'restore law and order' OR on the anti
side - 'facist oppressive policies', and 'hurt the innocent' -
hereafter, only the term 'hard line' will appear to designate this
group of law and order responses (1968)
1471.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
1472.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
1473.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
1474.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 1471-1473
(1968)
1476.
Democrats against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
1480.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference ('soft line' refers to
such phrases as 'justice and order', 'restrained policy', and 'would
avoid a police state', OR on the anti side - 'law and order broken
down under them', 'too lenient', and 'too permissive') - hereafter,
only the term 'soft line' will appear to designate this group of law
and order responses (1968)
1481.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
1482.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
1483.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
1484.
Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 1481-1483
(1968)
1486.
Democrats for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
1490.
Other ((1958, 1960, 1964 ONLY:)domestic issues); (no mention of
Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as an example - for all

codes except 1581-1589) (1968)
1492.
R gives indication that he likes Democrats because they oppose
government activity in any of the above specifics coded in 1301,
1302, 1310, 1320, 1330, 1343, 1344, 1345
1493.
Approve veterans policy, legislation (1956)
1499.
((1958:)Self-interest) - Any indication that R feels that he or his
family have been (will be) [(1952, 1956:) helped/ (1958,1960,
1968:) aided)] [(1952,1956:) by party (economically, social welfare,
social security, etc. / (1958,1960,1968:) domestic [(1958:) politics
/ (1960, 1968:) policies)]]

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
FOREIGN POLICY

1500.
Democrats would have more effective (clear-cut) foreign policy,
would cut out bungling, indecision, vacilation; good foreign policy
(na why) (1956)
1501.
Favor Democratic foreign policy, good foreign policy, effective
foreign policy (general)
1502.
Good foreign policy (unspecified why) (1964)
1503.
Would have more effective (clear-cut) foreign policy, cut out
bungling, indecision, vacilation (1968)
1504.
Strong, effective foreign policy, provide strong military position,
good scientific program, technological developments, keep up
defenses, handle communists (1964)
1510.
Internationalist, work and cooperate with UN, allies, favor trade, low
tariffs (1964)
1512.
Internationalist (na whether military or economic), would cooperate
with UN, allies (1956)
1518.
Internationalist (na whether military or economic)
1519.
Favors support for (cooperation with) UN, allies
1520.
Isolationist, mind own business, America first concern, oppose
trade, favor high tariffs (1964)
1524.
Would meddle less in other countries' business, would mind own
business (na whether economic or military), be concerned about
America first (1956)
1534.
Favors Democratic military policy, would effectively oppose
communism abroad, stopped spread of communism before
(including Korea) (1958)

1535.
Provided strong military position, has (effectively) opposed, stopped spread of communism abroad, not backed down to Russia, can handle Russia (1968)
1536.
Favors Democratic military policy, [(1952:) has / (1956:) would] (effectively) oppose(d) communism abroad, stopped spread of communism ((1956:) abroad)
1539.
((1952:) Pro) Korean war, Korean war was necessary, stopped communism
1540.
Favor foreign aid - military, economic or unspecified (1964)
1541.
Favors military aid to allies, favors sending troops abroad
1542.
Favors aid to backward nations, Point Four, economic aid
1550.
Oppose foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
1551.
Opposes foreign military aid, troops abroad (1968)
1552.
Would cut out (reduce) ((1968:) non-military) spending abroad, economic aid (1956)
1560.
Would handle [(1956:) Suez trouble / (1960:) specific trouble spots] better (1956); problems in Middle East, Egypt, response to new foreign situation (1956 ONLY); Congo, Cuba, Berlin, etc. (1960 ONLY)
1561.
((1958 ONLY:) Would handle) Mideast problems [(1958:) better (Lebanon, Egypt) / (1968:) (Egypt,Israel) - any comment] (1958)
1562.
Would handle Formosa situation better (China, Matsu, Quemoy) (1958); Red China - any comment (1968)
1564.
Pueblo - any comment (1968)
1566.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
1567.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
1568.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
1570.
Would raise (maintain) U.S. prestige in the world and with allies, would make other countries like us better (1960)
1580.
Better chance for peace with Democrats, will work for disarmament, limit nuclear testing, limit use of weapons (1964)
1581.
Better chance for peace under Democrats; will keep us out of (full-scale, nuclear) war (1968)
1582.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) Better chance for

peace in Vietnam under Democrats, like their stand on Vietnam war, (unspecified) (1968)

1583.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)

1584.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as representing a change (na direction)

1585.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as less militaristic, good at negotiating (1968)

1586.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)

1589.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)

1590.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1958, 1960:) Other ((1964:) foreign policy ((1964 ONLY:) issues)); Misc. foreign policy or foreign policy - na which aspect (1958, 1960 ONLY)

1591.
Approve stand on foreign trade and tariff

1592.
Like defense program (including hydrogen-bomb testing) (1958)

1593.
Like defense program, UMT, draft program

1594.
Approve Democratic draft program, UMT (1958)

1595.
H-bomb testing, atomic defense program (specific) (1956)

1597.
Preparedness and technology, Democrats would have better scientific program, better missiles, subs, etc. (1958)

1599.
Any tying of R's personal welfare or family's welfare to Democratic foreign policy

----

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
LIKE DEMOCRATIC PARTY BECAUSE BAD FOR / ANTI / HAS KEPT (WILL KEEP) IN CHECK / WILL PUT IN THEIR PLACE / WILL CEASE FAVORING --

----

1601.
Special interests, some groups

1615.
Workers, common people, the poor (1964)

1616.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses

1620.
Labor unions, labor union bosses, union members (1964)

1633.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people, rich people, powerful people, Wall Street

1640.
Small business, small businessmen (specifically) (1964)

1650.
White collar workers, salaried workers, the middle class (1964)
1660.
Farmers (1964)
1670.
Negroes
1671.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
1690.
Other(s); <groups party will keep in check> (1960 ONLY);
(includes younger, older people, misc. minority groups) (1964
ONLY)
1692.
Old people, aged (1960)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
LIKE DEMOCRATIC PARTY BECAUSE GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR / HAS
HELPED (WILL HELP) / IS MADE UP OF / WOULD BE FAIR TO --

1700.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies for all, people like me, people like us (1958)
1701.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies for all
1702.
All the people, good for everyone, 'the people', no special privileged
groups (1964)
1703.
People like me, people like us
1710.
Common people, poor people, "the people", lower income people,
working-class people, the laboring man (1958)
1711.
Common people, little people, poor people, "the people"
1712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
1713.
Common people, lower income people, working-class people, the
average man (1964)
1720.
Labor, labor unions (na whether members or leaders)
1721.
Labor, labor unions, members (1958)
1722.
Labor union members
1730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
1731.
Industry, (big) business, businessmen (1958)
1732.
Big business, industry
1740.

((1958:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1958:)
specifically)
1750.
Middle class people, white collar workers; salaried workers (1964)
1760.
Farmers
1770.
Negroes
1771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
1790.
Other; (includes younger people (1956); older people
(1956,1958,1960 ONLY); misc. minority groups (1958)); <favored
by party> (1960 ONLY))
1791.
Other minority groups
1792.
Old people, the aged (1964)
1793.
Veterans, servicemen
1794.
Sectionalism
1799.
Young people (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
PARTY RESPONSES

1800.
Traditional ((1964:) family) vote (always been a Democrat, I'm just
a Democrat); always voted Democrat (1968)
1810.
Speaks of Democrats in positive, personal, affective terms - good
people, nice people, etc.
1811.
Democrats are aggressive, forceful, the aggressive party (1968)
1820.
Can trust Democrats, keep their promises, know where they
stand; are more stable (1958)
1830.
Party well organized, sticks together; united (1964)
1840.
Positive reference to campaign Democrats are waging, like their
campaign, like their nominating convention, open VP nomination
(1956)
1841.
Positive references to campaign(s) Democrats have waged,
conventions (1960)
1842.
Positive reference to campaign(s) Democrats [(1952:) are waging
/ (1958,1968:) have waged]; like their campaign (1952 ONLY)
1843.
Positive reference to national convention (1968)
1850.

((1956:) Like)((1958:) Democratic)((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:)
campaign) promises, na what; platform (1960); (non-specific)
(1964)
1860.
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) Code) Any indication that R
[(1952,1956:) is reacting positively to / (1958,1960,1964,1968:)
likes] local Democratic party (they've done a good job in this
country, etc.)
1870.
Like faction that has influence or is controlling party (e.g., liberals,
Southerners) (1964)
1871.
Like liberal or Northern wing of the party ((1968:) as faction that
has influence or control of party)
1872.
Like conservative or Southern wing of the party, states' rights,
Dixiecrats ((1968:) as a faction that has influence or control of the
party)
1890.
Other party responses (1958)
1891.
Democratic party is sensible, intelligent, more recognized,
experienced, realistic (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
OTHER

1900.
I just like them;(1952, 1956 ONLY:) I like everything about them; it's
a [(1952,1956 ONLY:) great / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) good] party
1911.
Don't change horses in mid-stream; give them more time; party
will carry on Kennedy tradition (1964); Johnson tradition (1968)
1913.
Time for a change (1956)
1920.
[(1952, 1956 ONLY:) Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by husband or wife
1930.
[(1952,1956 ONLY:) Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by other people - father, friends,
business associates, [(1952,1956:) etc./ (1958,1960,1964,1968:)
na whom]
1940.
Democrats are against Republicans or Republican leaders
1950.
Democrats interested in good of the country, not just interested in
staying in power (1964)
1951.
Democratic party is democratic, has grass roots strength, is
representative (1968)
1970.
Like stand on extremism (1964)
1971.

Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
1977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
1978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
1979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
1981.
Like Truman's whistle-stopping
1982.
Releases information, doesn't release too much information (1964)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DISLIKES PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

2010.
Johnson (1960)
2020.
Kennedy (1958)
2021.
Kennedy, Robert (1968)
2022.
Kennedy, Ted (1968)
2030.
Truman
2040.
Roosevelt
2050.
Stevenson
2051.
McCarthy (1968)
2060.
Humphrey, bad choice for nominee (1964)
2061.
Kefauver (1956)
2062.
Sparkman
2063.
Acheson
2064.
Russell
2065.
Daley, the mayor of Chicago (1968)
2066.
Muskie, bad choice for nominee (1968)
2070.
Local and national Democratic leaders (1964)
2071.
Other national Democrats (Senators, Congressmen, etc.)
2072.
Local Democrats (city, state, etc.)
2080.
Democrats have bad leaders, old leaders, inexperienced leaders,
bad men; (1952 ONLY:) Missouri crowd; don't like ticket; some bad

people in party (1968)
2081.
Democrats have bad leaders, don't like leaders (1964)
2090.
Other; <people in party disliked> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

2100.
(1952,1956,1958,1960:) Inefficiency, waste, unbusiness-like
administration, too much bureaucracy, too many government
agencies, red tape (domestic or na whether domestic or foreign);
would provide an administration or government described as
inefficient, wasteful, unbusinesslike, bureaucratic (1964)
2110.
Would give dishonest government, reference to 'mess in
Washington', corruption, graft, patronage, buy votes (1964)
2111.
Corruption, graft, dishonest, patronage
2112.
That mess in Washington, won't clean up that 'mess in
Washington'
2113.
Corruption, graft, dishonest, patronage, buy votes with work
projects (1958)
2121.
Don't spend enough, too economy minded; should spend more
money (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964)
2130.
((1956,1958,1960,1968:) Are) Too much (for) government
spending, deficit spending, bankrupting country, unbalanced
budget; [(1956,1958,1960,1968:) would increase / (1964:)
increasing] national debt; Democrats would spend more money
than Republicans (1964)
2140.
[(1952,1956:) Un / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Not] dignified
government, does not act quietly, confidently (1956); don't go at
things without fuss (1958)
2150.
Don't use people with business experience in government (1956)
2160.
They don't do a good job (1958)
2190.
Other; <government management> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY, GOVERNMENT PHILOSOPHY

2200.
Don't like their ideas, their policies (unspecified) (1958)
2201.
[(1952, 1956:) Don't like / (1968:) Dislikes] their ideas ((1968
ONLY:) policies, stand, etc.), (1952, 1956 ONLY:) old ideas; (1952,

1956 ONLY:) don't agree with them (unspecified); (all unspecified, na domestic or foreign) (1968)
2202.
[(1952, 1956:) Don't like / (1968:) Dislikes] their domestic ideas, policies ((1952, 1956 ONLY:) unspecified)
2204.
Democratic party too much like Republican, no (little) difference between them (1964)
2210.
((1956,1960 ONLY:) Want) Too [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) many / (1960:) much] economic controls, price control, rent control, etc. ((1952 ONLY:) are bad) - only make matters worse, too much intereference with private [(1952, 1960:) enterprise / (1956, 1958:) industry / (1964, 1968:) enterprise or business]
2220.
((1956:) Want) Too much government economic and social welfare activity ((1952, 1956, 1958 ONLY:) education, social security, housing, etc.); (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) should be left to the states ((1964 ONLY:) and private enterprise); (1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) against the 'welfare state'; Democrats for welfare state (1968 ONLY)
2222.
Democrats are the give-away party (1968)
2230.
Too much govt activity; (1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) (not clear as the wh econ controls or welfare activity). govt too big, too centralized, too powerful, more should be left to the states to handle, too much govt control, too many bureaucrats telling us what to do (code here if NA wh [(1952,1956:) 2100 or 2230 or NA wh 2210 or 2220 / (1958,1960:) 2100 or 2220 or NA wh 2200 or 2210]); against individualism, individual initiative, against private enterprise, states - local rights (1964); centralization of power (1968)
2240.
(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) Not interesting in helping people, not interested in the people any more; more interested in property than human rights (1968)
2250.
Opposed to social change, ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) social) reforms, progress; has done bad things for country (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964)
2260.
Creeping socialism; Democratic party socialistic, communistic, too radical, left-wing; Democratic policies are bad for moral fiber of the American people; people too dependent, destroys individual initiative, people getting lazy, don't want to work anymore, etc.; lost faith in American people (1956)
2261.
Creeping socialism, Democratic party socialistic, communistic, too radical, left-wiong, welfare state destroys individual initiative and moral fiber (1960)
2262.
Creeping socialism, Democratic party socialistic, communistic, too radical, left-wing

2263.
Don't like their socialistic philosophy, too radical (1964)
2265.
Democratic policies destroying moral fiber of American people,
people too dependent, destroys individual initiative, people getting
lazy, don't want to work anymore, etc., lost faith in American people
2270.
Too liberal, don't like liberal, Northern wing of party (1958)
2272.
Too liberal
2273.
Don't like Northern wing of party (no mention of ideology, or
influence or control - see 2870s) (1968)
2274.
Like peace wing, McCarthy wing of party (1968)
2280.
Too conservative, getting too conservative, don't like Southern,
states' rights element of party (1958)
2282.
Too conservative, getting too conservative
2283.
Don't like Southern wing of party (no mention of ideology, or
influence or control - see 2870s) (1968)
2284.
Don't like states rights position (1968)
2290.
Other; <government activity, philosophy> (1960 ONLY)
2291.
[(1952, 1956:) Attitude toward / (1964,1968:) Stand on]
communism ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) na whether domestic
or foreign)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - (GEN.) WELFARE AND

ECONOMIC / (R SEES DEM. PTY AS FAVORING GOVT ACTIVITY)
2300.
Don't like stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours, don't like stand on Social Security, pensions (1958)
2301.
Against stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours
2302.
Against stand on Social Security, pensions
2303.
Dislike stand on welfare programs, combination of 2300 series
(1964)
2310.
[(1952,1956:) Against / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Don't like] stand on
aid to education
2320.
[(1952,1956:) Against / (1958,1960,1968:) Don't like] stand on
housing
2330.

[(1952,1956:) Against / (1958,1960:) Disapprove / (1964,1968:)
Don't like] stand on [(1952,1956,1958,1960:) national health
insurance (socialized medicine) / (1964,1968:) medical care, e.g.,
Medicare, socialized medicine, health insurance program]; medical
care for aged (1960 ONLY)
2340.
Dislike stand on fiscal policy, tight money, high interest rates, taxes
(1960)
2341.
Dislike stand on price, rent, wage control, fiscal policy (1958)
2342.
((1952, 1956 ONLY:) Disapprove of) Bank policy; monetary policy,
interest rates, tight money, loans (1968)
2343.
Against stand on price control
2344.
Against stand on rent control
2345.
Against stand on wage control
2348.
High taxes
2350.
Times bad under Democrats, Democrats bring depression,
wouldn't help us out of recession (1958)
2351.
Times are bad under Democrats, Democrats bring depression,
bad times, bad times now
2360.
((1958 ONLY:) Dems would bring (wouldn't help)) Inflation, high
cost of living, high prices; false prosperity (ALL YEARS EXCEPT
1964)
2370.
Democrats ((1964 ONLY:) bad for employment, e.g.,) bring low
wages, fewer jobs, [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) poorer / (1964
ONLY:) worse] working conditions
2380.
Democrats will bring lower prices [(1958,1960:) including crops) /
(1968:) to producers] (1956)
2390.
Don't like stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining
(1964)
2391.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party as
favoring government activity) (1968)
2392.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party favoring
private enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - OTHER

2400.
Stand on civil rights, integration, race problem (na direction) (1960)
2410.

(1952,1956,1958,1960 ONLY:) [(1952,1956 ONLY:)Against stand on / (1958, 1960:) Democrats') pro-] civil rights ((1958,1960 ONLY:) stand); Democrats too much for civil rights, e.g., favor integration, desegregation, FEPC, civil rights law, oppose poll tax, segregation (1964)

2420.
Democrats not enough for civil rights (e.g., the opposite of 2410) (1964)

2421.
Democrats haven't done enough on civil rights, [(1952,1956:) can't / (1958,1960:) don't] do much on [(1952,1956:) civil rights because of the South / (1958,1960:) integration because of Southern Democrats]; Democrats haven't done enough on desegregation (1956)

2432.
[(1952, 1956:) Bad / (1958, 1960, 1968:) Dislike their] stand on civil liberties, ((1958:) Dems) indulged in witchhunts

2435.
Democrats have been (would be) poor at handling communists in government, domestic communism (1958)

2436.
Communists in government, too soft on communists - na whether domestic or foreign (1956)

2437.
(1952 ONLY:) Communists in government, too soft on communists; too soft on domestic communism, will not get rid of communists in our government (1968 ONLY)

2440.
Dislike Democratic farm policy, price supports, other aid to farmers (1958)

2441.
Against Democrat farm policy, general

2442.
Against Democratic price supports for farmers

2444.
Against other Democratic aid to farmers

2446.
Against Democratic control of farmers, telling farmers what to do

2451.
Dislike Democratic labor policy, position on right-to-work issue, Taft-Hartley (1958)

2453.
Against Democrat labor policy, general

2454.
Against Democrat stand on Taft-Hartley

2455.
Too many strikes ((1958, 1968 ONLY:) under Democrats); ((1958, 1968 ONLY:) poor) handling of strikes (1956)

2460.
[(1952,1956:) Against / (1958,1960,1968:) Disapprove Dem. / (1964:) Don't like Democratic] stand on conservation, public power (TVA, REA, St. Lawrence Seaway; (1952,1956 ONLY:) Tidelands oil; etc. (1958)); public works, highways (1960)

2461.

Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
2470.
Law and order, hard line (or na line) - na group (see 1470) (1968)
2471.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
2472.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
2473.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
2474.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 2471-2473
(1968)
2476.
Democrats against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
2480.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 1480) (1968)
2481.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
2482.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
2483.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
2484.
Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 2481-2483
(1968)
2486.
Democrats for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
2487.
Party seen as favorable to (supporting) Supreme Court either by
implication or explicitly (1968)
2490.
Other; (domestic issues, ((1958 ONLY:) policies)) (1958)
2492.
R gives indication that he dislikes Democrats because they
oppose activity in any of the specifics coded in 2301, 2302, 2310,
2320, 2330, 2343, 2344, 2345
2493.
Against stand on veterans' policy, legislation
2499.
((1958:) Self-interest -) Any indication that R or R's family have
been (will be) hurt by [(1952, 1956 ONLY:) party economically,
social welfare, etc. / (1958,1960,1968:) Democratic domestic
((1960,1968 ONLY:) policies)]

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
FOREIGN POLICY

2500.
Against Democratic foreign policy, unclear policy, no real policy,
bad foreign policy - na why (1956)
2502.
((1952 ONLY:) Against Democrat foreign policy,) Bad foreign policy
- [(1952:) na / (1964,1968:) unspecified] why
2503.

Badly handled foreign policy, bungling, unclear policy, inconsistent, no real policy, not dynamic; (1952 ONLY:) not aggressive, inefficient handling of foreign aid
2504.
Weak, ineffective foreign policy, poor military position, can't keep up defenses, soft on communism, not enough scientific technological development (1964)
2516.
Too internationalistic, too much meddling in other countries' affairs, don't like stand on foreign trade and tariff (1964)
2518.
Too internationalist, too much meddling in other countries' affairs, we should mind our own business (na whether military or economic) ; assume less responsibility for world's problems (na whether military or economic) (1968)
2519.
R anti-UN, R against cooperation with UN, distrust of our allies
2524.
Too isolationist, not interested enough in rest of world, too nationalistic and selfish (1956)
2530.
Didn't stop communism, let communism spread, sold out to communism (Yalta), ((1956 ONLY:) let traitors in the State Department (Hiss)), couldn't handle Russia (1956); got us into Korean mess (1958)
2535.
Provided weak military position, has not stopped communism, has let communism spread, backed down to Russia, can not handle Russia (1968)
2536.
Has not stopped communism, helped communism spread
2537.
Sold out to communism - Yalta, traitors in State Dept.; (1952 ONLY:) Alger Hiss; Test Ban Treaty, Consular Treaty, Bay of Pigs, etc. (1968 ONLY)
2540.
Spends too much on foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
2541.
R against ((1968 ONLY: Dems for) military aid to allies, against sending troops abroad
2542.
(1952 ONLY:) R against economic aid; ((1956:) R against) Point Four, [(1952:) spending / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) would spend] too much [(1952 ONLY:) money / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) on economic aid] abroad
2550.
Democrats against foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
2551.
Dems against foreign military aid, troops abroad (1968)
2552.
Democrats against economic aid, against helping other countries (1958)

2560.
Would handle specific trouble spots badly -- Congo, Cuba, Berlin (1960)
2561.
No good policy on [(1956:) Suez trouble, problems in Middle East, Egypt / (1958,1968:) Mideast problems [(1958:) (Lebanon, Egypt) / (1968:) (Egypt, Israel) - any comment]] (1956)
2562.
Would handle Formosa situation badly (China, Matsu, Quemoy) (1958); Red China - any comment (1968)
2563.
Neglected Asia, too much in Europe at expense of Asia
2564.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) R against Korean war, Truman's war, should never have gone into Korea,((1952 ONLY:) could have been avoided), not being handled right; Pueblo - any comment (1968)
2566.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
2567.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
2568.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
2570.
Would lose (have lost) U.S. prestige in world, other countries would dislike us more (1960)
2580.
Democrats are the war party, are against disarmament, for nuclear testing, use of nuclear weapons (1964)
2581.
Democrats are the war party; (1952 ONLY:) will get us into full-scale war; always a war when Democrats in ((1960 ONLY:) office) (1956); can't keep us out of war, military too much in power (1968)
2582.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) They won't get us out (got us into) Vietnam war, will get us into a bigger war, don't like their stand on Vietnam (unspecified) (1968)
2583.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
2584.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as not representing a change (na direction)
2585.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as too reliant on negotiations, bombing pauses, diplomats, etc., will sell out the Vietnamese (1968)
2586.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)
2587.
Unclear stand on Vietnam war (1968)
2589.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
2590.

(1952, 1964, 1968 ONLY:) Other ((1964:) foreign policy ((1964 ONLY:) issues)); misc. foreign policy or foreign policy, na which aspects (1958, 1960 ONLY)
2591.
Disapprove stand on foreign trade and tariff
2592.
Don't like Democrats' defense program, didn't like their H-bomb testing proposals (1958)
2593.
Disapprove of defense program, UMT, draft program
2594.
Disapprove Democratic draft program, UMT (1958)
2595.
H-bomb testing, atomic defense program (specific) (1956)
2597.
Preparedness and technology, Dems would have mediocre, poor scientific program, missile and submarine program (1958)
2599.
Any tying of R's or his family's personal welfare to Democratic foreign policy (draft, ((1952, 1956 ONLY:) being called back to service, etc.))

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DISLIKE DEMOCRATIC PARTY BECAUSE TOO GOOD FOR / HELPS AT EXPENSE OF OTHERS / IS CONTROLLED BY / IS MADE UP OF --
----
2600.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others, plays class against class (1956)
2601.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others
2615.
Workers, common people, the poor (1964)
2616.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
2617.
Workers, working people, labor unions, union bosses, plays class against class (1958)
2620.
Labor unions, labor union bosses, union members (1964)
2633.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people, rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
2640.
Small business, small businessmen (specifically) (1964)
2650.
White collar workers, salaried workers, the middle class (1964)
2660.
Farmers (1964)
2670.
Negroes (1958)
2671.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
2690.

Other; <groups party too good for> (1960 ONLY); (includes younger, older people, misc. minority groups) (1964 ONLY)
2692.
Old people, aged (1960)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DISLIKE DEMOCRATIC PARTY BECAUSE IT'S BAD FOR / HAS KEPT (WILL KEEP) IN CHECK / WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO --
----
2701.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special privileged groups
2702.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special privileged groups (1964)
2703.
People like me, people like us
2704.
People like me, people like us (1958)
2710.
Common people, poor people, "the people", lower income people, working class people, the laboring man (1958)
2711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'
2712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the working man
2713.
Common people, lower income people, working-class people, the average man (1964)
2720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952, 1956, 1968 ONLY:) na whether) members or leaders
2721.
Labor, labor unions, members (1964)
2722.
Labor union members
2730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
2731.
Industry, (big) business, businessmen (1958)
2732.
Big business, industry
2740.
((1958:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1958:) specifically)
2750.
Middle class people, white collar workers; salaried workers (1964)
2760.
Farmers
2770.
Negroes
2771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
2790.

Other ((1958:) includes younger, ((1958, 1960 ONLY:) older)
people, misc. minority groups)); <kept in check> (1960 ONLY)
2791.
Other minority groups
2792.
Old people, the aged (1964)
2793.
Veterans, servicemen
2794.
Sectionalism
2799.
Young people (1968)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
PARTY RESPONSES

2800.
Never been a Democrat, just couldn't vote Democratic
2810.
Speaks of Democrats in a negative, personal, affective terms - bad
people, lazy people, etc.
2811.
Democrats are weak, weak-kneed, soft (1968)
2820.
Can't trust Democrats, don't keep their promises, don't know
where they stand
2830.
Party is split; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) really two parties, don't
know which faction is on top; dislike party organization, too much
fighting among leaders (1964 ONLY)
2841.
Negative reference to campaign Democrats are waging, or to
convention (1956)
2842.
Negative reference to campaign(s) Democrats [(1952:) are waging
/ (1958,1968:) have waged]
2843.
Negative reference to national convention (1968)
2844.
Democrats too critical of Republicans, run other party, other
people down too much (1968)
2850.
((1958:) Dislike) Democratic campaign promises, na what ((1960
ONLY:) platform); dislike platform (non-specific) (1964)
2860.
((1964 ONLY:) Any indication that) R [(1952, 1956:) reacts
negatively to / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) dislikes] local Democratic
party; politicians (1958, 1960, 1968 ONLY)
2870.
Faction or leadership R doesn't like is controlling ((1968 ONLY:) or
has influence over) party ((1952,1956 ONLY:) or campaign);
((1952,1956 ONLY:)Truman, radicals; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT
1964:) union bosses; (1958,1960,1964 ONLY:) Southerners; (1964
ONLY:) liberals; (1968 ONLY:) business, but other than 2871 and

2872; etc. ((1952, 1956 ONLY:) control party)
2871.
Don't like liberal or Northern wing of the party ((1968 ONLY:) as
faction that has influence or control of party)
2872.
Don't like conservative or Southern wing of the party, Dixiecrats,
Solid South ((1968 ONLY:) as faction that has influence or control
of party)
2880.
Dislike party ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) organization), bosses,
cheap politicians; too policial, partisan (in negative sense) (1964
ONLY)
2890.
Other party responses (1958)

PARTY DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
OTHER

2900.
I just don't like them, it's a [(1952,1956,1958,1960:) lousy / (1964,
1968:) bad] party
2903.
No - emphatic - to question on what like about party (1968)
2912.
Time for a change, been in too long, need two-party system (1964)
2914.
[(1952:) One party / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) Were] in power
too long, bad for country for one party to be in power too long (na
why), need for 2-party system
2920.
[(1952, 1956 ONLY:) Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by husband or wife
2930.
[(1952, 1956: Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by other people - father, friends,
business associates, [(1952,1956:) etc. / (1958,1960,1964,1968:)
or na whom]
2940.
Democrats are against Republicans or Republican leaders (1968)
2950.
((1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) Party) Only interested in staying
in (getting) power; (1952, 1956 ONLY:) ruthless; not interested in
good of country (1964)
2951.
Democratic party is undemocratic, dictatorial, has too much
power, does what wants (1968)
2960.
Take advantage of ignorant, uninformed people (1956)
2970.
Don't like extremists in party, party's connection with extremism,
e.g., ADA (1964)
2971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
2977.

Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
2978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
2979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
2981.
Disapprove of Truman's whistle-stopping
2982.
Releases (too little, too much) information about issues, too
secretive, too much publicity (1964)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
LIKES PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

3010.
Eisenhower
3020.
Nixon
3030.
Dulles (1956)
3040.
Goldwater, good choice for nominee (1964)
3050.
Rockefeller (1958)
3060.
Taft
3061.
Lodge (1960)
3062.
Miller, good choice for nominee (1964)
3063.
Dewey
3064.
McCarthy
3065.
Benson (1956)
3066.
Agnew, good choice for nominee (1968)
3070.
Local and national Republican leaders (1964)
3071.
Other national Republicans (Senators, Congressmen, etc.)
3072.
Local Republicans (city, state, etc.)
3080.
Republicans have ((1958:) have always had) good leaders, young
leaders, experienced leaders, good men, like whole ticket; some
good people in party (1968)
3081.
Have good leaders, like leaders (1964)
3090.
Other ((1964 ONLY:) Republicans); <people in party liked> (1960
ONLY)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

3100.
(1952,1956,1958,1960 ONLY:) Will give an efficient administration,
businesslike administration, good government, would put Hoover's
recommendations into operation; would provide an administration
or government described as good, efficient or businesslike (1964)
3110.
Have cleaned up the corruption, more honest than Democrats,
have given us honest government, patronage, have cleaned up
'that mess in Washington' (1956)
3111.
Will clean up the corruption, more honest than the Democrats, will
give us honest government, new broom sweeps clean, patronage
3112.
Will clean up 'that mess in Washington'
3120.
((1964,1968 ONLY:) Republicans) [(1952:) Will / (1964,1968:)
Would] spend less money ((1958,1960 ONLY:) than Democrats);
((1968 ONLY:) Republicans) more economy minded;
[(1952,1964,1968:) will / (1956,1958,1960:) have] balance(d)
budget; ((1952,1956,1958,1960:) ((1956:) have or) will) decrease
national debt
3130.
Republicans would spend more money than Democrats,
government spending is good for national economy (such as
during depression) (1964)
3131.
[(1952:) Will not be / (1956,1958,1960:) Are not] too economy
minded, not afraid to spend money
3140.
Dignified government, go at things without fuss, act quietly,
confidently (1956)
3151.
Use people with business experience to help run things (1956)
3160.
Have done a good job (not further specified) (1956 ONLY); they do
a good job (1958)
3190.
Other; <government management> (1960 ONLY)
3191.
Stable govt. under Reps., would stabilize things, R has feeling of
security when Reps. are in (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY, GOVERNMENT PHILOSOPHY

3200.
Like their ideas, like their policies (unspecified), their domestic
policies (unspecified) (1958)
3201.
Like their ideas, new ideas, agree with [(1952,1956:) them
(unspecified) / (1968:) their ideas, stand, etc. (all unspecified, na

domestic or foreign)]; likes their policies, stands (1968)
3202.
Like their domestic ideas, policies ((1952, 1956:) unspecified)
3211.
(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960:) Will eliminate or cut down economic controls, for free enterprise; less govt. economic controls, don't need planned economy, less control of private enterprise or business (1964)
3221.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) They're against the welfare state, against government economic and social welfare activity; less govt., economic and/or social welfare activity, govt. should leave things to states or private enterprise (1964 ONLY)
3222.
Republicans against give-aways (specifically) (1968)
3231.
(1952,1956,1958,1960 ONLY:) Against too much centralized government, will leave more to the states, against too much government activity (not clear whether economic controls or welfare activity) (code here if NA whether [(1952,1956:) 3211 or 3221 or NA whether 3100 or 3231 / (1958,1960:) 3290 or 3200 or NA whether 3110 or 3211]); less govt. activity - for individualism, individual initiative, for private enterprise, state - local rights (1964)
3240.
Humanistic, ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) interested in helping people), puts human rights before property rights; human rights (1968 ONLY)
3250.
Favors social reforms, social change, progress, will change things for the better, improve conditions; (1952, 1956, 1958, 1960:) would do good things for country
3264.
Like their socialistic philosophy (1964)
3266.
For liberty, against creeping socialism, restore individual initiative, has faith in American people (1956)
3267.
For liberty, against creeping socialism
3268.
Restore individual initiative, has faith in American people
3270.
Like their liberal philosophy, like liberal (Northern) wing of party (1964)
3272.
Liberal; like liberal wing of party (young liberal members) (1958)
3273.
Like Eastern (Nothern) wing (no mention of ideology, or influence or control - see 3870s) (1968)
3280.
Like their conservative philosophy, like conservative wing of party, like states rights position (1964)
3282.
Conservative; like conservative (old-guard) wing of party (1958)
3283.

Like Goldwater, Western wing (no mention of ideology, or influence
or control - see 3870s) (1968)
3284.
Like states rights position (1968)
3290.
Other; <government activity, philosophy> (1960 ONLY)
3291.
[(1952, 1956:) Attitude toward / (1964,1968:) Stand on]
communism ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) na whether domestic
or foreign)
3292.
Middle of the road (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - (GEN.) WELFARE AND

ECONOMIC / (R SEES REP. PTY AS AGAINST GOVT ACTIVITY)
3300.
Likes stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours, likes stand on Social Security, pensions (1958)
3301.
Likes stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours
3302.
Likes stand on Social Security, pensions
3303.
Like stand on welfare programs, combination of 3300 series
(1964)
3310.
Likes stand on aid to education
3320.
Likes stand on housing
3330.
Likes stand on [(1952, 1956, 1958,1960:) national health insurance
/ (1964,1968) medical care] (socialized medicine); e.g., Medicare,
health insurance program (1964); medical care for aged (1960
ONLY)
3340.
Likes stand on tight money, high interest rates, taxes (1960)
3341.
Likes stand on price, rent, wage control, fiscal policy (1958)
3342.
((1952, 1956:) Approve of) Bank policy; monetary policy, interest
rates, tight money, loans (1968)
3343.
Likes stand on price control
3344.
Likes stand on rent control
3345.
Likes stand on wage control
3347.
(1952, 1968 ONLY:) Republicans favor lower taxes; likes
Republicans' tax policy, have lowered (will lower) taxes (1964
ONLY)

3349.
Likes Republican tax policy, have lowered (will lower) taxes, bring more jobs, better working conditions (1958)
3352.
Times are (would be) better under Republicans, good times now, Reps would take (are taking) care of recession (1958)
3353.
Times are (will be) better under Republicans, economic conditions will improve, Republicans will bring prosperity, good times
3360.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1956:) Republicans [(1952:) will do / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) would do (did)] something about inflation, high cost of living, high prices; Republicans have stopped inflation, kept cost of living, prices down (1956 ONLY)
3370.
Republicans ((1964:) good for employment -) will bring more jobs, higher wages, [(1952, 1956:) improve / (1960,1964,1968:) better] working conditions
3380.
Republicans [(1952:) will bring / (1956:) brought / (1958,1960,1968:) would bring] higher prices; (including crops) (1958,1960 ONLY); to producers (1968)
3390.
Like stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining (1964)
3391.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party as favoring government activity) (1968)
3392.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party favoring private enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - OTHER

3400.
Stand on civil rights, integration, race problem (na direction) (1960)
3410.
Republicans [(1952,1956:) (will) do / (1958,1960:) would do (are doing)] more on (for) civil rights ((1956 ONLY:) than Democrats) ((1956:) desegregation, FEPC; [(1956,1958, 1960:) anti- / (1964,1968:) oppose] poll tax; [(1958, 1960:) school / (1964,1968:) favor] integration (1958); civil rights law, segregation, etc. (1964)
3420.
Republicans would do less on civil rights than Democrats (1958)
3422.
Republicans will do less on civil rights ((1956:) than Democrats (desegregation, FEPC, anti-poll tax, etc.)); will let states handle it
3431.
Republicans have good stand on civil liberties, pro-civil liberties (1956)
3433.
Republicans take a better stand on civil liberties
3435.
Republicans have been (would be) better at handling communists

in government, domestic communism (1958)
3436.
Republicans got rid of communists, will take care of communists
(na whether domestic or foreign) (1956)
3437.
(1952 ONLY:) Republicans got rid of communists, take care of
communists; hard on domestic communism (1968)
3440.
Like Republican farm policy, price supports, other aid to farmers
(1958)
3441.
Republicans have a better farm policy, general
3442.
Approve of price supports for farmers (1956)
3443.
Republicans are against price supports for farms
3444.
Approve of other aid to farms, soil bank, payments to farmers
(1956)
3445.
Republicans will do away with aid to farmers
3451.
Like Republican labor policy, position on right-to-work issue, on
Taft-Hartley (1958)
3453.
Republicans have a better labor policy, general
3454.
Approve Republican stand on Taft-Hartley
3455.
[(1952:) Won't be all these / (1958,1968:) Are (would be)] ((1956:)
less) strikes [(1952:) if / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) under]
Republicans ((1952 ONLY:) win); ((1958 ONLY:) better) handling of
stress (1956, 1958 ONLY)
3460.
Approve Republican stand on conservation, public power (TVA,
REA, St. Lawrence Seaway; (1952, 1956:) Tidelands oil); public
works and highways (1960)
3461.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
3470.
Law and order, hard line (or na line) - na group (see 1470) (1968)
3471.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
3472.
Law and order, hard line - college,war protestors (1968)
3473.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
3474.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 3471-3473
(1968)
3476.
Republicans against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
3480.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 1480) (1968)

3481.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
3482.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
3483.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
3484.
Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 3481-3483 (1968)
3486.
Republicans for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
3490.
Other ((1958:) domestic ((1958,1964,1968 ONLY:) issues)); (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as an example - for all codes except 3581-3589) (1968)
3491.
R gives indication that he likes Republicans because they support government activity in any of the species coded in 3301, 3302, 3310, 3320, 3330, 3343, 3344, 3345
3493.
Approve ((1952 ONLY:) Republican) stand on veterans policy, legislation
3499.
((1960:) Self-interest -) Any indication that R feels he or his family have been (will be) [(1952,1956:) helped / (1958,1960,1968:) aided] by [(1952, 1956:) party economically, social welfare, Social Security, etc) / (1958,1960,1968:) Republican domestic policy]

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
FOREIGN POLICY

3501.
[(1952:) Likes / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) Favors] Republican foreign policy, have good ([(1952:) better / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) effective]) foreign policy; (1952 ONLY:) will have more effective foreign policy (general)
3502.
Good foreign policy (unspecified) (1968)
3503.
(1952 ONLY:) Republicans will have a clear policy, dynamic, aggressive; cut out bungling; would have more effective (clear-cut) foreign policy, indecision, vacillation (1968)
3504.
Strong, effective foreign policy, provide strong military position, good scientific program, technological developments, keep up defenses, handle communists (1964)
3510.
Internationalist, work and cooperate with UN, allies, favor trade, low tariffs (1964)
3512.
Internationalist (na whether military or economic), would cooperate with UN, allies (1956)
3519.
Will know how to handle our allies, will get better cooperation from

them, from UN (no indication of anti-allies or anti-UN feeling)
3520.
Isolationist, mind own business, America first concern, oppose trade, favor high tariffs (1964)
3524.
(1952, 1956 ONLY:) Isolationist; ((1952 ONLY:) won't) meddle ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) less) in other countries' affairs, will mind our own business (na whether military or economic)
3525.
Will know how to handle our allies, will put UN in its place (anti-allies, anti-UN feeling)
3531.
Favors Republican military policy, had stopped (will stop, are stopping) spread of communism (including Korea), kicked traitors out of State Department (1958)
3533.
Favors Republican military policy, has stopped (will stop) spread of communism, kicked traitors out of State Department (1956)
3535.
Will ((1968:) oppose), stop ((1968:) spread of) communism ((1968:) abroad), [(1952:) will know how to / (1968:) could] handle Russia; would provide strong military position, would not back down to Russia (1968)
3538.
Will kick the traitors out of the State Department
3540.
Favor foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
3541.
Favors military aid to allies, favors sending troops abroad (1956)
3542.
Favors economic aid, ICA, aid to [(1956:) underdeveloped / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1956:) backward] nations (1956)
3550.
Oppose foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
3551.
(1952 ONLY:) Will stop sending troops abroad; opposes foreign military aid, troops abroad (1968)
3552.
[(1952:) Will / (1956,1958,1960:) Favors / (1968:) Would] cut(ting) out (reduce) all this ((1968:) non-military) spending abroad, economic aid ((1968:) or na kind of aid)
3560.
Will handle specific trouble spots better -- Congo, Cuba, Berlin, etc. (1960)
3561.
Will handle Suez trouble better, problems in Middle East, Egypt (1956,1958 ONLY); Lebanon (1958); Mideast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)
3562.
Will handle (are handling) Formosa situation well (China, Matsu, Quemoy) (1958); Red China - any comment (1968)
3564.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) Will end / (1956:) Ended] Korean war, clean up mess in Korea; Pueblo - any comment (1968)

3566.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
3567.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
3568.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
3570.
Would raise (maintain) U.S. prestige in the world, with allies, would make other countries like us better (1960)
3580.
Better chance for peace with Republicans, will work for disarmament, limit nuclear testing, use of weapons (1964)
3581.
Republican party the peace party, better chance for peace under Republicans
3582.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) Better change for peace in Vietnam under Republicans, like their stand on Vietnam war (unspecified) (1968)
3583.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party taking a tough, hard "victory" stand on the war (1968)
3584.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as representing a change (na direction) (1968)
3585.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as less militaristic, good at negotiating (1968)
3586.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)
3589.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
3590.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1958, 1960) Other ((1960:) foreign policy ((1960 ONLY:) issues)); misc. foreign policy or foreign policy, na which aspects (1958, 1960 ONLY)
3591.
Approve stand on foreign trade and tariff
3592.
Like defense program (1958)
3593.
Approve of defense program, UMT, draft program
3594.
Approve Republican draft program, UMT (1958)
3595.
H-bomb testing, atomic defense program (specific) (1956)
3597.
Preparedness and technology, Republicans have (would have) better scientific program, better missiles, subs, etc. (1958)
3599.
Any tying of R's personal welfare or family's welfare to Republican foreign policy
----

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
LIKE REPUBLICAN PARTY BECAUSE BAD FOR / ANTI / HAS KEPT (WILL
KEEP) IN CHECK / WILL PUT IN THEIR PLACE / WILL CEASE FAVORING --
----
3601.
Special interests, some groups
3615.
Workers, common people, the poor (1964)
3616.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
3620.
Labor union, labor union bosses, union members (1964)
3633.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
3640.
Small business, small businessmen (specifically) (1964)
3650.
White collar workers, salaried workers, the middle class (1964)
3660.
Farmers (1964)
3670.
Negroes
3671.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
3690.
Other; <groups not favored by party> (1960 ONLY); (includes
younger, older people, misc. minority groups) (1964 ONLY)
3692.
Old people, aged (1960)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
LIKE REPUBLICAN PARTY BECAUSE GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR / HAS
HELPED (WILL HELP) / IS MADE UP OF / WOULD BE FAIR TO --

3700.
All the people, good for everyone, equitable policies for all, no
special privileges, people like me, people like us (1958)
3701.
All the people, good for everyone, equitable policies for all, no
special privileges
3702.
All the people, good for everyone, 'the people', no special privileged
groups (1964)
3703.
People like me, people like us
3711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'
3712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
3713.
Common people, lower income people, working-class people, the
average man (1964)

3720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) na whether)
members or leaders)
3721.
Labor, labor unions, members (1964)
3722.
Labor union members
3730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
3731.
Industry, (big) business, businessmen (1958)
3732.
Big business, industry
3733.
Industry, Big business, businessmen, upper classes, big people
(1964)
3740.
((1958:) Small business or) small businessmen ((1958:)
specifically)
3750.
Middle class people, white collar workers; salaried workers (1964)
3760.
Farmers
3770.
Negroes
3771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
3790.
Other; (includes younger people (1956); older people
(1956,1958,1960 ONLY); misc. minority groups (1958)); <helped
by party> (1960 ONLY))
3791.
Other minority groups
3792.
Old people, the aged (1964)
3793.
Veterans, servicemen
3794.
Sectionalism
3799.
Young people (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
PARTY RESPONSES

3800.
Traditional ((1964, 1968 ONLY:) family) vote (always been a
Republican, I'm just a Republican)
3810.
Speaks of Republicans in positive, personal, affective terms - good
people, nice people, etc.
3820.
Can trust Republicans, they'll keep their promises, know where
they stand; are more stable (1958)

3830.
((1964:) Party) Well organized; ((1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:)
members) stick together; united (1964)
3841.
[(1956:) R reacts positively toward / (1960:) Positive references to]
Republican campaign, or to national convention (1956)
3842.
(1952 ONLY:) R reacts positively toward Republican campaign;
positive reference to campaign(s) Republicans have waged (1958)
3843.
Positive reference to national convention (1968)
3850.
Like ((1958:) Republican) ((1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:)
campaign) promises, na what; platform (1960); (non-specific)
(1964)
3860.
(1952, 1956 ONLY:) R reacts positively to local Republican party;
((1958,1960,1968:) code) any indication that R likes local
Republican party (they've done a good job in this country, etc.)
(1958)
3870.
Like faction that has influence or is controlling party (e.g.,
conservatives, Easterners) (1964)
3871.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Pro-liberal, progressive, young, Eisenhower or
Dewey part of the party (no reference to foreign affairs); R likes
Eastern, Rockefeller led wing of the party as faction that has
influence or control (1968)
3872.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Pro conservative, Taft-led part of the party, old
guard (no reference to foreign affairs); R likes Western, Goldwater
led wing of the party as faction that has influence or control (1968)
3873.
Pro internationalist wing of the party
3874.
Pro isolationist wing of the party
3880.
Less politics, backroom politics (1968)
3890.
Other party responses (1958)
3891.
Republican party is sensible, intelligent, more recognized,
experienced, realistic (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
OTHER

3900.
I just like them; (1952, 1956 ONLY:) I like everything about them;
it's a [(1952,1956:) great / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) good] party
3911.
Don't change horses in mid-stream, give them more time (1956)
3912.
Need for 2-party system (1956); we needed a change (1956

ONLY); time for a change (1964 ONLY)
3913.
It's time for a change
3915.
Need for 2-party system
3920.
[(1952,1956:) Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by husband or wife
3930.
[(1952, 1956:) Mention of vote / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any
indication that R] being influenced by other people - father, friends,
business associates, [(1952,1956:) etc. / (1958,1960,1964,1968:)
or na whom]
3940.
Republicans against Democrats, Democratic leaders
3950.
Republicans interested in good of the country, not just interested in
staying in power (1964)
3951.
Republican party is democratic, has grass roots strength, is
representative (1968)
3970.
Like stand on extremism (1964)
3971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
3977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
3978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
3979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
3982.
Releases information, doesn't release too much information (1964)
3983.
Like McCarthy's speech

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DISLIKES PEOPLE WITHIN THE PARTY

4010.
Eisenhower
4020.
Nixon; don't want Nixon for president (1956 ONLY); bad choice for
nominee (1968 ONLY)
4030.
Dulles (1956)
4040.
Goldwater, bad choice for nominee (1964)
4050.
Rockefeller (1958)
4060.
Taft
4061.
Lodge (1960)

4062.
Miller, bad choice for nominee (1964)
4063.
Dewey
4064.
McCarthy
4065.
Benson (1956)
4066.
Agnew, bad choice for nominee (1968)
4070.
Local and national Republican leaders (1964)
4071.
Other national Republicans (Senators, Congressmen, etc.)
4072.
Local Republicans (city, state, etc.)
4080.
Republicans have ((1958:) have always had) bad leaders, old
leaders, inexperienced leaders, bad men, don't like ticket; some
bad people in party (1968)
4081.
Republicans have bad leaders (1964)
4090.
Other; <people in party disliked> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

4100.
Inefficient government, waste, too much bureaucracy, red tape
(domestic or na whether domestic or foreign) (1956)
4101.
Will not give us an efficient government
4110.
Would give dishonest government, reference to 'mess in
Washington', corruption, graft, patronage, buy votes (1964)
4111.
Corruption, graft, dishonesty, patronage (1956)
4112.
Won't clean up that 'mess in Washington'
4114.
Just as corrupt as (more corrupt than) Democrats, dishonest
4115.
Corruption, graft, dishonesty, patronage, this Adams' affair (1958)
4121.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) Too interested in economy, won't
spend money where needed; too economy minded, don't spend
enough (1964 ONLY)
4130.
Spend too much money, less economical than Democrats, haven't
lowered national debt (1956)
4131.
Will spend too much money, less economical than Democrats
4140.

[(1956:) Un / (1958: Not] dignified government, ((1956 ONLY:) goes at things with fuss), doesn't act quietly, confidently (1956); don't go at things without fuss (1958)
4151.
Too many businessmen in government, conflict of interest (1956)
4160.
They don't do a good job (1958)
4190.
Other; <government management> (1960 ONLY)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY, GOVERNMENT PHILOSOPHY

4200.
Don't like their ideas, their policies (unspecified), their domestic policies (unspecified) (1958)
4201.
[(1952,1956:) Don't like / (1968:) Dislikes] their ideas, ((1952, 1956 ONLY:) old ideas, don't agree with them (unspecified)); policies, stands, etc. (all unspecified, na domestic or foreign) (1968)
4202.
[(1952,1956:) Don't like / (1968:) Dislikes] their domestic ideas, ((1968:) domestic) policies ((1952,1956 ONLY:) unspecified)
4203.
Too negative, no constructive program, just against things
4204.
(1952, 1956 ONLY:) Me-tooism; GOP has claimed Democratic philosophy, policies for its own (1958, 1960 ONLY); Republican party too much like Democratic, no (little) difference between them (1964)
4211.
[(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960:) Against / (1964, 1968:) Too few] government economic controls ((1952, 1956, 1958 ONLY:) price control, rent control, etc.); too little interference with private enterprise or business (1964)
4221.
[(1952,1956,1958,1960,1968:) Against government / (1964:) Want too little] economic and social welfare activity ((1952, 1956, 1958 ONLY:) education, Social Security, housing, etc.); shouldn't be left to states and private enterprise (1964 ONLY)
4231.
(1952,1958,1960 ONLY:)Against government activity (not clear as to whether economic controls or welfare activity), against letting government do things that are needed (code here if NA whether 4211 or 4221 or NA whether [(1952:) 4101 or 4231 / (1956,1958:) 4100 or 4231 / (1960:) 4100 or 4200]); too little government activity - too much for private enterprise, states - local rights (1964)
4240.
(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960:) Not interested in helping people, puts property rights above human rights, would let people starve; more interested in property than human rights (1968 ONLY)
4250.
Opposed to social reforms, social change, progress; (1952, 1956, 1958, 1960 ONLY:) would do bad things for country

4263.
Don't like their socialistic philosophy, too radical (1964)
4270.
Don't like their liberal philosophy, liberal (Northern) wing of party,
conservative (Western) wing of party, too radical, don't like states
rights position (1964)
4271.
Too liberal, don't like "new Republicanism" (1958)
4272.
Too liberal
4273.
Don't like Eastern wing of party (no mention of ideology, or
influence or control - see 4870s) (1968)
4280.
Don't like their conservative philosophy, don't like conservative
(Goldwater, Western) wing of party (1968)
4281.
Too conservative, ((1958:) negative) reactionary; don't like old
guard, right-wing elements (1958)
4284.
Don't like states rights position (1968)
4290.
Other; (include here - Republicans have claimed Democratic
philosophy, policies for their own) (1956 ONLY); <government
activity or philosophy> (1960 ONLY)
4291.
[(1952,1956: Attitude toward / (1964, 1968:) Stand on] communism
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) na whether domestic or foreign)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DOMESTIC POLICIES AND CONDITIONS - (GEN.) WELFARE AND

ECONOMIC / (R SEES REP PTY AS AGAINST GOVT ACTIVITY)
4300.
Don't like stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours, don't like stand on Social Security, pensions (1958)
4301.
Against stand on unemployment compensation, minimum wages
and hours
4302.
Against stand on Social Security, pensions
4303.
Don't like stand on welfare programs, combination of 4300 series
(1964)
4310.
[(1952, 1956:) Against / (1958,1960, 1964, 1968:) Don't like] stand
on aid to education
4320.
[(1952, 1956:) Against / (1958,1960, 1968:) Don't like] stand on
housing
4330.
[(1952, 1956:) Against / (1958, 1960:) Disapprove / (1964, 1968:)
Don't like] stand on [(1952, 1956, 1958, 1960:) national health
insurance (socialized medicine) / (1964, 1968:) medical care, e.g.,

Medicare, socialized medicine, health insurance program];
(medical care of aged) (1960 ONLY)
4340.
Dislike stand on tight money, high interest rates, taxes, fiscal policy
(1960)
4341.
Dislike stand on price, rent, wage control, fiscal policy (1958)
4342.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Disapprove of) Bank policy; monetary policy,
interest rates, tight money, loans (1968)
4343.
Against stand on price control
4344.
Against stand on rent control
4345.
Against stand on wage control
4348.
Taxes are higher ((1952 ONLY:) are not lower) under Republicans,
unfair tax policy
4350.
Times bad under Republicans, Republicans bring depression,
GOP hasn't helped us out of recession (1958)
4351.
Republicans party of depression, will bring depression, bad times
(no mention of 'Hoover' depression)
4354.
Republicans party of depression, will bring depression, bad times,
mention of 'Hoover' depression (1956)
4355.
Specific mention of 'Hoover' depression, how conditions were
during the depression, etc.
4360.
((1958 ONLY:) Republicans would bring (wouldn't help)) Inflation,
high cost of living, high prices; false prosperity (1958,1960,1968
ONLY)
4370.
Republicans [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) ((1952,1956 ONLY:)
will) bring / (1964:) bad for employment, e.g.,] fewer jobs, low(er)
wages, [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) poorer / (1964:) worse]
working conditions
4380.
[(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Republicans / (1968:) They] will
bring lower prices ((1958,1960 ONLY:) including crops) ((1968:) to
producers)
4390.
Don't like stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining
(1964)
4391.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees party as
favoring government activity) (1968)
4392.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees candidate as
favoring private enterprise activity, tax incentive) (1968)

4400.
Stand on race problem, integration, civil rights (na direction) (1960)
4410.
Republicans do too much on civil rights, responsible for
desegregation (FEPC, anti-poll tax) (1956)
4420.
(1952 ONLY:) Against stand on civil rights; (1952 and 1956
ONLY:) Republicans are against civil rights; (1956 ONLY:) don't do
enough on desegregations (FEPC, anti-poll tax); Republicans
[(1958,1960:) haven't done / (1964,1968:) not] enough
[(1958,1960:) on / (1964,1968:) for] civil rights (1958);
desegregation) (1958,1960 ONLY); (e.g., opposite of 4410) (1964)
4432.
(1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) Republicans are bad on civil liberties,
witchhunting; McCarthyism; dislike GOP stand on civil liberties
(1958,1960 ONLY)
4435.
Republicans have been (would be) poor at handling communists in
government, domestic communism (1958)
4436.
Republicans don't get rid of communists (na domestic or foreign)
(1956)
4437.
((1952 ONLY:) Republicans) Won't get rid of communists ((1968:)
in our government); too soft on domestic communism (1968)
4440.
Dislike Republican farm policy, price supports, other aid to farmers
(1958)
4441.
R against Republican farm policy, general
4443.
R opposes Republican stand on price supports, Republicans
opposed to price supports
4444.
Other aid to farmers - soil bank (1956)
4445.
Republicans opposed to other aid to farmers
4451.
Dislike Republican labor policy, position on right-to-work issue, on
Taft-Hartley (1958)
4453.
R against Republican labor policy, general
4454.
R against Republican stand on Taft-Hartley
4455.
((1956 ONLY:) Republicans don't settle strikes well), Too many
strikes under Republicans, ((1958:) poor) handling of strikes (1956)
4460.
[(1952,1956:) R against / (1958,1960,1968:) Disapprove / (1964:)
Don't like] Republican stand on conservation, public power (TVA,
REA, St. Lawrence Seaway; (1952,1956 ONLY:) Tidelands oil);

public works, highways (1960)
4461.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
4470.
Law and order, hard line (or na line) - na group (1968)
4471.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
4472.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
4473.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
4474.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 4471-4473
(1968)
4476.
Republicans against control, federal gun legislation (1968)
4477.
Party seen as (too) critical of (will change) decisions, members
(not connected with school discrimination) (1968)
4480.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (1968)
4481.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
4482.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
4483.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
4484.
Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 4481-4483
(1968)
4486.
Republicans for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
4487.
Party seen as favorable to (supporting) Supreme Court (1968)
4490.
Other; (include here specific but obsolete issues - prohibition, gold
standard, etc.) (1956 ONLY); domestic issues (1958); (no
mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as example - for
all codes except 4581-4589)) (1968)
4491.
R gives indication that he dislikes Republicans because they
support government activity in any of the specifics coded in 4301,
4302, 4310, 4320, 4330, 4343, 4344, 4345
4493.
((1952 ONLY:) R against Republican) Stand on veterans policy,
legislation
4499.
((1958:) Self-interest -) Any [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1958:)
indication that / (1958:) tying of] R or R's family [(ALL YEARS
EXCEPT 1958) have been (will be) hurt by party economically,
social welfare, etc. / (1958:) welfare to Republican domestic policy]

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
FOREIGN POLICY

4500.
Against Republican foreign policy, too much indecision, vacillation, unclear policy, no real policy, bad foreign policy - na why (1956)
4502.
(1952 ONLY:) Don't like Republican foreign policy, general; bad foreign policy (unspecified why) (1964)
4503.
Badly handled foreign policy, bungling, unclear policy, inconsistent, no real policy, not dynamic (1968)
4504.
Weak, ineffective foreign policy, poor military position, couldn't keep up defenses, soft on communism, not enough scientific, technological development (1964)
4516.
Too internationalist, too much meddling in other countries' affairs, don't like stand on foreign trade and tariff (1964)
4518.
Too internationalist, too much meddling in other countries' affairs, we should mind our own business (na whether economic or military) (1956)
4521.
Too isolationist, against aid to other countries (na whether economic or military), against UN, cooperating with our allies (1956)
4523.
Isolationist, against aid to other countries (NA whether military or economic)
4524.
Too isolationist, not enough interested in rest of world, too selfish (1964)
4525.
Republicans against the UN, against cooperating with UN, distrust our allies, won't be able to work with our allies
4532.
Haven't stopped communism, letting communism spread, haven't known how to handle Russia, didn't handle Korea the right way (1958)
4535.
[(1952:) Won't stop / (1956:) Haven't stopped / (1968:) Would not stop] communism; [(1952,1968:) will let / (1956:) letting] communism spread ((1968:) abroad); [(1952:) won't know how to / (1956:) haven't known how to / (1968:) could not] handle Russia; would provide weak military position, would back down to Russia (1968)
4540.
Spends too much on foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
4541.
R against military aid to allies, against sending troops abroad (1956)
4542.
(1952,1968 ONLY:) Spend too much abroad, too much economic aid; spending too much on economic aid abroad (1956,1958,1960 ONLY)

4550.
Republicans against foreign aid - military, economic, or unspecified (1964)
4551.
Republicans against sending troops abroad, against military aid to our allies
4552.
Republicans (are) against economic aid; (1952 ONLY:) Point Four; against [(1952:) economic help to / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) helping] other countries
4560.
Have handled (will handle) specific trouble spots badly -- Congo, Cuba, Berlin (1960)
4561.
((1956,1958 ONLY:) ((1958:) Have) Handled) [(1956:) Egypt, Suez canal / (1958:) Mideast] problem [(1956:) badly, Middle East / (1958:) badly (Lebanon, Egypt) / (1968:) (Egypt, Israel) - any comment] (1956)
4562.
Have handled Formosa situation badly (China, Matsu, Quemoy) (1958); Red China - any comment (1968)
4564.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Specific comments about Korea ((1952 ONLY:) Republican's fault, they didn't vote for Korean aid); didn't settle Korea the right way, dishonorable peace) (1956 ONLY); Pueblo - any comment (1968)
4566.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
4567.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
4568.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
4570.
Would lost (have lost) U.S. prestige in world, other countries (will) dislike us more (1960)
4580.
Republicans are the war party, are against disarmament, for nuclear testing, use of nuclear weapons (1964)
4581.
Republicans are a war party, likely to get us into ((1968:) full-scale, nuclear) war (1956)
4582.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) They won't let us get out of Vietnam war, will get us into a bigger war, don't like their stand on Vietnam (1968)
4583.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
4584.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as not representing a change (na direction) (1968)
4585.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as too reliant on negotiations, bombing pauses, diplomats, etc., will sell out the Vietnamese

(1968)
4586.
(Vietnam central point) R sees party as most likely to withdraw
unconditionally (1968)
4587.
Unclear stand on Vietnam war (1968)
4589.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
4590.
(1952,1956,1964,1968 ONLY:) Other ((1964:) foreign policy ((1964
ONLY:) issues)); misc. foreign policy or foreign policy (na aspects)
(1958,1960 ONLY)
4591.
Disapprove (of) stand on foreign trade and tariff(s)
4592.
Don't like Republicans' defense program (1958)
4593.
Disapprove of stand on defense program, UMT, draft program
4594.
Disapprove Republican draft program, UMT (1958)
4595.
H-bomb testing, atomic defense program (specific) (1956)
4597.
Preparedness and technology, Republicans haven't kept up with
(got ahead of) Russian science, mediocre, poor research program
(1958)
4599.
Any tying of R's or his family's welfare to Republican foreign policy
----
PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DISLIKE REPUBLICAN PARTY BECAUSE TOO GOOD FOR / HELPS AT
EXPENSE OF OTHERS / IS CONTROLLED BY / IS MADE UP OF --

4601.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others
4615.
Workers, common people, the poor (1964)
4616.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
4617.
Workers, working people, labor unions, union bosses, plays class
against class (1958)
4620.
Labor unions, labor union bosses, union members (1964)
4633.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
4640.
Small business, small businessmen (specifically) (1964)
4650.
White collar workers, salaried workers, the middle class (1964)
4660.
Farmers (1964)
4670.

Negroes
4671.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
4690.
Other; <groups favored by party> (1960 ONLY); (includes younger,
older people, misc. minority groups) (1964 ONLY)
4692.
Old people, aged (1960)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DISLIKE REPUBLICAN PARTY BECAUSE IT'S BAD FOR / HAS KEPT
(WILL KEEP) IN CHECK / WOULD NOT BE FAIR TO --

4701.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special, privileged groups
4702.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special, privileged groups
(1964)
4703.
People like me, people like us
4710.
Common people, poor people, "the people", lower income people,
working class people, the laboring man (1958)
4711.
Common people, little people, poor people, "the people"
4712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
4713.
Common people, lower income people, working-class people, the
average man (1964)
4720.
Labor, labor unions (((1952, 1956, 1968 ONLY:) na whether)
members or leaders)
4721.
Labor, labor unions, members (1964)
4722.
Labor union members
4730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
4731.
Industry, (big) business, businessmen (1958)
4732.
Big business, industry
4740.
((1958:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1958:)
specifically)
4750.
Middle class people, white collar workers; salaried workers (1964)
4760.
Farmers
4770.
Negroes
4771.

People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
4790.
Other; (includes younger people (1958,1958,1960,1964 ONLY);
older people (1956,1958,1960 ONLY); misc. minority groups
(1958,1960,1964 ONLY)); <not favored by party> (1960 ONLY)
4791.
Other minority groups
4792.
Old people, the aged (1968)
4793.
Veterans, servicemen
4794.
Sectionalism
4799.
Young people (1968)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
PARTY RESPONSES

4800.
Never been a Republican, just couldn't vote Republican
4810.
Speaks of Republicans in negative, personal, affective terms -
[(1952,1956 ONLY:) selfish people, mean people, etc. /
(1958,1960,1964,1968:) bad people, lazy people]
4811.
Republicans are weak, weak-kneed, soft (1968)
4820.
Can't trust Republicans, [(1952,1956:) won't /
(1958,1960,1964,1968:) don't] keep their promises, don't know
where they stand
4830.
Party is split, [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) really two parties,
don't know which faction is on top / (1964:) dislike party
organization, too much fighting among leaders]
4840.
Negative reference to campaign Republicans are waging or to
national convention, disliked VP nomination (1956)
4841.
Negative reference to campaign(s) Reps have waged, convention
(1960)
4842.
Negative reference to campaign(s) Republicans [(1952:) are
waging / (1958,1968:) have waged]
4843.
Negative reference to national convention (1968)
4844.
Republicans too critical of Democrats, run other party, other
people down too much (1968)
4850.
[(1952,1956:) Don't like / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Dislike
Republican] campaign promises, na what; platform (1960); (non-
specific) (1964)
4860.

((1968:) Code) ((1964:) Any indication that) R [(1952,1956:) reacts negatively to / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) dislikes] local Republican party; politicians (1958,1960 ONLY)
4870.
((1964 ONLY:) Dislike) Faction or leadership [(ALL YEARS BUT 1964:) R doesn't like / (1964:) that has influence or] is controlling party ((1952 ONLY:) Taft is running the party or campaign, etc.); (e.g., Easterners, conservatives) (1964 ONLY); (e.g., union bosses, business but other than 4871 and 4872) (1968 ONLY)
4871.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Anti-liberal, progressive, young, Eisenhower or Dewey part of the party (no reference to foreign affairs); R doesn't like pro-liberal, Eastern, Rockefeller led wing of the party as faction that has influence or control (1968)
4872.
Anti-conservative; [(1952,1956:) Taft / (1968:) Goldwater] [(1952:) - led Republican party / (1956, 1968:) wing] ((1968:) as faction that has influence or control); (1952, 1956 ONLY:) old guard (no reference to foreign affairs)
4873.
Anti-internationalist wing of the party
4874.
Anti-isolationist wing of the party
4880.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) (Dislikes [(1952,1956:) Republican party / (1958,1960,1968:) GOP] organization); dislikes party ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) or machine) bosses; cheap politicians, too political, partisan (in negative sense) (1964 ONLY)
4890.
Other party responses (1958)

PARTY REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
OTHER

4900.
I just don't like them, it's a [(1952,1956,1958,1960:) lousy / (1964,1968:) bad] party
4903.
No - emphatic - to question on what like about party (1968)
4913.
Been in power long enough, time for a change (1958)
4920.
[(1952,1956:) Mention of vote being / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any indication that R] influenced by husband or wife
4930.
[(1952,1956: Mention of vote being / (1958,1960,1964,1968:) Any indication that R] influenced by other people - father, friends, business associates, [(1952,1956:) etc. / (1958, 1960,1964,1968:) na whom]
4940.
Republicans are against Democrats or Democratic leaders (1968)
4950.
Party only interested in staying in (getting in) power; (1952,1956 ONLY:) ruthless; not interested in good of the country (1964)

4951.
Undemocratic, too powerful, dictatorial, do what they want (1968)
4960.
Take advantage of ignorant, uninformed people (1956)
4970.
Don't like extremists in party, party's connection with extremism,
e.g., John Birch Society (1964)
4971.
Stand on, connection with John Birch Society (1968)
4977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
4978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
4979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
4982.
Releases (too little, too much) information, too secretive, too much
publicity (1964)
4983.
Didn't like McCarthy's speech

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

5010.
Good man, well-qualified for the job, R has heard good things
(unspecified), experienced (na what kind) (1960)
5011.
Good man, well qualified for the job, will make a good president, R
has heard good things about him, capable, has ability, best man
for the job or best candidate
5012.
Experienced (na what kind)
5013.
Dependable, reliable, trustworthy, a man you can trust with
responsibilities of government (1968)
5020.
War experience, war hero (1960)
5021.
He's not a military man
5030.
Successful record, was a good [(1952,1956:) govenor ((1956
ONLY:) for Kefauver, crime) / (1960:) senator, representative /
(1964:) senator, vice-president, president / (1968:) senator]
5040.
Government or political experience, has experience in civil
government
5050.
Good administrator, good executive ability, good organizer
5060.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Has cleaned up corruption in Illinois; has
attacked large racketeers, will keep eye on corruption in unions
(1960 ONLY)
5070.

((1952,1956 ONLY:) Diplomat); Statesman, has diplomatic
experience; has traveled the world (1960)
5080.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Will cut spending; (1952,1956
ONLY:) will be economical; run government economically (1960);
good business sense (1968)
5090.
Other ((1960:) experience and ability)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

5100.
Has dignity (1956); dignified (1960 ONLY)
5110.
A leader, great, natural-born leader ((1960:) no other specification)
5120.
Strong man, self-confident; ((1952,1956 ONLY:) can make
decisions; (1952,1956,1960,1968 ONLY:) will end all this
indecision; (1952,1956 ONLY:) will act); decisive (1956);
aggressive (1960); able to take over after death of Kennedy (1964
ONLY); firm (1968)
5130.
Will save America, America needs a man like him, a man you can
follow, people have confidence in him, inspiring (1960)
5131.
Will save American, American needs a man like him
5132.
A man you can follow, inspiring
5133.
People have confidence in him
5134.
Can unite America again, can gain confidence of all groups in
America (1968)
5135.
Good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)
5140.
Above politics, not a politician
5141.
"Politician" (positive reference) (1964)
5150.
Independent, no one will run him, ((1960:) he's) his own boss,
((1952,1956 ONLY:) stand up for what he believes in)
5160.
R talks in terms of Democrat ((1956 ONLY:) Dem. VP cand.) as
protector, will take care of things, will know what to do
5170.
Man of humility, knows his own limitations, doesn't pretend to know
all the answers
5180.
Knows how to handle people ((1960:) personal level of government)
5190.
Other; <leadership abilities> (1968)
5191.

A changed man, he's changed (positive) (1968)
5200.
Man of integrity, man of principle, man of high ideals, high moral
purpose, means what he says, honest, won't make deals, ((1968:)
not too) ambitious (1956); trust him (unspecified), not 'tricky' (1968)
5201.
Man of integreity, man of principle, man of high ideals, high moral
purpose, ((1952 ONLY:) means what he says), honest, [(1952:)
won't / (1964:) doesn't] make deals
5210.
Public servant, man of duty, conscientious; tries his best (1968)
5220.
Patriotic, for America, [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) has country's
good at heart / (1964:) will be good for the country]
5230.
Understands the problems, well-informed, understands the people
(1960)
5231.
Understands the problems; well-informed (1956)
5232.
Realistic, down to earth (1968)
5233.
Sensible, makes (a lot of) sense, uses common sense (1968)
5234.
Broad-minded (1968)
5240.
Educated, scholarly, intelligent, smart; (quick on question and
answer period) (1968)
5250.
Like his religion, he's religious (1964)
5251.
Religious; devout Catholic (1960 ONLY)
5252.
Church won't dictate to him (1960)
5253.
He is a Catholic, Catholic has right to be president (1960)
5260.
Comes from a good family, well-bred, polished; refined (1968)
5262.
Wealthy, made own money, worked his way up, knows what it is to
be poor, personally wealthy - won't be tempted, influenced by
money (1964)
5263.
Self-made man, started as poor boy (1968)
5270.
Good family life; like his family ((1964 ONLY:) wife, daughters,
relatives) (1964)
5272.
Like his wife (1960)
5273.
Reference to retarded grandchild, mental retardation programs,
handicapped people (1968)
5280.
Hard-working, would be a full-time president, would stay on the job,

ambitious (1964)
5281.
Hard-working, would be a full-time president, would stay on the job (1960)
5282.
Hard working, energetic (1956)
5283.
Would be a 'full-time' president, would stay on the job (1956)
5290.
Other; <personal qualifications> (1968)
5291.
Stable, balanced (1964)
5292.
Like stand on corruption in government, Bobby Baker, Jenkins scandals (1964)
5293.
Like his handling of the Stevenson fund (for ref. no. 37 only: defense of his financial set-up)
5296.
Tried hard (to be elected) before, not afraid of defeat, tried so long, underdog, feel sorry for him (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

5300.
Like him as a person, like his face, nice personality, pleasant, good sense of humor (1960)
5302.
Like him, like him as a person, like his face
5304.
Like him as a person (1968)
5305.
Nice personality, pleasant
5306.
Sense of humor
5308.
Like his face (1968)
5311.
Kind, warm, has the people's interest at heart
5312.
Likeable, people like him, likes people, gets along with people
5313.
Gets along with people, has people's interests at heart (1964)
5330.
Sincere
5331.
Sincere, talks straight to the point (1960)
5340.
Democratic ((1964:) non-partisan meaning)
5350.
Good speaker, makes a good appearance (1964)
5351.
Good speaker, speaks well ((1968:) (see also 5841)) (1960)

5352.
Looks good on TV (1968)
5360.
He's in good health, not too old (1964)
5361.
Health is good, he can handle the job (1956 ONLY); good health
(1968)
5362.
Age, ((1952,1956 ONLY:) young ((1956 ONLY:) for both Stevenson
and Kefauver)); not too young, we need youth, young blood (1968)
5364.
Age, not too old or too young, mature (1968)
5365.
Good age (unspecified) (1968)
5370.
(Anti-intellectual response) Not 'high-fallutin', can understand him,
talks simply, can communicate to common people (1968)
5371.
Kennedy not high-falutin' (1960 ONLY); outspoken, tells it like it is,
talks straight to the point, forthright, straight-forward (1968)
5372.
Courageous (unspecified) (1968)
5380.
Well-known figure, popular hero (1960)
5381.
Better known, I know more about him (for ref. no. 91 only)
5390.
Other ((1960:personal characteristics); (applies to 51-5300 series
(1964 ONLY)); (enthusiastic (1968 ONLY))
5391.
(1952 ONLY:) Southerner (use only for ref. no. 37 and 91); he's
from the South, Texas (1964 ONLY); mention of region or state,
e.g. he's a Southerner (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

5401.
Agree with him, agree with (like) his policies, supports (will bring
back) Democratic policies (1956)
5402.
Agree with Kennedy, agree with (like) his policies, Kennedy takes a
clear stand on issues (1960)
5403.
Agree with him, agree with (like) his policies; new ideas (1968)
5404.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Takes a clear stand in issues; know where he
stands ((1952,1956 ONLY:) on issues); position on issues is clear
(1964); talks straight to the point (1964 ONLY)
5405.
((1952 ONLY:) Democrat supports Democratic platform) Supports
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) and will continue) Democratic
policies ((1960:) na whether domestic or foreign); supports party's
platform (1968)

5406.
Would change Democratic policies (na domestic or foreign) (1968)
5409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1964)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
STAND ON DOMESTIC POLICIES

5411.
[(1952,1956:) Will do a good job of handling / (1960,1964,1968:)
would handle] domestic affairs; (has the experience to handle)
domestic affairs ((1960:) well)
5413.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Agrees with) Democrat's domestic policies,
unspecified
5415.
Will support (((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) continue)((1968:)
would not change)) Democratic ((1968:) Johnson's) domestic
policies; (unspecified (1960))
5416.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic
(Johnson's) domestic policy (unspecified) (1968)
5420.
Will support needed government economic and social welfare
activitiy (supports such things as price controls, Social Security,
etc.)
5431.
Would cut out (down) government activity, stop this socialism (i.e.
medical care, social welfare) (1960)
5440.
Fiscal policy, taxes, interest rates, tight money (1960)
5442.
Bank policy, monetary policy, interest rates, tight money, loans
(1968)
5446.
More realistic tax policy, fairer tax policy
5448.
Will increase government spending (1968)
5450.
Will bring better times, lower cost of living, employment, jobs,
increase minimum wage (1960)
5455.
Will bring (continue) good times, prosperity, employment, jobs
(1956)
5456.
Will bring (continue) good times, prosperity
5460.
For big government, will use power of federal government, will
handle problems states and private enterprise can't (1964)
5470.
Liberal, more liberal than most Democrats, more for social
welfare, government economic activity (examples given in support
- Social Security, medical care, etc), will listen to/ bring in liberals,
continue new deal (fair deal) philosophy (1960)

5471.
Liberal; (1952,1956 ONLY:) favors social reform, social change, for new (fair) deal; more liberal than most Democrats (see 5970-5979 for responses on cand. stand on or connection with radicals, far right, etc. as opposed to R's labeling the cand. with such terms)
5472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals
5474.
Candidate favors social reform, social change, or progress (1968)
5480.
Conservative, middle of the road, not too radical, represents conservative wing of Democratic party, will listen to/bring in conservatives (1960)
5481.
Conservative; (1952,1956 ONLY:) middle-of-the-road, not too radical, less new (fair) deal; more conservative than most Dems. (1968)
5482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives
5483.
Middle of the road, moderate (unspecified) (1968)
5484.
Candidate for slow change, slow things down, keep things which made America great (1968)
5490.
Stand on anti-poverty programs, manpower retraining (1964)
5491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring government activity) (1968)
5492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring private enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
5500.
Stand on civil rights, na direction of stand on race problem (1960)
5510.
[(1952,1956:) Stand on / (1964,1968:) For] civil rights ((1952 ONLY:) for FEPC and desegregation; is in favor of desegregation, school integration (1956); civil rights law (1964))
5511.
Stand on civil rights, for desegregation, or civil rights, na direction (1956)
5520.
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) Against) ((1952,1956 ONLY:) moderate) ((1952,1956,1958,1960:) stand on) civil rights; will go easy on desegregation (1956); is against desegregation and school integration (1960); would stop favoritism to Negroes (1968)
5530.
Stand on civil liberties and communism in government, minimize security risks (1960)
5531.
Humphrey is pro civil liberties (1968)
5533.
Stand on civil liberties
5537.

Will [(1952:) expel / (1956:) keep] communists ((1956:) out of government); will take care of communists (1956)
5541.
Farm policy
5550.
Stand on labor, on union corruption, right to work laws, Taft-Hartley, Hoffa (1960)
5552.
Stand on labor, stand on Taft-Hartley
5553.
Labor policy (1968)
5560.
Stand on conservation, public power (TVA, REA; ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) St. Lawrence Seaway, Tidelands oil); giveaway programs (1956,1960,1964 ONLY); natural resources (1964 ONLY)); public works and highways (1960)
5561.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
5570.
Law and order, R sees cand. as following a tough or hard line but group reference is unclear or not mentioned, also code here when na which line (hard or soft) R sees cand. following ('hard' refers to such phrases as 'enforce the law', 'end or stop riots, demonstrations', etc. and 'restore law and order' OR on the anti side - 'facist oppressive policies', and 'hurt the innocent') - hereafter, only the term 'hard line' will appear to designate this group of law and order responses (1968)
5571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
5572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
5573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
5574.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 5571-5573 (1968)
5575.
Would stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
5576.
Humphrey against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
5580.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference ('soft line' refers to such phrases as 'justice and order', 'restrained policy', and 'would avoid a police state' OR on the anti side - 'law and order would break down', 'too lenient', and 'too permissive') - hereafter only the term 'soft line' will appear to designate this group of law and order responses (1968)
5581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
5582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
5583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
5584.

Law and order, soft line involving police separate from 5581-5583 (1968)
5585.
Would stop our drift to police or facist state (1968)
5586.
Humphrey for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
5590.
Other ((1960:) domestic policy reference); (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as example - for all codes except 5682-5689 (1968))
5591.
Stand on Social Security, unemployment compensation (1964)
5592.
Stand on Social Security (1960)
5593.
Stand on education (1964)
5594.
Stand on medical care (1960)
5595.
Will clean up corruption, will clean up mess in Washington
5599.
((1960:) R's self-interest) - Any indication that R feels that he or his family will be helped by Democrat [(1952,1956:) economically, social welfare, Social Security, etc. / (1960,1968:) domestic policies]

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

5601.
[(1956:) Would do a good job of handling the / (1960:) Familiar with] world situation (1956); has experience [(1956:) with foreign affairs / (1960:) abroad]; knows how to handle other countries (unspecified which), travel, foreign countries respect him, familiar with military situation (1960 ONLY)
5602.
Will do a good job of handling (will know how to handle) the world situation, likes (agrees with) Democrat's foreign policy (unspecified)
5603.
[(1956:) Prefers / (1960:) Likes] (agrees with) Democrat's foreign policy (unspecified) (1956)
5605.
Democrat will follow ((1952, 1968 ONLY:) continue, (1968 ONLY:) would not change) Democratic ((1968:) Johnson's) foreign policy
5606.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
5613.
Internationalist, favors aid to/cooperation with other countries, UN (1964)
5617.
Internationalistic, in favor of aid for, cooperation with other countries
5621.
Isolationist, keeps out of other countries' affairs, will reduce

spending abroad/foreign aid, will put UN allies in their place (1960)
5635.
Will stop communism ((1960:) abroad); [(1952,1956:) will know how to / (1960,1964,1968:) can] handle Russia; will stand up to communism (1968)
5640.
Defense and preparedness, will raise defense spending, firm foreign policy (1964)
5641.
Defense and preparedness, will raise defense spending, bomb testing (1960)
5660.
Can handle specific trouble spots, Middle East, Cuba, Congo, Berlin (1960)
5661.
Would know how to handle Suez problem, Middle East, Egypt (1956 ONLY); Mideast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)
5662.
Red China - any comment (1968)
5664.
(1952 ONLY:) Knows how to handle Korean war, any specifics relating to Korea; Pueblo - any comment (1968)
5666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
5667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
5668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
5670.
Will win prestige race with Russia, will raise American prestige in world (1960)
5680.
Will keep peace, better chance for peace under Kennedy, is working for peace/disarmament, can keep us out of war (1960)
5681.
Better change for peace under Democrat; [(1956:) kept / (1968:) will keep] us out of ((1968:) full scale, nuclear) war (1956); Korea not specified (1956 ONLY)
5682.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) Better chance for peace in Vietnam under Humphrey, like his stand on Vietnam war (unspecified) (1968)
5683.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
5684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as representing a change (na direction) (1968)
5685.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as less militaristic, good at negotiating (1968)
5686.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as most likely to withdraw

unconditionally (1968)
5689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
5690.
Other(s); (includes self-interest - any tying of R's personal or
family welfare to Kennedy's foreign policy) (1960 ONLY); foreign
policy reference (1964)
5691.
Stand on foreign trade and tariff
5693.
Stand on defense [(1952:) program / (1956:) spending], UMT, draft
program
5694.
Like stand on draft (1964)
5696.
Stand on atomic energy, use of atomic energy or hydrogren bomb
(1956)
5699.
Any tying of R's personal welfare or family's welfare to Democrat's
foreign policy

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
LIKE DEMOCRAT BECAUSE GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR / WILL HELP --

5701.
All the people, good for everyone, equitable policies ((1952,1956
ONLY:) for all), no special privileges
5702.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies, 'the people' (1964)
5703.
People like me, people like us
5710.
Common people, poor people, 'the people', working class people,
working people, the laboring man (1960)
5711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'
5712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
5714.
Common people, poor people, working class people, the laboring
man (1964)
5720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) na whether
members or leaders)
5722.
Labor union members
5730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
5731.
Business, Big business, industry (1960)
5732.
Big business, industry

5740.
((1960:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1960:) specific
reference to size)
5750.
Middle class people, white collar workers
5760.
Farmers
5770.
Negroes
5771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
5790.
Other ((1960,1964 ONLY:) groups Dem. cand will help - include
references to middle class or white collar workers, or to sectional
interests, veterans, etc.)
5791.
Other minority groups
5792.
Old people, the aged (1960)
5793.
Veterans, servicemen
5794.
Sectionalism
5799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
LIKE DEM BECAUSE BAD FOR / ANTI / WILL KEEP IN CHECK / WILL
PUT IN THEIR PLACE / WILL CEASE TO (WILL NOT FAVOR)

5780.
Like Kennedy because he will keep some groups in check (labor,
business, negroes) (1960)
5782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
5783.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
5787.
Negroes
5788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
5789.
Other

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
CANDIDATE AS PARTY REPRESENTATIVE

5800.
He's a Democrat, the Democratic nominee, a good Democrat
5810.
Not controlled by party, not a machine man
5820.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) He's not a real Democrat, different from most

Democrats; like him because he's not like most Democrats (1960)
5821.
He's not like Truman, administration
5830.
Like the men around him, his associates
5840.
Good speaker, like his speeches, campaign ((1956:) tactics)
5841.
Like his speeches, campaign tactics (1964)
5850.
Connection with Truman, Truman's man, Truman's successor
5851.
Kennedy's connection with Truman, F.D.R. (1960)
5852.
Johnson's connection with Kennedy, Truman, FDR (1964)
5853.
Humphrey's connection with Johnson, Johnson administration (1968)
5860.
Kennedy's relationship to vice-presidential candidate (1960)
5861.
Like the way he handled the [(1956:) choice / (1968:) question of selection] of vice president (1956)
5870.
Represents liberal, Northern wing of Democratic party
5890.
Other ((1960:) references tying the Democratic pres. cand. and the Dem. party)
5891.
(For Kefauver - he is better for president than Stevenson) (1956)
5893.
[(1952:) Party / (1960,1968:) Dem. pres. cand] [(1952:) would have had better chance (to win) (for ref. no. 91 only) / (1960:) can win, fought a good fight in primaries / (1968:) has a better chance of winning this election]
5894.
Popular choice in primaries, choice of the people (for ref. no. 91 only)
5895.
He tried hard [(1952 ONLY:) for it, worked for it (for ref. no. 91 only) / (1956:) to run before]

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- PRO:
OTHER

5900.
'I just like him', would vote for him, prefer him (no specific content) (1964)
5901.
Just like him (1956); like him a lot (1956 ONLY); ([(1956:) not further specified / (1960,1968:) no specific content])
5902.
I'm voting for Democrat

5911.
Johnson will continue the policies of the Kennedy administration, didn't change horses in mid-stream, give him a chance (1964)
5913.
He'll bring a change; he will change policies of Johnson administration (1968)
5930.
((1964:) Any indication that) R influenced by other people
5970.
Like stand on extremism, connection with extremists (1964)
5971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
5977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
5978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
5979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
5981.
Didn't ask for or want job
5985.
Like stand on immorality in country (1964)
5986.
Lesser of two (three) evils, couldn't vote for Nixon or Wallace, best available but not particularly happy with him (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

6010.
Not a good man, not qualified for the job, R has heard bad things about him, mediocre, inexperienced (na what kind of experience lacking) (1960)
6011.
Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocre
6012.
Inexperienced (na what kind)
6013.
Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government (1968)
6021.
No military experience
6030.
Unsuccessful record; was (is) a [(1952,1956:) bad governor ((1956 ONLY:) for kefauver, crime) / (1960:) poor senator, representative) / (1964:) poor vice president, a poor president) / (1968:) poor senator, vice-president]
6040.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Not enough (lack of) government, political experience; not enough experience in government, politics (1960)
6050.
[(1952,1956:) Bad / (1960,1964,1968:) Poor] administrator, [(1952,1956:) bad / (1960,1964,1968:) lacks] executive ability, poor

organizer
6060.
Has (did) not clean(ed) up corruption in Illinois
6070.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Not a diplomat), No statesman, no diplomatic
experience
6081.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Will spend too much; (1952,1956
ONLY:) no economy; would not economize (1960,1964 ONLY); run
government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)
6090.
Other ((1960:) experience and ability)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

6100.
Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of the country
(1956)
6110.
Not a leader; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) no leadership abilities;
(no other specification) (1960)
6120.
Weak; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) weak-looking; indecisive, no
self-confidence, vacillating
6121.
Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating,
people don't have confidence in him (1960)
6132.
Colorless, uninspiring
6133.
People don't have confidence in him
6134.
Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in
America (1968)
6135.
Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)
6140.
Not a (skilled) politician (1968)
6141.
A politician, too much in politics (1960)
6150.
Not independent; (1952 ONLY:) stooge, front man; ((1952 ONLY:)
will be) run by others; not his own boss (1956)
6151.
Not independent (1956); stooge, front man (1956 ONLY); will be
run by others, run by labor unions ((1960 ONLY:) church mention,
see 6252) (1956); not his own man (1960 ONLY)
6153.
Rub by labor unions (1968)
6160.
R talks in terms of Kennedy as a protector -- would not take care
of things, doesn't know what to do (1960)
6170.

(1952,1956 ONLY:) Not enough humility; too cocky, too self-confident (1956); not humble enough (1960); arrogant (1968)
6180.
Doesn't know how to handle people ((1960:) at personal level of government)
6181.
Reference to candidate's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)
6182.
Referance to candidate's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power (other than Congress) (1968)
6190.
Other; <leadership abilities> (1968)
6191.
A changed man, he's changed (negative) (1968)
6200.
Lacks integrity, unprincipled, opportunistic, dishonest, too ambitious (1960)
6201.
No integrity, no principles, compromised his principles, just a politician, opportunistic, dishonest, crooked
6210.
Doesn't think before he talks (1956); flighty, looks around for trouble (1956 ONLY); tries to stir up trouble (1956); impulsive (1960 ONLY)
6211.
Not enough public spirit, don't like his general attitude
6220.
Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1960)
6221.
Will be bad for the country (1964)
6230.
Poorly informed, doesn't understand the problems, doesn't understand the people, unrealistic, not down-to-earth (1964)
6231.
Doesn't understand the problems facing us; poorly informed (1956)
6232.
Unrealistic, not down to earth, too idealistic (1968)
6233.
Not sensible, doesn't know what he's talking about, doesn't know much (1968)
6240.
Stupid; not intelligent enough, not educated (1964)
6250.
Don't like his religion, he's irreligious (1964)
6251.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Not religious; irreligious (1960)
6252.
Catholic church would control him, don't want Pope in White House (1960)
6253.
He's a Catholic (1960)

6260.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Rich man's son, aristocratic; rich, has lots of (too much) money, high-falutin' background (1960 ONLY); too rich, has too much money (1964)
6264.
Reference to father's liquor business (1960)
6270.
Don't like his family, wife, daughters, relatives (1964)
6271.
Divorced, couldn't handle his own family affairs, unmarried
6272.
[(1960:) Dislike / (1968:) Don't like] his wife (1960)
6281.
Won't work hard enough, part-time president (1964)
6283.
Part-time president (1960)
6290.
Other; <personal qualifications> (1968)
6291.
Fanatic, unstable, dangerous (unspecified) (1964)
6292.
Corruption, immorality in government, connection with Baker, Jenkins scandals (1964)
6293.
Stevenson fund
6294.
Put his wife on the payroll (for ref. no. 38 only)
6295.
Too dictatorial, craves power (1964)
6296.
He's a loser, should have made it before, a die-hard (na whether 6100 or 6893) (1968)
6297.
Racist, bigot (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

6303.
Don't like him as a person, doesn't have a nice personality (1960)
6304.
Don't like him as a person
6305.
Doesn't have a nice personality
6306.
Jokes too much
6308.
Don't like his face (1968)
6311.
Cold, aloof, doesn't have the people's interests at heart
6312.
Not likable, people don't know him, doesn't get along with people
6313.
Doesn't get along with people, doesn't have people's interests at

heart (1964)

6314.
Not likable, people don't like him, doesn't get along with people, jokes too much (1960)

6330.
Insincere

6340.
Undemocratic; (1952,1956 ONLY:) snobbish; (non-partisan meaning)(1964)

6350.
Poor speaker, makes a poor appearance (1964)

6351.
Poor speaker (1960); doesn't speak well (see also 6841), windbag, talks too much, don't like his voice (1968)

6352.
Looks terrible on TV (1968)

6360.
He's in poor health, too old (1964)

6362.
Too young ((1952 ONLY:) for ref. no. 38 only); age (1956); -- for Kefauver (1956 ONLY)

6363.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Age; too old; not young enough (1968)

6365.
Bad age (unspecified) (1968)

6370.
Anti-intellectual response (too high fallutin', can't understand him, etc.); talks in circles, can't communicate to common people (1968)

6371.
Not outspoken, won't take any stands, doesn't say anything (1968)

6372.
Not courageous (unspecified) (1968)

6380.
No one ever heard of him; (1952,1956 ONLY:) no one knows him (negative); unpopular, not very well known (1960 ONLY); he's not well known (1964)

6390.
Other; <personal attraction (1960 ONLY); personal characteristics (applies to 61-6300 series) (1964 ONLY)

6391.
(1952 ONLY:) Southerner (for ref. no. 38 only); he's from the South, Texas (1964 ONLY); mention of region or state (1968 ONLY)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

6401.
Doesn't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies, supports (would bring back) Democratic policies (1956)

6402.
Don't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies, evasive, don't know where he stands on issues (1960)

6403.
Don't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies

6404.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Evasive; don't know where he stands
((1952,1956 ONLY:) on issues); position unclear, inconsistent
(1964)
6405.
(1952,1968 ONLY:) ((1952:)Democrat) Supports Democratic
platform; Will support ((1952,1968 ONLY:) will continue)
Democratic policies ((1960 ONLY:) na whether domestic or foreign)
6406.
Won't support Democratic policies (na whether domestic or
foreign) (1964)
6409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1964)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
STAND ON DOMESTIC POLICIES

6410.
Doesn't have the experience to handle domestic affairs, disagree
with his domestic policies (unspecified) (1960)
6411.
[(1956:) Wouldn't know how to / (1964:) Would] handle domestic
affairs ((1964 ONLY:) poorly) (1956); [(1956:) wouldn't have the /
(1964:) lacks] experience [(1956:)to handle / (1964:) in] domestic
affairs (1956)
6412.
Won't know how to handle domestic affairs, don't like (disagree
with) Democrat's domestic policies
6413.
[(1956:) Don't like (disagree with) Stevenson's / (1968:) His]
domestic policies ((1968:) unspecified) (1956)
6415.
Will support (continue, ((1968 ONLY:) would not change))
Democratic domestic policies
6416.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic
(Johnson's) domestic policies (1968)
6417.
Will (not) support Democratic domestic policies (1960)
6420.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Will keep up too much government economic
and social welfare activity - socialistic (support such things as
price controls, Social Security, etc.); Socialistic - will bring too
much government activity in economic and social welfare (Social
Security, medical care mentioned as examples), creeping
socialism (1960)
6422.
Humphrey is for give-away programs (1968)
6430.
Socialistic, in favor of welfare state (1964)
6440.
Dislike his fiscal policy, taxes, interest (1960)
6442.
Bank policy, monetary policy, interest rates, tight money, loans

(1968)
6447.
Won't increase government spending (enough) (1968)
6448.
Will raise taxes ((1968 ONLY:) too much); (ALL YEARS EXCEPT
1968:) won't lower taxes; keep high taxes, will increase
government spending (too much) (1968)
6451.
Would bring worse times, depression, higher cost of living, less
employment (1960)
6453.
Will bring (continue) bad times, cause depression, high cost of
living, inflation; will bring unemployment, fewer jobs (1956)
6460.
Favors big government, won't give states, private enterprise their
rights, against individual initiative (1964)
6470.
Too liberal, too radical, for new (fair) deal, would listen to radical
(Northern) wing of party (1960)
6471.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Too liberal, for new (fair) deal; liberal, more
liberal than most Democrats, too much of a left-wing radical,
extremist (see 6970-6979 for responses on cand. stand on or
connection with radicals, far right, etc., as opposed to R's labeling
the cand. with such terms) (1968)
6472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals
6473.
Too radical, too extreme (na direction) (1968)
6474.
Candidate too much for social reform, social change (1968)
6480.
Conservative, reactionary, opposed to social change, against new
(fair) deal, would listen to Southern Democrats (Johnson) (1960)
6481.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Too conservative, reactionary, against new
(fair) deal; conservative, more conservative than most Dems., too
much of a right-wing radical, extremist (1968)
6482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives
6484.
Reactionary, against change (1968)
6485.
Too middle of the road, too gradualistic (1968)
6490.
Stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining (1964)
6491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand as
favoring government activity) (1968)
6492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as
favoring priv. enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
6500.
Stand on civil rights, integration, race problem - na direction (1960)

6510.
Stand on civil rights; (1952 ONLY:) Democrats for FEPC; too much for desegregation, na how much (1956 ONLY); don't like him because he favors integration, desegregation (1960 ONLY); for civil rights, e.g., for desegregation, school integration, civil rights law (1964)
6520.
[(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) Against ((1952,1956:)moderate) / (1960: Don't like his] (stand on) civil rights; [(1956:) not strong enough / (1960:) not firm enough / (1964:) against] on desegregation; e.g., willing to go easy on desegregation and school integration (1964)
6530.
Has been (would be) too soft on communists, communist sympathizers, dislike his views on civil liberties (1960)
6533.
Stand on civil liberties (1956)
6537.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Will be too soft on communists, communist sympathizers; too soft on domestic communism, won't get rid of communists in our gov't., defense plants, etc. (1968)
6541.
Farm policy
6550.
Dislike his stand on labor, union corruption, right-to-work, Taft-Hartley (1960)
6552.
Stand on labor, stand on Taft-Hartley
6553.
Labor policy (1968)
6560.
Stand on conservation, public power (TVA, REA; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:)St. Lawrence Seaway, Tidelands oil; (1956,1960,1964 ONLY:) giveaway programs; (1964 ONLY:) natural resources); highways, public works (1960)
6561.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
6570.
Law and order, hard line - na group reference (see 5570) (1968)
6571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
6572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
6573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
6574.
Law and order, hard line involving police (separate from 6571-6573) (1968)
6575.
Law and order cover for facist, dictatorial policies, would bring about (not stop our drift to) a facist state, police state (1968)
6576.
Humphrey against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
6580.

Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 5580)
6581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
6582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
6583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
6584.
Law and order, soft line involving police (separate from 6581-6583)
(1968)
6585.
Wouldn't stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
6586.
Humphrey for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
6587.
Humphrey seen as favorable to (supporting) Supreme Court either
by implication of response or explicitly (1968)
6590.
Other; ((1960,1968 ONLY:) negative) domestic policy reference
(1960); (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as
an example - for all codes except 6682-6689) (1968)
6591.
Stand on Social Security, unemployment compensation (1964)
6592.
Stand on Social Security (1960)
6593.
Stand on education (1964)
6594.
Stand on medical care (1960)
6595.
Won't clean up corruption, won't clean up mess in Washington
6599.
((1960:) Self-interest) - Any indication that R or R's family will be
(would be) [(1952,1956:) hurt / (1960,1968:) injured] by Democrat
[(1952,1956:) economically, social welfare, etc. / (1960,1968:)
domestic policies]

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

6601.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Won't know how (doesn't have the experience)
to handle the world ((1952 ONLY:) situation); doesn't know how to
handle the world situation ((1960,1968 ONLY:) unspecified which),
military situation, ((1960,1968 ONLY:) doesn't know how to handle
other countries), not enough experience abroad, ((1964 ONLY:)
foreign) countries don't respect him (1960)
6603.
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Don't like) ([(1952,1956 ONLY:)
don't agree with / (1960,1964,1968:) disagrees with]) Democrat's
foreign policy (unspecified)
6605.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Democrat) will [(1952:) follow, continue
/(1956:) follow / (1968:) support, continue, would not change]

Democratic foreign policy

6606.
Wil not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)

6611.
Too internationalistic, too sympathetic to UN and allies, too much foreign spending (1960)

6617.
Too internationalistic, too much in favor of aid to other countries, favors too much spending abroad

6622.
Too isolationist, not interested enough in helping other countries, UN (1960)

6635.
[(1952:) Won't / (1960,1964,1968:) Wouldn't] stop communism ((1960,1964,1968:) abroad); [(1952,1956:) won't know how to / (1960,1964,1968:) can't] handle Russia ((1960 ONLY:) Kennedy's comments on U-2); wouldn't be able to control spread of communism (1956 ONLY); soft on communism (1964); won't stand up to communists (1968)

6640.
We would be weak and unprepared, will reduce defense spending, weak foreign policy (1964)

6641.
Weak and unprepared -- will reduce defense spending, stop bomb testing (1960)

6660.
Can't handle specific trouble spots -- Middle East, Cuba, Congo, Berlin (1960)

6661.
Wouldn't know how to handle Suez Problem, Middle East, Egypt (1956 ONLY); Mideast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)

6662.
Red China - any comment (1968)

6664.
(1952 ONLY:) Won't know how to handle the Korean war, any specifics relating to Korea; Pueblo - any comment (1968)

6666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)

6667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)

6668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)

6670.
Will lose prestige race with Russia, will lower America's prestige in world (1960)

6680.
Warlike, too militaristic, too much threat of force in foreign policy, poor control of nuclear weapons, against disarmament (1964)

6681.
Will get us into ([(1952:)full-scale / (1968:) full-scale, nuclear] war; warlike, too militaristic (1968)

6682.

Warlike, too militaristic, too much threat of force in our foreign policy (1960 ONLY); (Vietnam war central point of R's comment) he won't get us out of Vietnam war, will get us into a bigger war, don't like his stand on Vietnam (unspecified) (1968)

6683.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)

6684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand as not representing a change (na direction) (1968)

6685.
(Vietnam central point_ R sees cand as too reliant on negotiations, bombing pauses, diplomats, etc., will sell out the Vietnamese (1968)

6686.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)

6687.
Unclear stand on Vietnam war (1968)

6689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)

6690.
Other; include self-interest - any indication that R or his family will be injured by Kennedy's foreign policy (draft, being called back into service, etc.)(1960 ONLY); foreign policy reference (1964)

6691.
Stand on foreign trade and tariffs

6693.
Stand on defense [(1952:) program / (1956:) spending], UMT, draft program

6694.
Don't like stand on the draft (1964)

6696.
Stand on atomic energy, use of atomic energy or hydrogen bomb (1956)

6699.
Any tying in of R's or his family's personal welfare to Democrat's foreign policy (draft, being called back to service, etc.)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DISLIKE DEMOCRAT BECAUSE HE'S BAD FOR / ANTI / WILL KEEP IN CHECK --
----

6702.
Not good for everyone, 'the people', for special privileged groups (1964)

6703.
People like me, people like us

6710.
Common people, poor people, 'the people', working people, the laboring man (1960)

6711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'

6712.

Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
6714.
Common people, poor people, working class people, the laboring
man (1964)
6720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) na whether
members or leaders)
6722.
Labor union members
6730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
6731.
Business, Big business, industry (1960)
6732.
Big business, industry
6740.
((1960:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1960:) specific
reference to size)
6750.
Middle class people, white collar workers
6760.
Farmers
6770.
Negroes
6771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
6790.
Other ((1960,1964 ONLY:) groups Dem. cand will keep in check -
include middle class, white collar, sectional interests, veterans,
etc.)
6791.
Other minority groups
6792.
Old people, the aged (1960)
6793.
Veterans, servicemen
6794.
Sectionalism
6799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
DISLIKE DEM BECAUSE HE IS TOO GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR / HELPS
AT EXPENSE OF OTHER GROUPS / CONTROLLED BY / WILL HELP --

6780.
Don't like Kennedy because he's too good for certain groups, helps
them too much, is controlled by them (1960)
6781.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others
6782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
6783.

Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
6787.
Negroes
6788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
6789.
Other

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
CANDIDATE AS PARTY REPRESENTATIVE

6800.
He's a Democrat; I couldn't vote for a Democrat (1964)
6810.
Controlled by the Democratic party, controlled by the party bosses
6820.
He's not a real Democrat; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) not sure
of his party regularity; not like most Democrats (1964 ONLY)
6821.
He's not like Truman, has repudiated Truman
6830.
Don't like men around him, his associates; Johnson (1960 ONLY)
6840.
Bad speaker, don't like his speeches, campaign ((1956:) tactics)
6841.
Don't like his speeches, campaign tactics (1964)
6842.
Humphrey too critical of opponents, runs them (other parties, other
people) down too much (1968)
6843.
Convention (1968)
6850.
Connection with Truman, Truman's man
6851.
Kennedy's connection with F.D.R., Truman (1960)
6852.
Johnson's connection with Kennedy, Truman, FDR (1964)
6853.
Humphrey's connection with Johnson, Johnson administration
(1968)
6860.
Kennedy's relationship to vice-presidential candidate (1960)
6861.
Don't like the way he handled the question of selection of vice
president (1956)
6871.
Represents radical, Northern wing of the Democratic party
6890.
Other; <party references> (1960 ONLY); references tying [(1964:)
Johnson / (1968:) Humphrey] to Democratic party (1964)
6891.
(For Kefauver - was against Stevenson before, won't be able to
work with him now) (1956)

6893.
Stevenson lost last time, has been defeated (1956 ONLY); he can't win ((1968: (this election)) (1960)

CANDIDATE DEMOCRATIC -- ANTI:
OTHER

6900.
'I just don't like him', wouldn't vote for him, don't prefer him (no specific content) (1964)
6901.
I just don't like him, don't like him at all ([(1956:) not further specified / (1960,1968:) no specific content]) (1956)
6902.
I'm not voting for Democrat
6903.
No - emphatic - to question on what like about candidate (1968)
6913.
(1952,1968 ONLY:) Time for a change; (1952 ONLY:) he'll bring little change; [(1964:) Johnson / (1968:) Humphrey] won't change policies of [(1964:) Kennedy / (1968:) Johnson] administration ((1968 ONLY:) na foreign or domestic)
6930.
((1964 ONLY: Any indication that) R (being) influenced by [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) other people ((1968 ONLY:) including family) / (1964:) others]
6970.
Disapprove of stand on extremism, connection with extremists (1964)
6971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
6977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
6978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
6979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
6981.
Didn't ask for or want job
6982.
Support for Alger Hiss
6984.
Kennedy put in by rigged convention (1960)
6985.
Don't like stand on immorality in country (1964)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

7010.
Good man, well-qualified for the job, capable, R has heard good things (unspecified), experienced (na what kind) (1964)
7011.
Good man, well qualified for the job; (1952 ONLY:) will make a

good president; R has heard good things about him; (ALL YEARS
EXCEPT 1964:) capable, has ability, best man for the job or best
candidate ((1960 ONLY:) unspecified)
7012.
Experienced (na what kind); (for Nixon - has worked with Ike,
learned from him) (1956 ONLY)
7013.
Dependable, reliable, trustworthy, a man you can trust with
responsibilities of government (1968)
7020.
(1952,1956 ONLY) A military man; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:)
has military experience; (1952,1956 ONLY:) will help him in his job
(na why this qualifies him for the presidency); war experience, war
hero (1960)
7030.
Successful record; [(1952,1956 ONLY:) did a good job in Europe /
(1960,1968:) did a good job as vice president, president of Senate
((1960 ONLY:) president) / (1964:) is a good Senator]; (1952,1956
ONLY:) was a successful general
7031.
Successful record, has been a good president or good record (not
clear whether 7030 or 7031) (1956)
7040.
Government or political experience, has experience in civil
government (1960)
7041.
Has political experience
7050.
Good administrator, good executive ability, good organizer
7060.
Has cleaned up corruption in Washington (1956)
7070.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Diplomat), Statesman, has diplomatic
experience
7080.
(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Will cut ((1960 ONLY:)
unnecessary) spending; (1952,1956 ONLY:) economy; will run
government economically (1960); good business sense (1968)
7090.
Other ((1960:) experience and ability)
7091.
Able lawyer (1960); handled the Hiss case well, well trained
(general) (1960 ONLY); law experience (1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

7100.
Has dignity (1956); dignified (1960 ONLY)
7110.
A leader, great, natural-born leader; (no other specification) (1960)
7120.
Strong man, decisive, self-confident; (1952,1956 ONLY:) can
make decisions; (1952,1960,1968 ONLY:) will end all the

indecision - ((1952 ONLY:) will act); aggressive (1960); firm (1968)

7130.
Will save America, America needs a man like him, a man you can follow, people have confidence in him, inspiring (1960)

7131.
Will save ((1956 ONLY:) Has saved) America, America needs a man like him

7132.
A man you can follow, inspiring

7133.
People have confidence in him

7134.
Can unite America again, can gain confidence of all groups in America (1968)

7135.
Good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)

7140.
Above politics, not a politician

7141.
'Politician' (positive reference) (1964)

7142.
Tells people what they want to hear (1968)

7150.
Independent, no one will run him, he's his own boss

7160.
R talks ((1952,1956 ONLY:) in terms) of Republican as protector - will take care of things, will know what to do

7170.
Man of humility, knows his own limitations, doesn't pretend to know all the answers

7180.
Knows how to handle people ((1960:) personal level of government)

7190.
Other ((1968:) leadership abilities)

7191.
A changed man, he's changed (positive), misc. comparative comments - e.g., not as critical as before, not as impulsive (1968)

7200.
Man of integrity, man of principle, man of high ideals, high moral purpose, means what he says, honest, doesn't make deals, ((1968:) not too) ambitious (1956); trust him (unspecified), not 'tricky' (1968)

7201.
Man of integrity, man of principle, man of high ideals, high moral purpose; (1952 ONLY:) means what he says; honest, [(1952:) won't / (1964:) doesn't] make deals

7210.
Public servant, man of duty, conscientious; tries his best (1968)

7220.
Patriotic, for [(1952,1956:) America / (1960,1964,1968:) Americans]; [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) has country's good at heart / (1964:) will be good for the country]

7230.
Understand the problems, well-informed, understands the people,

realistic, down-to-earth (1964)
7231.
Understands the problems; well-informed (1956)
7232.
Realistic, down to earth (1968)
7233.
Sensible, makes (a lot of) sense, uses common sense (1968)
7234.
Broad-minded (1968)
7240.
Educated, scholarly, intelligent, smart (1960)
7241.
Educated, scholarly, university president, intelligent, smart
7250.
Like his religion, he's religious (1964)
7251.
Religious ((1960 ONLY:) no mention of type)
7252.
Independent of church influence (1960)
7253.
Protestant, Quaker, not a Catholic, can't vote for Kennedy (1960)
7260.
Comes from good family, well-bred, polished
7261.
Good family life (past and present), well-bred, polished, refined
(1960)
7262.
Wealthy, made own money, worked his way up, knows what it is to
be poor, personally wealthy - won't be tempted, influenced by
money (1964)
7263.
Self-made man, started as poor boy
7270.
Good family life; (1952,1956 ONLY:) good wife; like his family
((1964 ONLY:) wife, children, relatives) (1964)
7272.
Like his wife (1960)
7280.
Hard-working, would be a full-time president, would stay on the job,
ambitious (1964)
7282.
Hard working (1956)
7290.
Other; <personal qualifications> (1968)
7291.
Stable, balanced (1964)
7292.
Like stand on corruption in government, Baker, Jenkins scandals
(1964)
7293.
Like his handling of the Nixon case (for ref. no. 39 only: Nixon fund)
7296.
Tried hard (to be elected) before, not afraid of defeat, tried so long
(1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

7300.
Like him as a person, like his face, nice personality, pleasant, good
sense of humor (1964)
7301.
Like him as a person, like his face, nice personality, pleasant (1960)
7302.
Like him, like him as a person, like his face
7304.
Like him as a person (1968)
7305.
Nice personality, pleasant
7306.
Sense of humor (1968)
7308.
Like his face (1968)
7310.
Kind, warm, likable, gets along with people, has people's interests
at heart (1964)
7311.
Kind, warm, has the people's interest at heart
7312.
Likeable, people like him, likes people, gets along with people
7330.
Sincere
7331.
Sincere, talks straight to the point (1960)
7340.
Democratic ((1964:) non-partisan meaning)
7350.
Good speaker, makes a good appearance (1964)
7351.
Good speaker, speaks well ((1968:) (see also 7841)) (1960)
7352.
Looks good on TV (1968)
7360.
He's in good health, not too old (1964)
7361.
Good health (1968)
7362.
Age - young; (for Nixon - not too young) (1956 ONLY)
7363.
Age - not too old (1956)
7364.
Age, not too old, not too young (1960); mature (1968)
7365.
Good age (unspecified) (1968)
7370.
Anti-intellectual responses, (((1952,1956 ONLY:) Republican) not
high fallutin', can understand him, talks simply, ((1952, 1956
ONLY:) straight to the point)); can communicate to common

people (1968)
7371.
Nixon not high-falutin (1960 ONLY); outspoken, tells it like it is, talks
straight to the point, forthright, straight-forward (1968)
7372.
Courageous (unspecified) (1968)
7380.
[(1952,1956,1960:) Well-known figure / (1964,1968:) He's well
known]; (1952,1956,1960 ONLY:) popular hero
7381.
Better known, I know more about him (for ref. no. 91 only)
7390.
Other ((1960:) personal) [(1960:) attraction / (1964:)
characteristics (applies to 71-7300 series)]
7391.
He's from the West, Arizona (1964)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

7400.
Agree with Nixon, agree with (like) his policies, takes a clear stand
on issues, likes campaign promises (1960)
7401.
Agree with him, agree with (like) his policies, support Republican
policies (1956)
7403.
Agree with him, agree with (like) his policies; new ideas (1968)
7404.
[(1952,1956:) Takes a clear stand / (1964,1968:) Position] on
issues ((1964:) is clear), know where he stands ((1952,1956
ONLY:) on issues); talks straight to the point (1964 ONLY)
7405.
[(1952:) Republican / (1964,1968:) Will] support(s) ((1964:) and
continue) Republican ((1952 ONLY:) platform, Republican) policies
((1964:) na whether domestic or foreign); supports party's
platform (1968)
7407.
Has kept campaign promises (1956)
7408.
Will continue Eisenhower's program (na whether domestic or
foreign) (1960)
7409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1964)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
STAND ON DOMESTIC ISSUES/POLICIES

7410.
Would handle domestic affairs well, has the experience to handle
domestic matters, agree with (like) his domestic policies
(unspecified) (1960)
7411.
Does a good job of handling domestic affairs (1956 ONLY); has

the experience to handle domestic affairs (1956); would handle domestic affairs well (1964 ONLY)

7412.
Agree with (like) his domestic policies, unspecified; will know how to handle domestic policies

7413.
His domestic policy (unspecified) (1968)

7415.
Will support ((1968:) continue, would not change) Republican domestic policies

7416.
Will support (continue, would not change) Democratic (Johnson's) domestic policies (1968)

7431.
[(1952:) Has (will) / (1960:) Will / (1964,1968:) Would] cut down government activity, stop this socialism; (radicalism) (medical care and Social Security, etc., given only as examples of main point) (1960 ONLY)

7439.
Crusader against communism, Alger Hiss case (use only for ref. no. 39)

7440.
Fiscal policy, taxes, interest rates, tight money (1960)

7442.
Bank policy, monetary policy, interest rates, tight money, loans (1968)

7447.
Lower taxes; will decrease unnecessary government spending, balance the budget (1968)

7450.
Will bring better times, lower cost of living, employment, jobs, increase minimum wage (1964)

7452.
((1956 ONLY:)Has brought) Will bring better times, lower cost of living, employment, jobs (1956)

7454.
Will bring better times, lower cost of living

7461.
For states rights, free enterprise, individual initiative, against big government (1964)

7470.
Liberal, more liberal than most Republicans, more for social welfare, will listen to liberals (favors Social Security, medical care) (1960)

7471.
Liberal, more liberal than most Republicans; (1952, 1956 ONLY:) more for social welfare, etc.; (see 7970-7979 for responses on cand. stand on or connection with radicals, far right, etc. as opposed to R's labeling the cand. with such terms) (1968)

7472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals

7473.
Middle of the road, moderate (unspecified) (1968)

7474.

Candidate favors social reform, social change or progress (1968)
7480.
Conservative, middle of the road, will listen to/bring in conservatives, support conservative wing of Republican party, supported McCarthy, has support of Goldwater (1960)
7481.
Conservative; (1952,1956 ONLY:) middle of the road; more conservative than most reps (1968)
7482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives
7484.
Candidate for slow change, slow things down, keep things which made America great (1968)
7490.
Stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining (1964)
7491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring government activity) (1968)
7492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring priv. enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
7500.
Stand on civil rights -- na direction (1960)
7510.
[(1952,1956:) Stand on / (1964,1968:) For] civil rights ((1952 ONLY:) for FEPC); ((1960 ONLY:) in favor or) desegregation, school integration (1960); civil rights law (1964)
7511.
Stand on civil rights, is in favor of desegregation, etc.. or civil rights, na direction (1956)
7520.
Against ((1952,1956,1960 ONLY:) moderate stand on) civil rights; willing to go easy on desegregation ((1960:) and school integration) (1956); against desegregation (1964); would stop favoritism to Negroes (1968)
7530.
Stand on civil liberties and communism in government, minimize security risks (1960)
7537.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Will kick out the communists; hard line on domestic communism, would get rid of communists in our gov't., defense plants, etc. (1968)
7541.
Farm policy
7550.
Stand on labor, on union corruption, right-to-work laws, on Taft-Hartley, on Hoffa (1960)
7552.
Stand on labor, stand on Taft-Hartley
7553.
Labor policy (1968)
7560.
Stand on conservation, public power (TVA, REA; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) St. Lawrence Seaway, Tidelands oil;

(1956,1960,1964 ONLY:) giveaway programs; (1964 ONLY:)
natural resources); public works, highways (1960)
7561.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
7570.
Law and order, hard line - na group reference (see 5570) (1968)
7571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
7572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
7573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
7574.
Law and order, hard line involving police (separate from 7571-
7573) (1968)
7575.
Would stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
7576.
Nixon against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
7577.
Supreme Court - Nixon seen as critical of (will change) decisions,
members (not connected with school decisions - coded under civil
rights) (1968)
7580.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 5580) (1968)
7581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
7582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
7583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
7584.
Law and order, soft line involving police (separate from 7581-7583)
(1968)
7585.
Would stop our drift to police or facist state (1968)
7586.
Nixon for gun control, federal gun legislation, gun control - na
direction (1968)
7590.
Other ((1960:) domestic policy reference); (no mention of Vietnam
war or Vietnam war cited only as example - for all codes except
7682-7689) (1968)
7591.
Stand on Social Security, unemployment compensation (1964)
7592.
Stand on Social Security (1960)
7593.
Stand on education (1964)
7594.
Stand on medical care (1960)
7595.
[(1952:) Will / (1956:) Has] clean(ed) up mess in Washington,
clean(ed) up corruption

7599.
((1960:) R's self-interest) - Any ((1960 ONLY:) other) indication that
R feels that he or his family will be helped by Republican
[(1952,1956:) economically, social welfare, Social Security, etc. /
(1960,1968:) domestic policies]

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

7601.
[(1952,1956,1960:) Knows about / (1964,1968:) Familiar with]
world ((1952,1956,1960:) foreign) situation, military situation;
[(1952:) will (might) be able to / (1956,1960:) can] handle ((1952
ONLY:) experience will help him handle) world situation;
(1952,1956 ONLY:) experience in Europe ((1952 ONLY:) dealing
with other countries will be helpful); (1952,1956,1960 ONLY:)
knows how to handle other countries; [(1956:) other /
(1960,1964,1968:) foreign] countries ((1956,1960 ONLY:) people
abroad) respect him (1956); experience in goodwill tours (1960)
7603.
[(1952:) Prefer / (1956,1964:) Likes] ((1952,1956,1964:) agree(s)
with) Republican's foreign policy, unspecified
7605.
(1952, 1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) Republican will follow / (1956:) Is
following] Republican foreign policy; will support (continue, would
not change) Republican's foreign policy (1968)
7606.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic
(Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
7608.
Like, agree with Nixon's foreign policy, will follow Ike (unspecified)
(1960)
7615.
Republican is an internationalist, in favor of aid to, cooperation with
allies
7617.
Internationalistic, in favor of aid to (cooperation with) other
countries (1956)
7621.
[(1952:) Will be more / (1956:) Is] Isolationist - [(1952:) won't mix in
/ (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) keeps out of] other countries'
affairs; will [(1952:) stop / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) reduce]
spending ((1952 ONLY:) all this) ((1952,1956 ONLY:) money)
abroad; put UN (allies, ((1968:) other countries)) in their place;
(1952 ONLY:) will spend less money overseas
7635.
Will stop communism ((1960:) abroad); [(ALL YEARS EXCEPT
1968:) will know how to / (1968:) can] handle Russia; Kitchen
Debate mentioned (1960 ONLY); will stand up to communism
(1968)
7640.
Defense and preparedness, will raise defense spending, firm
foreign policy (1964)
7641.

Defense and preparedness, will raise defense spending, continue bomb testing (1960)
7660.
Can handle specific trouble spots, Middle East, Cuba, Congo, Berlin (1960)
7661.
Knows (will know) how to handle Suez problem, Middle East, Egypt (1956 ONLY); Mideast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)
7662.
Red China - any comment (1968)
7664.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) Will (may) end / (1956:) Ended] the war in Korea, [(1952:) better / (1956:) was] able to handle Korean war, other specifics relating to Korea; Pueblo - any comment (1968)
7665.
His promise to go to Korea
7666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
7667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
7668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
7670.
Will win prestige race with Russia, will raise America's prestige in world (1960)
7680.
((1960 ONLY:) Will keep peace), Better chance for peace under Republican, is working for peace, disarmament, kept us out of war ((1956 ONLY:) Korea not specified) (1956)
7681.
Better chance for peace under Republican; will keep us out of (full-scale, nuclear) war (1968)
7682.
Strong foreign policy, is willing to use troops if necessary, 'brink of war', massive retaliation (1956 ONLY); (Vietnam war central point of R's comment) better chance for peace in Vietnam under Nixon, like his stand on Vietnam war (unspecified) (1968)
7683.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
7684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as representing a change (na direction) (1968)
7685.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as less militaristic, good at negotiating (1968)
7686.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)
7689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
7690.

Other; (include here self-interest - any tying of R's personal or
family welfare to Nixon's foreign policy) (1960 ONLY); (foreign
policy reference) (1964 ONLY)
7691.
Stand on foreign trade and tariffs
7693.
Stand on defense program, UMT, draft program
7694.
Likes stand on draft (1964)
7696.
Stand on atomic energy, use of atomic energy or hydrogen bomb
(1956)
7699.
Any tying in R's personal welfare or family's welfare to
Republican's foreign policy

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
LIKE REPUBLICAN BECAUSE GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR / WILL HELP --

7701.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies for all
7702.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies, 'the people' (1964)
7703.
People like me, people like us
7710.
Common people, poor people, 'the people', working class people,
working people, the laboring man (1960)
7711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'
7712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the
working man
7714.
Common people, poor people, working class people, the laboring
man (1964)
7720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) na whether
members or leaders)
7722.
Labor union members
7730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
7731.
Business, Big business, industry (1960)
7732.
Big business, industry
7740.
((1960:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1960:) specific
reference to size)
7750.
Middle class people, white collar workers

7760.
Farmers
7770.
Negroes
7771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
7790.
Other ((1960,1964 ONLY:) groups Republican will [(1960:) be good
for / (1964:) help] - include references to middle class or white
collar workers, or to sectional interests, veterans, etc.)
7791.
Other minority groups
7792.
Old people, the aged (1960)
7793.
Veterans, servicemen
7794.
Sectionalism
7799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
LIKE REPUBLICAN BECAUSE WILL BE BAD FOR / ANTI / WILL KEEP IN
CHECK / WILL PUT IN THEIR PLACE--

7780.
Like Nixon because he will be bad for, or will keep some groups in
check (labor, business, negroes, etc.) (1960)
7782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
7783.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
7787.
Negroes
7788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
7789.
Other

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
CANDIDATE AS PARTY REPRESENTATIVE

7800.
He's a Republican, the Republican nominee, a good Republican;
understand problems of his party (1960 ONLY)
7810.
Not controlled by party, not a machine man
7820.
(1952,1956,1960 ONLY:) He's not a real Republican, different from
most Republicans; like him because he's not like most
Republicans (1964)
7830.
Like the men around him, his associates; Lodge (1960 ONLY)

7840.
Good speaker, like his speeches, campaign ((1956:) tactics)
7841.
Like his speeches, campaign tactics (1964)
7850.
Connection with Dewey
7851.
Eisenhower's boy, references of connection with Eisenhower
(1960 ONLY); Nixon's connection with Ike, Eisenhower
administration, he's like Ike (1968)
7852.
Nixon's connection with Goldwater (1968)
7860.
Goldwater's relationship to vice-presidential candidate (1964)
7861.
I like the way he handled the question of selection of vice president
(1956)
7870.
Represents liberal wing of the Republican party
7880.
Agreement with Taft wing of party, supported by old guard,
conservatives (1956)
7881.
Agreement with Taft
7890.
Other ((1960:) references tying the Republican cand. and the Rep.
party)
7891.
(For Nixon - Ike likes him) (1956)
7892.
Position on McCarthy, support of McCarthy
7893.
(1952 ONLY:) Party would have had better chance (to win) (for ref.
no. 91 only); Rep. cand is a winner (1956); he beat Stevenson
before (1956 ONLY); he has a better chance of winning (this
election) (1968)
7894.
Popular choice in primaries, choice of the people (for ref. no. 91
only)
7895.
He tried hard for it, worked for it (for ref. no. 91 only)
7896.
His support of other good men on Republican ticket

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- PRO:
OTHER

7900.
'I just like him', would vote for him, prefer him (no specific content)
(1964)
7901.
I just do like him (1956); like him a lot (1956 ONLY); [(1956:) not
further specified / (1960,1968:) no specific content] (1956)
7911.

Let Eisenhower finish the job, don't take him out now (1956)
7913.
He'll bring a change; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1960:) it's time for a change
7916.
He brought a change, it was time for a change (1956)
7930.
((1964 ONLY:) Any indication that) R influenced by [(ALL YEARS BUT 1964:) other people / (1964:) others]
7970.
Like stand on extremism, connection with extremists (1964)
7971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
7977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
7978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
7979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
7981.
Didn't want or ask for job
7985.
Like stand on immorality in country (1964)
7986.
Lesser of two (three) evils, couldn't vote for Humphrey or Wallace, best available but not particularly happy with him (1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

8010.
Not a good man, not qualified for the job, R has heard bad things about him, mediocre, inexperienced (na what kind of experience lacking) (1960)
8011.
Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocre
8012.
Inexperienced (na what kind)
8013.
Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government (1968)
8020.
A military man
8030.
Unsuccessful record; (1952,1956 ONLY:) did a bad job in Europe; was (is) a poor [(1952,1956:) general / (1960, 1968:) vice-president / (1964:) senator]
8031.
Unsuccessful record, has been a poor president (1956)
8040.
(1952 ONLY:) No government experience, no experience in civil government, knows nothing about being a president, no political experience; not enough experience in government, politics (1964)

8042.
Inexperienced (na in what area) (1960)
8043.
Been out of government too long (1968)
8050.
[(1952,1956:) Bad / (1960,1964,1968:) Poor] administrator;
[(1952,1956:) bad / (1960,1964,1968:) lacks] executive ability; poor
organizer
8060.
Hasn't cleaned up corruption in Washington (1956)
8070.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Not a diplomat), No statesman, no diplomatic
experience
8080.
Too ((1960 ONLY:) much) interested in [(1952,1956:) economy /
(1960:) economizing]; (1952,1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) won't / (1956:)
doesn't] spend money where needed
8081.
Will not economize, will spend too much (1964)
8090.
Other ((1960:) experience and ability)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

8100.
Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of the country
(1956)
8110.
Not a leader; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) no leadership ability;
(no other specifications) (1960)
8120.
Weak; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) weak looking; indecisive, no
self-confidence; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) vacillating
8121.
Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating,
people don't have confidence in him (1960)
8132.
Colorless, uninspiring
8133.
People don't have confidence in him
8134.
Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in
America (1968)
8135.
Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)
8140.
Not a skilled politician, not a politician (1968)
8141.
A politician, too much in politics (1960)
8142.
Tells people what they want to hear (1968)
8150.
Not independent; (1952 ONLY:) stooge, front man; will be run by

others; not his own boss (1964)
8152.
Not independent, stooge, front man, has been run by others, run by big business (1956)
8154.
Run by big business (1968)
8160.
R talks in terms of Nixon as a protector -- would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do (1960)
8170.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) Not enough humility; too cocky, too much self-confidence (1956); not humble enough (1960); arrogant (1968)
8180.
Doesn't know how to handle people ((1960:) at personal level of government)
8181.
Doesn't know how to handle people, can't get legislation through Congress (1956 ONLY); reference to Nixon's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)
8182.
Reference to Nixon's probable difficulty in getting support from others in positions of power (other than Congress) (1968)
8190.
Other; <leadership abilities> (1968)
8191.
A changed man, he's changed (negative) (1968)
8200.
No integrity, no principles, compromised his principles, just a politician, opportunistic, dishonest, too ambitious (1960)
8201.
No integrity, no principles, compromised his principles, just a politician, opportunistic, dishonest
8210.
Doesn't think before he talks (1956); flighty (1956 ONLY); looks around for trouble (1956); stirs up trouble (1956 ONLY)
8220.
Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1960)
8221.
Will be bad for country (1964)
8230.
Doesn't understand the problems facing us, poorly informed, doesn't understand the people (1960)
8231.
Doesn't understand the problems facing us; poorly informed (1956)
8232.
Unrealistic, not down to earth, too idealistic (1968)
8233.
Not sensible, doesn't know what he's talking about, doesn't know much (1968)
8240.
Stupid; not intelligent enough, not educated (1964)
8250.
Don't like his religion, he's irreligious (1964)

8251.
Not religious
8253.
He's a Quaker, non-combatant, pacifist (1960)
8254.
Not religious, changed religions (1960)
8260.
(1952,1956,1960 ONLY:) Rich, has lots of money; too rich, has too much money (1964)
8270.
Don't like his family, wife, children, relatives (1964)
8272.
[(1960:) Dislike / (1968:) Don't like] his wife (1960)
8281.
Part-time ((1960 ONLY:) vice) president, lets others do his work, too many vacations, ((1956 ONLY:) too much golf) (1956)
8290.
Other; <personal qualifications> (1968)
8291.
Fanatic, unstable, dangerous (unspecified) (1964)
8292.
Don't like stand on corruption in government, Baker, Jenkins scandals (1964)
8293.
Should have fired Nixon (for ref. no. 40 only: Nixon fund)
8295.
Too dictatorial, craves power (1964)
8296.
He's a loser, should have made it before, a die-hard (na whether 6100 or 6893), he's a two-time loser (1968)
8297.
Racist, bigot (1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

8303.
Don't like him as a person, doesn't have a nice personality (1960)
8304.
Don't like him as a person
8305.
Doesn't have a nice personality
8307.
No sense of humor
8308.
Don't like his face (1968)
8311.
Cold, aloof, doesn't have the people's interests at heart
8312.
Not likeable, people don't like him, doesn't get along with people
8313.
Doesn't get along with people, doesn't have people's interests at heart (1964)
8330.

Insincere
8340.
[(1952,1956,1960:) Not / (1964,1968:) Un] democratic ((1964:)
non-partisan meaning)
8350.
Poor speaker, makes a poor appearance (1964)
8351.
Poor speaker, doesn't speak well ((1968:) (see also 8841)) (1960);
windbag, talks too much, don't like his voice (1968)
8352.
Looks terrible on TV (1968)
8360.
He's in poor health, too old, too young (1964)
8361.
Health is poor, can't handle the job (1956)
8362.
Too young ((1952 ONLY:) for ref. no. 40 only); (- for Nixon (1956
ONLY)); age (1956)
8363.
Age - too old
8370.
(Anti-intellectual response) Too 'high-fallutin', can't understand him,
talks in circles, can't communicate to common people (1968)
8371.
Not outspoken, won't take any stands, doesn't say anything (1968)
8372.
Not courageous (unspecified) (1968)
8380.
(1952 ONLY:) Never heard of him, no one knows him (negative);
((1964:) He's) Not ((1964:) very) well known (1960); unpopular, no
one's ever heard of him (1960 ONLY)
8390.
Other; <personal attraction> (1960 ONLY); (personal
characteristics (applies to 81-8300)) (1964 ONLY)
8391.
He's from the West, Arizona (1964)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

8401.
Don't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies, he
supports Republican policies (1956)
8402.
Don't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies,
evasive, don't know where he stands on issues (1960)
8403.
Don't agree with him, don't agree with (don't like) his policies
8404.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Evasive; don't know where he stands
((1952,1956 ONLY:) on issues); position unclear, inconsistent
(1964)
8405.
Republican supports Republican platform, Republican policies

8406.
Won't support Republican policies (na whether domestic or foreign) (1964)
8407.
Hasn't kept campaign promises (1956)
8408.
Continuation of Eisenhower's policies (1960)
8409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1964)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
STAND ON DOMESTIC POLICIES

8410.
Doesn't know how (doesn't have the experience) to handle domestic affairs, disagree with (don't like) his domestic policies (unspecified) (1960)
8411.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) Won't / (1956:) Doesn't] know how (doesn't have the experience) to handle domestic affairs; would handle domestic affairs poorly, lacks experience in domestic affairs (1964)
8413.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Disagree with (don't like)) His domestic policies (unspecified)
8415.
Will support ((1968:) continue, would not change) Republican domestic policies
8416.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) domestic policies (1968)
8417.
Will (not) support Republican domestic policies (1960)
8421.
Will cut down needed government economic and social welfare activity, not interested in helping people (against such things as price controls, Social Security, etc. ((1960,1968 ONLY:) given as example))
8430.
Socialistic, in favor of welfare state (1964)
8440.
Fiscal policy, taxes, interest (1960)
8442.
Bank policy, monetary policy, interest rates, tight money, loans (1968)
8446.
Has (will) raise taxes, has (will) cut taxes too much (1956)
8447.
Will reduce government spending too much, won't increase government spending (enough), over-emphasizes balancing the budget (1968)
8448.
Will raise taxes ((1968 ONLY:) too much); keep high taxes, will increase government spending (too much) (1968)

8449.
Will cut taxes too much
8451.
Will bring worse times, will bring depression, will bring higher cost
of living; unemployment, less jobs (1956 ONLY); less employment
(1960)
8461.
Would give too much power to states, private enterprise, against
big government (1964)
8470.
Too liberal, too radical, would listen to Northern liberal wing of
party, favors social welfare (1964)
8471.
((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) Too) Liberal, too ((1968:) much of a
left-wing) radical; more liberal than most Republicans, extremist
(see 8970-8979 for responses on cand. stand on or connection
with radicals, far right, etc. as opposed to R's labeling the cand.
with such terms) (1968)
8472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals
8474.
Candidate too much for social reform, social change (1968)
8480.
Conservative, reactionary, too radical, opposed to social change,
would listen to conservative wing of party (1964)
8481.
Conservative, reactionary, opposed to social change; (1952,1956
ONLY:) opposed to social reform; supported by old guard, goes
along with Goldwater, Ike (1960 ONLY); more conservative than
most Reps., too much of a right-wing radical, extremist (1968)
8482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives
8483.
Too radical, too extreme (na direction)
8484.
Reactionary, against change (1968)
8485.
Too middle of the road, too gradualist (1968)
8490.
Stand on anti-poverty program, manpower retraining (1964)
8491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as
favoring government activity) (1968)
8492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as
favoring private enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
8500.
Stand on civil rights; desegregation (1956 ONLY); integration, race
problem - na direction (1960 ONLY)
8510.
(1952 ONLY:) Stand on civil rights, for FEPC; don't like him
because he favors integration (includes mentions of
desegregation) (1960 ONLY); for civil rights, e.g., for
desegregation, school integration, civil rights law (1964)

8520.
((1952,1956 ONLY:) Against (moderate)) Stand on civil rights; not strong enough on desegregation (1956 ONLY); - not firm enough on desegregation (1960 ONLY); (e.g., against desegregation, willing to go easy on desegregation) (1964)
8530.
Has been (would be) too soft on communists, communist sympathizers, dislike his views on civil liberties (1960)
8532.
Witch hunts ((1952 ONLY:) for ref. no. 40 only); he is anti-civil liberties (1968)
8537.
Has been too soft on communists, communist sympathizers (for Nixon - handling of communists in government) (1956 ONLY); too soft on domestic communism, won't get rid of communists in our gov't., defense plants, etc. (1968)
8541.
Farm policy
8550.
Stand on labor, union corruption, right-to-work, Taft-Hartley, Hoffa (1960)
8552.
Stand on labor, stand on Taft-Hartley
8553.
Labor policy (1968)
8560.
Stand on conservation, public power (TVA, REA; (1952,1956,1960,1968 ONLY:) St. Lawrence Seaway, Tidelands oil; giveaway programs (1956,1960,1964 ONLY); natural resources (1964 ONLY)); highways, public works (1960)
8561.
Air pollution, water pollution (1968)
8570.
Law and order, hard line - na group reference (see 5570) (1968)
8571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
8572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors (1968)
8573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
8574.
Law and order, hard line involving police (separate from 8571-8573) (1968)
8575.
Law and order cover for facist, dictatorial policies, would bring about (not stop our drift to) a facist state, police state (1968)
8576.
Nixon against gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
8580.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 5580) (1968)
8581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
8582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)

8583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals (1968)
8584.
Law and order, soft line involving police (separate from 8581-8583) (1968)
8585.
Wouldn't stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
8586.
Nixon for gun control, federal gun legislation (1968)
8590.
Other ((1960,1968 ONLY:) negative) domestic policy reference) (1960); (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as an example - for all codes except 8682-8689) (1968)
8591.
Stand on Social Security, unemployment compensation (1964)
8592.
Stand on Social Security (1960)
8593.
Stand on education (1964)
8594.
Stand on medical care (1960)
8595.
Won't clean up corruption, won't clean up the 'mess in Washington'
8599.
Any indication that R or R's family will be hurt by Republican economically, social welfare, etc.

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

8601.
Doesn't know how to handle the world situation (unspecified which), military situation, doesn't know how to handle other countries, not enough experience abroad, countries don't respect him (1960)
8602.
[(1952:) Won't / (1956:) Doesn't] know how to handle the world situation; (1952 ONLY:) don't like (don't agree with) Republican's foreign policy, unspecified
8603.
Don't like ([(1956:) don't agree / (1960:) disagree] with) Republican's foreign policy (unspecified) (1956)
8605.
(1952,1956 ONLY:) [(1952:) Republican will follow / (1956:) Is following] Republican foreign policy; will support (continue, would not change) Republican's foreign policy (1968)
8606.
Too internationalistic, too sympathetic to UN and allies, too much foreign spending (1968)
8611.
Too internationalistic, too sympathetic to UN and allies, too much foreign spending (1960)
8618.
Too internationalist

8622.
((1952 ONLY:) Will be) Too isolationist; [(1952:) anti- / (1960,1964:) not interested enough in] ((ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1968:) UN; [(1952:) will be against / (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1952:) not interested enough in] helping other countries; (1952 ONLY:) will spend less money overseas

8623.
Too isolationist, not interested enough in helping, cooperating with other countries (1956)

8635.
[(1952:) Won't / (1956:) Hasn't / (1960,1964,1968:) Wouldn't] stop communism ((1960:) abroad); [(1952:) won't know how to / (1956:) doesn't know how to / (1960,1964,1968:) can't] handle Russia; soft of communism (1964); won't stand up to communists (1968)

8640.
We would be weak and unprepared, will reduce defense spending, weak foreign policy (1964)

8641.
Weak and unprepared -- will reduce defense spending, stop bomb testing (1960)

8660.
Can't handle specific trouble spots -- Middle East, Cuba, Congo, Berlin (1960)

8661.
Won't (didn't) know how to handle Suez problem, Middle East, Egypt (1956 ONLY); Mideast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)

8662.
Red China - any comment (1968)

8664.
(1952 ONLY:) Will prolong war in Korea; didn't get a good settlement in Korea (1956 ONLY); (1952,1956 ONLY:) any specifics relating to Korea; Pueblo - any comment (1968)

8666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)

8667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)

8668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)

8670.
Will lose prestige race with Russia, will lower America's prestige in world (1960)

8680.
Warlike, too militaristic, too much threat of force in foreign policy, poor control of nuclear weapons, against disarmament (1964)

8681.
Will get us into ([(1952:) full-scale / (1968:) full-scale, nuclear]) war; warlike, too militaristic (1968)

8682.
((1960 ONLY:) Warlike) Too militaristic, too much of threat in force in foreign policy (1956,1960 ONLY); (Vietnam war central point of R's comment) he won't get us out of Vietnam war, will get us into a bigger war, don't like his stand on Vietnam (unspecified) (1968)

8683.

(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. taking a tough, hard, "victory" stand on the war (1968)
8684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as not representing a change (na direction) (1968)
8685.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as too reliant on negotiations, bombing pauses, diplomats, etc., will sell out the Vietnamese (1968)
8686.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as most likely to withdraw unconditionally (1968)
8687.
Unclear stand on Vietnam war (1968)
8689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
8690.
Other; (include self-interest - any indication that R or his family will be injured by Nixon's foreign policy (draft, being called back into service, etc.)) (1960 ONLY); foreign policy reference (1964)
8691.
Stand on foreign trade and tariffs
8693.
Stand on defense program, UMT, draft program
8694.
Don't like stand on the draft (1964)
8696.
Stand on atomic energy, use of atomic energy or hydrogren bomb (1956)
8699.
Any tying of R's or his family's personal welfare to Republican's foreign policy (draft, being called back into service, etc.)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DISLIKE REPUBLICAN BECAUSE HE'S BAD FOR / ANTI / WILL KEEP IN CHECK --
----
8702.
Not good for everyone, "the people", for privileged groups (1964)
8703.
People like me, people like us
8710.
Common people, poor people, 'the people', working people, the laboring man (1960)
8711.
Common people, little people, poor people, 'the people'
8712.
Working class people, working people, the laboring man, the working man
8714.
Common people, poor people, working class people, the laboring man (1964)
8720.
Labor, labor unions ((1952,1956,1968 ONLY:) na whether

members or leaders)
8722.
Labor union members
8730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little)
8731.
Business, Big business, industry (1960)
8732.
Big business, industry
8740.
((1960:) Small business or) Small businessmen ((1960:) specific
reference to size)
8750.
Middle class people, white collar workers
8760.
Farmers
8770.
Negroes
8771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
8790.
Other; (groups Rep. cand will keep in check - includes middle
class, white collar, sectional interests, veterans, etc.) (1960,1964
ONLY)
8791.
Other minority groups
8792.
Old people, the aged (1960)
8793.
Veterans, servicemen
8794.
Sectionalism
8799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
DISLIKES REP BECAUSE HE'S TOO GOOD FOR / BETTER FOR /
HELPS AT EXPENSE OF OTHER GROUPS / CONTROLLED BY / WILL HELP -
----
8780.
Don't like Nixon because he's too good for certain groups, helps
them too much, is controlled by them (1960)
8781.
Special interests, helps some groups at expense of others
8782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, union bosses
8783.
Big business, industry, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street
8787.
Negroes
8788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
8789.

Other

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
CANDIDATE AS PARTY REPRESENTATIVE

8800.
He's a Republican
8810.
Controlled by the Republican party, controlled by the party bosses
8820.
He's not a real Republican; (ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1964:) not sure
of his party regularity; not like most Republicans (1964 ONLY)
8830.
Don't like the men around him, his associates
8840.
Bad speaker, don't like his speeches, campaign ((1956:) tactics)
8841.
Don't like his speeches, campaign tactics (1964)
8842.
Nixon too critical of opponents, runs them (other parties, other
people) down too much (1968)
8850.
Connection with Dewey
8851.
Eisenhower's protégé (1960 ONLY); Nixon's connection with Ike,
Eisenhower administration (1968)
8852.
Nixon's connection with Goldwater (1968)
8860.
Goldwater's relationship to vice-presidential candidate (1964)
8861.
Don't like the way he handled [(1956:) vice-presidency issue /
(1968:) the question of selection of vice-president] (1956)
8870.
Represents liberal wing of the Republican party
8880.
Agreement with Taft or old guard; ((1952 ONLY:) Taft (Taft Forces)
now running the show; supported by conservative wing of the
party (1956 ONLY)
8890.
Other; <party references> (1960 ONLY); references tying Rep.
cand to Republican party (1964)
8892.
Support of McCarthy, should have repudiated McCarthy
8893.
He can't win ((1968:) (this election)) (1960)
8896.
His support of undesirable candidates on Republican ticket

CANDIDATE REPUBLICAN -- ANTI:
OTHER

8900.
'I just don't like him', wouldn't vote for him, don't prefer him (no

specific content) (1964)
8901.
I just don't like him, don't like him at all, [(1956:) not further
specified / (1960,1968:) no specific content] (1956)
8902.
I'm not voting for [(1952,1956:) Ike / (1960,1968:) Nixon]; he just
doesn't look right (1960 ONLY)
8903.
No - emphatic - to question on what like about candidate (1968)
8917.
Goldwater would bring too great a change (1964)
8918.
Not enough change from [(1960:) Eisenhower's / (1968:)
Johnson's] administration (1960)
8930.
((1960:) Any indication that) R influenced by [(ALL YEARS
EXCEPT 1964:) other people / (1964:) others]
8970.
Disapprove of stand on extremism, connection with extremists
(1964)
8971.
Stand on, connection with the John Birch Society (1968)
8977.
Stand, connection - 'racists' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
8978.
Stand, connection - 'the far left' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
8979.
Stand, connection - 'the far right' (unspecified, misc.) (1968)
8981.
Didn't ask for or want job
8983.
Too emotional about Korea
8985.
Don't like stand on immorality in country (1964)
8986.
Refused to debate (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
EXPERIENCE AND ABILITIES

9011.
Good man, well qualified for the job, will make a good president, R
has heard good things about him, capable, has ability, best man
for the job or best candidate (1968)
9012.
Experienced (na what kind) (1968)
9013.
Dependable, reliable, trustworthy, a man you can trust with
responsibilities of government (1968)
9030.
Successful record, was a good governor (1968)
9040.
Government or political experience, has experience in civil
government (1968)

9050.
Good administrator, good executive ability, good organizer (1968)
9080.
Run government economically, good business sense (1968)
9090.
Other experience and ability best he can (1968)
9100.
Has dignity, dignified (1968)
9110.
A leader, great natural-born leader (no other specification) (1968)
9120.
Strong man, decisive, self-confident, aggressive, will end all this
indecision, firm (1968)
9131.
Will save America, America needs a man like him (1968)
9132.
A man you can follow, inspiring (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND

9133.
People have confidence in him (1968)
9134.
Can unite America again, can gain confidence of all groups in
America (1968)
9135.
Good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)
9140.
Above politics, not a politician (1968)
9141.
"Politician" (positive reference) (1968)
9142.
Tells people what they want to hear (1968)
9150.
Independent, no one runs him, he's his own boss (1968)
9160.
R talks of Wallace as protector - will take care of things, knows
what to do, will straighten out the country, the government (1968)
9180.
Knows how to handle people (personal level in government) (1968)
9190.
Other <leadership abilities> (1968)
9200.
Man of integrity, principle, man of high ideals, high moral purpose,
means what he says, honest, doesn't make deals, less patronage,
graft, trust him (unspecified), not too ambitious, not 'tricky' (1968)
9210.
Public servant, man of duty, conscientious, best he can (1968)
9220.
Patriotic, for Americans, has country's good at heart (1968)
9231.
Understands the problems, well-informed (1968)
9232.

Realistic, down to earth (1968)
9233.
Sensible, makes (a lot of) sense, uses common sense (1968)
9240.
Educated, scholarly, intelligent, smart (1968)
9251.
Religious (1968)
9253.
Like his religion (1968)
9263.
Self-made man, started as poor boy (1968)
9272.
Mention of wife's illness, death (1968)
9281.
Hard-working, would be a full-time president, would stay on the job
(1968)
9290.
Other <personal qualifications> (1968)
9292.
Clean up the corruption in Washington (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
PERSONAL ATTRACTION

9304.
Like him as a person (1968)
9305.
Nice personality, pleasant (1968)
9306.
Sense of humor (1968)
9308.
Like his face (1968)
9311.
Kind, warm, has the people's interest at heart (1968)
9312.
Likable, people like him, likes people, gets along with people (1968)
9330.
Sincere (1968)
9340.
Democratic (non-partisan meaning) (1968)
9351.
Good speaker, speaks well (see also 9841) (1968)
9352.
Looks good on TV (1968)
9361.
Good health (1968)
9364.
Age, not too old or too young, mature (1968)
9365.
Good age (unspecified) (1968)
9370.
(Anti-intellectual response) Not 'high-fallutin', can understand him,
talks simply, can communicate to common people (1968)
9371.

Outspoken, tells it like it is, talks straight to the point, forthright, straight-forward (1968)
9372.
Courageous (unspecified) (1968)
9380.
He is well known (1968)
9390.
Other personal characteristics (1968)
9391.
Mention of region or state, e.g. he's a Southerner (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
ISSUES - NA WHETHER DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN

9403.
Agree with him, agree with (like) his policies, new ideas (1968)
9404.
Position on issues is clear, know where he stands (1968)
9409.
Stand on communism (na whether domestic or foreign) (1968)
9411.
Would handle domestic affairs well, has the experience to handle (1968)
9413.
His domestic policy (unspecified) (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
STAND ON DOMESTIC POLICIES

9415.
Will support (continue, would not change) Democratic (Johnson's) domestic policy (1968)
9416.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) domestic policy (1968)
9431.
Would cut down government activity, stop this socialism (1968)
9447.
Will lower taxes, will decrease government spending, balance the budget (1968)
9450.
Will bring better times, lower cost of living, employment, jobs, increase mininum wage (1968)
9471.
Liberal, more liberal than most Dems and/or Reps (see 9970-9979 for responses on cand. stand on or connection with radicals, far right, etc. as opposed to R's labeling the cand. with such terms) (1968)
9472.
Will bring in (listen to) liberals (1968)
9474.
Candidate favors social reform, social change or progress (1968)
9481.
Conservative, more conservative than most Dems and/or Reps

(1968)
9482.
Will bring in (listen to) conservatives (1968)
9484.
Candidate for slow change, slow things down, keep things which made America great (1968)
9485.
Wallace is for 'states rights', for local control, local government (1968)
9490.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (na direction of candidate's stand) (1968)
9491.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring government activity) (1968)
9492.
Stand on welfare, urban, poverty problems (R sees cand. as favoring priv. enterprise activity, tax incentives) (1968)
9500.
Stand on civil rights, negro problem, race problem - na direction of stand on race problem (1968)
9510.
For civil rights, e.g., for desegregation, school integration, civil rights law (1968)
9520.
Against civil rights, e.g., against desegregation, willing to go easy on desegregation and school integration, would stop favoritism to negroes (1968)
9536.
Strong against communists (na domestic or foreign) (1968)
9537.
Hard line on domestic communism, would get rid of communists in our gov't, defense plants, etc. (1968)
9541.
Farm policy (1968)
9553.
Labor policy (1968)
9570.
Law and order, hard line - na group reference (see 5570) (1968)
9571.
Law and order, hard line - negro riots (1968)
9572.
Law and order, hard line - college, war protestors, kids (1968)
9573.
Law and order, hard line - criminals (1968)
9574.
Law and order, hard line involving police separate from 9571-9573 (1968)
9575.
Would stop our drift to anarchy, guerrilla warfare, civil war (1968)
9576.
Wallace against gun control, federal gun legislation.., or gun control (na direction) (1968)
9577.

Supreme Court - Wallace seen as critical of (will change) decisions, members (not connected with school decisions - coded under civil rights) (1968)
9580.
Law and order, soft line - na group reference (see 5580) (1968)
9581.
Law and order, soft line - negro riots (1968)
9582.
Law and order, soft line - college, war protestors (1968)
9583.
Law and order, soft line - criminals separate from (581-583) (1968)
9590.
Other domestic policy reference (no mention of Vietnam war or Vietnam war cited only as an example - for all codes except 9682-9689) (1968)
9593.
Stand on education (1968)
9594.
Stand on medical care, e.g., Medicare, care for the aged (1968)
9599.
R's self interest - any indication that R feels he or his family will be helped by Wallace's domestic policy (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO: STAND ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

9601.
Handles foreign policy well, familiar with world situation, with military situation, experience abroad, travel, foreign countries respect him (1968)
9603.
His foreign policy (unspecified) (1968)
9605.
Will support (continue, would not change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
9606.
Will not support (not continue, would change) Democratic (Johnson's) foreign policy (1968)
9621.
Isolationist, keeps out of other countries' affairs, will reduce spending abroad, foreign aid, foreign aid (na reduce or increase), will put UN, allies, other countries in their place (1968)
9635.
Will stop communism abroad, can handle Russia, will stand up to communists (1968)
9641.
Defense and preparedness, will raise defense spending, bomb testing (1968)
9660.
Would handle trouble spots better, would respond better to new foreign situations, future world crisis, general (1968)
9661.
MidEast problems (Egypt, Israel) - any comment (1968)
9662.

Red China - any comment (1968)
9664.
Pueblo - any comment (1968)
9666.
Latin America, Cuba, Dominican Rep. - any comment (1968)
9667.
Africa, South Africa, Biafra - any comment (1968)
9668.
Czechoslovakia, Eastern Europe - any comment (1968)
9670.
Will win prestige race with Russia, will raise American's prestige in
world (1968)
9681.
Better chance for peace under him, will keep us out of (full-scale,
nuclear) war (1968)
9682.
(Vietnam war central point of R's comment) Better chance for
peace in Vietnam under Wallace, like his stand on Vietnam war
(unspecified) (1968)
9683.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as taking a tough, hard,
"victory" stand on the war (1968)
9684.
(Vietnam central point) R sees cand. as representing a change (na
direction) (1968)
9689.
Other comments about Vietnam war (1968)
9690.
Other foreign policy reference (1968)
9694.
Like stand on draft (1968)
9699.
Any tying of R's personal welfare or family's welfare to Wallace's
foreign policy (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
LIKES WALLACE BECAUSE HE'S GOOD FOR, WOULD BE FAIR TO,
ETC. --

9701.
All the people, good for everyone, no special privileges, equitable
policies (1968)
9703.
People like me, people like us (1968)
9711.
Common people, little people, poor people, "the people" (1968)
9712.
Working class (1968)
9720.
Labor, labor unions (na whether members or leaders) (1968)
9722.
Labor union members (1968)
9730.
Businessmen (na whether big or little) (1968)

9732.
Big business, industry (1968)
9740.
Small business or businessmen (specific reference to size) (1968)
9750.
Middle class people, white collar workers (1968)
9760.
Farmers (1968)
9770.
Negroes (1968)
9771.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
9790.
Other (1968)
9791.
Other minority groups (1968)
9792.
Old people, the aged (1968)
9793.
Veterans, servicemen (1968)
9794.
Sectionalism (1968)
9799.
Young people (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
LIKES WALLACE BECAUSE HE'S BAD FOR, ETC. --

9782.
Workers, working people, labor, labor unions, labor union bosses
(1968)
9783.
Big business, industy, businessmen, upper classes, big people,
rich people, powerful people, Wall Street (1968)
9787.
Negroes (good for whites) (1968)
9788.
People on welfare, A.D.C. mothers (1968)
9789.
Other (1968)

CANDIDATE AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE PARTY (WALLACE) -- PRO:
WALLACE AND POLITICAL PARTIES

9800.
He's a Democrat, a good Democrat, a real Dem. (1968)
9810.
(Anti-established parties response given in context of Wallace
candidacy) E.g., not controlled by a party, not a machine man, like
his standing up to the two major parties (1968)
9811.
Sympathy for having both parties against him (1968)
9812.
No difference between major parties (code here only if given in

context of Wallace candidacy otheriwse code in party master code) (1968)
9820.
He's not a real Democrat, different from most Democrats (1968)
9830.
Likes the men around him, his associates (1968)
9841.
Likes his speeches, campaign tactics (1968)
9860.
Likes his V.P. selection, relationship to V.P. (1968)
9870.
He can win, will keep HHH/Nixon from winning, throw it into House (1968)
9890.
Other responses relating Wallace to party system or his party (1968)

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS

9980.
Other miscellaneous

MISSING DATA

9987.
Don't know anything about party, can't say anything about them one way or another, don't mess in politics (neutral or apolitical) (1958); don't know much about him (neutral, not negative)
9988.
DK
9989.
RF; NA

>> 1972-LATER PARTY-CANDIDATE MASTER CODE

Note:
For 1972-later variables providing collapsed codes, corresponding collapsed code is provided within headers below.

----
11. PARTY ONLY -- PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

1.
Johnson
2.
Kennedy, John; JFK
3.
Kennedy, Robert; RFK
4.
Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"
5.
Kennedy, NA which

6.
Truman
7.
Roosevelt; "FDR"
8.
McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee
9.
Carter; good/bad choice for nominee
10.
Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee
11.
McCarthy, Eugene
12.
Humphrey
13.
Muskie
14.
Dukakis, Michael
15.
Wallace
16.
Jackson, Jesse
17.
Clinton, Bill
18.
Clinton, Hillary
19.
Gore, Al
20.
Lieberman, Joseph
21.
Kerry, John
22.
Edwards, John
23.
Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)
24.
Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)
25.
Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)
26.
Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)
27.
Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)
28.
Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)
31.
Eisenhower; Ike
32.
Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee
33.
Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)
34.
Rockefeller

35.
Reagan
36.
Ford; good/bad choice for nominee
37.
Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole
38.
Connally
39.
Kissinger
40.
McCarthy, Joseph
41.
Buchanan, Pat
42.
Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)
43.
Gingrich, Newt
44.
Cheney, Dick
45.
Bush, Jr. George W.
46.
McCain, John
51.
Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)
52.
Local party figures (city, state, etc.)
53.
Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket
54.
Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket
55.
Reference to vice-presidential candidate
97.
Other people within party reasons

----
12. PARTY ONLY -- PARTY CHARACTERISTICS

101.
Traditional Democratic voter: always been a Democrat; just a
Democrat; never been a Republican; just couldn't vote Republican
102.
Traditional Republican voter: always been a Republican; just a
Republican; never been a Democrat; just couldn't vote Democratic
111.
Positive, personal, affective terms applied to party--good/nice
people; patriotic; etc.
112.
Negative, personal, affective terms applied to party--bad/lazy
people; lack of patriotism; etc.
121.
Can trust them; they keep their promises; you know where they
stand

122.
Can't trust them; they break their promises; you don't know where they stand
131.
Party is well-organized, sticks together, is united; members are disciplined; votes party line; has disciplined members
132.
Party is poorly-organized/really two parties/divided/ factionalized; members not disciplined; doesn't vote party line
133.
Party is (more) representative/good cross-section of the country; encompasses a wider variety of views/people; is more at the center of the country's views
134.
Party is less/not representative; bad/poor cross-section of the country; encompasses more restricted views; is less at the center of the country's views
135.
Reference to participation of minority candidate(s); women candidate(s)
141.
Reference to party's most recent National Convention; party's process/method of selecting presidential/vice-presidential candidates
151.
Performance of local branch of party; how they've done in this state/county/town
161.
Reference to the predominant faction that R sees as being in control of the party (NA which faction); "I don't like the people running it"
162.
Reference to Northerners/Liberals (as in control) of Democratic Party
163.
Reference to Southerners/Conservatives (as in control) of Democratic Party
164.
Reference to Easterners/Liberals/Moderates (as in control) of Republican Party
165.
Reference to Midwesterners/Westerners/Southerners/ Conservatives (as in control) of Republican Party; "(Party) Old Boy Network" (as in control of Republican Party)
166.
Reference to Christian Coalition/Religious Right (as in control) of Republican Party
167.
Can't win; doesn't have a chance
168.
Can win; party can't be beat
169.
Too big a party; there are too many of them; party is too powerful
170.

Too small a party; there are not enough of them; party is too weak
171.
Listens (more) to people; takes (more) into consideration the needs and wants of people; understands (better) the people/the majority of the people
172.
Doesn't listen to/understand the needs and wants of the people/the majority of the people
173.
Campaign tactics, uses too much money in campaigns, slings mud
174.
Party been in office too long/long enough (but use 0430 for candidate been in office too long); party controlled Congress/held the White House too long/long enough; we need a change (of party)
191.
Doesn't recognize need to reform some of its stands/initiatives that haven't worked/won't work
197.
Other party-characteristic reasons
----
21. CANDIDATE ONLY -- EXPERIENCE, ABILITY

201.
General reference to him as "a good/bad man or a good/bad guy"; R has heard good/bad things about him; qualifications; general ability; reference to his "personality" ("job being done" is in code 0609)
203.
Not qualified for the office; the job is too big for him to handle
211.
Experienced (NA what kind) (see 0217, 0218, 0220 for specific kinds of experience; if in foreign policy see 1100's)
212.
Inexperienced
213.
Dependable/Trustworthy/Reliable; a man you can trust with the responsibilities of government ("trust" in the capability sense, rather than the honesty sense)
214.
Undependable/Untrustworthy/Unreliable; a man you can't trust with the responsibilities of government
215.
A military man; a good military/war record; served in Viet Nam: decorated veteran
216.
Not a military man; bad military/war record; no military/war record (but see 0719); dodged the draft; joined the National Guard; questions his service in Viet Nam
217.
His record in public service; how well he's performed in previous offices; voting record in Congress; he has done a good/poor job; Ford's vetos; he's done a good job so far (if incumbent), he has brought us through hard times

218.
Has government experience/political experience/seniority/
incumbency (also see code 0722)
219.
Lacks government experience/political experience
220.
A statesman; has experience in foreign affairs; has diplomatic
experience
221.
Not a statesman; lacks experience in foreign affairs; lacks
diplomatic experience
222.
"He has done a good/fair job so far"; he has brought us through
hard times"; has gotten things done; has some good ideas; trying
to do right things
223.
Hasn't done anything; hasn't produced any results (general); has
not been able to get programs off the ground
224.
Has fulfilled/kept (campaign) promises
225.
Has not fulfilled/kept (campaign) promises
226.
He did better than expected/a good job in the TV debates, won
debate (1976 ONLY)
227.
Did not do as well as expected/did not do good job in debates, lost
debate (1976 ONLY)
297.
Other candidate experience/ability reasons
----
22. CANDIDATE ONLY -- CANDIDATE LEADERSHIP QUALITIES

301.
Dignified/has dignity
302.
Undignified/lacks dignity
303.
Strong/decisive/self-confident/aggressive; will end all this
indecision; has guts; courage; 'sticks to his guns' [2004]
304.
Weak/indecisive/lacks self-confidence/vacillating; "waffles";
"wishy-washy"; flip flop(s); hazy; vague on issues
305.
Inspiring; a man you can follow; "a leader"; charisma
306.
Uninspiring; not a man you can follow; not a leader; lacks charisma
307.
People have confidence in him
308.
People don't have confidence in him
309.
Good at communicating with blacks, young people, other
"problem" groups

310.
Bad at communicating with blacks, young people, other "problem" groups (if communicate in general, see 0441, 0442)
311.
Knows how to handle people (at personal level)
312.
Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level)
313.
A politician/political person; (too) much in politics; a good politician; part of Washington crowd; politically motivated; just wants to be re-elected
314.
Not a politician; not in politics; above politics; a bad politician; not part of Washington crowd
315.
Independent; no one runs him; his own boss
316.
Not independent; run by others; not his own man/boss
317.
Humble; knows his limitations; doesn't pretend to know all the answers
318.
Not humble enough; too cocky/self-confident; can't admit shortcomings; blames others for his/her mistakes
319.
(Too) Careful/Cautious/Good judgment
320.
(Too) Impulsive/Careless/Bad/Poor judgment
321.
Helps people in the district on a personal level; has helped R personally with a problem (specific mention); tries to do things for the people
322.
Doesn't help people in the district on a personal level; was not helpful to R with a personal problem (specific mention)
323.
Represents (well) the views of the district; close to (the) people in the district; comes home regularly to chat and mix with people
324.
Does not represent (well) the views of the district; not close to the people in the district; doesn't interact enough with the people
325.
Keeps people well informed about governmental matters; communicates with constituents; any mention of R receiving newsletters or communications from him/her; explains matters well so people can understand
326.
Does not inform people enough about governmental matters; does not send enough newsletters or communications; doesn't explain matters well
327.
Listens to the people/solicits public opinion; any mention of polls or questionnaires; is accessible to constituents (NFS)
328.

Doesn't listen to the people/does not solicit public opinion; isn't accessible to constituents (NFS)
329.
Has helped local (district) economy; brought money, projects, jobs to district
330.
Has not helped local (district) economy; not brought money, projects, jobs to district
331.
Candidate helps the district; watches out for the interests of the district or region in general
332.
Candidate has not protected/watched out for the interests of the district (specific mentions)
334.
Poor at explaining himself/his positions; doesn't answer questions clearly; speaks off the top of his head/doesn't stop to think before he speaks
334.
Located after 0320
335.
Located after 0306
335.
Makes people feel good about America/being Americans; is patriotic/loves the country
336.
Located after 0306
336.
Has vision
337.
Lacks vision
337.
Located after 0306
397.
Other candidate leadership reasons

----

23. CANDIDATE ONLY -- PERSONAL QUALITIES

401.
Honest/Sincere; keeps promises; man of integrity; means what he says; fair; not tricky; open and candid; straightforward; positive Playboy references (1976)
402.
Dishonest/Insincere; breaks promises; no integrity; doesn't mean what he says; tricky; not open and candid; not straightforward
403.
Man of high principles/ideals; high moral purpose; idealistic (if too idealistic, code 0416) ; morality
404.
Lacks principles/ideals; not idealistic
405.
Racist/Bigoted/Prejudiced
406.
Not a racist/bigoted/prejudiced

407.
Public servant; man of duty; conscientious; hard-working; would be a full-time President; good attendance record in Congress; dedicated; really/genuinely interested in serving people
408.
Doesn't take public service seriously; lazy; would be a part-time President; poor attendance record in office; not dedicated; not really interested in serving people
409.
Doesn't use office for personal benefit; not in office to maximize personal benefit
410.
Uses/in office (mostly) for personal benefits (junket trips, big salary, other perks)
411.
Patriotic; (88) like Bush's stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue; (Pro) Kerry statements/actions about the Viet Nam War. (The R says that Kerry was right, showed bravery, in statements/actions after he came home from the war.)
412.
Unpatriotic; (88) dislike Dukakis stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue; (Anti) Kerry statements/actions about Viet Nam after he came back from war. (The R says Kerry was wrong, defamed America, was unpatriotic in statements/actions after he came home from
413.
Understands the nation's/district's problems; well-informed; studies up on issues
414.
Doesn't understand the nation's/district's problems; poorly informed; doesn't study up on issues
415.
Realistic; pragmatic/practical/down-to-earth/not too idealistic
416.
Unrealistic; too idealistic; (if "idealistic" in positive sense, code 0403)
417.
Uses common sense; makes a lot of sense; pragmatic/ practical/down-to-earth; not too idealistic
418.
Not sensible; impractical
419.
(Too) well educated; scholarly
420.
Poorly educated; unschooled
421.
Intelligent/Smart
422.
Unintelligent/Stupid/Dumb
423.
Religious; "moral" (in religious sense); God-fearing; "too" religious
424.
"Irreligious"; "immoral" (in religious sense); Playboy interview (reflects on Carter--1976)

425.
Self-made; not well off; started out as poor (boy); worked his way up; (started out) unpolished/unrefined/rough
426.
Wealthy; rich; born with silver spoon in mouth; polished/refined/well-mannered; buy way into office; use of own money to finance campaign
427.
Old hat; has run before; a die-hard; "a loser" (in the past)
428.
Someone new; a fresh face
429.
Don't change horses in midstream
430.
Time for a change (see 0174 for party has been in office too long); incumbent has been in office too long/long enough
431.
Unsafe/Unstable; dictatorial; craves power; ruthless
432.
Safe/Stable
433.
Sense of humor; jokes a lot (too much)
434.
No sense of humor; humorless (too serious)
435.
Kind/Warm/Gentle; caring
436.
Cold/Aloof
437.
Likeable; gets along with people; friendly; outgoing; nice
438.
Not/Un- likeable; can't get along with people
439.
Democratic (in non-partisan sense)
440.
Undemocratic (in non-partisan sense)
441.
High-fallutin'/High-brow; talks in circles; can't talk to common man; can't communicate ideas well
442.
Not high-fallutin'/is low-brow; talks straight; can talk to common man; can communicate ideas well
443.
Well-known; "I know him/her"
444.
Unknown; not well known
445.
Reference to his family; (not 0457); (including Billygate)
446.
Reference to his wife/spouse
447.
Speaking ability
448.
Health

449.
Appearance/Looks/Face/Appearance on TV; his smile
450.
Age (NA how perceived)
451.
(Too) Old
452.
(Too) Young
453.
Mature
454.
Immature
455.
Regional reference; "he's a Southerner"; "he's a Midwesterner"; he comes from the country/a rural area; area reference
456.
Previous occupation; 'Carter's a farmer'
457.
He's a family man; (not 0445)
458.
Will not disclose personal financial records, tax returns, or things related to finances.
459.
Energetic; too energetic
460.
Not energetic
461.
Gender, e.g., "She's a woman"
462.
Racial/Ethnic attribute; "He is a black man"
463.
Sexual orientation mentioned; "She is a lesbian"
464.
Uninformed; doesn't (seem to) know anything about the issues/what is going on in the country/government (for being "informed", see code 0413)
464.
Located after 0422
465.
Taking undeserved credit; taking credit for action, events, or policies one is not responsible for; Gore claiming "to have invented the internet"
466.
Overcoming adversity in one's personal life; overcoming handicaps, disabilities, disease, alcoholism, or other similar problem.
470.
Male (1974 ONLY)
470.
located after 0454
471.
Female (1974 ONLY)
471.
located after 0454

490.
'I like his character' (general)
491.
'I don't like his character' (general)
495.
Other negative personal qualities
496.
Other positive personal qualities
497.
Other candidate personal qualities
498.
References to Playboy interview--NA direction or neutral; "it's OK,"
"that is what the Bible says" (not 0401)--1976
----
24. CANDIDATE ONLY -- PARTY CONNECTIONS

500.
A Democrat; good Democrat; typical Democrat
501.
A Republican; good Republican; typical Republican
502.
Controlled by party regulars/bosses/machine
503.
Not controlled by party regulars/bosses
504.
Reference to men around him/staff/followers
505.
Reference to his speeches (exc. 0447), campaign tactics; mud-
slinging; (88) dislike Bush's stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue; all
campaign mentions
506.
Can win; best choice for party victory
507.
Cannot win; not good choice for party victory
508.
Reference to linkage with other party figures (he's close to the
Kennedy's; he was close to Eisenhower; etc.)
509.
Would continue/keep/follow Democratic policies (unspecified)
510.
Would change/get rid of   "   "
511.
Would continue/keep/follow Democratic domestic policies
(unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)
512.
Would change/get rid of   "   "   "
513.
Would continue/keep/follow Democratic foreign policies
(unspecified, not codeable in
[(1972,1986,1988,1990,1992,1994,1996,1998,2000,2004:) 1100's /
(1974,1976,1978,1980,1982,1984:) 1000s])
514.
Would change/get rid of   "   "   "
515.

Would continue/keep/follow Republican policies (unspecified)
516.
Would change/get rid of   "   "
517.
Would continue/keep/follow Republican domestic policies
(unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)
518.
Would change/get rid of   "   "   "
519.
Would continue/keep/follow Republican foreign policies
(unspecified, not codeable in
[(1972,1986,1988,1990,1992,1994,1996,1998,2000,2004:) 1100's /
(1974,1976,1978,1980,1982,1984:) 1000s])
520.
Would change/get rid of   "   "   "
531.
More liberal than most Democrats; a Northern Democrat
532.
More conservative   "   "   ; a Southern Democrat
533.
More liberal than most Republicans; an Eastern Republican
534.
More conservative   "   "   ; a Midwestern/Western/ Southern
Republican
535.
Will bring in/listen to the (party) liberals
536.
Will bring in/listen to the (party) conservatives
541.
Reference to the Eagleton affair--1972; reference to physical or
mental health of vice-presidential incumbent/ candidate; emotional
stability/state of V-P incumbent/ candidate
542.
Reference to vice-presidential incumbent/candidate, running mate;
- NEC
543.
Mondale's selection of a woman for vice-president (1984);
reference to age/gender/race/(ethnicity/ethnic background) of V-P
incumbent/ candidate
544.
Mention of issues that V-P incumbent/candidate is identified with or
has taken a leading role in promoting: 1992--Gore's position on
environment
551.
References to link with "Watergate"--positive reference to
Watergate; positive (good) connection with Watergate
552.
Not associated with "Watergate"--negative (bad) reference to
Watergate; negative (bad) connection with Watergate; making too
much out of Watergate
553.
Ford's pardon of Nixon--NA direction or against pardon
554.
"   "   " --pro; brave/right thing to do

555.
Positive references about independent candidacy; maybe the country needs a third party; third parties should have more recognition; the two party system needs buckling
556.
Negative references/liabilities related to independent candidacy; "He's an independent" (NFS); "We don't need a third party"; "He lacks backing from a party"
597.
Other candidate party connection reasons

----
31. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

601.
Good/Efficient/Businesslike administration; balanced budget; lower/wouldn't increase national debt; cautious spending
602.
Bad/Inefficient/Unbusinesslike administration; wasteful; "bureaucratic"; deficit budget; higher/increased national debt; overspend
603.
Honest government; not corrupt; no "mess in Washington"
604.
Dishonest/Corrupt government; "mess in Washington"; immorality in government; reference to Hayes, Mills, Lance; [1992] writing bad checks on the House of Representatives bank
605.
(Would) Spend less (than other side); (would) spend too little
606.
(Would) Spend more (than other side); (would) spend too much
607.
Has brought/will bring about bureaucratic reform
608.
Has not brought/will not bring about bureaucratic reform
609.
General assessment of job he/they would do/are doing; is (would be) good/bad President; are providing/would provide good/bad administration
610.
Reference to management/performance in Congress/Supreme Court/other government agency; made poor appointments; references to the quality of appointments made to public posts (courts, cabinet, commissions)
611.
He has/has not worked well with (Democratic) Congress; would/could have done better with (Republican) Congress; he kept/would keep Congress in check
612.
He will work well/better with (Democratic) Congress
613.
Gets more done/accomplishes (as much/more) / more productive
614.
Gets less done/doesn't accomplish as much/less productive
615.

Sympathy/understanding expressed for the complexity/ magnitude
of the job (e.g., President); tough job; rough job
616.
Sympathy/understanding expressed for the difficult situation ("a
mess") inherited by the incumbent
617.
Will face (difficult) issues; faces problems directly; faces up to
political reality
618.
Will not face (difficult) issues; will not face problems directly;
ignores political reality
619.
Supports the president/works well with the president/would work
well with the president
620.
Does not support the president/does not (would not) work well with
the president
621.
Response to/handling of domestic crisis or natural disaster--riot,
hurricane, tornado, earthquake, flood, etc.
622.
Located after 0609
622.
Doesn't work (hard) at job; not involved (enough) in the work of his
office/delegates too much authority to others; has chosen
poor/incompetent aides; his aides have not performed well
623.
Located after 0616
623.
Doing the best he can (under the circumstances); doing as good a
job as anyone else could do; everyone makes some mistakes
624.
Opposes term limitations for Congress
625.
Mostly approve of/happy with job done so far, but doesn't approve
of everything that has been done
625.
Located after 0614
626.
Favors term limits (for Congress)
627.
The economy is bad, but that is not (necessarily) his fault
628.
Contract with America that was proposed by Republicans;
support/commitment/opposition to Contract with America
697.
Other government management reasons
----
32. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY/PHILOSOPHY

801.
General assessment of ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)
802.
Different from other party/candidate

803.
Same as other party/candidate; not different enough
804.
(Too) negative; always tearing down other side; no solutions of his/their own
805.
For government activity; believe government should take care of things; for big government/ wants government bigger; supports social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907); would spend more on domestic needs
806.
Against government activity; believe government involved in too many things; favors reduction in social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907); against big government/ wants government smaller; wouldn't spend enough on domestic needs; spend enough/too much on
807.
Humanistic; favor human beings over property rights
808.
Not humanistic; favor property rights over human beings
809.
Favor social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions
810.
Against social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions
811.
Socialistic
812.
Anti-socialistic
813.
Communistic/soft on Communism/apologist for Communists/dupe
814.
(Too) anti-communistic/hard-liner on Communism
815.
(Too/More) liberal (except 0531 or 0533); - radical
816.
(Too/More) conservative (except 0532 or 0534); - reactionary
817.
Moderate/middle of the road/for slow change; not an extremist/fanatic; against change
818.
Extremist/fanatic/too far out; not too moderate/not a fence-sitter; for change
819.
Pro-Far Right/Birchers/reactionaries; encouraging fascist/ police state
820.
Anti-Far Right/ "   "   ; discouraging   "
821.
Pro-Far Left/radicals/Yippies/SDS; encouraging anarchy/ guerilla state
822.
Anti-Far Left/ "   "   " ; discouraging   "

823.
Pro-Extremists (NA direction)/nuts/bomb-throwers
824.
Anti-Extremists   "   "   "
827.
Pro-States'/local/community rights; better local government; more power in states' hands
828.
Anti- "   "   "   " ; worse/weaker local government; less power in states' hands
829.
For equality; believe everyone should have things equally/ be treated equally
830.
Anti-equality; believe some people should have more than others/people should not be treated equally
831.
Generous, compassionate, believe in helping others
832.
Selfish, only help themselves
833.
Acceptance of change/new ideas; less bound to status quo; more open to new ideas/ways of doing things; flexible, innovative
834.
Resistance to change/new ideas; stick to (protect) status quo; resist new ways of doing things; rigid
835.
Has a well-defined set of beliefs/definite philosophy; does not compromise on principles; has (clear) understanding of goals he/they stand for
836.
Has poorly defined set of beliefs; lacks a definite philosophy; compromise on principles; has no (clear) understanding (of goals he/they stands for)
837.
Favor work ethic; believes in self-reliance/in people working hard to get ahead
838.
Doesn't favor work ethic; believes in people being handed things/in government handouts (if specific policy mentioned, code in 0900's) ; doesn't believe in teaching people to be independent
841.
Keep track of/control over administration heads, cabinet members, etc.; follow through on policies; determine if programs are working
842.
Don't (as in 0841)
843.
Conditional evaluation: R suggests candidate/party cannot solve problems because not under his/their control (no negative connotations); will he/they be able to do what they say (determining factor outside his/their control); "I like what he says but wond
845.
Will involve/wants to involve people/Congress/Cabinet/ advisors/other government officials in government/ decision making

846.
Will not involve people/Congress/Cabinet/advisors/other
government officials in government/decision making
847.
Separation of church and state/religion and politics--pro
848.
Separation of church and state/religion and politics--anti
849.
Stand/views on religion (church/state relationship NA)
870.
General - emphasizes domestic concerns/issues; doesn't
emphasize nondomestic/foreign policy concerns
871.
General - doesn't emphasize domestic concerns/issues;
emphasizes nondomestic/foreign policy concerns
897.
Other Government Activity/Philosophy reasons

----

33. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- DOMESTIC POLICIES

900.
General assessment of domestic ideas/policies/stands
(unspecified exc. 870,871)
901.
General assessment of economic policy (unspecified)
902.
Government economic controls--NA direction
903.
"   "   "   --Pro; we need planned economy; control of
private enterprise
904.
"   "   "   --Anti; we have too much interference in private
enterprise
905.
Welfare/Poverty problems--NA direction; give-aways
906.
"   "   "   --Pro government aid/activity; pro give-aways
907.
"   "   "   --Anti government aid/activity; anti give-aways; pro
self-help
908.
Social Security/Pensions--NA direction
909.
"   "   "   --Pro expansion in coverage and/or increase in
benefits
910.
"   "   "   --Anti expansion in coverage and/or increase in
benefits; favoring contraction and/or decrease
911.
Unemployment compensation--NA direction
912.
"   "   --Pro expansion in coverage and/or increase in benefits
913.
"   "   --Anti expansion in coverage and/or increase in

benefits; favoring contraction and/or decrease

914.
Aid to education--NA direction

915.
"   "   --Pro

916.
"   "   --Anti

917.
Aid to parochial schools--NA direction

918.
"   "   "   --Pro

919.
"   "   "   --Anti

920.
Housing--NA direction

921.
"   --Pro more public housing

922.
"   --Anti more public housing

923.
Aid/Programs for older people/the aged, Medicare, Medicaid, prescription drug plan, direction -- NA

924.
"   "   "   -- Pro

925.
"   "   "   -- Anti

926.
Monetary policy--NA direction

927.
"   "   --Pro loose(r) money; more availability of loans for housing, cars, etc.; lower interest rates

928.
"   "   --Anti loose(r) money; for tighter money; less availability of loans; higher interest rates

929.
Tax policy--NA direction

930.
"   "   --Pro lower taxes

931.
"   "   --Anti lower taxes; for higher taxes

932.
"   "   --Pro reform/fairer system/end of loopholes/ write-offs/dodges

933.
"   "   --Anti reform/fairer system/end of loopholes/ write-offs/dodges

934.
"The Times"/General conditions/Prosperity/The Economy --better under him/them

935.
"   "   --worse under him/them

936.
Inflation/Cost of living--lower/better under him/them

937.
"   "   " --higher/worse under him/them

938.

Wages/Salaries/Income/Employment--higher/better under him/them
939.
"   "   "   "   --lower/worse under him/them
940.
Prices for producers--higher/better under him/them; (if farm, see 0943-0945)
941.
"   " --lower/worse (if farm, see 0943-0945)
942.
Located after 0933
942.
[1990] Candidate voted for the budget agreement which resulted in increased taxes/fees
943.
Programs to help farmers -- NA direction; Price supports for farmers - NA direction
944.
"   "   " ; Price supports for farmers   --Pro (greater) help/fairer system, reform in system; higher price supports; higher levels
945.
"   "   " ; Price supports for farmers --Anti (greater) help/fairer system, reform in system; higher price supports; higher levels and/or change in system
946.
Civil rights/Racial justice/Integration/Desegregation/ Voting Rights -- NA direction
947.
"   "   -- Pro
948.
"   "   -- Anti
949.
Civil liberties/Freedom of expression/First amendment/ Privacy -- NA direction
950.
"   -- Pro; against snooping; political trials, etc; (88) like Dukakis' stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue
951.
"   -- Anti; for snooping; political trials; McCarthyite; (88) dislike Republican party stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue
952.
General assessment of Labor policy (unspecified); (Pro labor code 1207, anti labor code 1208)
953.
Right to work laws--NA direction
954.
"   "   " --Pro (i.e., opposes unions [anti-labor, code 1208])
955.
"   "   " --Anti (i.e., supports unions [pro-labor, code 1207])
956.
Strikes--NA direction
957.
"   --will have fewer/will handle better
958.

"   --will have more/will handle worse
959.
Public power/Utilities/TVA/Atomic reactors/Nuclear power
plants/Etc. -- NA direction
960.
"   "   " -- Pro
961.
"   "   " -- Anti
962.
Ecology/Environment; Air and Water Pollution--NA direction
963.
Will crack down on polluters, will be activist; will protect the
environment; ecology/air and water pollution
964.
Won't crack down on polluters, doesn't care; in league with
polluters; not willing to protect the environment; ecology/air and
water pollution
965.
Veterans' Benefits--NA direction
966.
"   "   --Pro expansion of coverage and/or increase in benefits
967.
"   "   --Anti expansion of coverage and/or increase in benefits;
favoring contraction and/or decrease
968.
Law and order--NA direction
969.
"   "   --soft line--unspecified
970.
"   "   "   " --blacks
971.
"   "   "   " --campus demonstrators
972.
"   "   "   " --criminals/organized crime/ hoodlums/street crime
973.
"   "   "   " --anti power of police; court interference
974.
"   "   --hard line--unspecified
975.
"   "   "   " --blacks
976.
"   "   "   " --campus demonstrators
977.
"   "   "   " --criminals/organized crime/ hoodlums/street crime
978.
"   "   "   " --pro power of police; reduced court interference
979.
Public morality--NA direction
980.
"   "   --Strict/older/traditionalistic outlook; improve/renew
morality of country; pro-family; defends family values
981.
"   "   --Permissive/newer/modernistic outlook; not (strongly
enough) pro-family; doesn't defend (strongly enough) family values

982.
Drugs--NA direction
983.
" --Pro legalization/decriminalization; soft-liner; (88) doesn't
support (strongly enough) the war on drugs; not willing to do more
to combat drug use/pushers; involvement with Noreiga
984.
" --Anti legalization/decriminalization; hard-liner; (88) supports the
war on drugs; willing to do more to combat drug use/pushers
985.
Abortion and birth control--NA direction
986.
"   "   " --Pro reform/legalization; new outlook
987.
"   "   " --Anti reform/legalization; traditional outlook
988.
Gun control--NA direction
989.
"   " --Pro; controls
990.
"   " --Anti; "everyone has the right to own a gun"
991.
Busing--NA direction
992.
"   --Pro; against neighborhood school
993.
"   --Anti; for neighborhood school
994.
Urban problem/Cities--NA direction
995.
"   "   " --Pro government aid/activity
996.
"   "   " --Anti government aid/activity
997.
Other domestic policy reasons
998.
located after 0941
998.
General assessment of farm policy (unspecified) (1972-1984
ONLY)
1001.
National Health Insurance--NA direction
1002.
"   "   "   --Pro
1003.
"   "   "   --Anti
1004.
Energy/Gas shortage--Development of alternative energy source,
NA direction
1005.
"   "   "   --Pro development of alternative source, better/handled
better; more fuel
1006.
"   "   "   --Anti development of alternative energy source,

worse/handled worse; less fuel; (references to nuclear energy should be coded in 0959)

1007.
Government plans to make more jobs--NA direction; make-work programs; CETA; WPA; CCA

1008.
"   "   "   " --Pro

1009.
"   "   "   " --Anti

1010.
Confidence/Trust in government--NA direction

1011.
"   "   "   --would handle better; restore confidence

1012.
"   "   "   --would handle worse; cause loss of confidence

1013.
ERA; Women's rights--NA direction

1014.
"   "   "   --Pro

1015.
"   "   "   --Anti

1016.
Influx of political/economic/past refugees (Cubans, Haitians, Mexicans, etc.); include "the little Cuban boy"- Elian Gonzalez --NA direction

1017.
"   "   "   --Pro

1018.
"   "   "   --Anti

1019.
School prayer--NA direction

1020.
"   "   --Pro

1021.
"   "   --Anti

1022.
Gay rights; Gay marriages--NA direction

1023.
"   "   --Pro

1024.
"   "   --Anti

1025.
Health--NA direction; medical reform (do not use 1001 unless specific reference to National Health Insurance); [1994] (Clinton's) National health care plan/program

1026.
Health--Pro government programs/aid for mentally ill, disabled, handicapped, AIDS; [1994] (Clinton's) National health care plan/program

1027.
" --Anti   "   "   "   "   " (except 0923, 0924, 0925); [1994] (Clinton's) National health care plan/program

1028.
Space program--NA direction

1029.
"   "   --Pro

1030.
"   "   --Anti

1031.
Help to/improvement in a specific industry or occupation; Tort reform --NA direction

1032.
Help to/improvement in a specific industry or occupation; Tort reform -- Pro help/improvement

1033.
Help to/improvement in a specific industry or occupation; Tort reform -- Anti help/improvement

1035.
Polarization of classes/increasing gap between rich and poor--NA direction

1036.
"   "   "   "   " --will stop trend/handle better

1037.
"   "   "   "   " --will accelerate trend/handle worse

1038.
Day care--NA direction

1039.
"   " --favors/will expand or extend day care programs

1040.
"   " --opposes/will not expand or extend (will cut or eliminate) day care programs

1041.
"   "   "   " --opposes death penalty

1041.
Located after 0973

1042.
"   "   "   " --favors death penalty

1042.
Located after 0978

1043.
Affirmative Action programs -- NA direction

1043.
Located after 0948

1044.
"   "   "   -- Pro; favors quotas based on race or gender

1044.
Located after 0948

1045.
Located after 0948

1045.
"   "   "   -- Anti; opposes quotas based on race or gender

1046.
Located after 0928

1046.
Solvency/stability/regulation/control of the nation's FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. [1990] Involvement in the Savings and Loan

scandals; keeping an eye on corporate fraud.
1047.
Located after 0919
1047.
Establish/enforce standards for schools (test teachers, require minimum curricula, regulate class size, etc) -- NA direction
1048.
"   "   "   -- Pro
1048.
Located after 0919
1049.
"   "   "   --Anti
1049.
Located after 0919
1050.
Local/state issue mentioned--NA direction
1051.
"   "   "   --pro
1052.
"   "   "   --anti
1053.
How candidate feels about/votes on Clinton impeachment--NA direction
1054.
"   "   "   --pro
1055.
"   "   "   --anti
1056.
Financing of elections; campaign finance reform-NA dir
1057.
"   "   "   "   -Pro
1058.
"   "   "   "   -Anti
1059.
School vouchers--NA direction
1060.
"   "   --Pro; school choice plans - Pro
1061.
"   "   --Anti; school choice plans - Anti
1062.
"drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge" -- NA Direction
1063.
"drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge" -- Pro Direction
1064.
"drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge" -- Anti Direction
1065.
Stem cell research - NA direction
1066.
Stem cell research - Pro
1067.
Stem cell research - Anti (or limitations upon)
1068.
Scientific research/Biologic research/Cloning research -- NA direction

1069.
Scientific research/Biologic research/Cloning research -- Pro
1070.
Scientific research/Biologic research/Cloning research -- Anti
1080.
Value of the dollar relative to gold/other currencies; any mentions of gold/currencies (1992,1994, 1996 ONLY)
1080.
located after 0928
1081.
located after 0933
1081.
Line item veto -- Pro (1992,1994, 1996 ONLY)
1082.
located after 0933
1082.
Line item veto -- Anti (1992,1994, 1996 ONLY)
1083.
located after 0961
1083.
Regulation of companies engaged in public communication or transportation -- Pro (1992,1994, 1996 ONLY)
1084.
located after 0961
1084.
Regulation of companies engaged in public communication or transportation -- Anti (1992,1994, 1996 ONLY)
1085.
located after 1033
1085.
Spending on infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc.) -- Pro (1992,1994,1996 ONLY)
1086.
located after 1033
1086.
Spending on infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc.) -- Anti (1992, 1994, 1996 ONLY)
1087.
located after 1040
1087.
Family/maternity leave laws - Pro (1992,1994,1996 ONLY)
1088.
located after 1040
1088.
Family/maternity leave laws - Anti (1992,1994,1996 ONLY)
----
34. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- FOREIGN POLICIES

1101.
General assessment of foreign ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)
1102.
Foreign policies more clear-cut/decisive; less bungling
1103.
Foreign policies less clear-cut/decisive; more bungling

1104.
Internationalist/Interested in other countries' problems/Interested in world role/Pro-UN and allies; Meddling in other people's problems, care more about world opinion; would consult/act with allies.
1105.
Isolationist/America First/Fortress America/Would meddle less in other people's problems; care less about world opinion, unilateral action.
1106.
Strong military position/Preparedness/Weapons systems/Pentagon spending/Overkill; SDI ("Star Wars")
1107.
Weak military position/Pentagon spending cutbacks/No overkill/Reduce armed forces; SDI ("Star Wars")
1108.
Cold-war oriented; opposed detente; international Communist-fighter
1109.
Against cold war/Wants thaw/Detente/Understanding with international communists (if NA whether international, code (9N) in 0813-0814)
1110.
Military aid to allies--NA direction
1111.
"   "   " --Pro
1112.
"   "   " --Anti
1113.
Economic aid/Foreign aid/AID/Non-military aid--NA dir.
1114.
"   "   "   "   "   "   "   --Pro
1115.
"   "   "   "   "   "   "   --Anti
1116.
Trouble spots (not specifically coded)--would handle better (Panama, Afghanistan, Persian Gulf, Iraq, war in Afghanistan)
1116.
Located after 1163
1117.
"   "   "
1117.
"   "   "   "   "   --would handle worse (Panama, Afghanistan, Persian Gulf, Iraq, war in Afghanistan)
1118.
Mideast--NA direction; any references to oil embargo; boycott of companies dealing with Israel; [1992] references to involvement in Iraqgate/arming of Saddam Hussein
1119.
"   --handle better/more experience; positive comments about Arab-Israeli peace treaty
1120.
"   --handle worse/less experience; negative comments about Arab-Israeli peace treaty; [1992]Iraqgate
1121.

"   --Pro-Israel/anti-Arabs
1122.
"   --Anti-Israel/pro-Arabs; wishy-washy on Israel
1123.
Red China--NA direction
1124.
"   " --handle better/more experience/doing well, better
1125.
"   " --handle worse/less experience/doing poorly
1126.
"   " --pro understanding/thaw/detente/new
relationships/recognition/admission to UN; defender of
Formosa/Chiang/Nationalists
1127.
"   " --anti understanding/thaw/detente/new
relationships/recognition/admission to UN; defender of
Formosa/Chiang/Nationalists
1128.
Russia--NA direction
1129.
"   --handle better/more experience
1130.
"   --handle worse/less experience
1131.
"   --pro understanding/thaw/detente/broadening of relations; SALT
II
1132.
"   --anti understanding/thaw/detente/broadening of relations; SALT
II
1133.
Eastern Europe--NA direction
1134.
"   "   --handle better/more experience
1135.
"   "   --handle worse/less experience
1136.
"   "   --pro defense of Iron-Curtain countries
1137.
"   "   --anti   "   "   "
1138.
Latin America--NA direction
1139.
"   "   --handle better/more experience
1140.
"   "   --handle worse/less experience
1141.
"   "   --pro-third world posture; reach understanding with
Castro/Chile/ neutrals; anti-colonialism/European powers; against
Contra aid/pro- Sandinista
1142.
"   "   --anti-third world posture; hard anti-communism/anti-
revolutionary policy; pro-colonialism/European powers; pro Contra
aid/anti-Sandinista
1143.

Africa--NA direction
1144.
"   --handle better/more experience
1145.
"   --handle worse/less experience
1146.
"   --pro-third world posture; reach understanding with leftists/neutrals; anti-colonialism/European powers
1147.
"   --anti-third world posture; hard anti-communism/anti-revolutionary policy; pro-colonialism/European powers
1148.
Asia/India--NA direction
1149.
"   " --handle better/more experience
1150.
"   " --handle worse/less experience
1151.
"   " --pro India/Bangladesh
1152.
"   " --pro Pakistan
1153.
Located after 1163
1153.
Would raise American prestige
1154.
Would lower American prestige; not maintain American prestige; would de-emphasize/face-saving
1154.
"   "   "
1155.
Would have better chance for peace (unspecified); not get us into trouble abroad
1155.
"   "   "
1156.
"   "   "
1156.
Would have poorer chance for peace (unspecified); get us into war/trouble abroad
1157.
Vietnam/Indochina/Southeast Asia--NA direction
1158.
"   "   "   " --better chance for peace
1159.
"   "   "   " --poorer chance for peace; failed to end war
1160.
"   "   "   " --pro military victory/ preservation of Saigon regime
1161.
"   "   "   " --anti military victory/ willing to sacrifice Thieu/Ky; favoring withdrawal
1162.
(88) The invasion of Grenada

1163.
"   "   --will bring policy change (unspec.)
1164.
Tariffs--NA direction
1165.
"   --Pro free trade/reduce tariffs; would not protect US labor from
foreign competition; "not stop outsourcing of jobs"
1166.
"   --Anti free trade; for high tariffs; would protect US labor from
foreign competition; "would stop outsourcing of jobs"
1167.
Trade with communists--NA direction
1168.
"   "   --Pro
1169.
"   "   --Anti
1170.
Draft--NA direction
1171.
" --Pro volunteer army/abolition of peacetime draft
1172.
" --Anti volunteer army; for peacetime draft
1173.
" --Pro amnesty/pardon
1174.
" --Anti amnesty/draft dodgers/pardon
1175.
POW-MIA--Will get prisoners back, will not abandon them
1176.
POW-MIA--Will not get prisoners back, will abandon them
1177.
POW-MIA--NA direction
1178.
Located after 1174
1178.
Amnesty--NA direction
1179.
Did a good job of getting the boys/country out of Vietnam war; got
us out of Vietnam
1180.
Should have won Vietnam war; gave too much away and then
pulled out
1181.
Secrecy/deception in U.S. foreign policy; shuttle diplomacy;
Kissinger's foreign policy (1976)   --NA direction
1182.
"   "   "   "   --Pro
1183.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1184.
Military/Defense position/spending--NA direction or neutral (not
1106, 1107)
1184.
Located after 1105

1185.
Priorities in military/defense spending (not reduction or increase but allocation of existing defense budget--Pro
1186.
Priorities in military/defense spending (not reduction or increase but allocation of existing defense budget--Anti
1187.
Iranian crisis; American hostages (1980)/Arms sale (1986) --NA direction
1188.
"   "   "   "   --has handled well/would handle better
1189.
"   "   "   "   --has handled poorly/would handle worse
1190.
Nuclear freeze/Disarmament--NA direction
1191.
"   "   "   --Pro
1192.
"   "   "   --Anti
1193.
Terrorism; dealings with terrorists; hostages (except 1187-1189);(88) Bombing of Libya; "War on Terror"; Homeland security -- NA direction
1194.
"   "   " ;(88) Bombing ofLibya/handling of Khadafy; "War on Terror; hunt down Al Qaeda and Osama bin Ladin"; strong Homeland security   -- has handled/would handle better
1195.
"   "   " ;(88) Bombing of Libya/ handling of Khadafy; "War on Terror; hunt down Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden"; weak Homeland Security -- has handled/would handle worse
1196.
Located after 1166
1196.
Foreign trade/balance of payments deficit--any mention
1197.
Other foreign policy reasons
1198.
Located after 1142
1198.
(Involvement in) Diversion of money to the Contras (in violation of the law)
1199.
Iran-Contra affair--NFS (NA whether 1187 or 1198)
1300.
(91) The Persian Gulf war/ Desert Storm
1301.
(99) War in the Balkans;US/NATO led air war against Serbia
1301.
Located after 1162
1302.
Security at the Dept of Energy; supposed Chinese spying for nuclear secrets; treatment of physicist Wen Ho Lee; mismanagement by Energy Secretary Bill Richardson-NA dir

1302.
Located after 1195
1303.
"   -- has handled well/would handle better
1303.
Located after 1195
1304.
Located after 1195
1304.
"   -- has handled poorly/would handle worse
1305.
Located after 1162
1305.
War in/occupation of Iraq -- NA Direction
1306.
War in/occupation of Iraq -- handle better
1306.
Located after 1162
1307.
Located after 1162
1307.
War in/occupation of Iraq -- handle worse
1308.
Western Europe - NA direction (1992,1994,1996 ONLY)
1308.
Located after 1137
1309.
Western Europe - handling relations with European
Community/specific countries well (better) (1992,1994,1996
ONLY)
1309.
Located after 1137
1310.
Located after 1137
1310.
Western Europe - handling relations with European
Community/specific countries badly (worse) (1992,1994,1996
ONLY)
----
35. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- GROUP CONNECTIONS

1201.
Special interests/Privileged people/Influential people --Pro
1202.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1203.
"People like me"--pro, NA whether 1205, 1206
1204.
"   " " --anti, "   "   "   "
1205.
Common man/People/Little people/Working people--Pro
1206.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1207.

Labor/Unions/Labor bosses/Racketeers--Pro
1208.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1209.
Big Business/Corporate rich/The rich individuals/People with
power/Wall Street/Industry/Upper classes--Pro
1210.
(Same as 1209)   --Anti
1211.
Small businessman--Pro
1212.
"   "   --Anti
1213.
White collar workers/Salaried people/Middle class--Pro
1214.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1215.
Farmers/Country people--Pro
1216.
"   "   --Anti
1217.
Blacks/Black people/African-Americans--Pro
1218.
Blacks/Black people/African-Americans--Anti
1219.
People on welfare/ADC mothers/"Chiselers"--Pro
1220.
"   "   "   "   --Anti
1221.
Old people/Senior citizens--Pro
1222.
"   "   "   --Anti
1223.
Young people/Kids/"Freaks"/Hippies--Pro
1224.
"   "   "   "   "   --Anti
1225.
Women/Feminists/Womens Liberationists, "sexists"--Pro
1226.
"   "   "   "   "   --Anti
1227.
Veterans/Servicemen--Pro
1228.
"   "   --Anti
1229.
Ethnic or racial group (exc. 1217-1218); Minority groups (NA
composition--Pro)
1230.
"   "   " --Anti
1231.
Section of the country--Pro
1232.
"   "   --Anti
1233.

Poor people/needy people/handicapped/disabled; the unemployed
-- Pro
1234.
"   "   "   "   "   --Anti
1235.
Civil servants--Pro
1236.
"   "   --Anti
1239.
Gays/lesbians/homosexuals--Pro
1240.
"   "   --Anti
1241.
Christian Right/Religious Right--Pro
1242.
"   "   --Anti
1243.
White/White Race/White people--Pro
1244.
"   "   --Anti
1245.
White Men--Pro
1246.
White Men--Anti
1247.
Hispanics/Latinos/Chicanos/other people of Spanish descent --
Pro
1248.
Hispanics/Latinos/Chicanos/other people of   Spanish descent --
Anti
1249.
Factory workers/blue collar workers -- Pro
1250.
Factory workers/blue collar workers -- Anti
1251.
Native American -- Pro
1252.
Native American -- Anti
1297.
Other group connection reasons
1300.
Located after 1162

----
40. PARTY OR CANDIDATE -- MISCELLANEOUS

701.
Just like him/them (NA why); like everything about him/them; "I was
hoping he would win the (nomination/primaries)"
702.
Just dislike/Don't like him/them (NA why); don't like anything about
him/them
703.
Will save America; America needs him/them
704.

Will ruin America; last thing America needs
705.
Will unite Americans/bring people together
706.
Will divide Americans/drive people apart
707.
Speaks of party/candidate as good protector(s); will know what to
do; (they are) more intelligent
708.
Speaks of party/candidate as bad protector(s); won't know what to
do
709.
Good for country (unspecified); trying to do good job; trying; not just
out for self/own best interest; has/have country's interest at heart ;
will do a good job
710.
Bad for country (unspecified); don't have country's interests at
heart; only looking out for their own interests ; will not do a good job
711.
Lesser of two evils
718.
Treatment of Jesse Jackson; didn't offer him the vice-presidenal
nomination; didn't use him (effectively) to get out the Black vote;
weren't courteous/respectful toward him; didn't keep promises
made to him
719.
(References to) Sexual scandals; reference to Chappaquidic;
Kennedy's personal problems; damaging incidents in personal life-
-sexual escapades; financial problems, substance abuse; military
service, etc.
720.
Reference to Watergate affair (exc. 0551-0554)
721.
The way the incumbent came to office; the people should select
President; stole the election in Florida (reference to Bush in 2000
election)
722.
The incumbent should have a chance (on his own)/another
chance/second chance
723.
(I believe in/Necessary for) a two-party system; (makes it possible
for us to have a) choice between candidates; (provides needed)
opposition (to other party); balances power of other party
724.
Vote for the man (candidate) rather than party; look for more
qualified man; don't pay attention to parties
725.
The opponent who the candidate ran against; the candidate was
the better/worse of the two in general; the candidate ran against
someone I really like/dislike
726.
Splits votes; will elect wrong candidate; "spoiler"
727.
Expression of sympathy/admiration for the candidate's underdog

position; trying hard against terrible odds; courageous uphill battle; "I like underdogs"; "they are bucking the guy" (keeping him off ballot, not taking him seriously, not giving him enough p

728.
Negative comments about the candidate's switching parties, being a turncoat, disloyal to his original party

729.
Party selection of a woman for vice-president

730.
Mention of debates; candidate's performance in the debates

731.
Position (vote) on increasing congressional salary; position (vote) on accepting honoraria/outside pay/royalties while in office

732.
Used to like him but don't now; have lost respect for him

732.
Located after 0702

733.
References to candidate's children or extended family [code 446 for references to spouse]

734.
Non-sexual scandals; Whitewater; Travel Office firings; FBI file controversy; (Whitewatergate, Travelgate, FBI gate); Bush Jr's drug and alcohol use. (All sexual scandals should be coded in 0719 (incl. Paula Jones, "womanizing," "can't keep pants on," etc

735.
Campaign finance scandals; Gore at the Buddhist temple; Gore soliciting funds from his office

739.
Justifiable criticism in the media

796.
References to unfair/undeserved/excessive criticism by media or public

797.
Other miscellaneous reasons; other miscellaneous reasons relating to image and candidate/party effect on nation

8877.
Other miscellaneous

----
50. EVENTS UNIQUE TO ONE CAMPAIGN

5001.
Perot quit race, is quitter--NFS

5002.
(Because Perot quit race) he is not trustworthy or dependable (enough); (let down supporters); not steadfast (enough)

5003.
(Because Perot quit race) re-entered, he is indecisive, inconsistent, not stable (enough), other mention of quit and re-enter--NFS

5004.
(Perot is) Not a serious/legitimate candidate

MISSING DATA CODES

8801.
R has been influenced by spouse
8802.
R has been influenced by someone else
8880.
No text, "none", "no", other uncodeable
8888.
DK
8889.
Refused

ICPSR 8475

ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File (1948-2012)

Variable Description and Frequencies

Note: Frequencies displayed for the variables are not weighted. They are purely descriptive and may not be representative of the study population. Please review any sampling or weighting information available with the study.

Summary statistics (minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation) may not be available for every variable in the codebook. Conversely, a listing of frequencies in table format may not be present for every variable in the codebook either. However, all variables in the dataset are present and display sufficient information about each variable. These decisions are made intentionally and are at the discretion of the archive producing this codebook.

CASEID: ICPSR SEQUENTIAL RECORD IDENTIFIER

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

Location: 1-5 (width: 5; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VERSION: STUDY VARIABLE: Version Number Of Release

Version of Cumulative Data File

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
ANES_cdf-VERSION:2015-May-14	-	49760	89.4 %
ANES_cdf_VERSION:2015-May-14	-	5914	10.6 %
Total		**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

Location: 6-33 (width: 28; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: character

VCF0004: STUDY VARIABLE: Year of Study

Year of study (4-digit)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1948	-	662	1.2 %
1952	-	1899	3.4 %
1954	-	1139	2.0 %
1956	-	1762	3.2 %
1958	-	1450	2.6 %
1960	-	1181	2.1 %
1962	-	1297	2.3 %
1964	-	1571	2.8 %
1966	-	1291	2.3 %
1968	-	1557	2.8 %
1970	-	1507	2.7 %
1972	-	2705	4.9 %
1974	-	1575	2.8 %
1976	-	2248	4.0 %
1978	-	2304	4.1 %
1980	-	1614	2.9 %
1982	-	1418	2.5 %
1984	-	2257	4.1 %
1986	-	2176	3.9 %
1988	-	2040	3.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1990	-	1980	3.6 %
1992	-	2485	4.5 %
1994	-	1795	3.2 %
1996	-	1714	3.1 %
1998	-	1281	2.3 %
2000	-	1807	3.2 %
2002	-	1511	2.7 %
2004	-	1212	2.2 %
2008	-	2322	4.2 %
2012	-	5914	10.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1983.10
- Median: 1984.00
- Mode: 2012.00
- Minimum: 1948.00
- Maximum: 2012.00
- Standard Deviation: 18.16

Location: 34-37 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0006: STUDY VARIABLE: Study Respondent Number: Year-level Case ID

Case identification number

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1549.95
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6864.00
- Standard Deviation: 1383.75

Location: 38-41 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0006A: STUDY VARIABLE: Unique Respondent Number (Cross-year ID for panel cases)

Unique identification number

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 19828732.66
- Minimum: 19481001.00
- Maximum: 20126864.00
- Standard Deviation: 182489.58

Location: 42-49 (width: 8; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0009X: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 FTF sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 FTF sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.9795
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.5009

Location: 50-55 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0009Y: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 Web sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 Web sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0119
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.5794
- Standard Deviation: 0.4870

Location: 56-61 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0009Z: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 0 - 2012 full sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 0 - 2012 full sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0488
- Minimum: 0.0212
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.4814

Location: 62-67 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0010X: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 FTF sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 FTF sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.9688
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.5132

Location: 68-73 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0010Y: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 Web sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 Web sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0013
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.5794
- Standard Deviation: 0.5003

Location: 74-79 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0010Z: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 1 - 2012 full sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 1 - 2012 full sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0382
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.4956

Location: 80-85 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0011X: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 FTF sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 FTF sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.9685
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.5135

Location: 86-91 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0011Y: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 Web sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 Web sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0009
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.5794
- Standard Deviation: 0.5006

Location: 92-97 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0011Z: STUDY VARIABLE: Weight: For 1970 type 2 - 2012 full sample

CDF Weight: 1970 type 2 - 2012 full sample

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.0378
- Minimum: 0.0000
- Maximum: 4.9909
- Standard Deviation: 0.4959

Location: 98-103 (width: 6; decimal: 4)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0012: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Form Filter for Paper Questionnaires

Form or interview type of paper questionnaire

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Type 1/Form I/Form A	5721	10.3 %
2	Type 2/Form II/Form B	5684	10.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	NA	798	1.4 %
.	-	43471	78.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,405 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 104-104 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0012A: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: CAI Question Selection - Pre

CAI Question selection ('form') summary -- Pre

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1028	1.8 %
1	-	4624	8.3 %
2	-	3920	7.0 %
3	-	2280	4.1 %
4	-	1748	3.1 %
5	-	240	0.4 %
6	-	439	0.8 %
7	-	49	0.1 %
8	-	152	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	41194	74.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,480 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.19
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.52

Location: 105-105 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: .

VCF0012B: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: CAI Question Selection - Post

CAI Question selection ('form') summary -- Post

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	5649	10.1 %
2	-	5511	9.9 %
3	-	860	1.5 %
4	-	951	1.7 %
5	-	164	0.3 %
6	-	171	0.3 %
7	-	179	0.3 %
8	-	178	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	No Post IW in study with Post-assigned "forms"	817	1.5 %
.	-	41194	74.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,663 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.02
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.36

Location: 106-106 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0013: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Completion - Post-election (flag)

Post-election interview data present

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No Post-election interview data	4821	8.7 %
1	1. Post-election interview data present	50853	91.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 1.00

Location: 107-107 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0014: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Completion - Pre-election (flag)

Pre-election interview data present

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No Pre-election interview data present	18275	32.8 %
1	1. Pre-election interview data present	37399	67.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 1.00

Location: 108-108 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0015A: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Abbreviated Interview - Pre

Abbreviated Interview - Pre

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Pre IW not abbreviated (1992: "Long" form Pre)	35110	63.1 %
1	1. Abbreviated pre IW	2267	4.1 %
2	2. Spanish Pre	22	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	18275	32.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,399 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 109-109 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0015B: INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION: Abbreviated Interview - Post

Abbreviated Interview - Post

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Post IW is not abbreviated	49685	89.2 %
1	1. Abbreviated Post IW	1914	3.4 %
2	2. Additional Abbreviated Post IWs	82	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	3993	7.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 51,681 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 110-110 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0016: STUDY VARIABLE: Cross-section composition: fresh Cross or panel case

Sample component: 'new' cross-section or panel case

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Fresh Cross case	47223	84.8 %
1	Panel case	8451	15.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 1.00

Location: 111-111 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0017: STUDY ADMIN: Mode of Interview

Mode of Interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. All personal (pre-post studies: personal pre and post or personal pre and no post; post-only studies: personal post)	45969	82.6 %
1	1. Telephone pre (personal post or no post)	206	0.4 %
2	2. Telephone post (personal pre)	3192	5.7 %
3	3. All telephone (pre-post studies: pre and post {no post-only telephone studies in Time Series})	2447	4.4 %
4	4. All internet (2012: pre and post)	3860	6.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 112-112 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0018A: STUDY ADMIN: Language of Interview - Pre

1980: Was this interview conducted in English? (IF NO:) In What language was this interview conducted?

1984,1988,1992: Was this interview conducted entirely in English, or was it necessary to translate some (or all) questions into another language? What language?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. IW conducted entirely in English; 2008,2012: beginning language	37034	66.5 %
1	1. Some or all of IW translated to Spanish	423	0.8 %
3	3. Some or all of IW translated to French	2	0.0 %
5	5. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language other than Spanish or French	1	0.0 %
7	7. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language but NA which language	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA if English or other language	140	0.3 %
.	-	18074	32.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,460 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 113-113 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0018B: STUDY ADMIN: Language of Interview - Post

1980: Was this interview conducted in English? (IF NO:) In What language was this interview conducted?

1984,1988,1992: Was this interview conducted entirely in English, or was it necessary to translate some (or all) questions into another language? What language?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. IW conducted entirely in English; 2008,2012: beginning language	49051	88.1 %
1	1. Some or all of IW translated to Spanish	333	0.6 %
3	3. Some or all of IW translated to French	1	0.0 %
4	4. Some or all of IW conducted in either Spanish or French	15	0.0 %
5	5. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language other than Spanish or French	7	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	7. Some or all of IW translated to non-English language but NA which language	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA if English or other language	1994	3.6 %
.	-	4271	7.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 49,409 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 114-114 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0019: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: R Relationship to Head of HH 1952-1986

R's relationship to head

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R is head of household	16796	30.2 %
2	2. R is spouse of head of household	9771	17.6 %
3	3. R is neither head of household nor spouse of head	1790	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Pre IW (1952,1960)	117	0.2 %
9	9. NA	41	0.1 %
.	-	27159	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,357 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 115-115 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0050A: IWR OBSERVATION: Respondent Level of Political Info - Pre

PRE INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION: Respondent's general level of information about politics and public affairs seemed:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very high	3614	6.5 %
2	2. Fairly high	6900	12.4 %
3	3. Average	8645	15.5 %
4	4. Fairly low	4448	8.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. Very low	1683	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	213	0.4 %
.	-	30171	54.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,290 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 116-116 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0050B: IWR OBSERVATION: Respondent Level of Political Info - Post

POST INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION: Respondent's general level of information about politics and public affairs seemed:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very high	3340	6.0 %
2	2. Fairly high	7411	13.3 %
3	3. Average	11159	20.0 %
4	4. Fairly low	6235	11.2 %
5	5. Very low	2630	4.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW; abbrev. Post IW (1984)	1876	3.4 %
9	9. NA	1062	1.9 %
.	-	21961	39.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,775 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 117-117 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0070A: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Gender - Pre

Pre Interviewer Gender

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Male	2221	4.0 %
2	2. Female	12378	22.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	458	0.8 %
.	-	40617	73.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,599 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 118-118 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0070B: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Gender - Post

Post Interviewer Gender

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Male	2122	3.8 %
2	2. Female	14729	26.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW	565	1.0 %
9	9. NA	495	0.9 %
.	-	37763	67.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,851 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 119-119 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0071A: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race Full - Pre

Pre interviewer race - full

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White	8758	15.7 %
2	2. Black	469	0.8 %
3	3. Native American	63	0.1 %
4	4. Asian	20	0.0 %
7	7. Other	80	0.1 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA	167	0.3 %
.	-	46117	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,390 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 120-120 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0071B: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race Full - Post

Post interviewer race - full

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White	11369	20.4 %
2	2. Black	416	0.7 %
3	3. Native American	39	0.1 %
4	4. Asian	31	0.1 %
7	7. Other	73	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW	345	0.6 %
9	9. NA	300	0.5 %
.	-	43101	77.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,928 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 121-121 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0071C: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race 2-category - Pre

Pre Interviewer Race 2-category

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White	12741	22.9 %
2	2. Nonwhite (2012: and other)	1823	3.3 %
7	7. Other	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA	493	0.9 %
.	-	40617	73.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,564 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 122-122 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0071D: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Race 2-category - Post

Post Interviewer Race 2-category

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White	15183	27.3 %
2	2. Nonwhite (2012: and other)	1608	2.9 %
7	7. Other	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	No Post IW	565	1.0 %
9	9. NA	546	1.0 %
.	-	37772	67.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,791 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 123-123 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0072A: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Ethnicity - Pre

Pre Interviewer Ethnicity

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Non-Hispanic	11539	20.7 %
2	2. Hispanic	1374	2.5 %
7	7. Other	516	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	416	0.7 %
.	-	41829	75.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 124-124 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0072B: IWR DESCRIPTION: Interviewer Ethnicity - Post

Post Interviewer Ethnicity

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Non-Hispanic	13268	23.8 %
2	2. Hispanic	1416	2.5 %
7	7. Other	906	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW	565	1.0 %
9	9. NA	544	1.0 %
.	-	38975	70.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,590 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 125-125 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0101: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Age

1964-1976: What is your date of birth? 1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth? 1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
17	-	21	0.0 %
18	-	435	0.8 %
19	-	514	0.9 %
20	-	590	1.1 %
21	-	777	1.4 %
22	-	886	1.6 %
23	-	978	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	-	970	1.7 %
25	-	1060	1.9 %
26	-	1074	1.9 %
27	-	1040	1.9 %
28	-	1161	2.1 %
29	-	1137	2.0 %
30	-	1145	2.1 %
31	-	1109	2.0 %
32	-	1115	2.0 %
33	-	1111	2.0 %
34	-	1145	2.1 %
35	-	1207	2.2 %
36	-	1121	2.0 %
37	-	1132	2.0 %
38	-	1093	2.0 %
39	-	1039	1.9 %
40	-	1104	2.0 %
41	-	1017	1.8 %
42	-	1062	1.9 %
43	-	970	1.7 %
44	-	1017	1.8 %
45	-	942	1.7 %
46	-	924	1.7 %
47	-	912	1.6 %
48	-	910	1.6 %
49	-	863	1.6 %
50	-	926	1.7 %
51	-	886	1.6 %
52	-	939	1.7 %
53	-	908	1.6 %
54	-	845	1.5 %
55	-	808	1.5 %
56	-	882	1.6 %
57	-	859	1.5 %
58	-	852	1.5 %
59	-	739	1.3 %
60	-	825	1.5 %
61	-	722	1.3 %
62	-	802	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
63	-	756	1.4 %
64	-	687	1.2 %
65	-	776	1.4 %
66	-	672	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW	418	0.8 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 53,455 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 46.23
- Median: 44.00
- Mode: 35.00
- Minimum: 17.00
- Maximum: 99.00
- Standard Deviation: 17.17

Location: 126-127 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0102: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Age Group

1964-1976: What is your date of birth? 1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth? 1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 17 - 24	5302	9.5 %
2	2. 25 - 34	11531	20.7 %
3	3. 35 - 44	11183	20.1 %
4	4. 45 - 54	9418	16.9 %
5	5. 55 - 64	8153	14.6 %
6	6. 65 - 74	6164	11.1 %
7	7. 75 - 99 and over (except 1954)	3490	6.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW	433	0.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,241 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 128-128 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0

VCF0103: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Cohort

1964-1976: What is your date of birth? 1978-1982: What is the month and year of your birth? 1984-LATER: What is the month, day and year of your birth?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 1991 - present	242	0.4 %
2	2. 1975 - 1990	2750	4.9 %
3	3. 1959 - 1974	8050	14.5 %
4	4. 1943 - 1958	13718	24.6 %
5	5. 1927 - 1942	10962	19.7 %
6	6. 1911 - 1926	11116	20.0 %
7	7. 1895 - 1910	6169	11.1 %
8	8. Before 1895	2203	4.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; DK; RF; no Pre IW	464	0.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,210 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 129-129 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0

VCF0104: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Gender

Respondent Gender

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Male	24862	44.7 %
2	2. Female	30709	55.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW	103	0.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,571 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 130-130 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0

VCF0105A: Race-ethnicity summary, 7 categories

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.

1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1978: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being American, is there another nationality or ethnic group that you feel you belong to? (IF YES:) What group is that?

1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?

2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you? [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR] In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?

2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories. FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native / Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander / Other. Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White non-Hispanic (1948-2012)	42997	77.2 %
2	2. Black non-Hispanic (1948-2012)	6509	11.7 %
3	3. Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic (1966-2012)	417	0.7 %
4	4. American Indian or Alaska Native non-Hispanic (1966-2012)	313	0.6 %
5	5. Hispanic (1966-2012)	3492	6.3 %
6	6. Other or multiple races, non-Hispanic (1968-2012)	384	0.7 %
7	7. Non-white and non-black (1948-1964)	55	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. Missing	368	0.7 %
.	-	1139	2.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,167 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 131-131 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0105B: Race-ethnicity summary, 4 categories

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.

1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1978: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being American, is there another nationality or ethnic group that you feel you belong to? (IF YES:) What group is that?

1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?

2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you? [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR] In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanishor Hispanic origin or descent?

2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories. FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native / Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander / Other. Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White non-Hispanic	42997	77.2 %
2	2. Black non-Hispanic	6509	11.7 %
3	3. Hispanic	3492	6.3 %
4	4. Other or multiple races, non-Hispanic	1114	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Missing, pre-1966 data	55	0.1 %
9	9. Missing, DK/REF/NA	368	0.7 %
.	-	1139	2.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,112 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 132-132 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0106: Race summary, 3 categories

1948,1952,1956-1970: Interviewer observation of Race.

1972-1976: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1978: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being American, is there another nationality or ethnic group that you feel you belong to? (IF YES:) What group is that?

1980,1982,1984,1986: Interviewer observation of Race. Interviewer observation: R of Hispanic origin. In addition to being

American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group?

1988-1998: Interviewer observation of Race. In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?

2000-2008: What racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you? [MULTIPLE MENTIONS CODED BY IWR] In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? [IF HISPANIC ETHNIC GROUP NOT MENTIONED] Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?

2012: FTF ONLY: I am going to read you a list of five race categories. FTF AND WEB: Please choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be: [MULTIPLE MENTIONS]: White / Black or African-American / American Indian or Alaska Native /Asian / Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander / Other. Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White non-Hispanic	42997	77.2 %
2	2. Black non-Hispanic	6509	11.7 %
3	3. Other	4606	8.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Missing, pre-1966 data	55	0.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form "new" Cross Section or Spanish language (1992)	368	0.7 %
.	-	1139	2.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,112 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 133-133 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0107: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Hispanic Origin Type

1988 AND LATER: In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? (IF NO HISPANIC GROUP MENTIONED:) Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent? (IF YES:) Please look at the booklet and tell me which category best describes your Hispanic origin.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, Mexican-American, Chicano	1809	3.2 %
2	2. Yes, Puerto Rican	367	0.7 %
3	3. Yes, other Hispanic	1059	1.9 %
4	4. Yes, Hispanic but DK/NA type	60	0.1 %
7	7. No, not Hispanic	30137	54.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	4	0.0 %
8	8. DK if Hispanic	105	0.2 %
9	9. NA if Hispanic	289	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,432 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 134-134 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0108: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Hispanic Origin

1988 AND LATER: In addition to being American, what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? (IF NO HISPANIC GROUP MENTIONED:) Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent? (IF YES:) Please look at the booklet and tell me which category best describes your Hispanic origin.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, R is Hispanic	3295	5.9 %
2	2. No, R is not Hispanic	30137	54.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	4	0.0 %
8	8. DK	105	0.2 %
9	9. NA	289	0.5 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,432 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 135-135 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0109: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Ethnicity

In addition to being an American what do you consider your main ethnic group or nationality group? (IF MORE THAN 1 GROUP MENTIONED:) With which of these groups do you most closely identify?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	American Indian or Native American; tribal mentions	812	1.5 %
20	Canadian; not specified as French-Canadian (03)	67	0.1 %
30	Canadian, of French origin	130	0.2 %
40	Mexican (excluding explicit mention of "Chicano", "Mexican-American")	576	1.0 %
50	Central American	50	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
70	Barbados	4	0.0 %
80	Cuban	75	0.1 %
90	Dominican Republic	17	0.0 %
100	Haitian	2	0.0 %
110	Jamaican	20	0.0 %
120	Puerto Rican	148	0.3 %
130	West Indian--not from one of the above countries	8	0.0 %
140	West Indian--NA which country	20	0.0 %
160	South American--any country	47	0.1 %
180	English, British	1956	3.5 %
190	Irish (not specified as from Northern Ireland, Ulster--22)	2395	4.3 %
200	Scottish	423	0.8 %
210	Welsh	87	0.2 %
220	From Northern Ireland (Ulster)	3	0.0 %
230	Scot-Irish	193	0.3 %
240	From British Isles; from two or more countries of the British Isles	262	0.5 %
260	Austrian	40	0.1 %
270	Belgian	23	0.0 %
280	French	519	0.9 %
290	German; also Pennsylvania Dutch	3575	6.4 %
300	Luxembourg	8	0.0 %
310	Netherlands, Holland; Dutch	363	0.7 %
320	Swiss	59	0.1 %
330	From Western Europe; two or more countries of Western Europe	130	0.2 %
350	Danish	125	0.2 %
360	Finn, Finnish	51	0.1 %
370	Norwegian	328	0.6 %
380	Swedish	295	0.5 %
390	Icelander	4	0.0 %
400	Scandinavian; reference to two or more Scandinavian countries	132	0.2 %
410	Reference to two or more countries from combination of the following areas: British Isles, Western Europe, Scandi	334	0.6 %
430	Czechoslovakian, Slavic	231	0.4 %
431	Slovakian (specific)	0	0.0 %
432	Czech (specific); Bohemian (part of Czech Republic)	11	0.0 %
433	Slovenian	1	0.0 %
440	Estonian	6	0.0 %
450	Hungarian	117	0.2 %
460	Latvian	7	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
470	Lithuanian	53	0.1 %
480	Polish	640	1.1 %
490	Russian; from U.S.S.R.	119	0.2 %
500	Ukrainian	43	0.1 %
510	Eastern Europe; reference to two or more countries of Eastern Europe	31	0.1 %
530	Albanian	1	0.0 %
540	Bulgarian	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. Short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	4	0.0 %
877	"American"; "Just American"; none; neither (response to "choice" question); NA	7442	13.4 %
888	DK	861	1.5 %
.	-	25045	45.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,322 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 10.00
- Maximum: 876.00

Location: 136-138 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 877 , 888 , .

VCF0110: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 4-category

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?

1974,1976: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test? Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?

1978-1984: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test? Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that you have earned?

1986-2008: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test? Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that you have earned?

2012: What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Grade school or less (0-8 grades)	8057	14.5 %
2	2. High school (12 grades or fewer, incl. non-college training if applicable)	24828	44.6 %
3	3. Some college (13 grades or more but no degree; 1948 ONLY: college, no identification of degree status)	11861	21.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. College or advanced degree (no cases 1948)	10376	18.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form "new" Cross Section (1992)	552	1.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,122 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 139-139 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0

VCF0111: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Urbanism

Urbanism

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Central cities	11479	20.6 %
2	2. Suburban areas	15586	28.0 %
3	3. Rural, small towns, outlying and adjacent areas	16187	29.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; telephone (RDD) sample (2000)	801	1.4 %
.	-	11621	20.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 43,252 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 140-140 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0112: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Census Region

Region - U.S. Census

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Northeast (CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)	10568	19.0 %
2	2. North Central (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)	14428	25.9 %
3	3. South (AL, AR, DE, D.C., FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC OK, SC,TN, TX, VA, WV)	18879	33.9 %
4	4. West (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, WY)	9998	18.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	1801	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 53,873 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 141-141 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0113: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Political South/Nonsouth

Region - political south

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. South	16061	28.8 %
2	2. Nonsouth	37812	67.9 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 53,873 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 142-142 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0114: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Income Group

1952,1956-1960:
About what do you think your total income will be this year for yourself and your immediate family?

1962:
Would you tell me how much income you and your family will be making during this calendar year, 1962. I mean, before taxes.

1964,1968:
About what do you think your total income will be this year for yourself and your immediate family. Just give me the number/ letter) of the right income category.

1966,1970:
Many people don't know their exact (1966/1970) income yet; but would you tell me as best you can what you expect your (1966/ 1970) income to be--before taxes? You may just tell me the letter of the group on this card into which your family income will probably fall.

1972-1990, 1992 LONG-FORM,1994-LATER EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE:
Please look at this card/page (2000 FTF: the booklet) and tell me the letter of the income group that includes the income of all members of your family living here in [previous year] before taxes. This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all other income. (IF UNCERTAIN:) What would be your best guess?

1992 SHORT FORM:
Can you give us an estimate of your total family income in 1991 before taxes? This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest and all other income for every member of your family living in your house in 1991. First could you tell me if that was above or below $24,999? (IF UNCERTAIN: what would be your best guess?) (IF ABOVE/BELOW $24,999:) I will read you some income categories, could you please stop me when I reach the category that corresponds to your family situation?

2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a list of income categories. Please tell me which category best describes the. total income of all members of your family living in your house in 1999 before taxes. This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all other income. Please stop me when I get to your family's income.

2012: Information about income is very important to understand how people are doing financially these days. Your answers are confidential. Would you please give your best guess? The next question is about [the total income of all the members of your family living here/your total income] in 2011, before taxes. This figure should include income from all sources, including salaries, wages, pensions, Social Security, dividends, interest, and all other income. What was [the total income in 2011 of all your family members living here/your total income in 2011]?

(IF DK/RF:) Was it $40,000 or more, or less than that?

(IF LESS THAN 40,000:) Was it $20,000 or more, or less than that?

(IF LESS THAN 40,000 AND LESS THAN 20,000:) Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

(IF LESS THAN 40,000 BUT MORE THAN 20,000:) Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

(IF MORE THAN 40,000:) Was it $70,000 or more, or less than that?

(IF MORE THAN 40,000 BUT LESS THAN 70,000:) Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

IF MORE THAN 40,000 AND MORE THAN 70,000:) Was it $100,000 or more, or less than that?

(IF MORE THAN 40,000, MORE THAN 70,000, BUT LESS THAN 100,000:) Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

(IF MORE THAN 40,000, MORE THAN 70,000 AND MORE THAN 100,000:) Please mark the answer that includes the income of all members of your family living here in 2011 before taxes.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 0 to 16 percentile	8793	15.8 %
2	2. 17 to 33 percentile	8399	15.1 %
3	3. 34 to 67 percentile	16607	29.8 %
4	4. 68 to 95 percentile	13849	24.9 %
5	5. 96 to 100 percentile	2690	4.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW	3825	6.9 %
.	-	1511	2.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 50,338 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 143-143 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0115: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation Group 6-category

1952-1964:
What is your occupation. I mean, what kind of work do you do? (IF NOT CLEAR OR OBVIOUS [1958,1960,1964 only]:) What exactly do you do on your job? (IF NOT ASCERTAINED:) What kind of business is that? (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work do you usually do? (IF R IS RETIRED:) What kind of work did you do before you retired?

1968-1970:
(IF EMPLOYED OR ON STRIKE:) What kind of work do you do? [What exactly do you do on your job?] (IF UNEMPLOYED OR RETIRED:) What kind of work did you do when you were employed? [What exactly did you do on your job?]

1972-1982:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main occupation [What sort of work do you do? Tell me a little more about what you do.] (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?] (IF R IS RETIRED OR DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do when you worked [What was your main occupation?]

1984 AND LATER:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main occupation [What sort of work do you do?] What are your most important activities or duties? (IF R IS RETIRED/UNEMPLOYED /DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?] What were your most important activities or duties?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Professional and managerial	9719	17.5 %
2	2. Clerical and sales workers	7180	12.9 %
3	3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers	12708	22.8 %
4	4. Laborers, except farm	1173	2.1 %
5	5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen;	1379	2.5 %
6	6. Homemakers (1972-1992: 7 IN VCF0116, 4 in VCF0118;	7842	14.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; member of armed forces; no occupation and not a	1537	2.8 %
.	-	14136	25.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 40,001 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 144-144 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0116: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 7-category

1972-1978:
(1972: We'd like to know if you are looking for work, working now) (1974-1978: We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,) retired, (a housewife) a (student), or what? (IF HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (IF R IS HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

1980 AND LATER EXC. 2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980, 1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do you work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed, retired, a homemaker, (a student), or what?
(MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Working now	23821	42.8 %
2	2. Temporarily laid off	497	0.9 %
4	4. Unemployed	1760	3.2 %
5	5. Retired	6449	11.6 %
6	6. Permanently disabled	1490	2.7 %
7	7. Homemaker	4995	9.0 %
8	8. Student	1130	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; DK	216	0.4 %
.	-	15316	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 40,142 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 145-145 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0117: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Work Status 7-category 1948-1986

1948: What is [head's] occupation, I mean, what kind of work does head) do?

1972-1978:
We'd also like to know about the head of the family. Is (he/she) working now, looking for work, retired,(a housewife), (a student), or what? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT, AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

1980-1986:
We'd like to know if he/she is working now, temporarily laid off, or is he/she unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours does he/she work on his/her job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week does he/she work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY

1984,1986:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Working now	11863	21.3 %
2	2. Temporarily laid off	239	0.4 %
4	4. Unemployed (1972 adds 'looking for work.')	579	1.0 %
5	5. Retired	2664	4.8 %
6	6. Permanently disabled	529	1.0 %
7	7. Housewife (not working at least 20 hrs. per wk.)	777	1.4 %
8	8. Student (not working at least 20 hrs. per wk.)	202	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; DK	106	0.2 %
.	-	38715	69.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,853 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 146-146 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0118: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 5-category

1968-1970:
Are you presently employed, or are you unemployed, or retired, (a housewife), (a student), or what?

1972-1978:
(1972: We'd like to know if you are looking for work, working now) (1974-1978: We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed,) retired, (a housewife) a (student), or what? (IF HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (IF R IS HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

1980 AND LATER EXC. 2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980, 1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do you work 20 or more hours

on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

2002 FRESH CROSS:
We'd like to know if you are working now, or are you unemployed, retired, a homemaker, (a student), or what?
(MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Employed	29924	53.7 %
2	2. Not employed: laid off, unemployed, on strike,	3973	7.1 %
3	3. Retired	7480	13.4 %
4	4. Homemaker (since 1972: not working 20 or more hrs/wk;	8312	14.9 %
5	5. Student (since 1972: not working 20 or more hrs/wk;	1220	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW	376	0.7 %
.	-	4389	7.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 50,909 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 147-147 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0119: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Work Status 5-category 1952-1986

1968,1970:
Is (the head) presently employed, or is (he/she) unemployed, retired, (a housewife), (a student), or what?

1972-1978:
We'd also like to know about the head of the family. Is (he/she) working now, looking for work, retired,(a housewife), (a student), or what? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT, AND R IS WORKING FOR PAY:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

1980-1986:
We'd like to know if he/she is working now, temporarily laid off, or is he/she unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982) Is he/she doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours does he/she work on his/her job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week does he/she work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours does he/she work on your job in the average week?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Employed	20855	37.5 %
2	2. Not employed: laid off, unemployed, on strike,	1627	2.9 %
3	3. Retired (1966 adds 'over 65')	4101	7.4 %
4	4. Homemaker (see VCF0118)	1338	2.4 %
5	5. Student (see VCF0118)	271	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW	323	0.6 %
.	-	27159	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,192 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 148-148 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0120: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score S.E.I. Rank 1976-1984

Duncan S.E.I. score for R

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
41	-	14	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
59	-	6	0.0 %
60	-	4	0.0 %
63	-	51	0.1 %
70	-	73	0.1 %
71	-	48	0.1 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	1	0.0 %
82	-	22	0.0 %
83	-	34	0.1 %
86	-	13	0.0 %
89	-	33	0.1 %
92	-	4	0.0 %
98	-	41	0.1 %
99	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	-	13	0.0 %
109	-	25	0.0 %
110	-	44	0.1 %
116	-	15	0.0 %
119	-	3	0.0 %
120	-	9	0.0 %
125	-	77	0.1 %
129	-	13	0.0 %
135	-	75	0.1 %
137	-	2	0.0 %
140	-	143	0.3 %
145	-	13	0.0 %
147	-	2	0.0 %
148	-	24	0.0 %
150	-	108	0.2 %
151	-	98	0.2 %
153	-	4	0.0 %
154	-	6	0.0 %
157	-	13	0.0 %
160	-	91	0.2 %
161	-	12	0.0 %
162	-	5	0.0 %
164	-	29	0.1 %
165	-	20	0.0 %
166	-	7	0.0 %
168	-	42	0.1 %
169	-	6	0.0 %
170	-	70	0.1 %
171	-	20	0.0 %
172	-	91	0.2 %
173	-	27	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)--	1568	2.8 %
998	998. R is member of armed forces or former member	63	0.1 %
.	-	45833	82.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 8,210 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 405.66
- Minimum: 23.00
- Maximum: 999.00
- Standard Deviation: 230.04

Location: 149-151 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , .

VCF0121: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score S.E.I. Rank 1976-1984

Duncan S.E.I. score for Head

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
41	-	21	0.0 %
49	-	10	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	6	0.0 %
63	-	51	0.1 %
70	-	62	0.1 %
71	-	75	0.1 %
79	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	2	0.0 %
82	-	27	0.0 %
83	-	46	0.1 %
86	-	14	0.0 %
89	-	54	0.1 %
92	-	5	0.0 %
98	-	32	0.1 %
100	-	28	0.1 %
109	-	27	0.0 %
110	-	19	0.0 %
116	-	10	0.0 %
119	-	2	0.0 %
120	-	13	0.0 %
125	-	112	0.2 %
129	-	4	0.0 %
135	-	50	0.1 %
137	-	1	0.0 %
140	-	261	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
145	-	9	0.0 %
147	-	2	0.0 %
148	-	21	0.0 %
150	-	74	0.1 %
151	-	191	0.3 %
153	-	2	0.0 %
154	-	5	0.0 %
157	-	9	0.0 %
159	-	1	0.0 %
160	-	49	0.1 %
161	-	9	0.0 %
162	-	11	0.0 %
164	-	45	0.1 %
165	-	38	0.1 %
166	-	13	0.0 %
167	-	1	0.0 %
168	-	59	0.1 %
169	-	3	0.0 %
170	-	44	0.1 %
171	-	20	0.0 %
172	-	71	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)-	388	0.7 %
998	998. Head is member of armed forces or former member	87	0.2 %
999	999. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's	288	0.5 %
.	-	45833	82.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,078 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 397.38
- Minimum: 23.00
- Maximum: 960.00
- Standard Deviation: 229.30

Location: 152-154 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0122: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score NORC Rank 1976-1982

NORC Prestige score for R

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	-	1	0.0 %
122	-	1	0.0 %
141	-	20	0.0 %
144	-	5	0.0 %
154	-	16	0.0 %
164	-	6	0.0 %
173	-	4	0.0 %
174	-	89	0.2 %
175	-	25	0.0 %
180	-	67	0.1 %
182	-	19	0.0 %
185	-	9	0.0 %
188	-	51	0.1 %
190	-	38	0.1 %
191	-	22	0.0 %
193	-	77	0.1 %
194	-	7	0.0 %
195	-	38	0.1 %
199	-	12	0.0 %
202	-	13	0.0 %
203	-	98	0.2 %
207	-	35	0.1 %
208	-	29	0.1 %
209	-	3	0.0 %
212	-	14	0.0 %
215	-	8	0.0 %
218	-	7	0.0 %
220	-	1	0.0 %
221	-	27	0.0 %
223	-	26	0.0 %
225	-	16	0.0 %
229	-	6	0.0 %
235	-	14	0.0 %
241	-	79	0.1 %
242	-	3	0.0 %
244	-	2	0.0 %
245	-	4	0.0 %
247	-	14	0.0 %
250	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
251	-	83	0.1 %
252	-	24	0.0 %
259	-	6	0.0 %
262	-	8	0.0 %
264	-	105	0.2 %
267	-	1	0.0 %
268	-	3	0.0 %
272	-	1	0.0 %
273	-	7	0.0 %
275	-	91	0.2 %
276	-	7	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. R has never worked (unemployed or disabled)--	1263	2.3 %
998	998. R is member of armed forces or former member; R's	62	0.1 %
.	-	48090	86.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 6,259 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 409.74
- Median: 401.00
- Mode: 507.00
- Minimum: 99.00
- Maximum: 999.00
- Standard Deviation: 154.78

Location: 155-157 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , .

VCF0123: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score NORC Rank 1976-1982

NORC Prestige score for Head

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
122	-	2	0.0 %
141	-	12	0.0 %
154	-	9	0.0 %
164	-	3	0.0 %
173	-	6	0.0 %
174	-	107	0.2 %
175	-	37	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
180	-	59	0.1 %
182	-	16	0.0 %
185	-	11	0.0 %
188	-	51	0.1 %
190	-	60	0.1 %
191	-	27	0.0 %
193	-	112	0.2 %
194	-	4	0.0 %
195	-	31	0.1 %
199	-	11	0.0 %
202	-	4	0.0 %
203	-	55	0.1 %
207	-	41	0.1 %
208	-	12	0.0 %
209	-	4	0.0 %
212	-	12	0.0 %
215	-	21	0.0 %
218	-	3	0.0 %
220	-	1	0.0 %
221	-	29	0.1 %
223	-	47	0.1 %
225	-	15	0.0 %
229	-	3	0.0 %
235	-	22	0.0 %
241	-	18	0.0 %
242	-	3	0.0 %
244	-	3	0.0 %
245	-	3	0.0 %
247	-	8	0.0 %
250	-	1	0.0 %
251	-	36	0.1 %
252	-	30	0.1 %
259	-	18	0.0 %
262	-	14	0.0 %
264	-	92	0.2 %
267	-	2	0.0 %
268	-	4	0.0 %
272	-	2	0.0 %
273	-	10	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
275	-	68	0.1 %
276	-	10	0.0 %
280	-	2	0.0 %
282	-	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. Head has never worked (unemployed or	291	0.5 %
998	998. Head is member of armed forces or former member;	83	0.1 %
999	999. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's	264	0.5 %
.	-	48090	86.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 6,946 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 409.74
- Median: 404.00
- Mode: 507.00
- Minimum: 122.00
- Maximum: 812.00
- Standard Deviation: 137.62

Location: 158-160 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0124: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Prestige Score S.E.S. Rank 1968-1974

Duncan S.E.S. score for R

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	35	0.1 %
3	-	18	0.0 %
4	-	15	0.0 %
5	-	7	0.0 %
6	-	137	0.2 %
7	-	123	0.2 %
8	-	29	0.1 %
9	-	89	0.2 %
10	-	46	0.1 %
11	-	75	0.1 %
12	-	19	0.0 %
13	-	71	0.1 %
14	-	193	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	230	0.4 %
16	-	118	0.2 %
17	-	271	0.5 %
18	-	70	0.1 %
19	-	169	0.3 %
20	-	9	0.0 %
21	-	44	0.1 %
22	-	134	0.2 %
23	-	61	0.1 %
24	-	71	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.0 %
26	-	35	0.1 %
27	-	113	0.2 %
28	-	6	0.0 %
29	-	6	0.0 %
30	-	17	0.0 %
31	-	49	0.1 %
32	-	37	0.1 %
33	-	94	0.2 %
34	-	64	0.1 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
36	-	35	0.1 %
37	-	33	0.1 %
38	-	23	0.0 %
39	-	157	0.3 %
40	-	30	0.1 %
41	-	26	0.0 %
42	-	6	0.0 %
43	-	11	0.0 %
44	-	425	0.8 %
45	-	70	0.1 %
46	-	69	0.1 %
47	-	12	0.0 %
48	-	72	0.1 %
49	-	83	0.1 %
50	-	66	0.1 %
51	-	110	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. R is housewife, student (or student with job),	1859	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
98	98. R is member of armed forces or former member; R's	42	0.1 %
99	99. NA if R is working now/ has ever worked; R's	78	0.1 %
.	-	48330	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,365 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 39.41
- Median: 39.00
- Mode: 44.00
- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 96.00
- Standard Deviation: 23.52

Location: 161-162 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0125: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Prestige Score S.E.S. Rank 1968-1974

Duncan S.E.S. score for Head

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	45	0.1 %
3	-	23	0.0 %
4	-	35	0.1 %
5	-	18	0.0 %
6	-	161	0.3 %
7	-	140	0.3 %
8	-	39	0.1 %
9	-	128	0.2 %
10	-	60	0.1 %
11	-	69	0.1 %
12	-	29	0.1 %
13	-	52	0.1 %
14	-	423	0.8 %
15	-	397	0.7 %
16	-	146	0.3 %
17	-	264	0.5 %
18	-	89	0.2 %
19	-	343	0.6 %
20	-	33	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	-	87	0.2 %
22	-	146	0.3 %
23	-	84	0.2 %
24	-	147	0.3 %
25	-	4	0.0 %
26	-	45	0.1 %
27	-	248	0.4 %
28	-	14	0.0 %
29	-	16	0.0 %
30	-	8	0.0 %
31	-	58	0.1 %
32	-	86	0.2 %
33	-	184	0.3 %
34	-	118	0.2 %
36	-	69	0.1 %
37	-	68	0.1 %
38	-	31	0.1 %
39	-	159	0.3 %
40	-	77	0.1 %
41	-	43	0.1 %
42	-	10	0.0 %
43	-	15	0.0 %
44	-	462	0.8 %
45	-	49	0.1 %
46	-	40	0.1 %
47	-	27	0.0 %
48	-	92	0.2 %
49	-	136	0.2 %
50	-	136	0.2 %
51	-	129	0.2 %
52	-	104	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Head is housewife, student (or student with	572	1.0 %
98	98. Head is member of armed forces or former member;	89	0.2 %
99	99. NA if Head is working now/has ever worked; Head's	229	0.4 %
.	-	47039	84.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 7,745 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 39.72
- Median: 37.00
- Mode: 44.00
- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 96.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.20

Location: 163-164 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0126: DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation 5-category 1952-1996

What kind of work did your father (SINCE 1978: [or father surrogate]) do for a living while you were growing up? (SINCE 1984: What was his main occupation?) (SINCE 1986: What were his most important activities or duties?) (SINCE 1984: What kind of business or industry was that?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Professional and managerial	6541	11.7 %
2	2. Clerical and sales workers	2199	3.9 %
3	3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers	12220	21.9 %
4	4. Laborers, except farm	2145	3.9 %
5	5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen	8964	16.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; father wasn't living/not raised by father/no	2685	4.8 %
.	-	20920	37.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,069 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 165-165 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0126A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent Occupation 8-category 1970-1976

What kind of work did your father (SINCE 1978: [or father surrogate]) do for a living while you were growing up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	580	1.0 %
2	2. Managers, officials and proprietors exc. farm	1000	1.8 %
3	3. Clerical and kindred workers, sales workers	411	0.7 %
4	4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers and	1426	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. Operative and kindred workers	1163	2.1 %
6	6. Service workers, including private household	171	0.3 %
7	7. Laborers, except farm	529	1.0 %
8	8. Farm laborers and foremen; farmers; owners,	2156	3.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Father wasn't living; not raised by father; no	127	0.2 %
9	9. Occupation not reported (NA); members of armed	472	0.8 %
.	-	47639	85.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,436 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 166-166 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0126B: DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation Group 1978-1982,1996

What kind of work did your father or father surrogate do for a living while you were growing up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. Professional, technical and kindred workers	684	1.2 %
2	02. Managers and administrators, except farm	876	1.6 %
3	03. Sales workers	287	0.5 %
4	04. Clerical and kindred workers	171	0.3 %
5	05. Craftsmen and kindred workers	1374	2.5 %
6	06. Operatives, except transport	707	1.3 %
7	07. Transport equipment operatives	350	0.6 %
8	08. Laborers, except farm	408	0.7 %
9	09. Farmers (owners and tenants), farm managers,	1186	2.1 %
10	10. Farm foreman, farm laborer (wage-worker)	100	0.2 %
11	11. Service workers, except private household and	183	0.3 %
12	12. Government protective services: firemen; police;	86	0.2 %
13	13. Private household workers	1	0.0 %
14	14. Member of armed forces	151	0.3 %
15	15. Not in labor force	10	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Father wasn't living; not raised by father; no	75	0.1 %
98	98. DK	151	0.3 %
99	99. NA	250	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	48624	87.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,574 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 15.00

Location: 167-168 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0126C: DEMOGRAPHICS: Father of Respondent - Occupation Group 1984-1988,1992

What kind of work did your father or father surrogate do for a living while you were growing up? What was his main occupation? (SINCE 1986:) What were his most important activities or duties? What kind of business or industry was that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. Executive, administrative and managerial	835	1.5 %
2	02. Professional speciality occupations	666	1.2 %
3	03. Technicians and related support occupations	69	0.1 %
4	04. Sales occupation	605	1.1 %
5	05. Administrative support, including clerical	215	0.4 %
6	06. Private household	0	0.0 %
7	07. Protective service	136	0.2 %
8	08. Service exc. protective and household	208	0.4 %
9	09. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations	1802	3.2 %
10	10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations	1921	3.5 %
11	11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors	678	1.2 %
12	12. Transportation and material, moving occupations	583	1.0 %
13	13. Handler, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers	409	0.7 %
14	14. Member of armed forces	208	0.4 %
15	15. Not in labor force	21	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Father wasn't living; not raised by father;	373	0.7 %
98	98. DK	118	0.2 %
99	99. NA	111	0.2 %
.	-	46716	83.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,356 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 15.00

Location: 169-170 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0127: DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Union Membership

1948:
Does [head] belong to a labor union?

1952,1954:
Do either you or the head of your household belong to a labor union? Who is it that belongs?

1956 AND LATER:
(1956-1984,2002: Does anyone) (1986-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988: does] anyone else) in this household belong to a labor union? (IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, someone (1948: head) in household belongs to a	11207	20.1 %
2	2. No, no one in household belongs to a labor union	42680	76.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross	490	0.9 %
.	-	1297	2.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 53,887 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 171-171 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0127A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Who Belongs to Union 8-category

(1988-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988: does] anyone else; 2002: Does anyone) in this household belong to a labor union? (IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	00. No one	20131	36.2 %
11	11. Respondent only	2092	3.8 %
12	12. Spouse only	1049	1.9 %
13	13. Other household member only	340	0.6 %
21	21. R and spouse	278	0.5 %
22	22. R and other household member	38	0.1 %
23	23. Spouse and other household member	6	0.0 %
31	31. R, spouse and other household member	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. DK; NA; DK/NA if anyone in union; short-form 'new'	123	0.2 %
.	-	31613	56.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,938 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 31.00

Location: 172-173 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0127B: DEMOGRAPHICS: Household - Who Belongs to Union 4-category

1952:
Do either you or the head of your household belong to a labor union? Who is it that belongs?

1956 AND LATER:
(1956-1984,2002: Does anyone) (1986-LATER EXC.2002: Do you or [1988: does] anyone else) in this household belong to a labor union? (IF YES:) Who is it that belongs?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No one	41379	74.3 %
1	1. R only	5566	10.0 %
2	2. Someone other than R only	4335	7.8 %
3	3. R and someone other than R	813	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross	483	0.9 %
.	-	3098	5.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 52,093 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 174-174 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0128: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Major Group

1952-1964: Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant, Catholic or Jewish?

1966-1968: Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish?

1970-1988,2002: Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else?

1990 AND LATER, exc. 2002: (IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you mostly attend a place of worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or what? (IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or denomination? (IF YES:) Do you consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Protestant	33974	61.0 %
2	2. Catholic (Roman Catholic)	12865	23.1 %
3	3. Jewish	1304	2.3 %
4	4. Other and none (also includes DK preference)	6922	12.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;	609	1.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 55,065 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 175-175 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0

VCF0128A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion 7-category 1960-1988

1960,1964:
Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1966-1968:
Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1970:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1972-1988:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church or denomination is that? (IF BAPTIST:) Is that Southern Baptist or something else?

2002:
Is your religious preference PROTESTANT, ROMAN CATHOLIC, JEWISH, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT OR OTHER:) What church or denomination is that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Mainline Protestant	8832	15.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Evangelical Protestant	7599	13.6 %
3	3. Catholic (Roman Catholic)	5827	10.5 %
4	4. Jewish	613	1.1 %
5	5. Non-traditional orthodox	554	1.0 %
6	6. Non-Christian/Non-Jewish	171	0.3 %
7	7. Atheist, agnostic, none	1595	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;	253	0.5 %
.	-	30230	54.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,191 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 176-176 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0128B: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion 8-category 1990-1996

(IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you mostly attend a place of worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?

(IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or denomination? (IF YES:) Do you consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?

ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF PROTESTANT:
(IF BAPTIST:) With which Baptist group is your church associated? Is it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Churches in the USA, the American Baptist Association, [1992-LATER: the National Baptist Convention U.S.A.,]an independent Baptist church or some other Baptist group? (IF INDEPENDENT BAPTIST:) Are you affiliated with any larger Baptist group or is this strictly a local church?

(IF LUTHERAN:) Is this church part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Missouri Synod, or some other Lutheran group?

(IF METHODIST:) Is your church part of the United Methodist Church, African Methodist Episcopal, or some other Methodist group?

(IF PRESBYTERIAN:) Is this the Presbyterian Church in the USA or some other Presbyterian group?

(IF REFORMED:) Is this the Christian Reformed Church, the Reformed Church in America, or some other Reformed group?

(IF BRETHREN:) Is this the Church of the Brethren, the Plymouth Brethren, or what?

(IF CHRISTIAN OR JUST CHRISTIAN:) When you say "Christian" does that mean the denomination called the "Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)," or some other Christian denomination, or do you mean to say "I am just a Christian?"

(IF CHURCH OR CHURCHES OF CHRIST:) Is this the Church of Christ or United Church of Christ?

(IF CHURCH OF GOD:) Is this the Church of God of Anderson Indiana, the Church of God of Cleveland Tennessee, the Church of God in Christ, or some other Church of God?

(IF HOLINESS OR PENTECOSTAL:) What kind of church is that? What is it called exactly? Is that part of a larger church or denomination? What is that church called?

ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF OTHER:
What is it called exactly? Is that church part of a denomination? Is that group Christian?

ATTENDS/CONSIDERS SELF JEWISH:
Do you usually attend a synagogue or temple that is Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or what? / Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or what?

ALL CHRISTIANS:
Which one of these words BEST describes your kind of Christianity: Fundamentalist, Evangelical, Charismatic or Spirit-Filled, Moderate to Liberal? Would you call yourself a born-again Christian, that is, have you personally had a conversion experience related to Jesus Christ?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Mainline Protestant	1677	3.0 %
1	1. Evangelical Protestant	2208	4.0 %
2	2. Black Protestant Church	80	0.1 %
3	3. Catholic (Roman Catholic)	1681	3.0 %
4	4. Jewish	131	0.2 %
5	5. Non-traditional orthodox	138	0.2 %
6	6. Non-Christian/Non-Jewish	57	0.1 %
7	7. Atheist, agnostic, none	911	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; refused to answer; no Pre IW; no Post IW;	1091	2.0 %
.	-	47700	85.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,883 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 177-177 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0129: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Full Code 1960-1988,2002

1960,1964:
Is your Church (1962: religious) preference Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1966-1968:
Are you Protestant, Catholic or Jewish? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1970:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church is that, Baptist, Methodist or what?

1972-1988:
Is your religious preference Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT:) What church or denomination is that? (IF BAPTIST:) Is that Southern Baptist or something else?

2002:
Is your religious preference PROTESTANT, ROMAN CATHOLIC, JEWISH, or something else? (IF PROTESTANT OR OTHER:) What church or denomination is that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	Protestant, no denomination given	714	1.3 %
101	Non-denominational Protestant church	286	0.5 %
102	Community church (no denominational basis)	39	0.1 %
109	-	195	0.4 %
110	Presbyterian	1259	2.3 %
111	see 121	1900	3.4 %
112	Congregational	306	0.5 %
113	Evangelical and Reformed	55	0.1 %
114	Reformed, Dutch Reformed or Christian Reformed	115	0.2 %
115	see 136	190	0.3 %
116	Episcopalian, Anglican, Church of England	694	1.2 %
120	see 132	3246	5.8 %
121	African Methodist Episcopal (AME)	39	0.1 %
122	United Brethren; Evangelical Brethren	64	0.1 %
123	138	3399	6.1 %
124	Disciples of Christ	102	0.2 %
125	"Christian"	422	0.8 %
126	Mennonite; Amish	20	0.0 %
127	Church of the Brethren	20	0.0 %
130	United Missionary; Protestant Missionary	12	0.0 %
131	Church of God; Holiness	287	0.5 %
132	Nazarene; Free Methodist	130	0.2 %
133	Church of God in Christ	37	0.1 %
134	Plymouth Brethren	3	0.0 %
135	Pentecostal; Assembly of God	455	0.8 %
136	Church of Christ	550	1.0 %
137	Salvation Army	20	0.0 %
138	Primitive, Free Will, Missionary Fundamentalist, and Gospel Baptist	387	0.7 %
139	Seventh Day Adventist	100	0.2 %
140	Southern Baptist	1803	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
141	Missouri Synod Lutheran	44	0.1 %
149	Other fundamentalists	171	0.3 %
150	Christian Scientist	63	0.1 %
151	Spiritualist	7	0.0 %
152	Mormon Latter-Day Saints (LDS)	328	0.6 %
153	Unitarian; Universalist	79	0.1 %
154	Jehovah's Witness	124	0.2 %
155	Quaker	45	0.1 %
156	Unity	27	0.0 %
200	Roman Catholic	6220	11.2 %
300	Jewish	651	1.2 %
700	-	17	0.0 %
710	Greek Orthodox	56	0.1 %
711	Russian Orthodox	11	0.0 %
712	Rumanian Orthodox	1	0.0 %
713	Serbian Orthodox	4	0.0 %
719	Other Eastern Orthodox	23	0.0 %
720	Muslim, Mohammedan	28	0.1 %
721	Buddhist	30	0.1 %
722	Hindu	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
996	Refused	20	0.0 %
998	DK; none; no preference	1660	3.0 %
999	NA	242	0.4 %
.	-	28719	51.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 25,033 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 100.00
- Maximum: 800.00

Location: 178-180 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 996 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0130: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1970-

1970-1988: (IF ANY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE) Would you say you/do you go to (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

1990 AND LATER: Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals? (IF YES:) Do you go to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Every week (Except 1970: almost every week)	10773	19.4 %
2	2. Almost every week (no cases in 1970)	4652	8.4 %
3	3. Once or twice a month	5513	9.9 %
4	4. A few times a year	9020	16.2 %
5	5. Never (1990 and later: 'No' in filter)	10076	18.1 %
7	7. No religious preference (1970-1988)	1395	2.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. INAP religion (1970-1988); atheists and agnostics are	180	0.3 %
8	8. DK how often/DK if attend	21	0.0 %
9	9. NA/RF how often/NA/RF if attend	235	0.4 %
.	-	13809	24.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 41,429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 181-181 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0130A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1990-

Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals? (IF YES:) Do you go to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never? (IF R SAYS HE/SHE GOES TO RELIGIOUS SERVICES EVERY WEEK:) Would you say you go to religious services once a week or more often than once a week?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Every week - more than once a week	2548	4.6 %
1	1. Every week - once a week or NA if once a week/more	2958	5.3 %
2	2. Almost every week	2540	4.6 %
3	3. Once or twice a month	2965	5.3 %
4	4. A few times a year	3318	6.0 %
5	5. Never ('No' in filter)	7536	13.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK how often/DK if attend	17	0.0 %
9	9. NA how often/NA if attend; short-form 'new'	139	0.2 %
.	-	33653	60.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,865 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 182-182 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0131: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Church Attendance 1952-1968

Would you say you go to church regularly, often, seldom or never?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Regularly	4896	8.8 %
2	2. Often	2009	3.6 %
4	4. Seldom	3757	6.7 %
5	5. Never	774	1.4 %
7	7. No religious preference (1960-1968)	179	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Religion refused/NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	1805	3.2 %
9	9. NA	99	0.2 %
.	-	42155	75.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,615 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 183-183 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0132: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: State 1968-

Where was it that you grew up? (IF UNITED STATES:) Which state or states?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
101	Connecticut	408	0.7 %
102	Maine	206	0.4 %
103	Massachusetts	903	1.6 %
104	New Hampshire	152	0.3 %
105	Rhode Island	63	0.1 %
106	Vermont	40	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
109	general mention of area; 2 or more states in New England	19	0.0 %
111	Delaware	60	0.1 %
112	New Jersey	792	1.4 %
113	New York	2231	4.0 %
114	Pennsylvania	1696	3.0 %
118	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Middle Atlantic	18	0.0 %
119	"east;" mention of states in both New England and Middle Atlantic	26	0.0 %
121	Illinois	1323	2.4 %
122	Indiana	882	1.6 %
123	Michigan	1644	3.0 %
124	Ohio	1598	2.9 %
125	Wisconsin	670	1.2 %
129	general mention of area; 2 or more states in East North Central	32	0.1 %
131	Iowa	730	1.3 %
132	Kansas	420	0.8 %
133	Minnesota	769	1.4 %
134	Missouri	788	1.4 %
135	Nebraska	394	0.7 %
136	North Dakota	102	0.2 %
137	South Dakota	147	0.3 %
138	general mention of area; 2 or more states in West North Central	26	0.0 %
139	"midwest;" mention of states in both East North Central and West North Central	38	0.1 %
140	Virginia	833	1.5 %
141	Alabama	732	1.3 %
142	Arkansas	817	1.5 %
143	Florida	646	1.2 %
144	Georgia	1022	1.8 %
145	Louisiana	564	1.0 %
146	Mississippi	407	0.7 %
147	North Carolina	1005	1.8 %
148	South Carolina	311	0.6 %
149	Texas	1838	3.3 %
151	Kentucky	479	0.9 %
152	Maryland	387	0.7 %
153	Oklahoma	297	0.5 %
154	Tennessee	945	1.7 %
155	Washington D.C.	87	0.2 %
156	West Virginia	479	0.9 %
157	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Solid South	68	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
158	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Border States	6	0.0 %
159	"south;" mention of states in both Solid South and Border States	47	0.1 %
161	Arizona	183	0.3 %
162	Colorado	420	0.8 %
163	Idaho	59	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
998	DK	2	0.0 %
999	NA	337	0.6 %
.	-	22170	39.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 33,165 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 997.00

Location: 184-186 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0133: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: State 1952-1966

What part of the United States did you grow up in?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
101	Connecticut	156	0.3 %
102	Maine	41	0.1 %
103	Massachusetts	245	0.4 %
104	New Hampshire	15	0.0 %
105	Rhode Island	10	0.0 %
106	Vermont	11	0.0 %
109	general mention of area; 2 or more states in New England	8	0.0 %
111	Delaware	4	0.0 %
112	New Jersey	221	0.4 %
113	New York	709	1.3 %
114	Pennsylvania	650	1.2 %
118	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Middle Atlantic	14	0.0 %
119	"east;" mention of states in both New England and Middle Atlantic	5	0.0 %
121	Illinois	344	0.6 %
122	Indiana	223	0.4 %
123	Michigan	380	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
124	Ohio	442	0.8 %
125	Wisconsin	141	0.3 %
129	general mention of area; 2 or more states in East North Central	16	0.0 %
131	Iowa	366	0.7 %
132	Kansas	150	0.3 %
133	Minnesota	207	0.4 %
134	Missouri	260	0.5 %
135	Nebraska	142	0.3 %
136	North Dakota	42	0.1 %
137	South Dakota	122	0.2 %
138	general mention of area; 2 or more states in West North Central	18	0.0 %
139	"midwest;" mention of states in both East North Central and West North Central	17	0.0 %
140	Virginia	186	0.3 %
141	Alabama	183	0.3 %
142	Arkansas	278	0.5 %
143	Florida	141	0.3 %
144	Georgia	237	0.4 %
145	Louisiana	107	0.2 %
146	Mississippi	153	0.3 %
147	North Carolina	364	0.7 %
148	South Carolina	122	0.2 %
149	Texas	386	0.7 %
151	Kentucky	396	0.7 %
152	Maryland	71	0.1 %
153	Oklahoma	73	0.1 %
154	Tennessee	153	0.3 %
155	Washington D.C.	27	0.0 %
156	West Virginia	49	0.1 %
157	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Solid South	23	0.0 %
158	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Border States	3	0.0 %
159	"south;" mention of states in both Solid South and Border States	14	0.0 %
161	Arizona	22	0.0 %
162	Colorado	84	0.2 %
163	Idaho	53	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
999	NA	168	0.3 %
.	-	46520	83.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 8,986 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 997.00

Location: 187-189 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0134: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Farm 1952-1994,2000

1952: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a small town, or in a large city?

1956-1970: Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1972-1976: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1978-1982: Looking at this list, please tell me, were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1984-LATER: Looking at this list, please tell me, where were you mostly brought up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Farm/country (including "in the country, not on a farm" in 1978-1992)	12963	23.3 %
2	2. Not farm/country	25138	45.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	18	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	503	0.9 %
.	-	17052	30.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,101 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 190-190 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0135: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Large City 1952-1994,2000

1952: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a small town, or in a large city?

1956-1970: Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1972-1976: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1978-1982: Looking at this list, please tell me, were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in

a large city?

1984-LATER: Looking at this list, please tell me, where were you mostly brought up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. In a large city (in 1978-1992 this includes	7139	12.8 %
2	2. Not in a large city (in 1978-1992 this includes all	29202	52.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	18	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	364	0.7 %
.	-	18951	34.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 36,341 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 191-191 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0136: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Urbanism 1956-1976

1952: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a small town, or in a large city?

1956-1970: Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1972-1976: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1978-1982: Looking at this list, please tell me, were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1984-LATER: Looking at this list, please tell me, where were you mostly brought up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Farm, rural, 'country'	5993	10.8 %
2	2. Town, 'small town'	3877	7.0 %
3	3. City, not a large city	3051	5.5 %
4	4. Large city	3545	6.4 %
5	5. Other; mixture of communities; 'suburb'	224	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW	157	0.3 %
.	-	38827	69.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,690 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 192-192 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0137: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Where Grew Up: Urbanism 1978-2000

1952: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a small town, or in a large city?

1956-1970: Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1972-1976: Were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1978-1982: Looking at this list, please tell me, were you brought up mostly in the country, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

1984-LATER: Looking at this list, please tell me, where were you mostly brought up?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. On a farm	3906	7.0 %
2	2. In the country, not on a farm	2365	4.2 %
3	3. In a small city or town (under 50,000)	5843	10.5 %
4	4. In a medium-sized city (50,000-100,000)	2202	4.0 %
5	5. In a large city (100,000-500,000)	2416	4.3 %
6	6. In a suburb of a large city	1311	2.4 %
7	7. In a very large city (over 500,000)	1178	2.1 %
8	8. In a suburb of a very large city	430	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	225	0.4 %
.	-	35798	64.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,651 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 193-193 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number of Children

1958: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family?

1960: How many children under 18 years old are there in this family?

1962: How many children under 18 are there in your family?

1964: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family?

1966: How many children are there under 18 years old in this family (household)?

1968: Are there any children under 18 years old in this family? (How many?)

2008: How many children age 10 or younger live in this household? How many children age 11 to 17 live in this household?

2012: How many children age 10 or younger live in this household? How many children ages 11 to 17 live in this household [IF R 17 YEARS OLD:] including you?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	21210	38.1 %
1	1. One	5594	10.0 %
2	2. Two	5257	9.4 %
3	3. Three	4296	7.7 %
4	4. Four	0	0.0 %
5	5. Five	0	0.0 %
6	6. Six	0	0.0 %
7	7. Seven	0	0.0 %
8	8. Eight or more	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Pre IW; Panel (1992,1996,2002)	3980	7.1 %
.	-	15337	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 36,357 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 194-194 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138A: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Under Age 6

Number of children age 5 or younger old in household

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	14770	26.5 %
1	1. One	2295	4.1 %
2	2. Two	868	1.6 %
3	3. Three	143	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. Four	21	0.0 %
5	5. Five	1	0.0 %
6	6. Six	0	0.0 %
7	7. Seven	0	0.0 %
8	8. Eight	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)	3894	7.0 %
.	-	33682	60.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,098 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 195-195 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138B: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 6-9

Number of children 6-9 years old in household

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	15571	28.0 %
1	1. One	1998	3.6 %
2	2. Two	456	0.8 %
3	3. Three	51	0.1 %
4	4. Four	1	0.0 %
5	5. Five	0	0.0 %
6	6. Six	0	0.0 %
7	7. Seven	0	0.0 %
8	8. Eight	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)	3915	7.0 %
.	-	33682	60.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,077 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 196-196 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138C: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 10-13

Number of children 10-13 years old in household

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	15550	27.9 %
1	1. One	2034	3.7 %
2	2. Two	444	0.8 %
3	3. Three	47	0.1 %
4	4. Four	3	0.0 %
5	5. Five	0	0.0 %
6	6. Six	0	0.0 %
7	7. Seven	0	0.0 %
8	8. Eight	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)	3914	7.0 %
.	-	33682	60.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,078 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 197-197 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138D: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number Children Ages 14-17

Number of children 14-17 years old in household

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	15605	28.0 %
1	1. One	1933	3.5 %
2	2. Two	475	0.9 %
3	3. Three	58	0.1 %
4	4. Four	7	0.0 %
5	5. Five	0	0.0 %
6	6. Six	0	0.0 %
7	7. Seven	0	0.0 %
8	8. Eight	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Panel (1992,1996,2002)	3914	7.0 %
.	-	33682	60.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,078 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 198-198 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0138E: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Age Youngest Child

Age of youngest child in family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 1 - 1/2 years or less	1017	1.8 %
2	2. Over 1 - 1/2 years up to and including 2 -1/2 years	520	0.9 %
3	3. Over 2 - 1/2 years up to and including 3 - 1/2 years	429	0.8 %
4	4. Over 3 - 1/2 years up to and including 4 - 1/2 years	349	0.6 %
5	5. Over 4 - 1/2 years up to and including 5 - 1/2 years	313	0.6 %
6	6. Over 5 - 1/2 years up to and including 10 - 1/2 years	1238	2.2 %
7	7. Over 10 - 1/2 years up to and including 14- 1/2 years	806	1.4 %
8	8. Over 14 - 1/2 years up to 18 years	540	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no children; no Pre IW	4897	8.8 %
.	-	45565	81.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,212 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 199-199 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0139: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - How Many Children Does R Have

1970,1974,1976,1980: Do you have any children? (IF YES:) How many?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	1719	3.1 %
1	1. One	1174	2.1 %
2	2. Two	1658	3.0 %
3	3. Three	1100	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. Four	593	1.1 %
5	5. Five	313	0.6 %
6	6. Six	150	0.3 %
7	7. Seven	89	0.2 %
8	8. Eight or more	111	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	37	0.1 %
.	-	48730	87.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,907 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 200-200 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0140: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 6-category

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?

1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test?

1974,1976: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?

1978-1984: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that you have earned?

1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that you have earned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')	7766	13.9 %
2	2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency	7396	13.3 %
3	3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency	13617	24.5 %
4	4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic	3894	7.0 %
5	5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college	11415	20.5 %
6	6. BA level degrees; advanced degrees incl. LLB	10376	18.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	26	0.0 %
9	9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section	522	0.9 %
.	-	662	1.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,464 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 201-201 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0140A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Education 7-category

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?

1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college you have completed? Did you get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test?

1974,1976: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?

1978-1984: Do you have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that you have earned?

1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that you have earned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')	7766	13.9 %
2	2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency	7396	13.3 %
3	3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency	13617	24.5 %
4	4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic	3894	7.0 %
5	5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college	11415	20.5 %
6	6. BA level degrees	7142	12.8 %
7	7. Advanced degrees incl. LLB	3235	5.8 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	26	0.0 %
9	9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	521	0.9 %
.	-	662	1.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,465 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 202-202 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0141: DEMOGRAPHICS: Head of HH - Education 6-category 1962-1986

1952-1972: How many grades of school did (head) finish?

1974 AND LATER: What is highest grade of school or year of college(head) has completed? Did (head) get a high school diploma or pass a high school equivalency test?

1974,1976: Does (head) have a college degree? (IF YES:) What degree is that?

1978-1984: Does (head) have a college degree? (IF YES:) What is the highest degree that (head) has earned?

1986 AND LATER: What is the highest degree that (head) has earned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 8 grades or less ('grade school')	4068	7.3 %
2	2. 9-12 grades ('high school'), no diploma/equivalency	3332	6.0 %
3	3. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency	4321	7.8 %
4	4. 12 grades, diploma or equivalency plus non-academic	2906	5.2 %
5	5. Some college, no degree; junior/community college	3522	6.3 %
6	6. BA level degrees; advanced degrees incl. LLB	3716	6.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	115	0.2 %
9	9. NA; head of family not determined (1986)	249	0.4 %
.	-	33445	60.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,865 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 6.00

Location: 203-203 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0142: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Place of Birth

Where were you born? (IF UNITED STATES:) Which state?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	UNDOCUMENTED CODE	10	0.0 %
101	Connecticut	473	0.8 %
102	Maine	228	0.4 %
103	Massachusetts	1012	1.8 %
104	New Hampshire	136	0.2 %
105	Rhode Island	71	0.1 %
106	Vermont	42	0.1 %
109	general mention of area; 2 or more states in New England	2	0.0 %
111	Delaware	47	0.1 %
112	New Jersey	861	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
113	New York	2458	4.4 %
114	Pennsylvania	2238	4.0 %
118	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Middle Atlantic	1	0.0 %
119	"east;" mention of states in both New England and Middle Atlantic	0	0.0 %
121	Illinois	1524	2.7 %
122	Indiana	967	1.7 %
123	Michigan	1648	3.0 %
124	Ohio	1731	3.1 %
125	Wisconsin	653	1.2 %
129	general mention of area; 2 or more states in East North Central	0	0.0 %
131	Iowa	1063	1.9 %
132	Kansas	577	1.0 %
133	Minnesota	861	1.5 %
134	Missouri	1037	1.9 %
135	Nebraska	532	1.0 %
136	North Dakota	116	0.2 %
137	South Dakota	268	0.5 %
138	general mention of area; 2 or more states in West North Central	1	0.0 %
139	"midwest;" mention of states in both East North Central and West North Central	0	0.0 %
140	Virginia	855	1.5 %
141	Alabama	859	1.5 %
142	Arkansas	1057	1.9 %
143	Florida	485	0.9 %
144	Georgia	1216	2.2 %
145	Louisiana	547	1.0 %
146	Mississippi	563	1.0 %
147	North Carolina	1303	2.3 %
148	South Carolina	416	0.7 %
149	Texas	1765	3.2 %
151	Kentucky	940	1.7 %
152	Maryland	408	0.7 %
153	Oklahoma	370	0.7 %
154	Tennessee	1011	1.8 %
155	Washington D.C.	127	0.2 %
156	West Virginia	547	1.0 %
157	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Solid South	1	0.0 %
158	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Border States	0	0.0 %
159	"south;" mention of states in both Solid South and Border States	0	0.0 %
161	Arizona	126	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
162	Colorado	381	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
998	DK	4	0.0 %
999	NA	414	0.7 %
.	-	18859	33.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 36,397 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 100.00
- Maximum: 997.00

Location: 204-206 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0143: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Parents - Native Born

Were both your parents born in this country?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	37552	67.4 %
5	5. No	8360	15.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	156	0.3 %
9	9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short-form 'new' Cross Section	504	0.9 %
.	-	9102	16.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 45,912 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 207-207 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0144: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Father - Where Born

(IF BOTH PARENTS NOT BORN IN THE U.S.:) What country was your father born in?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	UNDOCUMENTED CODE	0	0.0 %
101	Connecticut	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
102	Maine	0	0.0 %
103	Massachusetts	0	0.0 %
104	New Hampshire	0	0.0 %
105	Rhode Island	0	0.0 %
106	Vermont	0	0.0 %
109	general mention of area; 2 or more states in New England	0	0.0 %
111	Delaware	0	0.0 %
112	New Jersey	0	0.0 %
113	New York	0	0.0 %
114	Pennsylvania	0	0.0 %
118	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Middle Atlantic	0	0.0 %
119	"east;" mention of states in both New England and Middle Atlantic	0	0.0 %
121	Illinois	0	0.0 %
122	Indiana	0	0.0 %
123	Michigan	0	0.0 %
124	Ohio	0	0.0 %
125	Wisconsin	0	0.0 %
129	general mention of area; 2 or more states in East North Central	0	0.0 %
131	Iowa	0	0.0 %
132	Kansas	0	0.0 %
133	Minnesota	0	0.0 %
134	Missouri	0	0.0 %
135	Nebraska	0	0.0 %
136	North Dakota	0	0.0 %
137	South Dakota	0	0.0 %
138	general mention of area; 2 or more states in West North Central	0	0.0 %
139	"midwest;" mention of states in both East North Central and West North Central	0	0.0 %
140	Virginia	0	0.0 %
141	Alabama	0	0.0 %
142	Arkansas	0	0.0 %
143	Florida	0	0.0 %
144	Georgia	0	0.0 %
145	Louisiana	0	0.0 %
146	Mississippi	0	0.0 %
147	North Carolina	0	0.0 %
148	South Carolina	0	0.0 %
149	Texas	0	0.0 %
151	Kentucky	0	0.0 %
152	Maryland	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
153	Oklahoma	0	0.0 %
154	Tennessee	0	0.0 %
155	Washington D.C.	0	0.0 %
156	West Virginia	0	0.0 %
157	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Solid South	0	0.0 %
158	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Border States	0	0.0 %
159	"south;" mention of states in both Solid South and Border States	0	0.0 %
161	Arizona	0	0.0 %
162	Colorado	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
998	DK	114	0.2 %
999	NA	560	1.0 %
.	-	34804	62.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 20,196 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 182.00
- Maximum: 997.00

Location: 208-210 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0145: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Mother - Where Born

(IF BOTH PARENTS NOT BORN IN THE U.S.:) What country was your mother born in?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	INAP, question not asked	0	0.0 %
101	Connecticut	0	0.0 %
102	Maine	0	0.0 %
103	Massachusetts	0	0.0 %
104	New Hampshire	0	0.0 %
105	Rhode Island	0	0.0 %
106	Vermont	0	0.0 %
109	general mention of area; 2 or more states in New England	0	0.0 %
111	Delaware	0	0.0 %
112	New Jersey	0	0.0 %
113	New York	0	0.0 %
114	Pennsylvania	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
118	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Middle Atlantic	0	0.0 %
119	"east;" mention of states in both New England and Middle Atlantic	0	0.0 %
121	Illinois	0	0.0 %
122	Indiana	0	0.0 %
123	Michigan	0	0.0 %
124	Ohio	0	0.0 %
125	Wisconsin	0	0.0 %
129	general mention of area; 2 or more states in East North Central	0	0.0 %
131	Iowa	0	0.0 %
132	Kansas	0	0.0 %
133	Minnesota	0	0.0 %
134	Missouri	0	0.0 %
135	Nebraska	0	0.0 %
136	North Dakota	0	0.0 %
137	South Dakota	0	0.0 %
138	general mention of area; 2 or more states in West North Central	0	0.0 %
139	"midwest;" mention of states in both East North Central and West North Central	0	0.0 %
140	Virginia	0	0.0 %
141	Alabama	0	0.0 %
142	Arkansas	0	0.0 %
143	Florida	0	0.0 %
144	Georgia	0	0.0 %
145	Louisiana	0	0.0 %
146	Mississippi	0	0.0 %
147	North Carolina	0	0.0 %
148	South Carolina	0	0.0 %
149	Texas	0	0.0 %
151	Kentucky	0	0.0 %
152	Maryland	0	0.0 %
153	Oklahoma	0	0.0 %
154	Tennessee	0	0.0 %
155	Washington D.C.	0	0.0 %
156	West Virginia	0	0.0 %
157	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Solid South	0	0.0 %
158	general mention of area; 2 or more states in Border States	0	0.0 %
159	"south;" mention of states in both Solid South and Border States	0	0.0 %
161	Arizona	0	0.0 %
162	Colorado	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
998	DK	119	0.2 %
999	NA	559	1.0 %
.	-	34804	62.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 20,192 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 182.00
- Maximum: 997.00

Location: 211-213 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0146: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent Family - Home Ownership

(Do you/ Does your family) own your own home, pay rent or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, own	31055	55.8 %
2	2. No, not owned	15236	27.4 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	13	0.0 %
9	9. NA; RF; no Pre IW; short form (1992)	588	1.1 %
.	-	8782	15.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 46,291 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 214-214 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0147: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Marital Status

1952: Are you married?

1956-2004: Are you married now and living with your husband/wife (2002: spouse)-- or are you widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never married?

2008: Are you married now and living with your husband/wife-- or are you widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never married?/Are you married, divorced, separated, widowed, or have you never been married?

2012: Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never married? Are you currently living with a partner, or not?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Married	32672	58.7 %
2	2. Never married	7529	13.5 %
3	3. Divorced	4751	8.5 %
4	4. Separated	1586	2.8 %
5	5. Widowed	5575	10.0 %
7	7. Partners; not married (VOLUNTEERED - exc.1986,2012)	1099	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. R not married/partnered, refused to say whether never married, divorced, separated or widowed (1992 only); DK	9	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Pre IW; unmarried at time of IW (1952 only); short-form 'new' Cross-Section (1992)	652	1.2 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 53,212 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 215-215 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0148: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Social Class 8-category

There's been some talk these days about different social classes. Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working class. Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes? (IF YES:) Which one? / (IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself middle class or working class? Would you say that you are about average middle/working class or that you are in the upper part of the middle/working class?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Lower class (VOLUNTEERED)	145	0.3 %
1	1. Average working	15438	27.7 %
2	2. Working--NA average or upper	2068	3.7 %
3	3. Upper working	3228	5.8 %
4	4. Average middle	12424	22.3 %
5	5. Middle class--NA average or upper	2673	4.8 %
6	6. Upper middle	3574	6.4 %
7	7. Upper class (VOLUNTEERED)	35	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; other (incl. refused to accept idea of	1658	3.0 %
.	-	14431	25.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 39,585 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 216-216 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0148A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Average or Upper Middle/Working Class

There's been some talk these days about different social classes. Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working class. Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes? (IF YES:) Which one? / (IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself middle class or working class? Would you say that you are about average middle/working class or that you are in the upper part of the middle/working class?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Average working	15438	27.7 %
2	2. Working--NA average or upper	4746	8.5 %
3	3. Upper working	3228	5.8 %
4	4. Average middle	12424	22.3 %
5	5. Middle class--NA average or upper	4701	8.4 %
6	6. Upper middle	3574	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; other (incl. "refused to accept idea of class")	2060	3.7 %
.	-	9503	17.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 44,111 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 217-217 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0149: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Think of Self as Member of Social Class

There's been some talk these days about different social classes. Most people say they belong either to the middle class or the working class. Do you ever think of yourself as belonging in one of these classes? (IF YES:) Which one? / (IF NO:) Well, if you had to make a choice, would you call yourself middle class or working class?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, think of self as member of class and that class is middle class	15373	27.6 %
2	2. No, don't think of self as member of class, but if had to choose middle or working, would choose middle	5241	9.4 %
3	3. Yes, think of self as member of class and that class is working class	15127	27.2 %
4	4. No, don't think of self as member of class, but if had to choose middle or working, would choose working	8153	14.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. Refuses to accept idea of class (except 1964, 1966, 1968)	285	0.5 %
6	6. Other (in 1964, 1966 and 1968, also includes "refuses to accept idea of class.")	755	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW; short form (1992)	1237	2.2 %
.	-	9503	17.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 44,934 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 218-218 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0150: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Work Status 16-category

We'd like to know if you are working now, temporarily laid off, or are you unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, (a homemaker), (a student), or what? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (RETIRED 1980,1982, 1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (DISABLED 1982,1988 AND LATER:) Are you doing any work for pay at the present time? (STUDENT OR HOMEMAKER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED AND ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1980:) In an average week do you work 20 or more hours on that job? (RETIRED OR DISABLED, AND R ANSWERED WORKING FOR PAY 1982,1988 AND LATER:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week? (RETIRED OR DISABLED AND R VOLUNTEERED WORKING FOR PAY 1984,1986:) About how many hours do you work on your job in the average week?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	10. Working now	16907	30.4 %
15	15. Working now and retired--20 or more hrs/wk	194	0.3 %
16	16. Working now and permanently disabled--20 or more	17	0.0 %
17	17. Working now and homemaker--20 or more hrs/wk	385	0.7 %
18	18. Working now and student--20 or more hrs/wk	481	0.9 %
20	20. Temporarily laid off	389	0.7 %
40	40. Unemployed	1383	2.5 %
50	50. Retired, no current occupation	4933	8.9 %
51	51. Retired and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk	164	0.3 %
60	60. Permanently disabled, no current occupation	1272	2.3 %
61	61. Permanently disabled and working--less than 20 hrs/wk	15	0.0 %
70	70. Homemaker, no other occupation	2599	4.7 %
71	71. Homemaker and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk	257	0.5 %
75	75. Homemaker and student, no other occupation	62	0.1 %
80	80. Student, no current occupation	640	1.1 %
81	81. Student and working now--less than 20 hrs/wk	262	0.5 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. NA	55	0.1 %
.	-	25659	46.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,960 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 10.00
- Maximum: 81.00

Location: 219-220 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0151: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation Group 5-Category

1952-1964:
What is your occupation. I mean, what kind of work do you do? (IF NOT CLEAR OR OBVIOUS [1958,1960,1964 only]:) What exactly do you do on your job? (IF NOT ASCERTAINED:) What kind of business is that? (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work do you usually do? (IF R IS RETIRED:) What kind of work did you do before you retired?

1968-1970:
(IF EMPLOYED OR ON STRIKE:) What kind of work do you do? [What exactly do you do on your job?] (IF UNEMPLOYED OR RETIRED:) What kind of work did you do when you were employed? [What exactly did you do on your job?]

1972-1982:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main occupation [What sort of work do you do? Tell me a little more about what you do.] (IF R IS UNEMPLOYED:) What kind of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?] (IF R IS RETIRED OR DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do when you worked [What was your main occupation?]

1984 AND LATER:
(IF R IS WORKING NOW OR IS TEMPORARILY LAID OFF:) What is your main occupation [What sort of work do you do?] What are your most important activities or duties? (IF R IS RETIRED/UNEMPLOYED /DISABLED:) What kind of work did you do on your last regular job [What was your occupation?] What were your most important activities or duties?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Professional and managerial	10004	18.0 %
2	2. Clerical and sales workers	7588	13.6 %
3	3. Skilled, semi-skilled and service workers	13217	23.7 %
4	4. Laborers, except farm	1216	2.2 %
5	5. Farmers, farm managers, farm laborers and foremen;	1417	2.5 %
6	6. Homemakers (1980-later: no other occupation (any number of hours) and have not worked in past 6/12 mos.; 1972-19	7048	12.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; member of armed forces; no occupation and not a homemaker; no Pre IW	1048	1.9 %
.	-	14136	25.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 40,490 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 6.00

Location: 221-221 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0152: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Religion Full Code 1990-

(IF R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you mostly attend a place of worship that is Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?

(IF R DOESN'T ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular church or denomination? (IF YES:) Do you consider yourself Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, or what?

PROTESTANTS:
(IF BAPTIST:) With which Baptist group is your church associated? Is it the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Churches in the USA, the American Baptist Association, [1992-LATER: the National Baptist Convention U.S.A.,]an independent Baptist church or some other Baptist group?

(IF INDEPENDENT BAPTIST:) Are you affiliated with any larger Baptist group or is this strictly a local church?

(IF LUTHERAN:) Is this church part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Missouri Synod, or some other Lutheran group?

(IF METHODIST:) Is your church part of the United Methodist Church, African Methodist Episcopal, or some other Methodist group?

(IF PRESBYTERIAN:) Is this the Presbyterian Church in the USA or some other Presbyterian group?

(IF REFORMED:) Is this the Christian Reformed Church, the Reformed Church in America, or some other Reformed group?

(IF BRETHREN:) Is this the Church of the Brethren, the Plymouth Brethren, or what?

(IF CHRISTIAN OR JUST CHRISTIAN:) When you say "Christian" does that mean the denomination called the "Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)," or some other Christian denomination, or do you mean to say "I am just a Christian?"

(IF CHURCH OR CHURCHES OF CHRIST:) Is this the Church of Christ or United Church of Christ?

(IF CHURCH OF GOD:) Is this the Church of God of Anderson Indiana, the Church of God of Cleveland Tennessee, the Church of God in Christ, or some other Church of God?

(IF HOLINESS OR PENTECOSTAL:) What kind of church is that? What is it called exactly? Is that part of a larger church or denomination? What is that church called?

(IF OTHER:) What is it called exactly? Is that church part of a denomination? Is that group Christian?

(IF JEWISH:) (IF R ATTENDS JEWISH RELIGIOUS SERVICES:) Do you usually attend a synagogue or temple that is Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or what?

(IF R DOES NOT ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES BUT CONSIDERS SELF JEWISH:) Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	Protestant, no denomination given	538	1.0 %
20	Non-denominational Protestant	548	1.0 %
30	Community church	20	0.0 %
40	Inter-denominational Protestant	32	0.1 %
99	Christian (NFS); "just Christian"	643	1.2 %
100	7th Day Adventist	68	0.1 %
102	1990 only	2	0.0 %
109	Adventist (NFS)	3	0.0 %
110	Episcopalian; Anglican	405	0.7 %
111	Independent Anglican, Episcopalian	1	0.0 %
120	American Baptist Association	152	0.3 %
121	American Baptist Churches U.S.A. (inaccurately known as "Northern Baptist")	228	0.4 %
122	Baptist Bible Fellowship	0	0.0 %
123	Baptist General Conference	4	0.0 %
124	Baptist Missionary Association of America	67	0.1 %
125	Conservative Baptist Association of America	10	0.0 %
126	General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (G.A.R.B.)	10	0.0 %
127	National Association of Free Will Baptists (United Free Will Baptist Church)	20	0.0 %
128	Primitive Baptists	19	0.0 %
129	National Baptist Convention in the U.S.A.*	28	0.1 %
130	National Baptist Convention of America*	1	0.0 %
131	National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.*	4	0.0 %
132	Progressive National Baptist Convention*	4	0.0 %
133	1990 only	98	0.2 %
134	Reformed Baptist (Calvinist)	1	0.0 %
135	Southern Baptist Convention	1653	3.0 %
147	Fundamental Baptist (no denom. ties)	7	0.0 %
148	Local (independent) Baptist churches with no denominational ties or links to a national fellowship	368	0.7 %
149	Baptist (NFS)	938	1.7 %
150	United Church of Christ (includes Congregational, Evangelical and Reformed)	210	0.4 %
155	Congregational Christian	1	0.0 %
160	Church of the Brethren	16	0.0 %
161	Brethren (NFS)	7	0.0 %
162	Mennonite Church	10	0.0 %
163	Moravian Church	0	0.0 %
164	Old Order Amish	4	0.0 %
165	Quakers (Friends)	23	0.0 %
166	Evangelical Covenant Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)	5	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
167	Evangelical Free Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)	15	0.0 %
168	Brethren in Christ	3	0.0 %
169	-	1	0.0 %
170	Mennonite Brethren	1	0.0 %
180	Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)	15	0.0 %
181	Church of God (Anderson, IN)	33	0.1 %
182	Church of the Nazarene	84	0.2 %
183	Free Methodist Church	3	0.0 %
184	Salvation Army	9	0.0 %
185	Wesleyan Church	18	0.0 %
186	Church of God of Findlay, OH	2	0.0 %
199	Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic	170	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. None; no preference; don't know preference; DK;	3454	6.2 %
999	999. NA; short-form 'new' Cross Section (1992)	89	0.2 %
.	-	35164	63.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 16,967 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 10.00
• Maximum: 997.00

Location: 222-224 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0153A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation 8-category 1970-1976

1972-1976: Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or mother substitute) have a job while you were growing up?

1970-1976: (IF YES:) What kind of work did she do?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	300	0.5 %
2	2. Managers, officials and proprietors exc. farm	109	0.2 %
3	3. Clerical and kindred workers, sales workers	619	1.1 %
4	4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers and (authoritative) protective service workers	33	0.1 %
5	5. Operative and kindred workers	557	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	6. Service workers, including private household workers and (exec. authoritative) protective service workers	651	1.2 %
7	7. Laborers, except farm	59	0.1 %
8	8. Farm laborers and foremen; farmers; owners,	110	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother; no parallel information for parental surrogate	46	0.1 %
9	9. Occupation not reported (NA); members of armed	5551	10.0 %
.	-	47639	85.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,438 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 225-225 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0153B: DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation Group 1978-1982

Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or mother substitute) have a job while you were growing up? (IF YES:) What kind of work did she do?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. Professional, technical and kindred workers	292	0.5 %
2	02. Managers and administrators, except farm	103	0.2 %
3	03. Sales workers	139	0.2 %
4	04. Clerical and kindred workers	401	0.7 %
5	05. Craftsmen and kindred workers	30	0.1 %
6	06. Operatives, except transport	436	0.8 %
7	07. Transport equipment operatives	8	0.0 %
8	08. Laborers, except farm	19	0.0 %
9	09. Farmers (owners and tenants), farm managers,	43	0.1 %
10	10. Farm foreman, farm laborer (wage-worker)	43	0.1 %
11	11. Service workers, except private household and	404	0.7 %
12	12. Government protective services: firemen; police;	4	0.0 %
13	13. Private household workers	124	0.2 %
14	14. Member of armed forces	2	0.0 %
15	15. Not in labor force	3196	5.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother; no	3	0.0 %
98	98. DK	14	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. NA	75	0.1 %
.	-	50338	90.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,244 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 15.00

Location: 226-227 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0153C: DEMOGRAPHICS: Mother of Respondent - Occupation Group 1984-1988

Other than being a housewife, did your mother (or mother substitute) have a job while you were growing up? (IF YES:) What kind of work did she do while you were growing up? (What was her main occupation?) (1986,1988,1992: What were her most important activities or duties? What kind of (business/industry was that?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. Executive, administrative and managerial	199	0.4 %
2	02. Professional speciality occupations	522	0.9 %
3	03. Technicians and related support occupations	100	0.2 %
4	04. Sales occupation	352	0.6 %
5	05. Administrative support, including clerical	745	1.3 %
6	06. Private household	213	0.4 %
7	07. Protective service	17	0.0 %
8	08. Service exc. protective and household	774	1.4 %
9	09. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations	179	0.3 %
10	10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations	102	0.2 %
11	11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors	627	1.1 %
12	12. Transportation and material moving occupations	34	0.1 %
13	13. Handler, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers	106	0.2 %
14	14. Member of armed forces	3	0.0 %
15	15. Not in labor force	4760	8.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Mother wasn't living; not raised by mother;	172	0.3 %
98	98. DK	27	0.0 %
99	99. NA	26	0.0 %
.	-	46716	83.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,733 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 15.00

Location: 228-229 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0154A: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation 71-category

What is/was your main occupation? (What sort of work do/did you do?) (1984-1986:IF NOT CLEAR: tell me a little more about what you do/did.) (1986 AND LATER: What are/were your most important activities or duties?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Executive, administrative, and managerial	1589	2.9 %
2	Management-related occupations	542	1.0 %
3	Engineers, architects, surveyors	334	0.6 %
4	Mathematical and computer scientists	164	0.3 %
5	Natural scientists	73	0.1 %
6	Health diagnosing occupations	119	0.2 %
7	Health assessment and treating occupations	368	0.7 %
8	Teachers, postsecondary	132	0.2 %
9	Teachers, except postsecondary	814	1.5 %
10	Social scientist and urban planners	61	0.1 %
11	Social, recreation, and religious workers	199	0.4 %
12	Lawyers and judges	74	0.1 %
13	Writers, artists, entertainers, and athletes	346	0.6 %
14	Health technologists and technicians	210	0.4 %
15	Engineering and related technologists and technicians	113	0.2 %
16	Science technicians	29	0.1 %
17	Technicians, except health, engineering, and science	163	0.3 %
18	Sales occupation supervisors and proprietors; sales representatives, finance and business services	794	1.4 %
19	Sales representatives, commodities except retail	202	0.4 %
20	Sales workers, retail and personal services	682	1.2 %
21	Sales related occupations	14	0.0 %
22	Clerical supervisors	196	0.4 %
23	Computer equipment operators	49	0.1 %
24	Secretaries, stenographers, and typists	605	1.1 %
25	Information clerks	165	0.3 %
26	Records processing occupations, except financial	118	0.2 %
27	Financial records processing occupations	336	0.6 %
28	Duplicating, mail and other office machine operators	7	0.0 %
29	Communications equipment operators	36	0.1 %
30	Mail and message distributing occupations	113	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	Material recording, scheduling, and distributing clerks	217	0.4 %
32	Adjusters and investigators	138	0.2 %
33	Miscellaneous administrative support occupations	395	0.7 %
34	Private household occupations	187	0.3 %
35	Protective service occupations	270	0.5 %
36	Food preparation and service occupations	701	1.3 %
37	Health service occupations	358	0.6 %
38	Cleaning and building service occupations, exc. household	426	0.8 %
39	Personal service occupations	441	0.8 %
40	Farm operators and managers	240	0.4 %
41	Farm occupations, except managerial	115	0.2 %
42	Related agricultural occupations	104	0.2 %
43	Forestry and logging occupations; fishers, hunters, and trappers	22	0.0 %
44	Mechanics and repairers supervisors; mechanics and repairers, vehicle and mobile equipment	280	0.5 %
45	Mechanics and repairers, except vehicle and mobile equipment	189	0.3 %
46	Miscellaneous mechanics and repairers	81	0.1 %
47	Supervisors, construction occupations	134	0.2 %
48	Construction trades, except supervisors	516	0.9 %
49	Extractive occupations	24	0.0 %
50	Production occupation supervisors; precision metalworking occupations	308	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. DK; NA; honworking homemaker/student; R has never	2318	4.2 %
.	-	36927	66.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 16,429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 71.00

Location: 230-231 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0154B: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Occupation 14-category

What is/was your main occupation? (What sort of work do/did you do?) (1984-1986:IF NOT CLEAR: tell me a little more about what you do/did.) (1986 AND LATER: What are/were your most important activities or duties?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Executive, administrative and managerial	2130	3.8 %
2	2. Professional specialty occupations	2684	4.8 %
3	3. Technicians and related support occupations	515	0.9 %
4	4. Sales occupation	1692	3.0 %
5	5. Administrative support, including clerical	2376	4.3 %
6	6. Private household	187	0.3 %
7	7. Protective service	270	0.5 %
8	8. Service except protective and household	1925	3.5 %
9	9. Farming, forestry and fishing occupations	481	0.9 %
10	10. Precision production, craft and repair occupations	1769	3.2 %
11	11. Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors	1175	2.1 %
12	12. Transportation and material moving occupations	689	1.2 %
13	13. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers	446	0.8 %
14	14. Member of armed forces	90	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. DK; NA; honworking homemaker/student; R has never	2318	4.2 %
.	-	36927	66.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 14.00

Location: 232-233 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0155: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Worried about Find/Losing Job

How worried are you about losing your job/finding a job in the near future: a lot, somewhat, or not much at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. A lot	1615	2.9 %
3	3. Somewhat	2384	4.3 %
5	5. Not much at all	11732	21.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R is nonworking homemaker or student; R is	3124	5.6 %
8	8. DK; refused	77	0.1 %
9	9. NA	330	0.6 %
.	-	36412	65.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,731 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 234-234 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0156: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Working R Laid off Last 6 Months

Were you out of work or laid off at any time during the last six months?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1834	3.3 %
5	5. No	14898	26.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R is not currently working	7511	13.5 %
8	8. DK	1	0.0 %
9	9. NA	34	0.1 %
.	-	31396	56.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,732 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 235-235 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0157: DEMOGRAPHICS: Respondent - Working R Hours Reduced/Cut in Pay

During the last six months, have you had a reduction in your work hours or had to take a cut in pay at any time for reasons other than illness or personal choice?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2018	3.6 %
5	5. No	14692	26.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R is not currently working	7511	13.5 %
8	8. DK	6	0.0 %
9	9. NA	51	0.1 %
.	-	31396	56.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,710 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 236-236 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0170A: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1956-1960

County code 1956-1960

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	TRACT MC 123 (WALTHAM), MIDDLESEX CO.	50	0.1 %
21	CHESTER, DELAWARE CO., PA.	37	0.1 %
31	TRACT 50 (COLLIER TWP. S.W. OF CITY) ALLEGHENY CO., PA.	18	0.0 %
41	DEARBORN, WAYNE CO., MICH.	19	0.0 %
42	TRACT 863A (ROYAL OAK TWP.), OAKLAND CO., MICH.	36	0.1 %
51	TRACT MH-1 (MAPLE HEIGHTS, S. OF CITY), CUYAHOGA CO., O.	17	0.0 %
61	TRACT SLC-9 (AROUND KINLOCH, N. OF CITY), ST. LOUIS CO., MO.	7	0.0 %
62	E. ST. LOUIS, ST. CLAIR CO., ILLINOIS	5	0.0 %
71	ALHAMBRA, LOS ANGELES CO., CAL.	81	0.1 %
72	ORANGE CITY, ORANGE CO., CAL.	36	0.1 %
81	BRENTWOOD TOWN (NE SIDE OF CITY), PRINCE GEORGE'S CO., MARYLAND	3	0.0 %
82	FALLS CHURCH DIST., PART (FAIRFAX CO.) VIRGINIA	7	0.0 %
91	TRACT B14 (AT WEST CITY LIMITS), BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD.	11	0.0 %
111	BRONX, BRONX CO., N.Y.	46	0.1 %
112	QUEENS, QUEENS CO., N.Y.	54	0.1 %
121	BROOKLYN, KINGS CO., N.Y.	66	0.1 %
131	MANHATTAN, NEW YORK CO., N.Y.	51	0.1 %
132	RICHMOND, RICHMOND CO., N.Y.	0	0.0 %
141	CHICAGO, COOK COUNTY, ILL.	78	0.1 %
171	LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES CO., CAL.	70	0.1 %
181	WASHINGTON, D.C. (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	6	0.0 %
191	BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE CITY, MD.	17	0.0 %
211	BOSTON, SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASS.	19	0.0 %
221	PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO., PA.	57	0.1 %
231	PITTSBURGH, ALLEGHENY CO., PA.	17	0.0 %
241	DETROIT, WAYNE CO., MICH.	41	0.1 %
251	CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA CO., O.	19	0.0 %
261	ST. LOUIS, ST. LOUIS CO., MO.	22	0.0 %
271	SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO CO., CAL.	25	0.0 %
272	OAKLAND, ALAMEDA CO., CAL.	7	0.0 %
301	PULASKI, ARKANSAS	68	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
303	SALINE, ARKANSAS	12	0.0 %
311	ONONDAGA, NEW YORK	48	0.1 %
321	WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS	58	0.1 %
331	FAIRFIELD, CONNECTICUT	94	0.2 %
341	HENNEPIN, MINNESOTA	34	0.1 %
343	RAMSEY, MINNESOTA	30	0.1 %
351	MARION, INDIANA	66	0.1 %
361	MONTGOMERY, OHIO	61	0.1 %
371	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA	41	0.1 %
381	HARRIS, TEXAS	95	0.2 %
391	JEFFERSON, KENTUCKY	84	0.2 %
401	MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA	45	0.1 %
402	ELMORE, ALABAMA	10	0.0 %
411	LUZERNE, PENNSYLVANIA	34	0.1 %
421	RENSSELAER, NEW YORK	60	0.1 %
441	GENESEE, MICHIGAN	59	0.1 %
451	BLACK HAWK, IOWA	58	0.1 %
452	BUCHANAN, IOWA	6	0.0 %
461	BUTLER, OHIO	39	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	51281	92.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,393 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 1071.00

Location: 237-240 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0170B: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1964-1976

Sampling PSU-county code 1964-1976

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES	374	0.7 %
2	CALIFORNIA, ORANGE	62	0.1 %
3	LOUISIANA, ACADIA	91	0.2 %
4	GEORGIA, CLAYTON	30	0.1 %
5	TENNESSEE, BLEDSOE	87	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	WEST VIRGINIA, KANAWHA	104	0.2 %
7	MICHIGAN, LAPEER	19	0.0 %
8	TEXAS, FORT BEND	11	0.0 %
9	INDIANA, MORGAN	22	0.0 %
10	ARKANSAS, SALINE	7	0.0 %
11	CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO	33	0.1 %
12	CALIFORNIA, ALAMEDA	49	0.1 %
13	CALIFORNIA, SAN MATEO	36	0.1 %
14	CALIFORNIA, CONTRA COSTA	44	0.1 %
15	GEORGIA, LOWNDES	67	0.1 %
16	ALABAMA, ELMORE	7	0.0 %
17	ILLINOIS, RANDOLPH	93	0.2 %
18	UTAH, DAVIS	18	0.0 %
19	MISSISSIPPI, SIMPSON	100	0.2 %
20	PENNSYLVANIA, SNYDER	110	0.2 %
21	MICHIGAN, MONROE	15	0.0 %
22	CALIFORNIA, SOLANO	75	0.1 %
101	ILLINOIS, COOK	166	0.3 %
102	ILLINOIS, LAKE	0	0.0 %
103	ILLINOIS, LAKE	5	0.0 %
104	INDIANA, PORTER	35	0.1 %
105	ILLINOIS, DUPAGE	90	0.2 %
111	ILLINOIS, COOK	58	0.1 %
121	OHIO, CUYAHOGA	89	0.2 %
122	OHIO, LAKE	31	0.1 %
131	MICHIGAN, WAYNE	184	0.3 %
132	MICHIGAN, OAKLAND	7	0.0 %
133	MICHIGAN, MACOMB	92	0.2 %
141	MISSOURI, ST. LOUIS CITY	38	0.1 %
142	MISSOURI, ST. LOUIS COU	56	0.1 %
143	ILLINOIS, ST. CLAIR	3	0.0 %
144	ILLINOIS, MADISON	34	0.1 %
201	NEW YORK, BRONX	83	0.1 %
202	NEW YORK, QUEENS	74	0.1 %
211	NEW YORK, KINGS	119	0.2 %
221	NEW YORK, NEW YORK	86	0.2 %
231	NEW YORK, RICHMOND	13	0.0 %
232	NEW YORK, NASSAU	68	0.1 %
233	NEW YORK, SUFFOLK	30	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
234	NEW YORK, WESTCHESTER	19	0.0 %
235	NEW YORK, ROCKLAND	33	0.1 %
241	NEW JERSEY, HUDSON	5	0.0 %
242	NEW JERSEY, ESSEX	28	0.1 %
243	NEW JERSEY, BERGEN	58	0.1 %
244	NEW JERSEY, UNION	100	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	43220	77.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 12,454 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 993.00

Location: 241-243 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0170C: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1968-1982

ICPSR county code 1968-1982

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1001	CONNECTICUT, FAIRFIELD	115	0.2 %
1006	CONNECTICUT, NEW LONDON	144	0.3 %
2016	MAINE, YORK	216	0.4 %
3009	MASSACHUSETTS, MIDDLESEX	84	0.2 %
3011	MASSACHUSETTS, NORFOLK	57	0.1 %
3012	MASSACHUSETTS, PLYMOUTH	27	0.0 %
3013	MASSACHUSETTS, SUFFOLK	43	0.1 %
3014	MASSACHUSETTS, WORCESTER	220	0.4 %
11002	DELAWARE, NEW CASTLE	28	0.1 %
12002	NEW JERSEY, BERGEN	63	0.1 %
12003	NEW JERSEY, BURLINGTON	35	0.1 %
12004	NEW JERSEY, CAMDEN	78	0.1 %
12007	NEW JERSEY, ESSEX	25	0.0 %
12009	NEW JERSEY, HUDSON	32	0.1 %
12011	NEW JERSEY, MERCER	85	0.2 %
12012	NEW JERSEY, MIDDLESEX	7	0.0 %
12014	NEW JERSEY, MORRIS	21	0.0 %
12016	NEW JERSEY, PASSAIC	36	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12018	NEW JERSEY, SOMERSET	7	0.0 %
12020	NEW JERSEY, UNION	116	0.2 %
13003	NEW YORK, BRONX	94	0.2 %
13014	NEW YORK, DUTCHESS	39	0.1 %
13015	NEW YORK, ERIE	28	0.1 %
13024	NEW YORK, KINGS	112	0.2 %
13027	NEW YORK, MADISON	53	0.1 %
13030	NEW YORK, NASSAU	85	0.2 %
13031	NEW YORK, NEW YORK	89	0.2 %
13034	NEW YORK, ONONDAGA	61	0.1 %
13038	NEW YORK, OSWEGO	40	0.1 %
13041	NEW YORK, QUEENS	78	0.1 %
13043	NEW YORK, RICHMOND	10	0.0 %
13044	NEW YORK, ROCKLAND	54	0.1 %
13052	NEW YORK, SUFFOLK	23	0.0 %
13056	NEW YORK, ULSTER	139	0.2 %
13060	NEW YORK, WESTCHESTER	14	0.0 %
14002	PENNSYLVANIA, ALLEGHENY	80	0.1 %
14015	PENNSYLVANIA, CHESTER	12	0.0 %
14025	PENNSYLVANIA, ERIE	30	0.1 %
14040	PENNSYLVANIA, LUZERNE	203	0.4 %
14041	PENNSYLVANIA, LYCOMING	46	0.1 %
14046	PENNSYLVANIA, MONTGOMERY	68	0.1 %
14051	PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA	154	0.3 %
14055	PENNSYLVANIA, SNYDER	179	0.3 %
14058	PENNSYLVANIA, SUSQUEHANNA	38	0.1 %
14063	PENNSYLVANIA, WASHINGTON	9	0.0 %
14065	PENNSYLVANIA, WESTMORELAND	88	0.2 %
21016	ILLINOIS, COOK	209	0.4 %
21022	ILLINOIS, DUPAGE	107	0.2 %
21037	ILLINOIS, HENRY	4	0.0 %
21045	ILLINOIS, KANE	5	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	40746	73.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 14,928 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1001.00
- Maximum: 73037.00

Location: 244-248 (width: 5; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0170D: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: County of IW 1970,1978-1998

FIPS state-county code 1970,1978-1998

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1001	AUTAUGA	-	-
1003	BALDWIN	-	-
1005	BARBOUR	-	-
1007	BIBB	-	-
1009	BLOUNT	-	-
1011	BULLOCK	-	-
1013	BUTLER	-	-
1015	CALHOUN	-	-
1017	CHAMBERS	-	-
1019	CHEROKEE	-	-
1021	CHILTON	-	-
1023	CHOCTAW	-	-
1025	CLARKE	-	-
1027	CLAY	-	-
1029	CLEBURNE	-	-
1031	COFFEE	-	-
1033	COLBERT	-	-
1035	CONECUH	-	-
1037	COOSA	-	-
1039	COVINGTON	-	-
1041	CRENSHAW	-	-
1043	CULLMAN	-	-
1045	DALE	-	-
1047	DALLAS	-	-
1049	DE KALB	-	-
1051	ELMORE	-	-
1053	ESCAMBIA	-	-
1055	ETOWAH	-	-
1057	FAYETTE	-	-
1059	FRANKLIN	-	-
1061	GENEVA	-	-
1063	GREENE	-	-

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1065	HALE	-	-
1067	HENRY	-	-
1069	HOUSTON	-	-
1071	JACKSON	-	-
1073	JEFFERSON	-	-
1075	LAMAR	-	-
1077	LAUDERDALE	-	-
1079	LAWRENCE	-	-
1081	LEE	-	-
1083	LIMESTONE	-	-
1085	LOWNDES	-	-
1087	MACON	-	-
1089	MADISON	-	-
1091	MARENGO	-	-
1093	MARION	-	-
1095	MARSHALL	-	-
1097	MOBILE	-	-
1099	MONROE	-	-
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,571 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1033.00
- Maximum: 56013.00

Location: 249-253 (width: 5; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0201: GROUP THERMOMETER: Democrats

Democrats -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see

things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	179	0.3 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	14	0.0 %
15	-	143	0.3 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	13	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	278	0.5 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
40	-	819	1.5 %
45	-	12	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	3365	6.0 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	17	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	1999	3.6 %
65	-	25	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	2217	4.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	150	0.3 %
76	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
77	-	3	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	253	0.5 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2083	3.7 %
88	-	2	0.0 %
90	-	219	0.4 %
92	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	31	0.1 %
96	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1983	3.6 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	315	0.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1330	2.4 %
.	-	40188	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,841 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 66.15
- Median: 70.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.87

Location: 254-255 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0202: GROUP THERMOMETER: Republicans

Republicans -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we

did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	437	0.8 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	33	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	216	0.4 %
20	-	33	0.1 %
25	-	21	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	399	0.7 %
32	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	13	0.0 %
40	-	1008	1.8 %
45	-	16	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	4021	7.2 %
55	-	21	0.0 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2139	3.8 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
65	-	40	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	2182	3.9 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	126	0.2 %
80	-	202	0.4 %
85	-	1790	3.2 %
90	-	111	0.2 %
93	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	14	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	950	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	341	0.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1344	2.4 %
.	-	40188	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,801 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 59.87
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.29

Location: 256-257 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0203: GROUP THERMOMETER: Protestants

Protestants -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we

did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	44	0.1 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	15	0.0 %
15	-	27	0.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	26	0.0 %
25	-	9	0.0 %
30	-	40	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
40	-	109	0.2 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	9	0.0 %
49	-	3	0.0 %
50	-	2817	5.1 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	20	0.0 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	912	1.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
65	-	54	0.1 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1417	2.5 %
75	-	281	0.5 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	415	0.7 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1945	3.5 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	305	0.5 %
92	-	1	0.0 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	45	0.1 %
96	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	2275	4.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	378	0.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1506	2.7 %
.	-	42984	77.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 10,806 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 72.23
- Median: 70.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.56

Location: 258-259 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0204: GROUP THERMOMETER: Catholics

Catholics -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	429	0.8 %
1	-	9	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	6	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	26	0.0 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	4	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	80	0.1 %
15	-	274	0.5 %
19	-	2	0.0 %
20	-	66	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	60	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	472	0.8 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	39	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	943	1.7 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	4	0.0 %
45	-	62	0.1 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	7659	13.8 %
51	-	8	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	87	0.2 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	2757	5.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	142	0.3 %
66	-	3	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	7	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	3581	6.4 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
73	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	846	1.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3185	5.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	26754	48.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 24,889 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 64.41
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.40

Location: 260-261 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0205: GROUP THERMOMETER: Jews

Jews -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	189	0.3 %
1	-	3	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	9	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	38	0.1 %
15	-	128	0.2 %
20	-	38	0.1 %
25	-	27	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	251	0.5 %
35	-	12	0.0 %
40	-	473	0.8 %
45	-	23	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	5	0.0 %
50	-	6572	11.8 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	33	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	1853	3.3 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	97	0.2 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	2549	4.6 %
72	-	2	0.0 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	349	0.6 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
77	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
78	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	429	0.8 %
81	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2285	4.1 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	235	0.4 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	50	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	833	1.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	2436	4.4 %
.	-	34925	62.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 17,480 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 63.79
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.58

Location: 262-263 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0206: GROUP THERMOMETER: Blacks

Blacks -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	539	1.0 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	25	0.0 %
6	-	6	0.0 %
7	-	5	0.0 %
10	-	70	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	442	0.8 %
20	-	88	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	58	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	788	1.4 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	32	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1821	3.3 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	60	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	3	0.0 %
49	-	9	0.0 %
50	-	10467	18.8 %
51	-	6	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	104	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	5250	9.4 %
61	-	3	0.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	220	0.4 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	6422	11.5 %
71	-	2	0.0 %
72	-	5	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	944	1.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3805	6.8 %
.	-	11694	21.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 39,231 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 65.32
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.92

Location: 264-265 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0207: GROUP THERMOMETER: Whites

Whites -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	117	0.2 %
1	-	6	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	17	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	24	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	62	0.1 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	12	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
27	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	118	0.2 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	10	0.0 %
40	-	290	0.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	24	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	7449	13.4 %
51	-	4	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	70	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	3105	5.6 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	161	0.3 %
66	-	3	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	5697	10.2 %
72	-	6	0.0 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	843	1.5 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
77	-	3	0.0 %
78	-	5	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	694	1.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3760	6.8 %
.	-	15850	28.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 35,370 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 74.10
- Median: 75.00
- Mode: 97.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 18.62

Location: 266-267 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0208: GROUP THERMOMETER: Southerners

Southerners -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	116	0.2 %
5	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	19	0.0 %
15	-	144	0.3 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	19	0.0 %
25	-	12	0.0 %
30	-	247	0.4 %
32	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
40	-	650	1.2 %
45	-	12	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	3917	7.0 %
55	-	14	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1730	3.1 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	23	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	2101	3.8 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	144	0.3 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	224	0.4 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1988	3.6 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	102	0.2 %
95	-	21	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1765	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	578	1.0 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1861	3.3 %
.	-	39960	71.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,275 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 65.34
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.23

Location: 268-269 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0209: GROUP THERMOMETER: Big Business

Big business -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1048	1.9 %
1	-	13	0.0 %
2	-	11	0.0 %
3	-	6	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	50	0.1 %
6	-	7	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	173	0.3 %
11	-	2	0.0 %
12	-	3	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	1098	2.0 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	236	0.4 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	158	0.3 %
26	-	1	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	3	0.0 %
30	-	2220	4.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	3	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	108	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
37	-	2	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	4016	7.2 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	174	0.3 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	15	0.0 %
50	-	7648	13.7 %
51	-	14	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	152	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	929	1.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3525	6.3 %
.	-	20056	36.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 31,164 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.47
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.61

Location: 270-271 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0210: GROUP THERMOMETER: Labor Unions

Labor unions -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1905	3.4 %
1	-	23	0.0 %
2	-	16	0.0 %
3	-	10	0.0 %
4	-	6	0.0 %
5	-	68	0.1 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	228	0.4 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
15	-	1477	2.7 %
20	-	288	0.5 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
23	-	4	0.0 %
25	-	189	0.3 %
30	-	2525	4.5 %
32	-	4	0.0 %
33	-	4	0.0 %
35	-	120	0.2 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	4098	7.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	3	0.0 %
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	155	0.3 %
48	-	10	0.0 %
49	-	10	0.0 %
50	-	7750	13.9 %
51	-	17	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	172	0.3 %
56	-	3	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	8	0.0 %
60	-	5352	9.6 %
62	-	4	0.0 %
63	-	3	0.0 %
65	-	219	0.4 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	4	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	4455	8.0 %
72	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	1265	2.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3601	6.5 %
.	-	14619	26.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 36,189 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.05
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.41

Location: 272-273 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0211: GROUP THERMOMETER: Liberals

Liberals -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1938	3.5 %
1	-	27	0.0 %
2	-	16	0.0 %
3	-	7	0.0 %
4	-	8	0.0 %
5	-	59	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	214	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1431	2.6 %
16	-	2	0.0 %
19	-	2	0.0 %
20	-	251	0.5 %
21	-	2	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	168	0.3 %
26	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	2346	4.2 %
33	-	4	0.0 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	100	0.2 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	4	0.0 %
40	-	3950	7.1 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	163	0.3 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	3	0.0 %
48	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	17	0.0 %
50	-	11608	20.8 %
51	-	10	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	175	0.3 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	5493	9.9 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	2753	4.9 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3734	6.7 %
.	-	11694	21.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 37,493 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.67
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.87

Location: 274-275 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0212: GROUP THERMOMETER: Conservatives

Conservatives -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	819	1.5 %
1	-	5	0.0 %
2	-	13	0.0 %
3	-	8	0.0 %
4	-	8	0.0 %
5	-	37	0.1 %
6	-	9	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	5	0.0 %
9	-	5	0.0 %
10	-	147	0.3 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	786	1.4 %
17	-	2	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	194	0.3 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	136	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	2	0.0 %
29	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	1565	2.8 %
32	-	5	0.0 %
33	-	4	0.0 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	97	0.2 %
36	-	2	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	3	0.0 %
40	-	3196	5.7 %
41	-	2	0.0 %
42	-	4	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	148	0.3 %
46	-	4	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	4	0.0 %
49	-	11	0.0 %
50	-	10991	19.7 %
51	-	9	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	6	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	155	0.3 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	6183	11.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	2538	4.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3748	6.7 %
.	-	11694	21.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 37,694 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.81
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.39

Location: 276-277 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0213: GROUP THERMOMETER: Military

Military -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you

don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	353	0.6 %
1	-	7	0.0 %
2	-	4	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	18	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	52	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	255	0.5 %
20	-	54	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	41	0.1 %
30	-	531	1.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	31	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	-	1078	1.9 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	59	0.1 %
48	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	5	0.0 %
50	-	3720	6.7 %
51	-	5	0.0 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	88	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	3356	6.0 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	186	0.3 %
66	-	3	0.0 %
67	-	4	0.0 %
68	-	5	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	4823	8.7 %
72	-	3	0.0 %
73	-	2	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	746	1.3 %
77	-	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	509	0.9 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3551	6.4 %
.	-	21635	38.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 29,979 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 72.95
- Median: 75.00

- Mode: 97.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.16

Location: 278-279 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0214: GROUP THERMOMETER: Policemen

Policemen (1992: the police) -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	99	0.2 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	14	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	68	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	13	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	8	0.0 %
30	-	141	0.3 %
35	-	7	0.0 %
40	-	313	0.6 %
45	-	8	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1162	2.1 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	8	0.0 %
60	-	1411	2.5 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	31	0.1 %
70	-	2395	4.3 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	194	0.3 %
80	-	312	0.6 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2889	5.2 %
90	-	271	0.5 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
93	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	37	0.1 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	2585	4.6 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc. 1964-1968: see note preceding VCF0201)	104	0.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1276	2.3 %
.	-	42306	76.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,988 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 74.77
- Median: 80.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.16

Location: 280-281 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0215: GROUP THERMOMETER: Black Militants

Black militants -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	4648	8.3 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	17	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	177	0.3 %
15	-	1535	2.8 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	198	0.4 %
25	-	64	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
30	-	1255	2.3 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	23	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1106	2.0 %
45	-	29	0.1 %
50	-	1588	2.9 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	11	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	462	0.8 %
65	-	12	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	247	0.4 %
75	-	27	0.0 %
80	-	26	0.0 %
85	-	147	0.3 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	19	0.0 %
95	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	103	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	795	1.4 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1561	2.8 %
.	-	41592	74.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,726 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 22.95
- Median: 15.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.01

Location: 282-283 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0216: GROUP THERMOMETER: Civil Rights Leaders

Civil rights leaders -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:

There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:

We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:

(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:

([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1272	2.3 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	6	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	116	0.2 %
15	-	633	1.1 %
20	-	101	0.2 %
25	-	49	0.1 %
30	-	742	1.3 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	17	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1121	2.0 %
45	-	29	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	-	2718	4.9 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	28	0.1 %
60	-	1700	3.1 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	49	0.1 %
70	-	1184	2.1 %
75	-	119	0.2 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	142	0.3 %
82	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	787	1.4 %
90	-	91	0.2 %
91	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	24	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	582	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	597	1.1 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1818	3.3 %
.	-	41728	75.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,531 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 48.86
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 26.33

Location: 284-285 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0217: GROUP THERMOMETER: Chicanos/Hispanics

1976:Chicanos-- feeling thermometer

1980,1984,1988: Hispanics-- feeling thermometer

1992: Hispanic-Americans-- feeling thermometer

1994: Hispanics or Latinos-- feeling thermometer

1996-later: Hispanics (Hispanic-Americans)-- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	303	0.5 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	4	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	25	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	39	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	290	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
19	-	2	0.0 %
20	-	78	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	48	0.1 %
30	-	592	1.1 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	36	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1182	2.1 %
43	-	3	0.0 %
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	66	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	7174	12.9 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	95	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	2856	5.1 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	174	0.3 %
66	-	3	0.0 %
67	-	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	1262	2.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2965	5.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	28755	51.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,692 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 62.52
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.51

Location: 286-287 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0218: GROUP THERMOMETER: Democratic Party

The Democratic Party -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1196	2.1 %
1	-	13	0.0 %
2	-	11	0.0 %
3	-	5	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	41	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	5	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	111	0.2 %
12	-	6	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1080	1.9 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	114	0.2 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	4	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	129	0.2 %
30	-	1729	3.1 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	73	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	2708	4.9 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	97	0.2 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	4	0.0 %
49	-	14	0.0 %
50	-	5693	10.2 %
51	-	14	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
52	-	11	0.0 %
53	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	144	0.3 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	3	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	4638	8.3 %
62	-	3	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	1055	1.9 %
99	99. NA	247	0.4 %
.	-	23355	41.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 31,017 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 59.26
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.35

Location: 288-289 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0219: GROUP THERMOMETER: Middle Class People

Middle class people -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	33	0.1 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	7	0.0 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	13	0.0 %
15	-	14	0.0 %
20	-	8	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	4	0.0 %
30	-	38	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	7	0.0 %
40	-	145	0.3 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	12	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	2350	4.2 %
51	-	4	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	-	45	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1922	3.5 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	94	0.2 %
67	-	4	0.0 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	3435	6.2 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	3	0.0 %
73	-	2	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	373	0.7 %
76	-	5	0.0 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
78	-	9	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	545	1.0 %
81	-	1	0.0 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	4353	7.8 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	282	0.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	2326	4.2 %
.	-	35827	64.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 17,239 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 75.33
- Median: 80.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.81

VCF0220: GROUP THERMOMETER: People on Welfare

People on welfare -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1149	2.1 %
1	-	15	0.0 %
2	-	9	0.0 %
3	-	6	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	35	0.1 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	141	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	-	2	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	1081	1.9 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	234	0.4 %
22	-	3	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	158	0.3 %
29	-	3	0.0 %
30	-	2097	3.8 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	3	0.0 %
34	-	4	0.0 %
35	-	115	0.2 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	5	0.0 %
40	-	3939	7.1 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	198	0.4 %
46	-	4	0.0 %
47	-	6	0.0 %
48	-	8	0.0 %
49	-	17	0.0 %
50	-	7016	12.6 %
51	-	5	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	133	0.2 %
56	-	3	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	4280	7.7 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	863	1.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2953	5.3 %
.	-	24599	44.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 27,259 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.26
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.71

Location: 292-293 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0221: GROUP THERMOMETER: Political Independents

People who call themselves political independents - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	253	0.5 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	5	0.0 %
15	-	141	0.3 %
20	-	14	0.0 %
25	-	6	0.0 %
30	-	213	0.4 %
35	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	299	0.5 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	8	0.0 %
50	-	2047	3.7 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	6	0.0 %
60	-	625	1.1 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	18	0.0 %
70	-	466	0.8 %
75	-	25	0.0 %
78	-	3	0.0 %
80	-	19	0.0 %
85	-	276	0.5 %
90	-	7	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	162	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	635	1.1 %
99	99. NA	56	0.1 %
.	-	50385	90.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,598 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.96
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.46

Location: 294-295 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0222: GROUP THERMOMETER: Political Parties

Political parties, in general -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	502	0.9 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	6	0.0 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	39	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	341	0.6 %
20	-	44	0.1 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	36	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	704	1.3 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	21	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1301	2.3 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	33	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	3	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	4330	7.8 %
51	-	5	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	62	0.1 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2723	4.9 %
65	-	66	0.1 %
67	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	1961	3.5 %
75	-	129	0.2 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	100	0.2 %
85	-	850	1.5 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	40	0.1 %
93	-	2	0.0 %
94	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	6	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	390	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	940	1.7 %
99	99. NA	98	0.2 %
.	-	40913	73.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,723 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.01
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.56

Location: 296-297 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0223: GROUP THERMOMETER: Poor People

Poor people -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	124	0.2 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
2	-	5	0.0 %
3	-	5	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	17	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	6	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	28	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	108	0.2 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	31	0.1 %
25	-	27	0.0 %
30	-	295	0.5 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	24	0.0 %
40	-	685	1.2 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	41	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	5594	10.0 %
51	-	6	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	104	0.2 %
57	-	4	0.0 %
58	-	3	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	5021	9.0 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	4	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	222	0.4 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	3	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
70	-	6123	11.0 %
71	-	3	0.0 %
72	-	4	0.0 %
74	-	3	0.0 %
75	-	681	1.2 %
76	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	895	1.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3526	6.3 %
.	-	19038	34.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 32,215 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 71.45
- Median: 70.00
- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 18.63

Location: 298-299 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0224: GROUP THERMOMETER: Republican Party

The Republican Party -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to

rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2432	4.4 %
1	-	18	0.0 %
2	-	11	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	7	0.0 %
5	-	66	0.1 %
6	-	8	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	176	0.3 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1589	2.9 %
18	-	3	0.0 %
20	-	147	0.3 %
21	-	2	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	125	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	2062	3.7 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	91	0.2 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	3147	5.7 %
41	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	116	0.2 %
46	-	2	0.0 %
47	-	3	0.0 %
48	-	9	0.0 %
49	-	10	0.0 %
50	-	6530	11.7 %
51	-	9	0.0 %
52	-	13	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	131	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	4760	8.5 %
62	-	9	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	1081	1.9 %
99	99. NA	255	0.5 %
.	-	23355	41.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 30,983 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.71
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.02

Location: 300-301 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0225: GROUP THERMOMETER: Womens Libbers

1970-1976,1980,1984: the women's liberation movement--feeling thermometer

1986,1990,1992,1996: the women's movement--feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1429	2.6 %
1	-	5	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	17	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	102	0.2 %
15	-	776	1.4 %
20	-	124	0.2 %
25	-	68	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1002	1.8 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
35	-	20	0.0 %
40	-	1614	2.9 %
45	-	54	0.1 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	4406	7.9 %
51	-	2	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	70	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	3	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	3081	5.5 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	108	0.2 %
70	-	3009	5.4 %
75	-	301	0.5 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
78	-	2	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	313	0.6 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2149	3.9 %
86	-	2	0.0 %
87	-	3	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	211	0.4 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	53	0.1 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1711	3.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	932	1.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	2262	4.1 %
.	-	31811	57.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 20,669 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.32
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.59

Location: 302-303 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0226: GROUP THERMOMETER: Young People

Young people -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	15	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	7	0.0 %
15	-	20	0.0 %
20	-	10	0.0 %
25	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	53	0.1 %
35	-	3	0.0 %
40	-	152	0.3 %
45	-	3	0.0 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	673	1.2 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	6	0.0 %
60	-	981	1.8 %
65	-	18	0.0 %
70	-	1699	3.1 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	93	0.2 %
78	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	155	0.3 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2195	3.9 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	106	0.2 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	22	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1673	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	124	0.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1334	2.4 %
.	-	46320	83.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,896 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 76.24
- Median: 85.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.97

Location: 304-305 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0227: GROUP THERMOMETER: Asian-Americans

Asian-Americans -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	111	0.2 %
1	-	3	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	21	0.0 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	30	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	99	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	29	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	3	0.0 %
25	-	27	0.0 %
30	-	207	0.4 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	16	0.0 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	476	0.9 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	32	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	3	0.0 %
50	-	4198	7.5 %
51	-	2	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	65	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	1621	2.9 %
62	-	4	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	134	0.2 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	2129	3.8 %
71	-	2	0.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
73	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	391	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. NA; no Post IW	1557	2.8 %
.	-	40423	72.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 13,303 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 64.36
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.40

Location: 306-307 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0228: GROUP THERMOMETER: Congress

1998: U.S. Congress -- thermometer

1980,1988,1992,2000-later: Congress (1980,1992: that is, the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives)-- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:

([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	695	1.2 %
1	-	15	0.0 %
2	-	18	0.0 %
3	-	14	0.0 %
4	-	7	0.0 %
5	-	47	0.1 %
6	-	7	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	124	0.2 %
11	-	2	0.0 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	780	1.4 %
20	-	149	0.3 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	129	0.2 %
27	-	2	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1307	2.3 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	5	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	89	0.2 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	2557	4.6 %
41	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	3	0.0 %
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	165	0.3 %
46	-	3	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	11	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	-	4267	7.7 %
51	-	5	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	153	0.3 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	3	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	3493	6.3 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	454	0.8 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2144	3.9 %
.	-	33774	60.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 19,302 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 52.11
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.09

Location: 308-309 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0229: GROUP THERMOMETER: Environmentalists

1980,1988,1990: people seeking to protect the environment --thermometer

1994-later: environmentalists -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you

don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	158	0.3 %
1	-	6	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	7	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	44	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	181	0.3 %
20	-	47	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	37	0.1 %
30	-	398	0.7 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	27	0.0 %
40	-	830	1.5 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	48	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	2195	3.9 %
51	-	8	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	91	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	2527	4.5 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	126	0.2 %
70	-	3027	5.4 %
75	-	366	0.7 %
78	-	3	0.0 %
79	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	491	0.9 %
83	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	2644	4.7 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
88	-	3	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	313	0.6 %
92	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	536	1.0 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	1743	3.1 %
.	-	37194	66.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 16,201 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 68.62
- Median: 70.00

- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.84

Location: 310-311 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0230: GROUP THERMOMETER: Anti-Abortionists

1984: Anti-abortionists -- thermometer

1988,1990: Opponents of abortion -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	576	1.0 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	13	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	71	0.1 %
15	-	258	0.5 %
20	-	68	0.1 %
25	-	35	0.1 %
30	-	379	0.7 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
40	-	476	0.9 %
45	-	18	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1342	2.4 %
55	-	13	0.0 %
60	-	431	0.8 %
65	-	15	0.0 %
70	-	334	0.6 %
75	-	72	0.1 %
80	-	74	0.1 %
85	-	381	0.7 %
90	-	63	0.1 %
95	-	16	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	731	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	258	0.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. Post IW (1984)	635	1.1 %
.	-	49397	88.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,384 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.68
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 29.53

Location: 312-313 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0231: GROUP THERMOMETER: Federal Government

The federal government in Washington -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	850	1.5 %
1	-	15	0.0 %
2	-	16	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	10	0.0 %
5	-	53	0.1 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	7	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	137	0.2 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	897	1.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	133	0.2 %
22	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	2	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	118	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1505	2.7 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	4	0.0 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	113	0.2 %
38	-	5	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	2762	5.0 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	145	0.3 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	7	0.0 %
49	-	14	0.0 %
50	-	3163	5.7 %
51	-	12	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	3	0.0 %
55	-	142	0.3 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	3148	5.7 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	6	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	194	0.3 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	5	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	375	0.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2145	3.9 %
.	-	35055	63.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 18,099 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 50.63
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.43

Location: 314-315 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0232: GROUP THERMOMETER: Gays and Lesbians

Gay men and lesbians (that is), homosexuals -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3934	7.1 %
1	-	44	0.1 %
2	-	17	0.0 %
3	-	8	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	77	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	311	0.6 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	1077	1.9 %
20	-	256	0.5 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	3	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	116	0.2 %
26	-	1	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1122	2.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	45	0.1 %
40	-	1410	2.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	82	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	5	0.0 %
49	-	16	0.0 %
50	-	6751	12.1 %
51	-	6	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
55	-	55	0.1 %
56	-	4	0.0 %
57	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	1497	2.7 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	106	0.2 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1490	2.7 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
74	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	630	1.1 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2361	4.2 %
.	-	31336	56.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 21,347 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 43.18
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.27

Location: 316-317 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0233: GROUP THERMOMETER: Illegal Aliens

Illegal aliens (2004: illegal immigrants) -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2239	4.0 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	12	0.0 %
3	-	7	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	59	0.1 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	163	0.3 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1401	2.5 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	150	0.3 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	85	0.2 %
30	-	1605	2.9 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	5	0.0 %
33	-	4	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	46	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1949	3.5 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	3	0.0 %
45	-	85	0.2 %
48	-	3	0.0 %
49	-	8	0.0 %
50	-	2774	5.0 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
55	-	41	0.1 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	6	0.0 %
60	-	1253	2.3 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	64	0.1 %
67	-	3	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	302	0.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	1352	2.4 %
.	-	39906	71.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 14,114 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 39.10
- Median: 40.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.91

VCF0234: GROUP THERMOMETER: Christian Fundamentalists

Christian fundamentalists -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1108	2.0 %
1	-	13	0.0 %
2	-	20	0.0 %
3	-	10	0.0 %
4	-	9	0.0 %
5	-	59	0.1 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	8	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	149	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	-	4	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	762	1.4 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	167	0.3 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	90	0.2 %
28	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	1004	1.8 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	3	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	62	0.1 %
37	-	2	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1582	2.8 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	103	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	3	0.0 %
49	-	12	0.0 %
50	-	4983	9.0 %
51	-	10	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	73	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	1926	3.5 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	90	0.2 %
66	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	1312	2.4 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	2114	3.8 %
.	-	34874	62.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 17,374 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 52.76
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.25

Location: 320-321 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0235: GROUP THERMOMETER: Radical Students

Radical students -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2573	4.6 %
1	-	3	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	9	0.0 %
10	-	86	0.2 %
15	-	1273	2.3 %
20	-	104	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	20	0.0 %
30	-	1014	1.8 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	4	0.0 %
40	-	1115	2.0 %
45	-	13	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1060	1.9 %
55	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	369	0.7 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	172	0.3 %
75	-	14	0.0 %
80	-	5	0.0 %
85	-	77	0.1 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	5	0.0 %
95	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	39	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	470	0.8 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1207	2.2 %
.	-	46025	82.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,972 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 24.90
- Median: 20.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.62

Location: 322-323 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0236: GROUP THERMOMETER: Farmers

Farmers -- thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	6	0.0 %
20	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	17	0.0 %
35	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	41	0.1 %
50	-	436	0.8 %
55	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	497	0.9 %
65	-	8	0.0 %
70	-	965	1.7 %
75	-	47	0.1 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	106	0.2 %
85	-	1467	2.6 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	88	0.2 %
95	-	17	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1280	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	88	0.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	815	1.5 %
.	-	49780	89.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,991 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 78.70
- Median: 85.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.08

Location: 324-325 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0253: GROUP THERMOMETER: Feminists

Feminists -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:

There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	675	1.2 %
1	-	15	0.0 %
2	-	9	0.0 %
3	-	7	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	37	0.1 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	98	0.2 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	478	0.9 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	120	0.2 %
21	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	79	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	858	1.5 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	58	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1475	2.6 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	3	0.0 %
45	-	118	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	5	0.0 %
49	-	10	0.0 %
50	-	4354	7.8 %
51	-	10	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	91	0.2 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	1955	3.5 %
62	-	4	0.0 %
65	-	149	0.3 %
66	-	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK	668	1.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	1832	3.3 %
.	-	38383	68.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 14,791 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.32
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.50

Location: 326-327 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0290: PARTIES: Major Party Thermometer Avg

Thermometers --both major parties

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	194	0.3 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	7	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	9	0.0 %
6	-	6	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	55	0.1 %
10	-	13	0.0 %
11	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	13	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	130	0.2 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	9	0.0 %
20	-	71	0.1 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
23	-	79	0.1 %
25	-	157	0.3 %
26	-	5	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	105	0.2 %
29	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	465	0.8 %
31	-	6	0.0 %
32	-	3	0.0 %
33	-	118	0.2 %
34	-	8	0.0 %
35	-	671	1.2 %
36	-	8	0.0 %
37	-	5	0.0 %
38	-	468	0.8 %
39	-	7	0.0 %
40	-	649	1.2 %
41	-	8	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
43	-	1289	2.3 %
44	-	5	0.0 %
45	-	1197	2.2 %
46	-	15	0.0 %
47	-	7	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
48	-	179	0.3 %
49	-	1391	2.5 %
50	-	7243	13.0 %
51	-	16	0.0 %
52	-	9	0.0 %
53	-	191	0.3 %
54	-	23	0.0 %
55	-	2757	5.0 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK in VCF0218 or VCF0224	1126	2.0 %
999	999. NA	248	0.4 %
.	-	23355	41.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 30,945 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 55.71
- Median: 55.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 99.00
- Standard Deviation: 14.26

Location: 328-330 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0291: PARTIES: Major Party Thermometer Index

Major party thermometer index

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Most Republican	337	0.6 %
3	-	8	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	27	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	11	0.0 %
8	-	194	0.3 %
9	-	120	0.2 %
10	-	42	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
13	-	38	0.1 %
14	-	9	0.0 %
15	-	522	0.9 %
16	-	4	0.0 %
17	-	104	0.2 %
18	-	41	0.1 %
19	-	4	0.0 %
20	-	174	0.3 %
21	-	4	0.0 %
22	-	80	0.1 %
23	-	650	1.2 %
24	-	3	0.0 %
25	-	164	0.3 %
26	-	4	0.0 %
27	-	201	0.4 %
28	-	590	1.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	609	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	-	3	0.0 %
32	-	108	0.2 %
33	-	433	0.8 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	1032	1.9 %
36	-	2	0.0 %
37	-	88	0.2 %
38	-	575	1.0 %
39	-	9	0.0 %
40	-	1472	2.6 %
41	-	5	0.0 %
42	-	8	0.0 %
43	-	506	0.9 %
44	-	84	0.2 %
45	-	1525	2.7 %
46	-	3	0.0 %
47	-	9	0.0 %
48	-	101	0.2 %
49	-	20	0.0 %
50	50. Neutral	6459	11.6 %
51	-	19	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK in VCF0218 or VCF0224	1196	2.1 %
999	999. NA	257	0.5 %
.	-	23355	41.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 30,866 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.95
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 99.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.31

Location: 331-333 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0301: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- 7-point Scale

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what? (IF REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT) Would you call yourself a strong (REP/DEM) or a not very strong (REP/DEM)? (IF INDEPENDENT, OTHER [1966 AND LATER: OR NO PREFERENCE]; 2008: OR DK) Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Strong Democrat	10805	19.4 %
2	2. Weak Democrat	11261	20.2 %
3	3. Independent - Democrat	6396	11.5 %
4	4. Independent - Independent	6409	11.5 %
5	5. Independent - Republican	5382	9.7 %
6	6. Weak Republican	7413	13.3 %
7	7. Strong Republican	6354	11.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; other; refused to answer; no Pre IW	992	1.8 %
.	-	662	1.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,020 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 334-334 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0302: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Initial Party ID Response

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Republican	10331	18.6 %
2	2. Independent	11962	21.5 %
3	3. No preference; none; neither	2841	5.1 %
4	4. Other	378	0.7 %
5	5. Democrat	16121	29.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	113	0.2 %
9	9. NA; refused	169	0.3 %
.	-	13759	24.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 41,633 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

VCF0303: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Summary 3-Category

Party ID - 3 categories

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats (including leaners)	28462	51.1 %
2	2. Independents	6409	11.5 %
3	3. Republicans (including leaners)	19149	34.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; other; refused to answer; no Pre IW	992	1.8 %
.	-	662	1.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,020 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 3.00

Location: 336-336 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0305: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent- Strength of Partisanship

Party ID - strength of partisanship

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Independent or Apolitical	6801	12.2 %
2	2. Leaning Independent	11776	21.2 %
3	3. Weak Partisan	18793	33.8 %
4	4. Strong Partisan	17158	30.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; other; refused to answer; no Pre IW	484	0.9 %
.	-	662	1.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 54,528 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 337-337 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0306: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent's Father

(1970,1988,1990: When you were growing up) Did he/your father (1988,1992: or stepfather) think of himself mostly as a Democrat, as a Republican, or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	9747	17.5 %
2	2. Independent (some years also: shifted around)	1355	2.4 %
3	3. Republican	5351	9.6 %
4	4. Other; minor party; apolitical; never voted, didn't	1203	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; R had no	1446	2.6 %
9	9. DK (exc. 1988)	2278	4.1 %
.	-	34294	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,656 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 338-338 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0307: PARTISANSHIP: Party Identification of Respondent's Mother

(1970,1988,1990: When you were growing up) Did she/your mother (1988,1992: or stepmother) think of himself mostly as a Democrat, as a Republican, or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	9337	16.8 %
2	2. Independent	1416	2.5 %
3	3. Republican	5061	9.1 %
4	4. Other; minor party; apolitical; never voted, didn't	1702	3.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; R had no	1363	2.4 %
9	9. DK (exc. 1988)	2501	4.5 %
.	-	34294	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,516 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 339-339 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0308: PARTISANSHIP: Political Interest of Respondent's Father

Do you remember when you were growing up whether your father was very much interested in politics, somewhat interested, or didn't he pay much attention to it?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Didn't pay much attention	2309	4.1 %
2	2. Somewhat interested	3028	5.4 %
3	3. Very much interested	3385	6.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; R had no father/father substitute	347	0.6 %
9	9. DK	462	0.8 %
.	-	46143	82.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,722 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 3.00

Location: 340-340 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0309: PARTISANSHIP: Political Interest of Respondent's Mother

Now how about your mother? When you were growing up was she very much interested in politics, somewhat interested, or didn't she pay much attention to it?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Didn't pay much attention	4412	7.9 %
2	2. Somewhat interested	2871	5.2 %
3	3. Very much interested	1600	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; R had no mother/mother substitute	261	0.5 %
9	9. DK	387	0.7 %
.	-	46143	82.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,883 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 3.00

Location: 341-341 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0310: POLITICAL INTEREST: Interest in the Elections

Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you, would you say that you have been/were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in (1952-1998: following) the political campaigns (so far) this year?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much interested	11677	21.0 %
2	2. Somewhat interested	21874	39.3 %
3	3. Very much interested	17264	31.0 %
9	9. DK	15	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; version B (2008)	1468	2.6 %
.	-	3376	6.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 50,830 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 342-342 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0311: POLITICAL INTEREST: Does Respondent Care Which Party Wins Presidential Election

Generally speaking, would you say that you personally care a good deal which party (1992 and later: who) wins the presidential election this fall, or that you don't care very much which party (1992 and later: who) wins?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Don't care very much or DK, pro-con, depends, and	9970	17.9 %
2	2. Care a good deal	23859	42.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW	459	0.8 %
.	-	21386	38.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,829 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 343-343 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0312: POLITICAL INTEREST: Does Respondent Care Which Party Wins Congressional Election

POST ADMINISTRATION:

As you know, representatives to Congress in Washington are being chosen in this election from congressional districts all around the country. How much would you say that you personally cared about the way the elections (1996 AND LATER: election) to the U.S. House of Representatives (1966,1970,1974: to Congress) came out: Did you care very much, pretty much, not very much or not at all?

PRE ADMINISTRATION:

As you know, representatives to Congress in Washington are being chosen in this election from congressional districts all around the country. How much would you say that you personally care about the way the elections (1996 AND LATER: election) to the U.S. House of Representatives (1970,1974: to Congress) come(s) out: Do you care very much, pretty much, not very much or not at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not very much, not at all, DK, pro-con, depends, other	11333	20.4 %
2	2. Very much, pretty much	15939	28.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	720	1.3 %
.	-	27682	49.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,272 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 344-344 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0313: POLITICAL INTEREST: Interest in Public Affairs

1964 AND LATER:
Some people seem to follow (1964: think about) what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?

1960, 1962:
We'd also like to know how much attention you pay to what's going on in politics generally. I mean from day to day, when there isn't any big election campaign going on, would you say you follow politics very closely, fairly closely, or not much at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Hardly at all (1960,1962: not much at all)	5452	9.8 %
2	2. Only now and then	7425	13.3 %
3	3. Some of the time (1960,1962: fairly closely)	13498	24.2 %
4	4. Most of the time (1960,1962: very closely)	10413	18.7 %
9	9. DK	79	0.1 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972); abbrev	4474	8.0 %
.	-	14333	25.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 36,867 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 345-345 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0314: PARTIES: Democratic Party: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	16405	29.5 %
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	6860	12.3 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	4892	8.8 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	2611	4.7 %
4	4. Four positive mentions (likes)	1158	2.1 %
5	5. Five positive mentions (likes)	830	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 346-346 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0315: PARTIES: Democratic Party: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	19117	34.3 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	6502	11.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	3829	6.9 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	1834	3.3 %
4	4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)	847	1.5 %
5	5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)	627	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 347-347 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0316: PARTIES: Democratic Party: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Democratic Party

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-5. Maximum negative	351	0.6 %
-4	-	544	1.0 %
-3	-	1109	2.0 %
-2	-	2167	3.9 %
-1	-	3727	6.7 %
0	0. Neutral	13195	23.7 %
1	-	5280	9.5 %
2	-	3506	6.3 %
3	-	1758	3.2 %
4	-	768	1.4 %
5	+5. Maximum positive	351	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.22
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00

- Minimum: -5.00
- Maximum: 5.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.70

Location: 348-349 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0317: PARTIES: Democratic Party: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Democratic Party

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	10617	19.1 %
1	-	6106	11.0 %
2	-	5997	10.8 %
3	-	4259	7.6 %
4	-	2636	4.7 %
5	-	1766	3.2 %
6	-	770	1.4 %
7	-	382	0.7 %
8	-	134	0.2 %
9	-	63	0.1 %
10	10. Ten mentions	26	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.81
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.83

Location: 350-351 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0318: PARTIES: Republican Party: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	19687	35.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	5956	10.7 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	3764	6.8 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	1933	3.5 %
4	4. Four positive mentions (likes)	835	1.5 %
5	5. Five positive mentions (likes)	581	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 352-352 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0319: PARTIES: Republican Party: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	17753	31.9 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	6868	12.3 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	4328	7.8 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	2166	3.9 %
4	4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)	912	1.6 %
5	5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)	729	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 353-353 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0320: PARTIES: Republican Party: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Republican Party

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-5. Maximum negative	406	0.7 %
-4	-	619	1.1 %
-3	-	1462	2.6 %
-2	-	2843	5.1 %
-1	-	4701	8.4 %
0	0. Neutral	14396	25.9 %
1	-	4067	7.3 %
2	-	2341	4.2 %
3	-	1178	2.1 %
4	-	506	0.9 %
5	+5. Maximum positive	237	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: -0.12
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -5.00
- Maximum: 5.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.63

Location: 354-355 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0321: PARTIES: Republican Party: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Republican Party

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	11962	21.5 %
1	-	6043	10.9 %
2	-	5560	10.0 %
3	-	4000	7.2 %
4	-	2335	4.2 %
5	-	1632	2.9 %
6	-	695	1.2 %
7	-	321	0.6 %
8	-	131	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	-	55	0.1 %
10	10. Ten mentions	22	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.67
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.80

Location: 356-357 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0322: PARTIES: Major Parties: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Net affect toward major parties

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-10	-10. Maximum Republican	42	0.1 %
-9	-	75	0.1 %
-8	-	168	0.3 %
-7	-	288	0.5 %
-6	-	484	0.9 %
-5	-	694	1.2 %
-4	-	1094	2.0 %
-3	-	1494	2.7 %
-2	-	2030	3.6 %
-1	-	2801	5.0 %
0	0. Neutral	10940	19.7 %
1	-	3454	6.2 %
2	-	2932	5.3 %
3	-	2240	4.0 %
4	-	1559	2.8 %
5	-	1025	1.8 %
6	-	637	1.1 %
7	-	401	0.7 %
8	-	244	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	-	111	0.2 %
10	+10. Maximum Democrat	43	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.33
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -10.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.85

Location: 358-360 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0323: PARTIES: Major Parties: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Major party salience

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	8479	15.2 %
1	-	2980	5.4 %
2	-	3596	6.5 %
3	-	3385	6.1 %
4	-	3282	5.9 %
5	-	2858	5.1 %
6	-	2301	4.1 %
7	-	1681	3.0 %
8	-	1394	2.5 %
9	-	974	1.7 %
10	-	684	1.2 %
11	-	435	0.8 %
12	-	288	0.5 %
13	-	185	0.3 %
14	-	96	0.2 %
15	-	57	0.1 %
16	-	40	0.1 %
17	-	22	0.0 %
18	-	11	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	6	0.0 %
20	20. Twenty mentions	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.49
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 20.00
- Standard Deviation: 3.29

Location: 361-362 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0324: PARTIES: Major Parties: Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Relative salience of major parties

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-10	-10. Ten Republican mentions, no Democratic	0	0.0 %
-9	-	1	0.0 %
-8	-	4	0.0 %
-7	-	15	0.0 %
-6	-	35	0.1 %
-5	-	123	0.2 %
-4	-	382	0.7 %
-3	-	949	1.7 %
-2	-	2119	3.8 %
-1	-	4544	8.2 %
0	0. No mentions	14071	25.3 %
1	-	5468	9.8 %
2	-	2996	5.4 %
3	-	1276	2.3 %
4	-	513	0.9 %
5	-	192	0.3 %
6	-	50	0.1 %
7	-	15	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	+10. Ten Democratic mentions, no Republican	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); form B (1986); form A	4419	7.9 %
.	-	18499	33.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,756 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.14
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -9.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.53

Location: 363-365 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0338: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Intelligent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3823	6.9 %
2	2. Quite well	6816	12.2 %
3	3. Not too well	2285	4.1 %
4	4. Not well at all	957	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post	3389	6.1 %
8	8. DK	183	0.3 %
9	9. NA	71	0.1 %
.	-	38150	68.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,881 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 366-366 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0339: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Compassionate

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1516	2.7 %
2	2. Quite well	4243	7.6 %
3	3. Not too well	2523	4.5 %
4	4. Not well at all	789	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986)	1226	2.2 %
8	8. DK	306	0.5 %
9	9. NA	69	0.1 %
.	-	45002	80.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,071 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 367-367 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0340: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Decent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1495	2.7 %
2	2. Quite well	2792	5.0 %
3	3. Not too well	560	1.0 %
4	4. Not well at all	175	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986)	1226	2.2 %
8	8. DK	165	0.3 %
9	9. NA	60	0.1 %
.	-	49201	88.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,022 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 368-368 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0341: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Inspiring

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1754	3.2 %
2	2. Quite well	4364	7.8 %
3	3. Not too well	4099	7.4 %
4	4. Not well at all	1682	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986)	1226	2.2 %
8	8. DK	433	0.8 %
9	9. NA	146	0.3 %
.	-	41970	75.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,899 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 369-369 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0342: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Knowledgeable

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	4858	8.7 %
2	2. Quite well	9970	17.9 %
3	3. Not too well	3542	6.4 %
4	4. Not well at all	1326	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post	3373	6.1 %
8	8. DK	380	0.7 %
9	9. NA	183	0.3 %
.	-	32042	57.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,696 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 370-370 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0343: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Moral

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3852	6.9 %
2	2. Quite well	7897	14.2 %
3	3. Not too well	4542	8.2 %
4	4. Not well at all	3107	5.6 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post	3378	6.1 %
8	8. DK	664	1.2 %
9	9. NA	192	0.3 %
.	-	32042	57.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,398 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 371-371 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0344: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Leadership

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3701	6.6 %
2	2. Quite well	7969	14.3 %
3	3. Not too well	5591	10.0 %
4	4. Not well at all	2458	4.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post	3388	6.1 %
8	8. DK	353	0.6 %
9	9. NA	172	0.3 %
.	-	32042	57.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,719 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 372-372 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0345: CANDIDATE TRAITS: President- Cares

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	2152	3.9 %
2	2. Quite well	5770	10.4 %
3	3. Not too well	5188	9.3 %
4	4. Not well at all	3564	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); R selected for Post	3389	6.1 %
8	8. DK	432	0.8 %
9	9. NA	105	0.2 %
.	-	35074	63.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 373-373 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0346: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Angry

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	13736	24.7 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)	12727	22.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post	1353	2.4 %
8	8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)	54	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	165	0.3 %
.	-	27639	49.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,463 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

- 200 -

• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 374-374 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0347: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Afraid

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	8034	14.4 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)	18443	33.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post	1353	2.4 %
8	8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)	45	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	160	0.3 %
.	-	27639	49.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,477 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 375-375 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0348: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Hopeful

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	14622	26.3 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)	11818	21.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post	1353	2.4 %
8	8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)	71	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	171	0.3 %
.	-	27639	49.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,440 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 376-376 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0349: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: President- Proud

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	13660	24.5 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980,1982 only: DK)	12758	22.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Form B (1986); no Post IW; R selected for Post	1353	2.4 %
8	8. DK (exc. 1980-1984)	82	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	182	0.3 %
.	-	27639	49.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,418 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 377-377 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0350: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Intelligent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3530	6.3 %
2	2. Quite well	6962	12.5 %
3	3. Not too well	1234	2.2 %
4	4. Not well at all	268	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	585	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA	69	0.1 %
.	-	41837	75.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,994 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 378-378 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0351: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Compassionate

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1199	2.2 %
2	2. Quite well	4582	8.2 %
3	3. Not too well	1563	2.8 %
4	4. Not well at all	299	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	791	1.4 %
9	9. NA	62	0.1 %
.	-	47178	84.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,643 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 379-379 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0352: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Decent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	700	1.3 %
2	2. Quite well	2748	4.9 %
3	3. Not too well	352	0.6 %
4	4. Not well at all	83	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	362	0.7 %
9	9. NA	52	0.1 %
.	-	51377	92.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,883 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 380-380 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0353: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Inspiring

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	981	1.8 %
2	2. Quite well	3604	6.5 %
3	3. Not too well	3564	6.4 %
4	4. Not well at all	1191	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	636	1.1 %
9	9. NA	134	0.2 %
.	-	45564	81.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,340 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 381-381 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0354: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Knowledgeable

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3094	5.6 %
2	2. Quite well	7881	14.2 %
3	3. Not too well	2039	3.7 %
4	4. Not well at all	430	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	675	1.2 %
9	9. NA	143	0.3 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,444 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 382-382 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0355: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Moral

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	2280	4.1 %
2	2. Quite well	6546	11.8 %
3	3. Not too well	2930	5.3 %
4	4. Not well at all	1203	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	1156	2.1 %
9	9. NA	147	0.3 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,959 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 383-383 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0356: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Leadership

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1812	3.3 %
2	2. Quite well	5476	9.8 %
3	3. Not too well	4243	7.6 %
4	4. Not well at all	1536	2.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	1053	1.9 %
9	9. NA	142	0.3 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,067 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 384-384 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0357: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Cares

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1996	3.6 %
2	2. Quite well	5296	9.5 %
3	3. Not too well	3053	5.5 %
4	4. Not well at all	1237	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	987	1.8 %
9	9. NA	79	0.1 %
.	-	41837	75.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,582 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 385-385 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0358: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Angry

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	7856	14.1 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	13286	23.9 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	62	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	161	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,142 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 386-386 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0359: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Afraid

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	5348	9.6 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	15813	28.4 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	52	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	152	0.3 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,161 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 387-387 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0360: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Hopeful

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	11516	20.7 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	9610	17.3 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	73	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	166	0.3 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,126 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 388-388 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0361: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Democratic Presidential Cand- Proud

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	9166	16.5 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	11897	21.4 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	110	0.2 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	192	0.3 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,063 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 389-389 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0362: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Intelligent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	2590	4.7 %
2	2. Quite well	5617	10.1 %
3	3. Not too well	1767	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. Not well at all	635	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	277	0.5 %
9	9. NA	48	0.1 %
.	-	43551	78.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,609 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 390-390 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0363: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Compassionate

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	909	1.6 %
2	2. Quite well	2929	5.3 %
3	3. Not too well	1989	3.6 %
4	4. Not well at all	544	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	365	0.7 %
9	9. NA	46	0.1 %
.	-	48892	87.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,371 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 391-391 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0364: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Decent

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1141	2.0 %
2	2. Quite well	2331	4.2 %
3	3. Not too well	476	0.9 %
4	4. Not well at all	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	190	0.3 %
9	9. NA	42	0.1 %
.	-	51377	92.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,065 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 392-392 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0365: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Inspiring

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1051	1.9 %
2	2. Quite well	3243	5.8 %
3	3. Not too well	3844	6.9 %
4	4. Not well at all	1388	2.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	460	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA	124	0.2 %
.	-	45564	81.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,526 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 393-393 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0366: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Knowledgeable

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	2959	5.3 %
2	2. Quite well	7462	13.4 %
3	3. Not too well	2468	4.4 %
4	4. Not well at all	788	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	451	0.8 %
9	9. NA	134	0.2 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,677 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 394-394 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0367: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Moral

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	3250	5.8 %
2	2. Quite well	6764	12.1 %
3	3. Not too well	2486	4.5 %
4	4. Not well at all	733	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	899	1.6 %
9	9. NA	130	0.2 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,233 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 395-395 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0368: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Leadership

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	2394	4.3 %
2	2. Quite well	5868	10.5 %
3	3. Not too well	3893	7.0 %
4	4. Not well at all	1346	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	631	1.1 %
9	9. NA	130	0.2 %
.	-	40223	72.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,501 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 396-396 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0369: CANDIDATE TRAITS: Republican Presidential Cand- Cares

I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...

Think about [NAME].

The first phrase is [TRAIT] In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all? (What about) [NEXT TRAIT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely well	1281	2.3 %
2	2. Quite well	3922	7.0 %
3	3. Not too well	4182	7.5 %
4	4. Not well at all	2620	4.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	INAP, split versions: not asked (2008)	1189	2.1 %
8	8. DK	580	1.0 %
9	9. NA	63	0.1 %
.	-	41837	75.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,005 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 397-397 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0370: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Angry

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	8295	14.9 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	12859	23.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	76	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	135	0.2 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,154 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 398-398 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0371: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Afraid

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	6328	11.4 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	14836	26.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	72	0.1 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	129	0.2 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,164 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 399-399 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0372: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Hopeful

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	9160	16.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	11960	21.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	103	0.2 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	142	0.3 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,120 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 400-400 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0373: CANDIDATE AFFECTS: Republican Presidential Cand- Proud

Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME]. Has [NAME] -- because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done -- made you feel [AFFECT]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, have felt	8207	14.7 %
2	2. No, haven't felt (1980 only: DK)	12882	23.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK (exc. 1980,1984)	113	0.2 %
9	9. NA (1984 only: DK)	163	0.3 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,089 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 401-401 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0374: PARTIES: Likes Anything about Democratic party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	15455	27.8 %
5	5. No	14240	25.6 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK	1821	3.3 %
9	9. RF; NA	173	0.3 %
.	-	23985	43.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,695 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 402-402 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0375A: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	1	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	27	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	1	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	6	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	7	0.0 %
6	Truman	4	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	48	0.1 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	4	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	30	0.1 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	15	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	3	0.0 %
13	Muskie	1	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	8	0.0 %
15	Wallace	3	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	5	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	53	0.1 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	3	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	7	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	2	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	2	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	2	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	1	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	37	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	27	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	110	0.2 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	3	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	17	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	22	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	51	0.1 %
8889	Refused	79	0.1 %
.	-	44681	80.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 10,863 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 403-406 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0375B: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	450	0.8 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	1604	2.9 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	8	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	3	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	34	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	9	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	275	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	1768	3.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1667	3.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	137	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	4417	7.9 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	459	0.8 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	51	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	79	0.1 %
.	-	44713	80.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,831 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 407-408 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0375C: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9987	Don't know anything about party, can't say anything about them one way or another, don't mess in politics (ne	236	0.4 %
9988	DK	134	0.2 %
9989	RF; NA	30	0.1 %
.	-	49806	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,468 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 409-412 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0375D: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	770	1.4 %
2	02. Government management	123	0.2 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	455	0.8 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	889	1.6 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	282	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	06. Foreign policy	99	0.2 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	14	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	2095	3.8 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	804	1.4 %
10	10. Other	337	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49806	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,868 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 413-414 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0376A: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	3	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	18	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	2	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	7	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	9	0.0 %
6	Truman	10	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	70	0.1 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	16	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	2	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	2	0.0 %
15	Wallace	1	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	2	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	19	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	2	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	Lieberman, Joseph	2	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	1	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	1	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	29	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	13	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	45	0.1 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	1	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	7	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	10	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49341	88.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 6,333 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 415-418 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0376B: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	280	0.5 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	563	1.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	5	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	3	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	12	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	4	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	201	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	893	1.6 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1944	3.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	208	0.4 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	1962	3.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	250	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49349	88.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,325 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 419-420 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0376C: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52508	94.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,166 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 421-424 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0376D: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	208	0.4 %
2	02. Government management	84	0.2 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	262	0.5 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	804	1.4 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	256	0.5 %
6	06. Foreign policy	102	0.2 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	32	0.1 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	929	1.7 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	301	0.5 %
10	10. Other	188	0.3 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	52508	94.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,166 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 425-426 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0377A: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	6	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	10	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	2	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	4	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	10	0.0 %
6	Truman	8	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	26	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	10	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	2	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	15	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	3	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	1	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	1	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	1	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	1	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	11	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	10	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	28	0.1 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	2	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	8	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52581	94.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,093 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 427-430 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0377B: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	163	0.3 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	219	0.4 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	1	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	5	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	1	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	110	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	391	0.7 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1268	2.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	150	0.3 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	684	1.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	99	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52583	94.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,091 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 431-432 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0377C: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54159	97.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,515 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1010.00
• Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 433-436 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0377D: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	130	0.2 %
2	02. Government management	37	0.1 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	113	0.2 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	395	0.7 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	132	0.2 %
6	06. Foreign policy	86	0.2 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	14	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	327	0.6 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	164	0.3 %
10	10. Other	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54159	97.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,515 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 10.00

Location: 437-438 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0378A: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	1	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	6	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	1	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	1	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	2	0.0 %
6	Truman	6	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	6	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	3	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	3	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	1	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	5	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	1	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	6	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	2	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54358	97.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,316 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8801.00

Location: 439-442 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0378B: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	52	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	71	0.1 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	0	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	40	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	177	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	604	1.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	76	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	256	0.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	37	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54359	97.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,315 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 443-444 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0378C: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55031	98.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 643 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1010.00
- Maximum: 1950.00

Location: 445-448 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0378D: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	69	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	19	0.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	59	0.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	169	0.3 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	58	0.1 %
6	06. Foreign policy	29	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	7	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	114	0.2 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	77	0.1 %
10	10. Other	42	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55031	98.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 643 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 449-450 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0379A: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	1	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	2	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	2	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	2	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	5	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	3	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	1	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	2	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	6	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55085	98.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 451-454 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0379B: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	27	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	37	0.1 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	0	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	11	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	78	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	268	0.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	45	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	110	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	11	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55085	98.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 455-456 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0379C: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55442	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 232 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1010.00
- Maximum: 1980.00

Location: 457-460 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0379D: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	27	0.0 %
2	02. Government management	10	0.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	19	0.0 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	42	0.1 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	22	0.0 %
6	06. Foreign policy	19	0.0 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	3	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	29	0.1 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	37	0.1 %
10	10. Other	24	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55442	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 232 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 10.00

Location: 461-462 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0380: PARTIES: Dislikes Anything about Democratic party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	13067	23.5 %
5	5. No	17061	30.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	1394	2.5 %
9	9. RF; NA	167	0.3 %
.	-	23985	43.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,128 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 463-463 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0381A: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	7	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	3	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	14	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	5	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	4	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	80	0.1 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	75	0.1 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	30	0.1 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	3	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	10	0.0 %
15	Wallace	2	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	6	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	83	0.1 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	4	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	4	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	4	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	1	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	3	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	1	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	52	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	14	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	4	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	222	0.4 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	8	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	25	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	33	0.1 %
8889	Refused	36	0.1 %
.	-	46268	83.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,337 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 464-467 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0381B: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	665	1.2 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	1601	2.9 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	4	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	18	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	25	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	32	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	1591	2.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	2349	4.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1685	3.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	536	1.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	518	0.9 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	302	0.5 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	33	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	36	0.1 %
.	-	46279	83.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,326 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 468-469 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0381C: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
9987	Don't know anything about party, can't say anything about them one way or another, don't mess in politics (ne	43	0.1 %
9988	DK	108	0.2 %
9989	RF; NA	25	0.0 %
.	-	51200	92.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,298 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 470-473 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0381D: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	662	1.2 %
2	02. Government management	811	1.5 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	600	1.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	278	0.5 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	298	0.5 %
6	06. Foreign policy	597	1.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	159	0.3 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	50	0.1 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	699	1.3 %
10	10. Other	320	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	51200	92.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,474 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 474-475 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0382A: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	6	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	2	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	10	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	9	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	9	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	8	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	26	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	12	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	8	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	5	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	34	0.1 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	9	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	6	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	1	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	3	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	2	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	16	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	15	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	55	0.1 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	4	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	15	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50707	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,967 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8889.00

Location: 476-479 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0382B: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	259	0.5 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	514	0.9 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	7	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	18	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	20	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	7	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	796	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	1051	1.9 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1412	2.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	334	0.6 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	363	0.7 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	186	0.3 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50707	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,967 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 480-481 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0382C: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53497	96.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,177 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 482-485 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0382D: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	229	0.4 %
2	02. Government management	350	0.6 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	324	0.6 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	234	0.4 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	165	0.3 %
6	06. Foreign policy	310	0.6 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	87	0.2 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	60	0.1 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	272	0.5 %
10	10. Other	146	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53497	96.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,177 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 486-487 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0383A: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	6	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	3	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	1	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	7	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	6	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	3	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	11	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	5	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	1	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	1	0.0 %
15	Wallace	1	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	25	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	4	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	3	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	2	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	2	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	14	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	6	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	15	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	3	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53399	95.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,275 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8889.00

Location: 488-491 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0383B: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	134	0.2 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	213	0.4 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	1	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	5	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	6	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	8	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	269	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	437	0.8 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	769	1.4 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	172	0.3 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	179	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	81	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	53400	95.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,274 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 492-493 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0383C: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54634	98.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,040 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

VCF0383D: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	111	0.2 %
2	02. Government management	172	0.3 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	133	0.2 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	136	0.2 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	101	0.2 %
6	06. Foreign policy	153	0.3 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	39	0.1 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	25	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	112	0.2 %
10	10. Other	58	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54634	98.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,040 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

VCF0384A: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	4	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	1	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	5	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	4	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	8	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	1	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	10	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	2	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	1	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	1	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	1	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	9	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	2	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	9	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54709	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 965 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 1305.00

Location: 500-503 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0384B: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	67	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	76	0.1 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	3	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	1	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	106	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	177	0.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	340	0.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	87	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	81	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	25	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54709	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 965 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 504-505 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

VCF0384C: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacilating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55184	99.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 490 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 506-509 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0384D: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	50	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	70	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	56	0.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	69	0.1 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	42	0.1 %
6	06. Foreign policy	82	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	15	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	9	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	60	0.1 %
10	10. Other	37	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55184	99.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 490 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 510-511 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0385A: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	1	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	1	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	1	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	1	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	2	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	2	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	3	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	1	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	1	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55272	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 402 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 512-515 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0385B: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	20	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	25	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	2	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	40	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	59	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	157	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	45	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	36	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	17	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55272	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 402 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 516-517 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0385C: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55449	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 225 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2010.00
- Maximum: 2982.00

Location: 518-521 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0385D: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Democratic party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Democratic Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	30	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	38	0.1 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	22	0.0 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	26	0.0 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	23	0.0 %
6	06. Foreign policy	37	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	12	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	7	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	15	0.0 %
10	10. Other	15	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	55449	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 225 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 522-523 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0386: PARTIES: Likes Anything about Republican party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	12121	21.8 %
5	5. No	17955	32.3 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	1446	2.6 %
9	9. RF; NA	167	0.3 %
.	-	23985	43.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,076 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 524-524 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0387A: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	2	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	10	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	73	0.1 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	3	0.0 %
35	Reagan	198	0.4 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	32	0.1 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	49	0.1 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	2	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	1	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	2	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	1	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	4	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	9	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	1	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	73	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	21	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	195	0.4 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	1	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	7	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	53	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	41	0.1 %
8889	Refused	102	0.2 %
.	-	46740	84.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 8,791 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 525-528 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0387B: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	742	1.3 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	1004	1.8 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	25	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	5	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	29	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	11	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	999	1.8 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	2340	4.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1784	3.2 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	850	1.5 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	548	1.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	431	0.8 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	41	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	102	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	46763	84.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,768 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 529-530 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0387C: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9987	Don't know anything about party, can't say anything about them one way or another, don't mess in politics (ne	210	0.4 %
9988	DK	161	0.3 %
9989	RF; NA	33	0.1 %
.	-	51013	91.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,257 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 3010.00
• Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 531-534 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0387D: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	1267	2.3 %
2	02. Government management	573	1.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	722	1.3 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	307	0.6 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	175	0.3 %
6	06. Foreign policy	501	0.9 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	23	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	168	0.3 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	540	1.0 %
10	10. Other	385	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	51013	91.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,661 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 10.00

Location: 535-536 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0388A: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	7	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	16	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	6	0.0 %
35	Reagan	73	0.1 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	8	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	20	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	1	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	4	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	5	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	25	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	14	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	58	0.1 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	8	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	16	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50712	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,962 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 537-540 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0388B: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	265	0.5 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	312	0.6 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	11	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	12	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	17	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	4	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	631	1.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	982	1.8 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1537	2.8 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	660	1.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	306	0.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	221	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50716	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,958 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 541-542 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0388C: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53512	96.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,162 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 3010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 543-546 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0388D: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	238	0.4 %
2	02. Government management	350	0.6 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	299	0.5 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	241	0.4 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	118	0.2 %
6	06. Foreign policy	336	0.6 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	26	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	120	0.2 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	217	0.4 %
10	10. Other	217	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53512	96.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,162 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 547-548 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0389A: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	1	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	2	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	4	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	8	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	1	0.0 %
35	Reagan	24	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	4	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	15	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	1	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	13	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	2	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	29	0.1 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	1	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	5	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53324	95.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,350 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 8802.00

Location: 549-552 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0389B: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	111	0.2 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	131	0.2 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	6	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	4	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	9	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	1	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	230	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	439	0.8 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	854	1.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	355	0.6 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	117	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	91	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53326	95.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,348 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 553-554 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0389C: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54674	98.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,000 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 3010.00
- Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 555-558 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0389D: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	115	0.2 %
2	02. Government management	146	0.3 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	110	0.2 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	134	0.2 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	71	0.1 %
6	06. Foreign policy	150	0.3 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	16	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	46	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	103	0.2 %
10	10. Other	109	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54674	98.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,000 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 559-560 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0390A: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	3	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	15	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	2	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	2	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	6	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	2	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	13	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54714	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 960 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 1305.00

Location: 561-564 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0390B: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	47	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	44	0.1 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	4	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	0	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	84	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	159	0.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	391	0.7 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	151	0.3 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	55	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	25	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54714	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 960 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 565-566 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0390C: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55245	99.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 3010.00
- Maximum: 9987.00

Location: 567-570 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0390D: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	36	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	55	0.1 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	57	0.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	55	0.1 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	34	0.1 %
6	06. Foreign policy	70	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	9	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	25	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	37	0.1 %
10	10. Other	51	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55245	99.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 571-572 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0391A: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	6	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	1	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	1	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	2	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	2	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55269	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 405 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 32.00
- Maximum: 1223.00

Location: 573-576 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0391B: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	17	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	14	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	0	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	42	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	63	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	177	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	65	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	17	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	9	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55269	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 405 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 577-578 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0391C: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55506	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 168 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 3010.00
- Maximum: 3980.00

Location: 579-582 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0391D: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	16	0.0 %
2	02. Government management	23	0.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	21	0.0 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	13	0.0 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	9	0.0 %
6	06. Foreign policy	33	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	3	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	3	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	19	0.0 %
10	10. Other	28	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55506	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 168 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 583-584 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0392: PARTIES: Dislikes Anything about Republican party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	15070	27.1 %
5	5. No	15104	27.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	1330	2.4 %
9	9. RF; NA	185	0.3 %
.	-	23985	43.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,174 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 585-585 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0393A: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	1	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	2	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	3	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	116	0.2 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	4	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	2	0.0 %
35	Reagan	123	0.2 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	23	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	46	0.1 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	2	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	7	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	1	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	13	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	60	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	11	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	1	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	108	0.2 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	19	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	21	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	28	0.1 %
8889	Refused	52	0.1 %
.	-	45176	81.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 10,418 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7.00
- Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 586-589 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0393B: PARTIES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	568	1.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	1351	2.4 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	7	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	23	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	23	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	36	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	733	1.3 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	1363	2.4 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1747	3.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	536	1.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	3613	6.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	407	0.7 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	28	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	52	0.1 %
.	-	45187	81.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,407 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 590-591 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0393C: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9987	Don't know anything about party, can't say anything about them one way or another, don't mess in politics (ne	57	0.1 %
9988	DK	129	0.2 %
9989	RF; NA	27	0.0 %
.	-	50883	91.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,578 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 4010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 592-595 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0393D: PARTIES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	720	1.3 %
2	02. Government management	199	0.4 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	451	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	639	1.1 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	317	0.6 %
6	06. Foreign policy	214	0.4 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	951	1.7 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	418	0.8 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	599	1.1 %
10	10. Other	283	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50883	91.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,791 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 596-597 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0394A: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	5	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	44	0.1 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	4	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	5	0.0 %
35	Reagan	56	0.1 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	9	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	19	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	3	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	12	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	4	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	3	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	5	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	41	0.1 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	10	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	38	0.1 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	7	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	18	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49813	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,861 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 598-601 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0394B: PARTIES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	289	0.5 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	466	0.8 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	2	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	8	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	18	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	15	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	313	0.6 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	741	1.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1680	3.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	424	0.8 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	1665	3.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	239	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49814	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,860 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 602-603 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0394C: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53393	95.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,281 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 4010.00
- Maximum: 9987.00

Location: 604-607 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0394D: PARTIES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	201	0.4 %
2	02. Government management	105	0.2 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	142	0.3 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	385	0.7 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	163	0.3 %
6	06. Foreign policy	163	0.3 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	323	0.6 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	471	0.8 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	228	0.4 %
10	10. Other	100	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	53393	95.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,281 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 608-609 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0395A: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	1	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	1	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	1	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	18	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	41	0.1 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	4	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	12	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	3	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	1	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	3	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	1	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	5	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	1	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	23	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	7	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	13	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	6	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52826	94.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,848 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 610-613 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0395B: PARTIES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	150	0.3 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	236	0.4 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	0	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	1	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	6	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	8	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	163	0.3 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	330	0.6 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	890	1.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	258	0.5 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	698	1.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	108	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52826	94.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,848 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 614-615 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0395C: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54712	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 962 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 4010.00
• Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 616-619 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0395D: PARTIES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	90	0.2 %
2	02. Government management	42	0.1 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	56	0.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	205	0.4 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	87	0.2 %
6	06. Foreign policy	59	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	98	0.2 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	189	0.3 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	95	0.2 %
10	10. Other	41	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54712	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 962 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 10.00

Location: 620-621 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0396A: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	1	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	6	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	1	0.0 %
35	Reagan	12	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	6	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	6	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	1	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	3	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	1	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	3	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	5	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	1	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	10	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	5	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54462	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,212 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 622-625 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0396B: PARTIES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	62	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	85	0.2 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	2	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	2	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	3	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	4	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	64	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	139	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	433	0.8 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	124	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	253	0.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	41	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54462	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,212 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 626-627 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0396C: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55276	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 398 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 4010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 628-631 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0396D: PARTIES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	39	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	15	0.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	29	0.1 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	88	0.2 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	43	0.1 %
6	06. Foreign policy	28	0.1 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	42	0.1 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	55	0.1 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	43	0.1 %
10	10. Other	16	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55276	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 398 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 632-633 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0397A: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	1	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	5	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	2	0.0 %
35	Reagan	7	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	1	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	5	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	1	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	2	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55115	99.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 559 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 634-637 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0397B: PARTIES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	27	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	39	0.1 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	1	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	0	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	1	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	33	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	67	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	214	0.4 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	67	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	95	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	13	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55115	99.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 559 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 638-639 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0397C: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55515	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 159 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 4010.00
• Maximum: 9989.00

Location: 640-643 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0397D: PARTIES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Party COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular that you don't like about the Republican party? What is that? Anything else [you don't like about the Republican Party]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. People within party	30	0.1 %
2	02. Government management	9	0.0 %
3	03. Government activity, government philosophy	10	0.0 %
4	04. Domestic policies, welfare and economic	29	0.1 %
5	05. Domestic policies, other	20	0.0 %
6	06. Foreign policy	8	0.0 %
7	07. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	7	0.0 %
8	08. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	26	0.0 %
9	09. General party attitudes/responses	14	0.0 %
10	10. Other	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55515	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 159 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 10.00

Location: 644-645 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0401: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Now I'd like to ask you about the good and bad points of the two (1996 and later: "the major") candidates for President. Is there anything in particular about [Democratic presidential candidate] that might make you want to vote for him? What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	11604	20.8 %
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	4358	7.8 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	3538	6.4 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	2412	4.3 %
4	4. Four positive mentions (likes)	1339	2.4 %
5	5. Five positive mentions (likes)	1307	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00

• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 646-646 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0402: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular about [Democratic presidential candidate] that might make you want to vote against him? What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	11586	20.8 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	5399	9.7 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	3692	6.6 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	2109	3.8 %
4	4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)	980	1.8 %
5	5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)	792	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 647-647 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0403: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Democratic Presidential candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-5. Maximum negative	558	1.0 %
-4	-	751	1.3 %
-3	-	1530	2.7 %
-2	-	2466	4.4 %
-1	-	3319	6.0 %
0	0. Neutral	6149	11.0 %
1	-	3498	6.3 %
2	-	2674	4.8 %
3	-	1831	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1043	1.9 %
5	+5. Maximum positive	739	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.15
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -5.00
- Maximum: 5.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.19

Location: 648-649 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0404: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Democratic Presidential candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	4475	8.0 %
1	-	4715	8.5 %
2	-	5078	9.1 %
3	-	4192	7.5 %
4	-	2635	4.7 %
5	-	2156	3.9 %
6	-	722	1.3 %
7	-	351	0.6 %
8	-	142	0.3 %
9	-	61	0.1 %
10	10. Ten mentions	31	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.34
- Median: 2.00

- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.85

Location: 650-651 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0405: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Now I'd like to ask you about the good and bad points of the two (1996 and later: the major) candidates for President. Is there anything in particular about [Republican presidential candidate] that might make you want to vote for him? What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	11253	20.2 %
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	4189	7.5 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	3711	6.7 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	2613	4.7 %
4	4. Four positive mentions (likes)	1363	2.4 %
5	5. Five positive mentions (likes)	1429	2.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 652-652 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0406: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular about [Republican presidential candidate] that might make you want to vote against him? What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	10954	19.7 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	5466	9.8 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	3730	6.7 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	2199	3.9 %
4	4. Four negative mentions (dislikes)	1086	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. Five negative mentions (dislikes)	1123	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 653-653 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0407: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Republican Presidential candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-5. Maximum negative	785	1.4 %
-4	-	811	1.5 %
-3	-	1564	2.8 %
-2	-	2462	4.4 %
-1	-	3350	6.0 %
0	0. Neutral	5903	10.6 %
1	-	3227	5.8 %
2	-	2684	4.8 %
3	-	1861	3.3 %
4	-	1033	1.9 %
5	+5. Maximum positive	878	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.10
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -5.00
- Maximum: 5.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.29

Location: 654-655 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

VCF0408: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Republican Presidential candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	4082	7.3 %
1	-	4299	7.7 %
2	-	4952	8.9 %
3	-	4238	7.6 %
4	-	2859	5.1 %
5	-	2657	4.8 %
6	-	806	1.4 %
7	-	401	0.7 %
8	-	161	0.3 %
9	-	70	0.1 %
10	10. Ten mentions	33	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.51
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.90

Location: 656-657 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0409: CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Net affect toward Major party Presidential candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-10	-10. Maximum Republican	132	0.2 %
-9	-	216	0.4 %
-8	-	332	0.6 %
-7	-	574	1.0 %
-6	-	786	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-	1114	2.0 %
-4	-	1469	2.6 %
-3	-	1648	3.0 %
-2	-	1978	3.6 %
-1	-	2034	3.7 %
0	0. Neutral	3724	6.7 %
1	-	2178	3.9 %
2	-	1995	3.6 %
3	-	1725	3.1 %
4	-	1426	2.6 %
5	-	1069	1.9 %
6	-	842	1.5 %
7	-	545	1.0 %
8	-	343	0.6 %
9	-	243	0.4 %
10	+10. Maximum Democratic	185	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. No Pre IW; form II (1972)	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.04
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -10.00
- Maximum: 10.00
- Standard Deviation: 3.92

Location: 658-660 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0410: CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Major party Presidential candidate salience

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	2220	4.0 %
1	-	1786	3.2 %
2	-	2481	4.5 %
3	-	2756	5.0 %
4	-	2973	5.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	2810	5.0 %
6	-	2492	4.5 %
7	-	2041	3.7 %
8	-	1579	2.8 %
9	-	1145	2.1 %
10	-	949	1.7 %
11	-	530	1.0 %
12	-	332	0.6 %
13	-	174	0.3 %
14	-	133	0.2 %
15	-	74	0.1 %
16	-	38	0.1 %
17	-	24	0.0 %
18	-	11	0.0 %
19	-	6	0.0 %
20	20. Twenty mentions	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.85
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 20.00
- Standard Deviation: 3.28

Location: 661-662 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0411: CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Relative Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Major party relative salience of Presidential candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-10	-10. Ten Republican mentions, no Democratic	0	0.0 %
-9	-	3	0.0 %
-8	-	4	0.0 %
-7	-	15	0.0 %
-6	-	49	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-5	-	239	0.4 %
-4	-	601	1.1 %
-3	-	1414	2.5 %
-2	-	2858	5.1 %
-1	-	4450	8.0 %
0	0. No mentions	6944	12.5 %
1	-	4029	7.2 %
2	-	2268	4.1 %
3	-	1049	1.9 %
4	-	459	0.8 %
5	-	135	0.2 %
6	-	26	0.0 %
7	-	12	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
10	+10. Ten Democratic mentions, no Republican	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. No Pre IW; form II (1972); abbrev. IW form	1494	2.7 %
.	-	29622	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: -0.16
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -9.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.82

Location: 663-665 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0412: CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Avg

Thermometers -- both Major party Presidential candidates

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person).

On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	113	0.2 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
3	-	6	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	13	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	54	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.0 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
13	-	3	0.0 %
15	-	101	0.2 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
17	-	3	0.0 %
18	-	4	0.0 %
19	-	3	0.0 %
20	-	73	0.1 %
23	-	53	0.1 %
24	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	259	0.5 %
26	-	3	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	90	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	444	0.8 %
31	-	9	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	141	0.3 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	820	1.5 %
36	-	5	0.0 %
37	-	4	0.0 %
38	-	439	0.8 %
39	-	8	0.0 %
40	-	427	0.8 %
41	-	9	0.0 %
42	-	7	0.0 %
43	-	1720	3.1 %
44	-	8	0.0 %
45	-	1041	1.9 %
46	-	11	0.0 %
47	-	10	0.0 %
48	-	146	0.3 %
49	-	1647	3.0 %
50	-	3787	6.8 %
51	-	18	0.0 %
52	-	8	0.0 %
53	-	192	0.3 %
54	-	35	0.1 %
55	-	2059	3.7 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK/don't recognize in VCF0424 or VCF0426	608	1.1 %
99	99. NA	413	0.7 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 26,854 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 58.08
- Median: 55.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00

- Maximum: 999.00
- Standard Deviation: 44.65

Location: 666-668 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0413: CANDIDATES: Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Index

Major party Presidential candidate thermometer index

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Most Republican	663	1.2 %
3	-	9	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	67	0.1 %
6	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	13	0.0 %
8	-	595	1.1 %
9	-	217	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	60	0.1 %
11	-	3	0.0 %
12	-	12	0.0 %
13	-	71	0.1 %
14	-	8	0.0 %
15	-	897	1.6 %
16	-	6	0.0 %
17	-	190	0.3 %
18	-	51	0.1 %
19	-	4	0.0 %
20	-	270	0.5 %
21	-	3	0.0 %
22	-	189	0.3 %
23	-	788	1.4 %
24	-	9	0.0 %
25	-	225	0.4 %
26	-	6	0.0 %
27	-	295	0.5 %
28	-	694	1.2 %
29	-	5	0.0 %
30	-	562	1.0 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	157	0.3 %
33	-	548	1.0 %
34	-	5	0.0 %
35	-	854	1.5 %
36	-	2	0.0 %
37	-	111	0.2 %
38	-	621	1.1 %
39	-	12	0.0 %
40	-	1036	1.9 %
41	-	2	0.0 %
42	-	8	0.0 %
43	-	490	0.9 %
44	-	85	0.2 %
45	-	1197	2.2 %
46	-	5	0.0 %
47	-	8	0.0 %
48	-	63	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
49	-	6	0.0 %
50	50. Neutral	2827	5.1 %
51	-	24	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK/don't recognize in VCF0424 or VCF0426	580	1.0 %
999	999. NA	444	0.8 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 26,851 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.73
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 99.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.44

Location: 669-671 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0414: CANDIDATES: Vice-Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Avg

Thermometers -- both Major party vice-Presidential candidates

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:

I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	189	0.3 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	5	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	11	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	78	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	19	0.0 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
13	-	7	0.0 %
15	-	157	0.3 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	3	0.0 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	86	0.2 %
23	-	97	0.2 %
25	-	371	0.7 %
26	-	3	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	131	0.2 %
29	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	560	1.0 %
31	-	8	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	299	0.5 %
34	-	4	0.0 %
35	-	815	1.5 %
36	-	6	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	453	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
39	-	10	0.0 %
40	-	781	1.4 %
41	-	13	0.0 %
42	-	8	0.0 %
43	-	1463	2.6 %
44	-	12	0.0 %
45	-	1235	2.2 %
46	-	10	0.0 %
47	-	11	0.0 %
48	-	172	0.3 %
49	-	812	1.5 %
50	-	4089	7.3 %
51	-	13	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	152	0.3 %
54	-	22	0.0 %
55	-	2106	3.8 %
56	-	237	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK/don't recognize in VCF0425 or VCF0427	4657	8.4 %
99	99. NA	487	0.9 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,731 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 75.58
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 999.00
- Standard Deviation: 147.98

Location: 672-674 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0415: CANDIDATES: Vice-Presidential Candidates: Thermometer Index

Major party vice-Presidential candidate thermometer index

1968-1974:

(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Most Republican	318	0.6 %
3	-	28	0.1 %
4	-	6	0.0 %
5	-	46	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	11	0.0 %
8	-	417	0.7 %
9	-	101	0.2 %
10	-	52	0.1 %
11	-	5	0.0 %
12	-	7	0.0 %
13	-	41	0.1 %
14	-	4	0.0 %
15	-	527	0.9 %
16	-	5	0.0 %
17	-	71	0.1 %
18	-	45	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	5	0.0 %
20	-	207	0.4 %
22	-	67	0.1 %
23	-	440	0.8 %
24	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	201	0.4 %
27	-	125	0.2 %
28	-	367	0.7 %
29	-	4	0.0 %
30	-	336	0.6 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
32	-	54	0.1 %
33	-	498	0.9 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	553	1.0 %
37	-	58	0.1 %
38	-	307	0.6 %
39	-	7	0.0 %
40	-	1025	1.8 %
41	-	3	0.0 %
42	-	4	0.0 %
43	-	304	0.5 %
44	-	36	0.1 %
45	-	1553	2.8 %
46	-	3	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	88	0.2 %
49	-	8	0.0 %
50	50. Neutral	4154	7.5 %
51	-	15	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	98	0.2 %
54	-	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK/don't recognize in VCF0425 or VCF0427	4051	7.3 %
999	999. NA	921	1.7 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,903 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.88
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 99.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.64

Location: 675-677 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF0424: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic Presidential Candidate

Democratic presidential candidate -- feeling thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2234	4.0 %
1	-	20	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	5	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	46	0.1 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	6	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	126	0.2 %
11	-	2	0.0 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	1442	2.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	111	0.2 %
22	-	3	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	82	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1693	3.0 %
32	-	7	0.0 %
33	-	3	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	56	0.1 %
38	-	3	0.0 %
40	-	2058	3.7 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	64	0.1 %
46	-	2	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	5	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	3265	5.9 %
51	-	11	0.0 %
52	-	7	0.0 %
53	-	5	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	71	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	3483	6.3 %
62	-	5	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
64	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	134	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	483	0.9 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	413	0.7 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 26,979 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.43
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.63

Location: 678-679 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0425: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic Vice-presidential Candidate

Democratic vice-presidential candidate thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1715	3.1 %
1	-	17	0.0 %
2	-	9	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	6	0.0 %
5	-	53	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	5	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	112	0.2 %
11	-	4	0.0 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1115	2.0 %
16	-	3	0.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	109	0.2 %
25	-	63	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1293	2.3 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	42	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
37	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1644	3.0 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	44	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	3	0.0 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	5563	10.0 %
51	-	6	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	82	0.1 %
58	-	3	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	3262	5.9 %
61	-	2	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	3793	6.8 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	713	1.3 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 23,369 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.27
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.55

Location: 680-681 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0426: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican Presidential Candidate

Republican presidential candidate thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2404	4.3 %
1	-	22	0.0 %
2	-	10	0.0 %
3	-	10	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	46	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	5	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	130	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	-	4	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1534	2.8 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
17	-	2	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	120	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	98	0.2 %
30	-	1873	3.4 %
32	-	3	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	74	0.1 %
37	-	2	0.0 %
38	-	6	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	2374	4.3 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	63	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	10	0.0 %
50	-	3750	6.7 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	12	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	74	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	3446	6.2 %
62	-	6	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	373	0.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	439	0.8 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 27,063 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.66
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.03

Location: 682-683 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0427: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican Vice-presidential Candidate

Republican vice-presidential candidate thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't

care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2404	4.3 %
1	-	27	0.0 %
2	-	19	0.0 %
3	-	10	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	61	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	120	0.2 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	5	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1447	2.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
17	-	3	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	130	0.2 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	78	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1519	2.7 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	61	0.1 %
40	-	2012	3.6 %
41	-	3	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	61	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	4	0.0 %
49	-	6	0.0 %
50	-	5902	10.6 %
51	-	4	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
54	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	78	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	3224	5.8 %
62	-	5	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	2948	5.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	894	1.6 %
.	-	27799	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 24,033 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 49.80
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 26.03

Location: 684-685 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0428: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: U.S. President

President thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings

toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3725	6.7 %
1	-	38	0.1 %
2	-	17	0.0 %
3	-	11	0.0 %
4	-	8	0.0 %
5	-	76	0.1 %
6	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	10	0.0 %
8	-	4	0.0 %
9	-	4	0.0 %
10	-	211	0.4 %
11	-	2	0.0 %
12	-	6	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	2118	3.8 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	171	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	-	3	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	164	0.3 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	2440	4.4 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
32	-	9	0.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	92	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	5	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	2908	5.2 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	90	0.2 %
46	-	3	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	10	0.0 %
49	-	26	0.0 %
50	-	4438	8.0 %
51	-	21	0.0 %
52	-	11	0.0 %
53	-	5	0.0 %
55	-	85	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	404	0.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	532	1.0 %
.	-	12252	22.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 42,486 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 58.11
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.85

Location: 686-687 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0429: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Vice-president

Vice-president thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3071	5.5 %
1	-	42	0.1 %
2	-	24	0.0 %
3	-	6	0.0 %
4	-	10	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	80	0.1 %
6	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	5	0.0 %
8	-	9	0.0 %
9	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	225	0.4 %
11	-	4	0.0 %
12	-	8	0.0 %
14	-	3	0.0 %
15	-	1902	3.4 %
16	-	3	0.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	206	0.4 %
21	-	2	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	2	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	139	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	3	0.0 %
30	-	2281	4.1 %
32	-	5	0.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	97	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	3135	5.6 %
41	-	2	0.0 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	94	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	12	0.0 %
49	-	19	0.0 %
50	-	8048	14.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
51	-	13	0.0 %
52	-	9	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	4	0.0 %
55	-	117	0.2 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1980 and later)	2255	4.1 %
99	99. NA	754	1.4 %
.	-	14574	26.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 38,091 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 53.03
• Median: 50.00
• Mode: 50.00
• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 97.00
• Standard Deviation: 25.84

Location: 688-689 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0432: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Hubert Humphrey

Hubert Humphrey -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you

don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	640	1.1 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	34	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	423	0.8 %
20	-	36	0.1 %
25	-	20	0.0 %
30	-	599	1.1 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	4	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	813	1.5 %
45	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1831	3.3 %
55	-	12	0.0 %
60	-	1465	2.6 %
65	-	17	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1179	2.1 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	69	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	123	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
85	-	862	1.5 %
90	-	76	0.1 %
95	-	16	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	525	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968)	453	0.8 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	371	0.7 %
.	-	46082	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,768 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.66
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.26

Location: 690-691 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0433: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ted Kennedy

Ted Kennedy -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have

been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1848	3.3 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	10	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	60	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	909	1.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	60	0.1 %
25	-	25	0.0 %
30	-	1066	1.9 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	22	0.0 %
40	-	1371	2.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	15	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2496	4.5 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	20	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2246	4.0 %
65	-	42	0.1 %
70	-	2200	4.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
75	-	99	0.2 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	155	0.3 %
82	-	2	0.0 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	2099	3.8 %
90	-	154	0.3 %
91	-	1	0.0 %
92	-	1	0.0 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
94	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	44	0.1 %
96	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1762	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)	695	1.2 %
99	99. NA	236	0.4 %
.	-	38006	68.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 16,737 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.41
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 29.24

Location: 692-693 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0434: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Eugene McCarthy

Eugene Mccarthy -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings

toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	346	0.6 %
5	-	6	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	12	0.0 %
15	-	200	0.4 %
20	-	20	0.0 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	270	0.5 %
35	-	3	0.0 %
40	-	396	0.7 %
45	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	1418	2.5 %
55	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	594	1.1 %
65	-	6	0.0 %
70	-	423	0.8 %
75	-	19	0.0 %
76	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
80	-	34	0.1 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	221	0.4 %
90	-	13	0.0 %
95	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	89	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968)	898	1.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	322	0.6 %
.	-	50362	90.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,092 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 48.31
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.50

Location: 694-695 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0435: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George McGovern

George Mcgovern -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	844	1.5 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	3	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	36	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	497	0.9 %
20	-	38	0.1 %
25	-	14	0.0 %
30	-	657	1.2 %
35	-	11	0.0 %
40	-	866	1.6 %
45	-	9	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2457	4.4 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	8	0.0 %
60	-	1321	2.4 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	14	0.0 %
70	-	882	1.6 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	43	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	66	0.1 %
85	-	562	1.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
90	-	45	0.1 %
95	-	6	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	242	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)	1525	2.7 %
99	99. NA	170	0.3 %
.	-	45343	81.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,636 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 47.97
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.16

Location: 696-697 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0436: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Walter Mondale

Walter Mondale -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the

person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	337	0.6 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	4	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	11	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	352	0.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	18	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	470	0.8 %
35	-	11	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	682	1.2 %
45	-	6	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2894	5.2 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	23	0.0 %
60	-	1617	2.9 %
65	-	29	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1284	2.3 %
75	-	46	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	56	0.1 %
85	-	807	1.4 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	27	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
92	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	8	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	375	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)	2038	3.7 %
99	99. NA	289	0.5 %
.	-	44258	79.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,089 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.99
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.01

Location: 698-699 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0437: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Edmund Muskie

Edmund Muskie -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the

person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	275	0.5 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	12	0.0 %
15	-	176	0.3 %
20	-	20	0.0 %
25	-	16	0.0 %
30	-	275	0.5 %
35	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	354	0.6 %
45	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	1361	2.4 %
55	-	6	0.0 %
60	-	714	1.3 %
65	-	15	0.0 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	576	1.0 %
75	-	38	0.1 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	72	0.1 %
85	-	477	0.9 %
90	-	43	0.1 %
95	-	7	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	249	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968)	750	1.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	320	0.6 %
.	-	49905	89.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,699 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.62
- Median: 50.00

- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 23.62

Location: 700-701 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0438: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George Bush Sr.

George Bush Sr. -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	683	1.2 %
1	-	6	0.0 %
2	-	6	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	13	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	64	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	539	1.0 %
20	-	50	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	44	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	790	1.4 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	27	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1194	2.1 %
45	-	34	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	5	0.0 %
50	-	2933	5.3 %
51	-	2	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	52	0.1 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2433	4.4 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	81	0.1 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
70	-	2357	4.2 %
72	-	3	0.0 %
75	-	222	0.4 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	207	0.4 %
83	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	1839	3.3 %
86	-	2	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
90	-	152	0.3 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
94	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	39	0.1 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	761	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	844	1.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	354	0.6 %
.	-	39897	71.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 14,579 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.20
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 23.59

Location: 702-703 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0439: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: George Wallace

George Wallace -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50

degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	2295	4.1 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	5	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	13	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	80	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	937	1.7 %
20	-	59	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	29	0.1 %
30	-	1058	1.9 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	9	0.0 %
40	-	1057	1.9 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	8	0.0 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2452	4.4 %
55	-	17	0.0 %
60	-	1501	2.7 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	22	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
70	-	1161	2.1 %
75	-	57	0.1 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	59	0.1 %
81	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	724	1.3 %
90	-	44	0.1 %
92	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	10	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	672	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)	806	1.4 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	410	0.7 %
.	-	42164	75.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,294 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 43.04
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.89

Location: 704-705 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0440: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Spiro Agnew

Spiro Agnew -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political

parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	534	1.0 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	32	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	267	0.5 %
20	-	33	0.1 %
25	-	7	0.0 %
30	-	307	0.6 %
35	-	7	0.0 %
40	-	453	0.8 %
45	-	3	0.0 %
50	-	1196	2.1 %
55	-	7	0.0 %
60	-	703	1.3 %
65	-	18	0.0 %
70	-	680	1.2 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	43	0.1 %
80	-	70	0.1 %
85	-	507	0.9 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	38	0.1 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	243	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968)	310	0.6 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	299	0.5 %
.	-	49905	89.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,160 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.05
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 26.37

Location: 706-707 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0441: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Gerald Ford

Gerald Ford -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell

- 365 -

me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	342	0.6 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	3	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	14	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	273	0.5 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	25	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	426	0.8 %
35	-	9	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	754	1.4 %
45	-	11	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1564	2.8 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	23	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1872	3.4 %
62	-	3	0.0 %
65	-	30	0.1 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1950	3.5 %
75	-	68	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	84	0.2 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1497	2.7 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	48	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
95	-	9	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	536	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)	306	0.5 %
99	99. NA	118	0.2 %
.	-	45676	82.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,574 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 60.19
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.23

Location: 708-709 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0442: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Richard Nixon

Richard Nixon -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't

care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3279	5.9 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	15	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	77	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	1231	2.2 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	88	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	22	0.0 %
30	-	1238	2.2 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	14	0.0 %
40	-	1299	2.3 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	18	0.0 %
50	-	2350	4.2 %
51	-	2	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	22	0.0 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1902	3.4 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	38	0.1 %
70	-	1668	3.0 %
72	-	2	0.0 %
75	-	86	0.2 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
79	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
80	-	141	0.3 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
83	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	1658	3.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	110	0.2 %
95	-	13	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1041	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)	386	0.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	453	0.8 %
.	-	38489	69.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,346 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 45.04
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 31.09

Location: 710-711 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0443: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ronald Reagan

(2004: And finally, in retrospect,) Ronald Reagan -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and

warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:

I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1485	2.7 %
1	-	6	0.0 %
2	-	5	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	21	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	66	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	792	1.4 %
20	-	73	0.1 %
25	-	33	0.1 %
30	-	1078	1.9 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
35	-	14	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1416	2.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	19	0.0 %
50	-	3075	5.5 %
51	-	3	0.0 %
52	-	7	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	-	23	0.0 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2599	4.7 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	47	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	2884	5.2 %
72	-	2	0.0 %
75	-	157	0.3 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	187	0.3 %
83	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	2984	5.4 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	138	0.2 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
95	-	44	0.1 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1934	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968); don't recognize (1978 and later)	737	1.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	449	0.8 %
.	-	35361	63.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 19,127 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.92
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 27.33

Location: 712-713 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0444: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Nelson Rockefeller

Nelson Rockefeller -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	335	0.6 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	23	0.0 %
15	-	208	0.4 %
20	-	21	0.0 %
25	-	9	0.0 %
30	-	320	0.6 %
35	-	3	0.0 %
40	-	528	0.9 %
41	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	-	7	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1294	2.3 %
55	-	8	0.0 %
60	-	836	1.5 %
65	-	13	0.0 %
70	-	609	1.1 %
75	-	24	0.0 %
77	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	37	0.1 %
85	-	356	0.6 %
90	-	16	0.0 %
95	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	111	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK (exc.1968)	289	0.5 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	320	0.6 %
.	-	50294	90.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,771 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 50.61
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.62

Location: 714-715 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0445: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Robert Dole

Robert Dole -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person).

On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	381	0.7 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	10	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	13	0.0 %
15	-	365	0.7 %
20	-	15	0.0 %
25	-	21	0.0 %
30	-	542	1.0 %
35	-	12	0.0 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	869	1.6 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	11	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	2955	5.3 %
51	-	2	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	27	0.0 %
56	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1536	2.8 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	31	0.1 %
70	-	1259	2.3 %
75	-	50	0.1 %
80	-	57	0.1 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
83	-	2	0.0 %
85	-	836	1.5 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	41	0.1 %
95	-	7	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	205	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1986,1988,1994,1996)	2863	5.1 %
99	99. NA	103	0.2 %
.	-	43444	78.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,264 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.40
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.73

Location: 716-717 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0446: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Jimmy Carter

Jimmy Carter -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the

thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	593	1.1 %
2	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	26	0.0 %
15	-	523	0.9 %
20	-	28	0.1 %
25	-	21	0.0 %
30	-	717	1.3 %
35	-	16	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	994	1.8 %
45	-	11	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1629	2.9 %
51	-	3	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	11	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	1925	3.5 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	55	0.1 %
70	-	1956	3.5 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	92	0.2 %
77	-	3	0.0 %
80	-	115	0.2 %
85	-	1550	2.8 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	57	0.1 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	13	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	869	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1978 and later)	243	0.4 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW	405	0.7 %
.	-	43793	78.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,233 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.81
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.01

Location: 718-719 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0447: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Bill Clinton

Bill Clinton -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings

toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1155	2.1 %
1	-	25	0.0 %
2	-	20	0.0 %
3	-	13	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	54	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	184	0.3 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	649	1.2 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	130	0.2 %
25	-	125	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	888	1.6 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	40	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	956	1.7 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
45	-	45	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	8	0.0 %
49	-	11	0.0 %
50	-	1479	2.7 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	55	0.1 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1748	3.1 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	98	0.2 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	2	0.0 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
70	-	2091	3.8 %
72	-	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	132	0.2 %
99	99. NA	23	0.0 %
.	-	41547	74.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 13,972 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.45
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 70.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.77

Location: 720-721 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0448: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Al Gore

Al Gore -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	457	0.8 %
1	-	19	0.0 %
2	-	12	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	35	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	132	0.2 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	355	0.6 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	134	0.2 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
24	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	113	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	592	1.1 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	41	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	822	1.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	71	0.1 %
46	-	2	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	6	0.0 %
49	-	16	0.0 %
50	-	1912	3.4 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	3	0.0 %
54	-	3	0.0 %
55	-	64	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
60	-	1496	2.7 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	96	0.2 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	716	1.3 %
99	99. NA	27	0.0 %
.	-	45081	81.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,850 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 54.60
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.21

Location: 722-723 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0449: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Ross Perot

Ross Perot -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you

don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:

I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	776	1.4 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	8	0.0 %
10	-	61	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	517	0.9 %
20	-	45	0.1 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	32	0.1 %
30	-	547	1.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	11	0.0 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	539	1.0 %
45	-	15	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1392	2.5 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	20	0.0 %
60	-	712	1.3 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	22	0.0 %
70	-	441	0.8 %
72	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	29	0.1 %
80	-	30	0.1 %
85	-	329	0.6 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	11	0.0 %
95	-	6	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	293	0.5 %
99	99. NA	16	0.0 %
.	-	49680	89.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 42.40
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.57

Location: 724-725 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0450: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve of President Performance

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that [the president] is handling his job as President?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve	21043	37.8 %
2	2. Disapprove	15613	28.0 %
8	8. DK	1802	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; form II (1972)	1900	3.4 %
.	-	15316	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,458 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

VCF0451: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Strength Approve/Disapprove President Performance

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that [the president] is handling his job as President? Do you (approve/disapprove) {of the president's performance} strongly or not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve, strongly	9246	16.6 %
2	2. Approve, not strongly	7564	13.6 %
3	3. Disapprove, not strongly	4193	7.5 %
4	4. Disapprove, strongly	9112	16.4 %
8	8. DK	202	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; form II (1972)	1181	2.1 %
.	-	24176	43.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,317 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

VCF0471: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Hillary Clinton

Hillary Clinton -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50

degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have
been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call)
the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the
person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't
care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm
or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell
me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold
toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1732	3.1 %
1	-	34	0.1 %
2	-	23	0.0 %
3	-	14	0.0 %
4	-	6	0.0 %
5	-	106	0.2 %
6	-	6	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	5	0.0 %
10	-	177	0.3 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	933	1.7 %
16	-	2	0.0 %
17	-	4	0.0 %
20	-	171	0.3 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	113	0.2 %
26	-	1	0.0 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1045	1.9 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	55	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	3	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1329	2.4 %
42	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	86	0.2 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
48	-	4	0.0 %
49	-	11	0.0 %
50	-	2648	4.8 %
51	-	4	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	112	0.2 %
56	-	3	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2439	4.4 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	3	0.0 %
64	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	143	0.3 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	349	0.6 %
99	99. NA	52	0.1 %
.	-	35633	64.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 19,640 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.21
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 85.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 28.84

Location: 728-729 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0472: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Pat Buchanan

Pat Buchanan -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	668	1.2 %
1	-	7	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	25	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
10	-	90	0.2 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	383	0.7 %
20	-	60	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	-	59	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	526	0.9 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	24	0.0 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	646	1.2 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	28	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	1800	3.2 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
55	-	22	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	858	1.5 %
65	-	22	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	415	0.7 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	48	0.1 %
80	-	34	0.1 %
85	-	157	0.3 %
86	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	7	0.0 %
95	-	1	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	45	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize	1299	2.3 %
99	99. NA	21	0.0 %
.	-	48387	86.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,967 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 42.31

- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.54

Location: 730-731 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0473: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Dan Quayle

Dan Quayle -- thermometer

1968-1974:
(1968,1972: As you know, there were many people mentioned this past year as possible candidates for President [1972: or Vice-President] by the political parties.) (1970: Several political leaders have already been mentioned as possible candidates for President in 1972.) (1968-1972: We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people.) (1974: Now I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days.) I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings toward these people. (1968: You probably remember that we used something like this in our earlier interview with you.) Here's how it works. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person, then you should place him in the middle of the thermometer, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward him or feel favorably toward him, you would give him a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees. (1968-1970 only: depending on how warm your feeling is toward that person). On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward a person--that is, if you don't care for him too much--then you would place him somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees. Of course, if you don't know too much about a person, just tell me and we'll go on to the next name.

1976:
As you know, many people were mentioned this year as possible candidates for president or vice-president by the political parties. We would like to get your feelings toward some of these people. I'll read the name of each person and I'd like you to rate that person with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person, ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the person and that you don't care too much for that person. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a person you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a person you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-LATER:
I'd like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days (1990: have been in the news). I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using (1986-LATER: something we call) the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 (1986-LATER: degrees) mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the person; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person. (1986-LATER: You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person.) If we come to a person whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that person. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. (1978-1984: If you do recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the person, then you would rate the person at the 50 degree mark.)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	967	1.7 %
1	-	5	0.0 %
2	-	5	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	16	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	69	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	649	1.2 %
20	-	65	0.1 %
25	-	40	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	774	1.4 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	24	0.0 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	883	1.6 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	26	0.0 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2188	3.9 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	19	0.0 %
60	-	1167	2.1 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	36	0.1 %
70	-	903	1.6 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	60	0.1 %
80	-	58	0.1 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	518	0.9 %
86	-	2	0.0 %
87	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	28	0.1 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	3	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	199	0.4 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
98	98. DK; don't recognize	812	1.5 %
99	99. NA	41	0.1 %
.	-	46093	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,728 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 45.35
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.88

Location: 732-733 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0475: CANDIDATES: Likes Anything about Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	13397	24.1 %
5	5. No	11022	19.8 %
8	8. DK	458	0.8 %
9	9. NA	108	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	30689	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,985 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 734-734 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: .

VCF0476A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	2	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	1	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	11	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	1	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	18	0.0 %
8889	Refused	51	0.1 %
.	-	47044	84.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 8,561 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 735-738 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0476B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	22	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	8	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	839	1.5 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	243	0.4 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2207	4.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	974	1.7 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	295	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	530	1.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1611	2.9 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	413	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	834	1.5 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	570	1.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	18	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	51	0.1 %
.	-	47059	84.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,546 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 739-740 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0476C: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9988	DK	108	0.2 %
.	-	50964	91.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,602 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 5010.00
• Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 741-744 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0476D: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	1093	2.0 %
22	22. Character and background	903	1.6 %
23	23. Personal attraction	438	0.8 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	115	0.2 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	331	0.6 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	120	0.2 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	281	0.5 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	4	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative*	808	1.5 %
30	30. Other	393	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
87	87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in	116	0.2 %
89	89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)	108	0.2 %
.	-	50964	91.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,486 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 30.00

Location: 745-746 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0477A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	2	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	2	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	1	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49902	89.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,772 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 747-750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0477B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	9	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	5	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	432	0.8 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	233	0.4 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1187	2.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	338	0.6 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	290	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	478	0.9 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1475	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	344	0.6 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	650	1.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	331	0.6 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49902	89.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,772 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 751-752 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0477C: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52811	94.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,863 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 5010.00
• Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 753-756 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0477D: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	679	1.2 %
22	22. Character and background	691	1.2 %
23	23. Personal attraction	310	0.6 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	104	0.2 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	304	0.5 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	104	0.2 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	253	0.5 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	0	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	261	0.5 %
30	30. Other	157	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52811	94.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,863 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 30.00

Location: 757-758 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0478A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52264	93.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,410 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 8802.00

Location: 759-762 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0478B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	4	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	231	0.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	96	0.2 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	638	1.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	199	0.4 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	229	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	263	0.5 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1002	1.8 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	236	0.4 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	329	0.6 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	182	0.3 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	52265	93.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,409 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 763-764 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0478C: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54010	97.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,664 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 765-768 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0478D: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	312	0.6 %
22	22. Character and background	426	0.8 %
23	23. Personal attraction	157	0.3 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	65	0.1 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	211	0.4 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	90	0.2 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	164	0.3 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	1	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	142	0.3 %
30	30. Other	96	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54010	97.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,664 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 769-770 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0479A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	2	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53926	96.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,748 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 2.00
• Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 771-774 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0479B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	5	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	2	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	129	0.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	51	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	313	0.6 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	106	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	126	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	141	0.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	527	0.9 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	124	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	152	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	72	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53926	96.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,748 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 775-776 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0479C: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54804	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 870 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 777-780 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0479D: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	168	0.3 %
22	22. Character and background	202	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	23. Personal attraction	81	0.1 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	31	0.1 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	108	0.2 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	63	0.1 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	79	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	1	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	85	0.2 %
30	30. Other	52	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54804	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 870 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 781-782 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0480A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54778	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 896 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 1306.00

Location: 783-786 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0480B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	2	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	49	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	26	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	159	0.3 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	56	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	70	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	88	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	270	0.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	62	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	74	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	40	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54778	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 896 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 787-788 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0480C: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55270	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 404 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5010.00
- Maximum: 5986.00

Location: 789-792 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0480D: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	90	0.2 %
22	22. Character and background	88	0.2 %
23	23. Personal attraction	40	0.1 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	14	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	56	0.1 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	26	0.0 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	30	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29	29. Candidate as party representative	40	0.1 %
30	30. Other	20	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55270	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 404 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 793-794 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0481: CANDIDATES: Dislikes Anything about Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	12901	23.2 %
5	5. No	11640	20.9 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	338	0.6 %
9	9. NA	106	0.2 %
.	-	30689	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,541 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 795-795 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0482A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	3	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	4	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	7	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	1	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	1	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	20	0.0 %
8889	Refused	43	0.1 %
.	-	46448	83.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,163 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 796-799 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0482B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	22	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	13	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	1225	2.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	1219	2.2 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1911	3.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	896	1.6 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	241	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	672	1.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1725	3.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	675	1.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	142	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	397	0.7 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	20	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	43	0.1 %
.	-	46473	83.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,138 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 800-801 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0482C: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9988	DK	99	0.2 %
.	-	51667	92.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,908 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 802-805 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0482D: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	360	0.6 %
22	22. Character and background	1027	1.8 %
23	23. Personal attraction	438	0.8 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	160	0.3 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	308	0.6 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	183	0.3 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	15	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	18	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	784	1.4 %
30	30. Other	567	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
87	87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in	48	0.1 %
89	89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)	99	0.2 %
.	-	51667	92.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,860 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 806-807 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0483A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	3	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	1	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	50068	89.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,606 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 2.00
- Maximum: 8801.00

Location: 808-811 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0483B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	10	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	11	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	639	1.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	606	1.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1010	1.8 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	483	0.9 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	239	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	449	0.8 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1136	2.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	564	1.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	125	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	333	0.6 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	50069	89.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,605 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 812-813 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0483C: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53680	96.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,994 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 814-817 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0483D: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	192	0.3 %
22	22. Character and background	613	1.1 %
23	23. Personal attraction	231	0.4 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	93	0.2 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	169	0.3 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	144	0.3 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	16	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	21	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	333	0.6 %
30	30. Other	183	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53679	96.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,995 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 818-819 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0484A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	1	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	1	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52691	94.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,983 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 1307.00

Location: 820-823 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0484B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	8	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	2	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	330	0.6 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	291	0.5 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	504	0.9 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	233	0.4 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	144	0.3 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	231	0.4 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	653	1.2 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	298	0.5 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	88	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	201	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52691	94.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,983 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

VCF0484C: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54764	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 910 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 826-829 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0484D: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	83	0.1 %
22	22. Character and background	286	0.5 %
23	23. Personal attraction	105	0.2 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	49	0.1 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	97	0.2 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	75	0.1 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	15	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	7	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	109	0.2 %
30	30. Other	84	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54764	98.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 910 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 830-831 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0485A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	1	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54368	97.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,306 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7.00
- Maximum: 8802.00

Location: 832-835 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0485B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	4	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	1	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	141	0.3 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	115	0.2 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	210	0.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	101	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	84	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	97	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	299	0.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	129	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	37	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	87	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54369	97.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,305 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 836-837 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0485C: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55288	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 386 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 838-841 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0485D: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	30	0.1 %
22	22. Character and background	101	0.2 %
23	23. Personal attraction	47	0.1 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	24	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	42	0.1 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	32	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	9	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	10	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	52	0.1 %
30	30. Other	39	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55288	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 386 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 30.00

Location: 842-843 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0486A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
.	-	55064	98.9 %
Total		**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 610 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 9.00
• Maximum: 1307.00

Location: 844-847 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0486B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	1	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	55	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	37	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	87	0.2 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	58	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	41	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	64	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	148	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	57	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	23	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	39	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55064	98.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 610 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 848-849 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0486C: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55523	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 151 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 6010.00
- Maximum: 6981.00

Location: 850-853 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0486D: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Democratic Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	9	0.0 %
22	22. Character and background	45	0.1 %
23	23. Personal attraction	20	0.0 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	8	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	15	0.0 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	18	0.0 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	2	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	0	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	21	0.0 %
30	30. Other	13	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55523	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 151 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 854-855 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0487: CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	11883	21.3 %
5	5. No	12582	22.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	418	0.8 %
9	9. NA	102	0.2 %
.	-	30689	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,465 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 856-856 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0488A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	7	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	1	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	2	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8888	DK	15	0.0 %
8889	Refused	30	0.1 %
.	-	47032	84.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 8,597 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 8.00
- Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 857-860 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0488B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	15	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	8	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	2074	3.7 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	436	0.8 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1756	3.2 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	477	0.9 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	298	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	446	0.8 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1447	2.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	977	1.8 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	144	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	496	0.9 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	15	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	30	0.1 %
.	-	47055	84.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,574 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 861-862 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0488C: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9988	DK	71	0.1 %
.	-	50800	91.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,803 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 863-866 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0488D: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	1472	2.6 %
22	22. Character and background	1102	2.0 %
23	23. Personal attraction	537	1.0 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	153	0.3 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	285	0.5 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	538	1.0 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	82	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	1	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	277	0.5 %
30	30. Other	332	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
87	87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in	24	0.0 %
89	89. DK ;RF; NA (mention 1 only)	71	0.1 %
.	-	50800	91.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,779 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 30.00

Location: 867-868 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0489A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	2	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	2	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	2	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49842	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,832 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 8.00
• Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 869-872 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0489B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	11	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	4	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	981	1.8 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	292	0.5 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1082	1.9 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	210	0.4 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	358	0.6 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	367	0.7 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1220	2.2 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	849	1.5 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	93	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	364	0.7 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49843	89.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,831 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 873-874 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0489C: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52373	94.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,301 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7010.00
- Maximum: 9988.00

Location: 875-878 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0489D: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	787	1.4 %
22	22. Character and background	954	1.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	23. Personal attraction	328	0.6 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	110	0.2 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	262	0.5 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	463	0.8 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	81	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	0	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	162	0.3 %
30	30. Other	154	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52373	94.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,301 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 879-880 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0490A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52382	94.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,292 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 9.00
• Maximum: 1309.00

Location: 881-884 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0490B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	4	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	415	0.7 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	174	0.3 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	611	1.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	128	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	245	0.4 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	225	0.4 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	746	1.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	480	0.9 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	69	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	195	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52382	94.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,292 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 885-886 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0490C: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53554	96.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,120 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7010.00
- Maximum: 9988.00

Location: 887-890 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0490D: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	444	0.8 %
22	22. Character and background	610	1.1 %
23	23. Personal attraction	209	0.4 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	60	0.1 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	197	0.4 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	312	0.6 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	63	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29	29. Candidate as party representative	124	0.2 %
30	30. Other	100	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53554	96.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,120 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 891-892 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0491A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54173	97.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,501 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 9.00
• Maximum: 1306.00

Location: 893-896 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0491B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	3	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	198	0.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	74	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	256	0.5 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	65	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	106	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	132	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	350	0.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	196	0.4 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	34	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	87	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54173	97.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,501 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 897-898 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0491C: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54473	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7010.00
- Maximum: 7995.00

Location: 899-902 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0491D: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	241	0.4 %
22	22. Character and background	324	0.6 %
23	23. Personal attraction	124	0.2 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	33	0.1 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	117	0.2 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	199	0.4 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	31	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	2	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	62	0.1 %
30	30. Other	68	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54473	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 903-904 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0492A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54909	98.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 765 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 5.00
- Maximum: 1306.00

Location: 905-908 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0492B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	1	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	100	0.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	41	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	134	0.2 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	34	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	57	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	70	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	189	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	78	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	14	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	47	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54909	98.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 765 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 909-910 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0492C: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55048	98.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 626 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7010.00
- Maximum: 7986.00

Location: 911-914 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0492D: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Like About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote for him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	116	0.2 %
22	22. Character and background	170	0.3 %
23	23. Personal attraction	49	0.1 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	25	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	69	0.1 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	92	0.2 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	22	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	0	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	38	0.1 %
30	30. Other	45	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55048	98.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 626 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 915-916 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0493: CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	14330	25.7 %
5	5. No	10190	18.3 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	360	0.6 %
9	9. NA	105	0.2 %
.	-	30689	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,520 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 917-917 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0494A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	1	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	1	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	1	0.0 %
6	Truman	1	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	4	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	1	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	53	0.1 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	2	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	4	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	1	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	4	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	5	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	1	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	1	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	22	0.0 %
8889	Refused	42	0.1 %
.	-	46127	82.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,483 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8880.00

Location: 918-921 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF0494B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	82	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	7	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	793	1.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	707	1.3 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1820	3.3 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	1074	1.9 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	310	0.6 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	399	0.7 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1988	3.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	1267	2.3 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	707	1.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	309	0.6 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	22	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	42	0.1 %
.	-	46147	82.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,463 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 11.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 922-923 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF0494C: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9988	DK	66	0.1 %
.	-	51444	92.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,164 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 8010.00
- Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 924-927 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9987 , 9988 , 9989 , .

VCF0494D: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	694	1.2 %
22	22. Character and background	701	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	23. Personal attraction	458	0.8 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	0	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	697	1.3 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	217	0.4 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	114	0.2 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	62	0.1 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	753	1.4 %
30	30. Other	424	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
87	87. Don't know much about party/candidate; not involved in	44	0.1 %
89	89. DK; RF; NA (mention 1 only)	66	0.1 %
.	-	51444	92.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,120 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 928-929 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 87 , 89 , .

VCF0495A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	35	0.1 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	1	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	1	0.0 %
35	Reagan	5	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	2	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	4	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	2	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49591	89.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 6,083 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 32.00
- Maximum: 1307.00

Location: 930-933 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0495B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	53	0.1 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	5	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	399	0.7 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	415	0.7 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	934	1.7 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	434	0.8 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	300	0.5 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	335	0.6 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1592	2.9 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	768	1.4 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	621	1.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	227	0.4 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	49591	89.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,083 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 934-935 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0495C: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53604	96.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,070 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 8010.00
• Maximum: 9986.00

Location: 936-939 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0495D: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	276	0.5 %
22	22. Character and background	456	0.8 %
23	23. Personal attraction	193	0.3 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	0	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	390	0.7 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	204	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	100	0.2 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	51	0.1 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	242	0.4 %
30	30. Other	158	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53604	96.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,070 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 940-941 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0496A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	1	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	11	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	2	0.0 %
35	Reagan	2	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	4	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	1	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	2	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52215	93.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,459 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 7.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 942-945 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0496B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	24	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	194	0.3 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	200	0.4 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	421	0.8 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	232	0.4 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	193	0.3 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	176	0.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	1016	1.8 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	451	0.8 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	400	0.7 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	151	0.3 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52216	93.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,458 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 946-947 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0496C: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54722	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 952 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 8010.00
- Maximum: 9988.00

Location: 948-951 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0496D: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	95	0.2 %
22	22. Character and background	211	0.4 %
23	23. Personal attraction	91	0.2 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	0	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	214	0.4 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	103	0.2 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	52	0.1 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	18	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	100	0.2 %
30	30. Other	68	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54722	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 952 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 30.00

Location: 952-953 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0497A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	5	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	1	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	4	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53900	96.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,774 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 32.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 954-957 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0497B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	10	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	4	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	71	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	80	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	208	0.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	115	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	99	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	111	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	534	1.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	226	0.4 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	244	0.4 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	72	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53900	96.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,774 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 958-959 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0497C: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55289	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 385 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 8010.00
- Maximum: 9980.00

Location: 960-963 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0497D: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	36	0.1 %
22	22. Character and background	85	0.2 %
23	23. Personal attraction	26	0.0 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	0	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	89	0.2 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	49	0.1 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	21	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	10	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	39	0.1 %
30	30. Other	30	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55289	99.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 385 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 964-965 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0498A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	5	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54730	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 944 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 32.00
- Maximum: 1307.00

Location: 966-969 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0498B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	6	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	40	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	42	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	104	0.2 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	60	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	51	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	66	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	311	0.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	139	0.2 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	94	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	31	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54730	98.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 944 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 970-971 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0498C: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1010-1090,2010-2090,3010-3090,4010-4090	0	0.0 %
2	1100-1190,2100-2190,3100-3190,4100-4190	0	0.0 %
3	1200-1291,2200-2291,3200-3292,4200-4291	0	0.0 %
4	1300-1392,2300-2399,3300-3392,4300-4399	0	0.0 %
5	1400-1499,2400-2499,3400-3499,4400-4499	0	0.0 %
6	1500-1599,2500-2599,3501-3599,4500-4599	0	0.0 %
7	1601-1692,2600-2692,3601-3692,4601-4692	0	0.0 %
8	1700-1799,2701-2799,3700-3799,4701-4799	0	0.0 %
9	1800-1891,2800-2890,3800-3891,4800-4890	0	0.0 %
10	1900-1982,2900-2982,3900-3999,4900-4999	0	0.0 %
11	Not a good man, not qualified for the job, won't make a good president, R has heard bad things about him, mediocr	0	0.0 %
12	Inexperienced (na what kind) (1968)	0	0.0 %
13	Undependenable, unreliable, man who shouldn't be trusted with responsibilities of government, be afraid of him (u	0	0.0 %
21	0011-0090,5010-5090,6010-6090,7010-7091, 8010-8090,9011-9132	0	0.0 %
22	0100-0297,5100-5296,6100-6297,7100-7296, 8100-8297,9133-9292	0	0.0 %
23	0304-0391,5300-5391,6302-6391,7300-7391, 8302-8391,9304-9391	0	0.0 %
24	0403-0409,5401-5409,6401-6409,7400-7409, 8401-8409,9403-9413	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	0411-0599,5411-5599,6410-6599,7410-7599, 8410-8599,9415-9599	0	0.0 %
26	0601-0699,5601-5699,6601-6699,7601-7699, 8600-8699,9601-9699	0	0.0 %
27	0702-0779,0790-0799,5701-5779,5790-5799, 6701-6779,6790-6799,7701-7779,7790-7799, 8700-8779,8790-8799,9701-9779,979	0	0.0 %
28	0781-0789,5780-5789,6780-6789,7780-7789, 8780-8789,9782-9789	0	0.0 %
29	0800-0890,5800-5895,6800-6893,7800-7896, 8800-8896,9800-9890	0	0.0 %
30	0901-0985,5900-5999,6900-6999,7900-7999, 8900-8999,9901-9986	0	0.0 %
40	Not enough experience in government, politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
50	Poor administrator, lacks executive ability, poor organizer (1968)	0	0.0 %
70	Not a statesman, no diplomatic experience (1968)	0	0.0 %
81	Run government inefficiently, bad business sense (1968)	0	0.0 %
90	Other experience and ability (1968)	0	0.0 %
100	Lacks dignity, silly, ridiculous, poor representative of country (1968)	0	0.0 %
110	Not a leader, no leadership ability (no other specification) (1968)	0	0.0 %
120	Weak, weak looking, indecisive, no self-confidence, vacillating (1968)	0	0.0 %
132	Colorless, uninspiring (1968)	0	0.0 %
133	People don't have confidence in him (1968)	0	0.0 %
134	Would divide country, wouldn't gain confidence of all groups in America, cause race war, civil war (1968)	0	0.0 %
135	Not good at communicating with young people, negroes (1968)	0	0.0 %
140	Not a (skilled) politician (1968)	0	0.0 %
141	A politician, too much in politics (1968)	0	0.0 %
142	Tells people what they want to hear (1968)	0	0.0 %
150	Not independent, run by others, not his own boss (1968)	0	0.0 %
160	R talks of Wallace as a bad protector, would not take care of things, doesn't know what to do, doesn't have any	0	0.0 %
170	Not humble enough, too cocky, too self-confident, arrogant, too abrupt, too forward (1968)	0	0.0 %
180	Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level of government) (1968)	0	0.0 %
181	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support of Congress (1968)	0	0.0 %
182	Reference to Wallace's probable difficulty in getting support for his program from others in positions of power	0	0.0 %
190	Other <leadership abilities> (1968)	0	0.0 %
200	Lacks integrity, unprincipled, dishonest, too ambitious, promises everything opportunistic, can't be trusted (na	0	0.0 %
201	Racist, bigot, prejudiced (1968)	0	0.0 %
210	Impulsive, doesn't think before he talks, stirs up trouble, loses his temper (1968)	0	0.0 %
220	Unpatriotic, doesn't have the country's good at heart (1968)	0	0.0 %
221	Will be bad for the country (1968)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55519	99.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 155 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 8010.00
- Maximum: 8980.00

Location: 972-975 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0498D: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1952-1968 Dislike About Republican Presidential Cand COLLAPSED

Is there anything in particular about {REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE} that might make you want to vote against him? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	21. Experience and abilities	16	0.0 %
22	22. Character and background	33	0.1 %
23	23. Personal attraction	11	0.0 %
24	24. Issues - NA whether domestic or foreign	0	0.0 %
25	25. Stand on domestic policies	32	0.1 %
26	26. Stand on foreign affairs	17	0.0 %
27	27. Bad for/anti/keep in check/cease favoring group or interest	7	0.0 %
28	28. Good for/better for/help to/made up of/fair to group or interest	5	0.0 %
29	29. Candidate as party representative	14	0.0 %
30	30. Other	20	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55519	99.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 155 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 30.00

Location: 976-977 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0501: PARTIES: Difference Between Major Parties

Do you think there are any important differences in what the Republicans and Democrats stand for?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No difference	14862	26.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Yes, a difference	16316	29.3 %
9	9. DK; yes, a difference but don't know what (1964,1966);	1585	2.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; form II,III,IV	8286	14.9 %
.	-	14625	26.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,763 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 978-978 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0502: PARTIES: Which Major Party is More Conservative 3-Category

1960-1976:
Would you say that one of the parties (1972: either party) is more conservative or more liberal than the other (1970-1976: at the national level)? (IF YES:) Which party is more conservative? (IF NO 1960,1968:) Do you think that people generally consider the Democrats or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't you want to guess about that? (IF NO OR DK 1964,1970,1972,1976:) Do you think that people generally consider the Democrats or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't you want to guess about that?

1984 AND LATER:
Would you say that either one of the parties is more conservative than the other at the national level? (IF YES:) Which party is more conservative?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, Democrats more conservative	3268	5.9 %
2	2. Yes, Republicans more conservative	14078	25.3 %
9	9. No, both the same; DK; no guess (1970-1976); other	5919	10.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form	5714	10.3 %
.	-	26695	47.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,265 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 979-979 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0502A: PARTIES: Which Major Party is More Conservative 4-Category

1970-1976:
Would you say that one of the parties (1972: either party) is more conservative or more liberal than the other at the national level? (IF YES:) Which party is more conservative? (IF NO OR DK:) Do you think that people generally consider the Democrats or the Republicans more conservative or wouldn't you want to guess about that?

1984 AND LATER:
Would you say that either one of the parties is more conservative than the other at the national level? (IF YES:) Which party is more conservative?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, Democrats more conservative	2639	4.7 %
2	2. Yes, Republicans more conservative	11318	20.3 %
5	5. No, both the same	3443	6.2 %
9	9. DK whether one more conservative; yes, one more	1991	3.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA whether one more conservative; yes, one more	5279	9.5 %
.	-	31004	55.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,391 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 980-980 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0503: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you (1996 AND LATER: Here is) a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	3070	5.5 %
2	2. Liberal	9163	16.5 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	6981	12.5 %
4	4. Moderate, middle of the road	5499	9.9 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	2662	4.8 %
6	6. Conservative	1910	3.4 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	726	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA self-placement (1984-1996);	5785	10.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK party placement	3051	5.5 %
.	-	16827	30.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,011 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 981-981 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0504: PARTIES: Republican Party- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you (1996 AND LATER: Here is) a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	784	1.4 %
2	2. Liberal	1632	2.9 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	2259	4.1 %
4	4. Moderate, middle of the road	4382	7.9 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	6479	11.6 %
6	6. Conservative	10483	18.8 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	3859	6.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA self-placement (1984-1996);	5799	10.4 %
8	8. DK party placement	3170	5.7 %
.	-	16827	30.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,878 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 982-982 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0507: PARTIES: Which Favors Government Help With Medical Care

1960, 1962:
Which party do you think is more likely to see to it that people get doctors and hospital care at low cost, the Democrats or the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference?

1964, 1968:
Which party do you think is more likely to want the government to help in getting doctor and hospital care at low cost, the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them on this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	2577	4.6 %
2	2. No difference	1224	2.2 %
3	3. Republicans	308	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no opinion for R's opinion on this	68	0.1 %
8	8. DK which party	650	1.2 %
9	9. NA party placement	779	1.4 %
.	-	50068	89.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,109 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 983-983 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0508: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some (1988,1994: people) feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1988,1994: for everyone). Others feel that (1988,1994: all) medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross (1988, 1994: or other company paid plans). Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale [1988 ONLY: or haven't you thought much about this]? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	2829	5.1 %
2	-	3053	5.5 %
3	-	2657	4.8 %
4	-	2487	4.5 %
5	-	876	1.6 %
6	-	503	0.9 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	372	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK self-placement(1972,	3251	5.8 %
8	8. DK party placement	2485	4.5 %
.	-	37161	66.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,777 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.88
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.55

Location: 984-984 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0509: PARTIES: Republican Party- Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some (1988,1994: people) feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1988,1994: for everyone). Others feel that (1988,1994: all) medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross (1988, 1994: or other company paid plans). Where would you place the Republican Party on this scale [1988 ONLY: or haven't you thought much about this]? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	428	0.8 %
2	-	466	0.8 %
3	-	852	1.5 %
4	-	2477	4.4 %
5	-	2540	4.6 %
6	-	2863	5.1 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	3010	5.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK self-placement (1972,	3255	5.8 %
8	8. DK party placement	2622	4.7 %
.	-	37161	66.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,636 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.13
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.58

Location: 985-985 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0512: PARTIES: Which Favors Guaranteed Jobs and Standard of Living

1960:

Which party do you think is more likely to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job, the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them?

1964,1968:
Which party do you think is more likely to favor the government seeing to it that each person has a job and a good standard of living (1964 only: the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them on this)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	1815	3.3 %
2	2. No difference	1097	2.0 %
3	3. Republicans	366	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/no opinion for self-	561	1.0 %
8	8. DK which party	470	0.8 %
.	-	51365	92.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,278 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 3.00

Location: 986-986 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0513: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Guaranteed Jobs-Living Scale

Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. (1972- 1978: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his/her own. (1972-1978: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	3177	5.7 %
2	-	4751	8.5 %
3	-	5339	9.6 %
4	-	4864	8.7 %
5	-	1909	3.4 %
6	-	891	1.6 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on his own	614	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA/haven't thought much about self-	1652	3.0 %
8	8. DK party placement	3200	5.7 %
9	9. NA party placement	2977	5.3 %
.	-	26300	47.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,545 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.13
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 3.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.48

Location: 987-987 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0514: PARTIES: Republican Party- Guaranteed Jobs-Living Scale

Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. (1972- 1978: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his/her own. (1972-1978: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7- POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	581	1.0 %
2	-	889	1.6 %
3	-	1682	3.0 %
4	-	4445	8.0 %
5	-	4916	8.8 %
6	-	4970	8.9 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on his own	4035	7.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA/haven't thought much about self-	1661	3.0 %
8	8. DK party placement	3219	5.8 %
9	9. NA party placement	2976	5.3 %
.	-	26300	47.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,518 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.01
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 6.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.52

Location: 988-988 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0517: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Aid to Blacks Scale

1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

1970-1984, 1988 FORM B: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves (1970: but they should be expected to help themselves).

ALL YEARS: Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale} (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help minority groups	2158	3.9 %
2	-	3589	6.4 %
3	-	4174	7.5 %
4	-	4072	7.3 %
5	-	1526	2.7 %
6	-	662	1.2 %
7	7. Minority groups should help themselves	471	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK self-placement (1972-1984,1990,1994); NA	1841	3.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	3762	6.8 %
9	9. NA party placement	2207	4.0 %
.	-	31212	56.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,652 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 3.19
• Median: 3.00
• Mode: 3.00
• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00
• Standard Deviation: 1.46

Location: 989-989 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0518: PARTIES: Republican Party- Aid to Blacks Scale

1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

1970-1984, 1988 FORM B: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves (1970: but they should be expected to help themselves).

ALL YEARS: Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale} (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help minority groups	579	1.0 %
2	-	983	1.8 %
3	-	1994	3.6 %
4	-	4622	8.3 %
5	-	3985	7.2 %
6	-	2760	5.0 %
7	7. Minority groups should help themselves	1594	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK self-placement (1972-1984,1990,1994); NA	1850	3.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	3887	7.0 %
9	9. NA party placement	2208	4.0 %
.	-	31212	56.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,517 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.52
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.48

Location: 990-990 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0521: PARTIES: Which Favors Stronger Government

Which party do you think is more likely to favor a stronger [1978,1980, 1984: more powerful; 1988,1992: a powerful] government in Washington -- the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them on this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	3236	5.8 %
2	2. No difference	4384	7.9 %
3	3. Republicans	1768	3.2 %
8	8. DK which party	963	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Filter response is that R has no opinion/interest for	10237	18.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	35086	63.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,351 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 991-991 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0521A: PARTIES: Which Favors Stronger Government w/ No Opinion

Which party do you think is more likely to favor a stronger [1978,1980, 1984: more powerful; 1988,1992: a powerful] government in Washington -- the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be any difference between them on this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	3236	5.8 %
2	2. No difference	4384	7.9 %
3	3. Republicans	1768	3.2 %
9	9. DK which party; no opinion	6585	11.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R's own opinion is: thinks govt. not getting too	4615	8.3 %
.	-	35086	63.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,973 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 992-992 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0522: PARTIES: Which Will Best Avoid War/Bigger War

Looking ahead, do you think the problem of keeping out of war (1966-1972: a bigger war) would be handled better in the next four years (1966-1970: two years) by the Republicans, by the Democrats, or about the same by both? [2000: IF 'DK' OR 'NEITHER PARTY' IS VOLUNTEERED, DO NOT PROBE]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better by Democrats	5453	9.8 %
2	2. Same by both	13884	24.9 %
3	3. Better by Republicans	5494	9.9 %
9	9. DK; depends (1972); neither (2000)	1659	3.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. NA; Form II (1972); no Pre IW; question not	4129	7.4 %
.	-	25055	45.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,490 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 993-993 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0523: PARTIES: Which Favors Military Spending Cut

Which political party do you think is more in favor of cutting military spending - the Democrats, the Republicans, or wouldn't there be much difference between them?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	1081	1.9 %
2	2. Not much difference	1515	2.7 %
3	3. Republicans	336	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form II,IV (1972)	1555	2.8 %
8	8. DK	466	0.8 %
.	-	50721	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,932 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 994-994 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0524: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Rights of Accused Scale

Some people are primarily concerned with doing everything possible to protect the legal rights of those accused of committing crimes. Others feel that it is more important to stop criminal activity even at the risk of reducing the rights of the accused. Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Protect rights of accused	828	1.5 %
2	-	969	1.7 %
3	-	1347	2.4 %
4	-	1775	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	641	1.2 %
6	-	265	0.5 %
7	7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused	258	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; NA/haven't thought much	2144	3.9 %
8	8. DK party placement	2112	3.8 %
.	-	45335	81.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,083 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.37
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.53

Location: 995-995 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0525: PARTIES: Republican Party- Rights of Accused Scale

Some people are primarily concerned with doing everything possible to protect the legal rights of those accused of committing crimes. Others feel that it is more important to stop criminal activity even at the risk of reducing the rights of the accused. Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Protect rights of accused	495	0.9 %
2	-	518	0.9 %
3	-	831	1.5 %
4	-	1914	3.4 %
5	-	1216	2.2 %
6	-	683	1.2 %
7	7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused	447	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; NA/haven't thought much	2147	3.9 %
8	8. DK party placement	2088	3.8 %
.	-	45335	81.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,104 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.09

- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.58

Location: 996-996 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0528: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Urban Unrest Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with the problem of urban unrest and rioting. Some say it is more important to use all available force to maintain law and order - no matter what results. Others say it is more important to correct the problems of poverty and unemployment that give rise to the disturbances. Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7- POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment	681	1.2 %
2	-	791	1.4 %
3	-	930	1.7 %
4	-	1115	2.0 %
5	-	323	0.6 %
6	-	154	0.3 %
7	7. Use all available force	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much	2924	5.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	1000	1.8 %
.	-	47639	85.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,111 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.13
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.49

Location: 997-997 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0529: PARTIES: Republican Party- Urban Unrest Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with the problem of urban unrest and rioting. Some say it is more important to use all available force to maintain law and order - no matter what results. Others say it is more important to correct the problems of poverty and unemployment that give rise to the disturbances. Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7- POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment	261	0.5 %
2	-	311	0.6 %
3	-	566	1.0 %
4	-	1362	2.4 %
5	-	838	1.5 %
6	-	464	0.8 %
7	7. Use all available force	300	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much	2928	5.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	1005	1.8 %
.	-	47639	85.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,102 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.17
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.52

Location: 998-998 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0533: PARTIES: Democratic Party- School Busing Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with racial problems. Some people think achieving racial integration of schools is so important that it justifies busing children to schools out of their own neighborhoods. Others think letting children go to their neighborhood schools is so important that they oppose busing. Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Bus to achieve integration	602	1.1 %
2	-	557	1.0 %
3	-	725	1.3 %
4	-	1051	1.9 %
5	-	461	0.8 %
6	-	227	0.4 %
7	7. Keep children in neighborhood schools	379	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much about	700	1.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	1826	3.3 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,002 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.60
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.77

Location: 999-999 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0534: PARTIES: Republican Party- School Busing Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with racial problems. Some people think achieving racial integration of schools is so important that it justifies busing children to schools out of their own neighborhoods. Others think letting children go to their neighborhood schools is so important that they oppose busing. Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Bus to achieve integration	339	0.6 %
2	-	279	0.5 %
3	-	427	0.8 %
4	-	993	1.8 %
5	-	741	1.3 %
6	-	595	1.1 %
7	7. Keep children in neighborhood schools	691	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much about	700	1.3 %
8	8. DK party placement	1763	3.2 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,065 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.49
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.78

Location: 1000-1000 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0537: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Women Equal Role Scale

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	1856	3.3 %
2	-	2005	3.6 %
3	-	2410	4.3 %
4	-	2456	4.4 %
5	-	663	1.2 %
6	-	261	0.5 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	168	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought	1461	2.6 %
8	8. DK party placement	3542	6.4 %
.	-	40852	73.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,819 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.95
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.41

Location: 1001-1001 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0538: PARTIES: Republican Party- Women Equal Role Scale

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	1067	1.9 %
2	-	1107	2.0 %
3	-	1700	3.1 %
4	-	2955	5.3 %
5	-	1629	2.9 %
6	-	784	1.4 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	471	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought	1464	2.6 %
8	8. DK party placement	3645	6.5 %
.	-	40852	73.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,713 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.74
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.57

Location: 1002-1002 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0541: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Government Services-Spending Scale

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. (1996 AND LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. (1996: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Democratic Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce	390	0.7 %
2	-	654	1.2 %
3	-	1448	2.6 %
4	-	4027	7.2 %
5	-	5659	10.2 %
6	-	5422	9.7 %
7	7. Government should provide many more services: increase	3356	6.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much	2570	4.6 %
8	8. DK party placement	2553	4.6 %
.	-	29595	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,956 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.08
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.39

Location: 1003-1003 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0542: PARTIES: Republican Party- Government Services-Spending Scale

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. (1996 AND LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. (1996: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Republican Party {on this scale}? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce	3140	5.6 %
2	-	4634	8.3 %
3	-	5058	9.1 %
4	-	4423	7.9 %
5	-	2156	3.9 %
6	-	995	1.8 %
7	7. Government should provide many more services: increase	554	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much	2588	4.6 %
8	8. DK party placement	2531	4.5 %
.	-	29595	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,960 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.14
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 3.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1004-1004 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0545: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale? (7-PT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cooperate more/get along with Russia	352	0.6 %
2	-	693	1.2 %
3	-	1071	1.9 %
4	-	1096	2.0 %
5	-	416	0.7 %
6	-	167	0.3 %
7	7. Get much tougher/big mistake	84	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much	1183	2.1 %
8	8. DK party placement	849	1.5 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,879 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.35
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.36

Location: 1005-1005 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0546: PARTIES: Republican Party- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place the Republican Party on this scale? (7-PT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cooperate more/get along with Russia	183	0.3 %
2	-	291	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	563	1.0 %
4	-	992	1.8 %
5	-	1013	1.8 %
6	-	672	1.2 %
7	7. Get much tougher/big mistake	292	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/NA/haven't thought much	1182	2.1 %
8	8. DK party placement	723	1.3 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,006 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.38
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1006-1006 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0549: PARTIES: Democratic Party- Defense Spending Scale

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Democratic Party on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	1406	2.5 %
2	-	3079	5.5 %
3	-	4745	8.5 %
4	-	5366	9.6 %
5	-	2827	5.1 %
6	-	1350	2.4 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	635	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much	2447	4.4 %
8	8. DK party placement	2762	5.0 %
.	-	31057	55.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,408 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.60
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.45

Location: 1007-1007 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0550: PARTIES: Republican Party- Defense Spending Scale

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place the Republican Party on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	469	0.8 %
2	-	724	1.3 %
3	-	1367	2.5 %
4	-	3374	6.1 %
5	-	5349	9.6 %
6	-	5417	9.7 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	2885	5.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA party placement; DK/haven't thought much	2453	4.4 %
8	8. DK party placement	2579	4.6 %
.	-	31057	55.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,585 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.05
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 6.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.42

Location: 1008-1008 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0601: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Participation in Protests

There are many possible ways for people to show their disapproval or disagreement with governmental policies and actions. I am going to describe three such ways. We would like to know which ones you approve of as ways of showing dissatisfaction with the

government and which ones you disapprove of. How about taking part in protest meetings or marches that are permitted by the local authorities? Would you approve of taking part, disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Disapprove	2770	5.0 %
2	2. Pro-con, depends, don't know	2571	4.6 %
3	3. Approve	1102	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	901	1.6 %
.	-	48330	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,443 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1009-1009 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0602: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Civil Disobedience

How about refusing to obey a law which one thinks is unjust, if the person feels so strongly about it that he is willing to go to jail rather than obey the law? Would you approve of a person doing that, disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Disapprove	2992	5.4 %
2	2. Pro-con, depends, don't know	2511	4.5 %
3	3. Approve	936	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	905	1.6 %
.	-	48330	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,439 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1010-1010 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0603: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve Demonstrations

Suppose all other methods have failed and the person decides to try to stop the government from going about its usual activities with sit-ins, mass meetings, demonstrations, and things like that? Would you approve of that, disapprove, or would it depend on the circumstances?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Disapprove	4329	7.8 %
2	2. Pro-con, depends, don't know	3399	6.1 %
3	3. Approve	603	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	1261	2.3 %
.	-	46082	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,331 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1011-1011 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0604: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Trust the Federal Government To Do What is Right

People have (1958,1964: I'd like to talk about some of the) different ideas about the government in Washington. These ideas don't refer to Democrats or Republicans in particular, but just to government in general. We want to see how you feel about these ideas. (1996 and later: For example:) How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right -- just about always, most of the time (not 1966: or) only some of the time (1996: or almost never)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. None of the time (VOLUNTEERED); almost never (1966	653	1.2 %
2	2. Some of the time	22500	40.4 %
3	3. Most of the time	14211	25.5 %
4	4. Just about always	1908	3.4 %
9	9. DK; depends	652	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See	4919	8.8 %
.	-	10831	19.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 39,924 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1012-1012 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0605: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Federal Government Run by Few Interests or for the Benefit of All

Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Few big interests	25979	46.7 %
2	2. Benefit of all	12687	22.8 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; depends; other; refused to choose; both	2454	4.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See	2988	5.4 %
.	-	11566	20.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 41,120 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1013-1013 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0606: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Does the Federal Government Waste Tax Money

Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. A lot	27359	49.1 %
2	2. Some	12354	22.2 %
3	3. Not very much	1172	2.1 %
9	9. DK	655	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See	2727	4.9 %
.	-	11407	20.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 41,540 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1014-1014 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0607: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Many Government Officials Are Smart

Do you feel that almost all of the people running the government are smart people (1958-1972: who usually know what they are doing), or do you think that quite a few (1970: quite a lot) of them don't seem to know what they are doing?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Don't know what they're doing	6973	12.5 %
2	2. Know what they're doing	7815	14.0 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; depends; other; refused to choose; both	858	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. MD; no Post IW	885	1.6 %
.	-	39143	70.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,646 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1015-1015 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0608: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Many Government Officials Are Crooked

Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are (1958-1972: a little) crooked, not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked (1958-1972: at all)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Quite a few; quite a lot (1958-1972)	13404	24.1 %
2	2. Not many	15345	27.6 %
3	3. Hardly any	4234	7.6 %
9	9. DK	1053	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984: See	2899	5.2 %
.	-	18739	33.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 34,036 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1016-1016 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0609: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Officials Care What People Like Respondent Think

1952-1980,1982,1992: Now I'd like to read some of the kinds of things people tell us when we interview them. Please tell me whether (1992: and ask you whether) (1966,1988,1990,1994-LATER: how much) you agree or disagree with these statements (1992: with them) (2002: about the government.) (1988,1990: You can just give me the number of your choice.) (1992: I'll read them one at a time and you just tell me whether you agree or disagree) (1996 and later: The first is:)

1952-1988,1992:
'I don't think public officials care much what people like me think."

1990,1994-LATER:
'Public officials don't care much what people like me think.'

2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	21172	38.0 %
2	2. Disagree	18775	33.7 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)	2626	4.7 %
9	9. DK; not sure; it depends; can't say; refused to say	868	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; form B (1986)	4794	8.6 %
.	-	7439	13.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 43,441 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1017-1017 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0610: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Congressmen Lose Touch with Constituents

'Generally speaking, those we elect to Congress in Washington lose touch with the people pretty quickly.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	8279	14.9 %
2	2. Disagree	3815	6.9 %
9	9. DK; it depends; can't say; refused to say	567	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	849	1.5 %
.	-	42164	75.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,661 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1018-1018 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0611: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Parties Only Interested in Votes

'Parties are only interested in people's votes but not in their opinions.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	7248	13.0 %
2	2. Disagree	4883	8.8 %
9	9. DK; it depends; can't say; refused to say	519	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	860	1.5 %
.	-	42164	75.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,650 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1019-1019 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0612: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Voting is the Only Way to Have a Say in Government

'Voting is the only way that people like me can have any (1956-1964: a) say about how the government runs things.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	13051	23.4 %
2	2. Disagree	6783	12.2 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say;	387	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	993	1.8 %
.	-	34460	61.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,221 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1020-1020 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0613: SYSTEM SUPPORT: People like Respondent Have Any Say in What the Government Does

'People like me don't have any say about what the government does.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	17102	30.7 %
2	2. Disagree	23091	41.5 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)	1976	3.5 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	445	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	3445	6.2 %
.	-	9615	17.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 42,614 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1021-1021 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0614: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Politics and Government Seem Too Complicated

'Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	25911	46.5 %
2	2. Disagree	10774	19.4 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988 and later only)	1621	2.9 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	299	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	3313	6.0 %
.	-	13756	24.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,605 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1022-1022 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0615: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Matter Whether Respondent Votes or Not

2002: Now I'd like to read you a few statements about public life. I'll read them one at a time. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

ALL YEARS:

'So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't matter much to me whether I vote or not.'

2000:
Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?

2002:
Do you AGREE, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, or DISAGREE with this statement?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree (2000: agree strongly/somewhat)	1687	3.0 %
2	2. Disagree (2000: disagree strongly/somewhat)	14266	25.6 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree (2000, 2002 only)	153	0.3 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	137	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; IW conducted prior to addition	788	1.4 %
.	-	38643	69.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,243 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1023-1023 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0616: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Should Those Who Don't Care About Election Outcome Vote

'If a person doesn't (1988: if people don't) care how an election comes out he (1980,1984: then that person; 1988,1992: they) shouldn't vote in it.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	9492	17.0 %
2	2. Disagree	9555	17.2 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree (1988, 1990, 1992 only)	389	0.7 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	243	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	816	1.5 %
.	-	35179	63.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,679 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1024-1024 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0617: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Should Someone Vote If Their Party Can't Win

'It isn't so important to vote when you know your party doesn't have any chance to win.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	1178	2.1 %
2	2. Disagree	12111	21.8 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	172	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW	252	0.5 %
.	-	41961	75.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,461 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1025-1025 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0618: SYSTEM SUPPORT: A Good Many Local Elections Unimportant

'A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree	1851	3.3 %
2	2. Disagree	11412	20.5 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; can't say; refused to say	182	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW	268	0.5 %
.	-	41961	75.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,445 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1026-1026 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0619: SOCIAL TRUST: Most People Can Be Trusted OR: Can't Be Too Careful With People

1968:

Now here is something different. We have questions on other things besides politics.

ALL YEARS:
Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Can't be too careful	10340	18.6 %
2	2. Most people can be trusted	9505	17.1 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say	248	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3186	5.7 %
.	-	32395	58.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,093 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1027-1027 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0620: SOCIAL TRUST: People Are Helpful OR: People Look Out for Themselves

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Just look out for themselves	6251	11.2 %
2	2. Try to be helpful	8531	15.3 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say	427	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	2753	4.9 %
.	-	37712	67.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,209 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1028-1028 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0621: SOCIAL TRUST: People Will Take Advantage of Others OR: People Will Try to be Fair

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Would take advantage	5092	9.1 %
2	2. Would try to be fair	9190	16.5 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; both; can't say; refused to say	402	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	2497	4.5 %
.	-	38493	69.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,684 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1029-1029 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0622: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Government Pays Attention to What People Think

Over the years, how much attention do you feel the government pays to what the people think when it decides what to do -- a good deal, some, or not much?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much	7295	13.1 %
2	2. Some	14128	25.4 %
3	3. A good deal	4025	7.2 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; can't say	592	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3255	5.8 %
.	-	26379	47.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,040 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1030-1030 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0623: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Parties Make Government Pay Attention to People

How much do you feel that political parties help to make the government pay attention to what the people think, a good deal, some or not much?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much	2660	4.8 %
2	2. Some	6385	11.5 %
3	3. A good deal	3312	5.9 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; can't say	609	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV 1972)	2115	3.8 %
.	-	40593	72.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,966 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1031-1031 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0624: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Elections Make Government Pay Attention to People

(And) How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think, a good deal, some or not much?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much	4612	8.3 %
2	2. Some	13494	24.2 %
3	3. A good deal	16656	29.9 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; can't say	517	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3636	6.5 %
.	-	16759	30.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 35,279 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1032-1032 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0625: SYSTEM SUPPORT: How Much Attention Congressmen Pay to Constituents

How much attention do you think most Congressmen pay to the people who elect them when they decide what to do in Congress, a good deal, some, or not much?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much	2715	4.9 %
2	2. Some	6599	11.9 %
3	3. A good deal	3139	5.6 %
9	9. DK; other; depends; can't say	494	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form 2 whites (1970); form	2134	3.8 %
.	-	40593	72.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,947 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1033-1033 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0626: PERSONAL EFFICACY: Respondent Usually Able to Carry Out Plans as Expected

1958,1960,1964:
Now here is something a little different. It helps use know what kinds of people we have talked to if we can find out how they feel about things besides politics. For example..

1968-1972:
Now here is something different. We have questions on other things besides politics.

1976:
Now we have a few questions on other things besides politics.

ALL YEARS:
When you do make plans ahead, do you usually get to carry out things the way you expected, or do things usually come up to make you change your plans?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Have to change plans	6100	11.0 %
2	2. Things work out as expected	6332	11.4 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both other; refused to choose	471	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	891	1.6 %
.	-	41880	75.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,903 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1034-1034 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0627: PERSONAL EFFICACY: Better to Plan Life a Good Way Ahead

Do you think it's better to plan your life a good way ahead, or would you say life is too much a matter of luck to plan ahead very far?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Too much luck to plan	3039	5.5 %
2	2. Plan ahead	5633	10.1 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to	289	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	631	1.1 %
.	-	46082	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,961 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1035-1035 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0628: PERSONAL EFFICACY: Sure Life Would Work out as Expected

Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way you want it to, or have there been times when you haven't been (1958: very) sure about it?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Haven't been sure	7547	13.6 %
2	2. Pretty sure	5192	9.3 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to	227	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	828	1.5 %
.	-	41880	75.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,966 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1036-1036 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0629: PERSONAL EFFICACY: Can Run Life as Wanted

Some people feel they can run their lives pretty much the way they want to; others feel the problems of life are sometimes too big for them. Which one are you most like?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Problems of life too big	2137	3.8 %
2	2. Can run own life	6446	11.6 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; it depends; both; other; refused to	375	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	634	1.1 %
.	-	46082	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,958 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1037-1037 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0630: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Level Respondent Has Most Faith in

We find that people differ in how much faith and confidence they have in various levels of government in this country. In your case, do you have more faith and confidence in the national government, the government of this state, or in the local government around here?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. National government	2259	4.1 %
2	2. State government	1749	3.1 %
3	3. Local government	2127	3.8 %
9	9. DK; none; all; other; depends; refuses to choose;	1266	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)	2398	4.3 %
.	-	45875	82.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,401 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1038-1038 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0631: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Level Respondent Has Least Faith in

Which level (1996: of government) do you have the least faith and confidence in -- the national government, the government of this state, or the local government around here?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. National government	2388	4.3 %
2	2. State government	1154	2.1 %
3	3. Local government	2163	3.9 %
9	9. DK; none; all; other; depends; refuses to choose;	1660	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)	2434	4.4 %
.	-	45875	82.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,365 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1039-1039 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0632: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts Most

Which part of the government on the list do you most often trust to do what's right: Congress, the Supreme Court, the President, or political parties? (LIST SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Congress	1110	2.0 %
2	2. Supreme Court	1524	2.7 %
3	3. President	1167	2.1 %
4	4. Political parties	80	0.1 %
9	9. DK; all; none	641	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972)	2006	3.6 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,522 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1040-1040 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0633: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts 2nd Most

Which of the others do you next often trust to do what's right {Congress, Supreme Court, President or political parties}?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Congress	1479	2.7 %
2	2. Supreme Court	899	1.6 %
3	3. President	1100	2.0 %
4	4. Political parties	186	0.3 %
9	9. DK; all; none	828	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972); answered	2036	3.7 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,492 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1041-1041 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0634: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Branch of Government Respondent Trusts Least

Which {part of the government} do you least often trust to do what's right {Congress, Supreme Court, President or political parties}?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Congress	281	0.5 %
2	2. Supreme Court	443	0.8 %
3	3. President	397	0.7 %
4	4. Political parties	2731	4.9 %
9	9. DK; all; none	614	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III,IV (1972); answered	2062	3.7 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,466 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1042-1042 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0640: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Handling of Most Important Problem mentioned by Respondent

(IF R HAS MENTIONED A 'MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM' IN THE NATION:) How good (of) a job is the government doing in dealing with this problem: a good job, only fair, or a poor job?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Good job	1213	2.2 %
3	3. Only fair	6018	10.8 %
5	5. Poor job	8114	14.6 %
8	8. Don't know	330	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R has not identified any problem	687	1.2 %
9	9. NA; R not selected (1996,2000); no Post IW;	3564	6.4 %
.	-	35748	64.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,675 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1043-1043 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0648: SYSTEM SUPPORT: External Efficacy Index

External efficacy index, 100-pt scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Least efficacious	13967	25.1 %
25	-	1566	2.8 %
50	-	10706	19.2 %
75	-	1420	2.6 %
100	100. Most efficacious	15843	28.5 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. Not scored in both VCF0609 and VCF0613	4733	8.5 %
.	-	7439	13.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 43,502 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 52.07
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 100.00
- Minimum: 0.00

- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 41.85

Location: 1044-1046 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0649: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Government Responsiveness Index

Government responsiveness index, 100-pt scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Least responsive	4440	8.0 %
25	-	3280	5.9 %
50	-	13492	24.2 %
75	-	7245	13.0 %
100	100. Most responsive	7892	14.2 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. Not scored in both VCF0622 and VCF0624	3984	7.2 %
.	-	15341	27.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 36,349 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.48
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 31.20

Location: 1047-1049 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0650: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Federal Government Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	172	0.3 %
1	-	58	0.1 %
2	2. Poor job	734	1.3 %
3	-	408	0.7 %
4	4. Fair job	2099	3.8 %
5	-	435	0.8 %
6	6. Good job	568	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	59	0.1 %
8	8. Very good job	62	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	842	1.5 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,595 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1050-1050 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0651: SYSTEM SUPPORT: State Government Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - State governments, in general

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	77	0.1 %
1	-	45	0.1 %
2	2. Poor job	475	0.9 %
3	-	350	0.6 %
4	4. Fair job	1807	3.2 %
5	-	602	1.1 %
6	6. Good job	977	1.8 %
7	-	92	0.2 %
8	8. Very good job	80	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	932	1.7 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,505 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1051-1051 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0652: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Local Government Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - Local governments, in general

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	148	0.3 %
1	-	71	0.1 %
2	2. Poor job	467	0.8 %
3	-	345	0.6 %
4	4. Fair job	1526	2.7 %
5	-	538	1.0 %
6	6. Good job	1083	1.9 %
7	-	186	0.3 %
8	8. Very good job	128	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	945	1.7 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,492 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 0.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1052-1052 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0653: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Presidency Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - The presidency

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	209	0.4 %
1	-	91	0.2 %
2	2. Poor job	629	1.1 %
3	-	372	0.7 %
4	4. Fair job	1523	2.7 %
5	-	546	1.0 %
6	6. Good job	950	1.7 %
7	-	132	0.2 %
8	8. Very good job	148	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	837	1.5 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,600 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1053-1053 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0654: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Congress Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - Congress, that is the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	149	0.3 %
1	-	66	0.1 %
2	2. Poor job	695	1.2 %
3	-	477	0.9 %
4	4. Fair job	1641	2.9 %
5	-	570	1.0 %
6	6. Good job	634	1.1 %
7	-	92	0.2 %
8	8. Very good job	81	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	1032	1.9 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,405 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1054-1054 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0655: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Supreme Court Performance Rating

Now, I'd like to ask you how good a job you feel some of the parts of our government are doing. As I read, please give me the number that best describes how good a job you feel that part of the government is doing for the country as a whole. - The U.S. Supreme Court

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Very poor job	162	0.3 %
1	-	95	0.2 %
2	2. Poor job	429	0.8 %
3	-	323	0.6 %
4	4. Fair job	1139	2.0 %
5	-	505	0.9 %
6	6. Good job	947	1.7 %
7	-	240	0.4 %
8	8. Very good job	218	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no opinion; haven't thought about it;	1379	2.5 %
.	-	50237	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,058 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1055-1055 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0656: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Trust in Government Index

Trust in government index, 100 pt scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Least trusting	2981	5.4 %
8	-	7240	13.0 %
11	-	2619	4.7 %
13	-	66	0.1 %
17	-	1797	3.2 %
21	-	4463	8.0 %
22	-	567	1.0 %
25	-	585	1.1 %
28	-	985	1.8 %
29	-	1777	3.2 %
33	-	3412	6.1 %
34	-	247	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	-	112	0.2 %
39	-	708	1.3 %
42	-	1745	3.1 %
44	-	618	1.1 %
46	-	1284	2.3 %
50	-	735	1.3 %
54	-	1978	3.6 %
56	-	777	1.4 %
58	-	904	1.6 %
59	-	96	0.2 %
61	-	260	0.5 %
63	-	199	0.4 %
67	-	3414	6.1 %
71	-	258	0.5 %
72	-	604	1.1 %
75	-	635	1.1 %
78	-	47	0.1 %
79	-	950	1.7 %
83	-	189	0.3 %
84	-	424	0.8 %
88	-	257	0.5 %
89	-	112	0.2 %
92	-	136	0.2 %
100	100. Most trusting	545	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. Not scored in all of: VCF0604, VCF0605, VCF0606,	4008	7.2 %
.	-	7940	14.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 43,726 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 33.66
- Median: 29.00
- Mode: 8.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.02

Location: 1056-1058 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0675: MEDIA: How Much of the Time Does Respondent Trust the Media to Report Fairly

How much of the time do you think you can trust the media to report the news fairly? Just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or almost never?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Just about always	335	0.6 %
2	2. Most of the time	2292	4.1 %
3	3. Only some of the time	3607	6.5 %
4	4. Almost never	1140	2.0 %
5	5. None of the time (VOL)	133	0.2 %
8	8. DK	23	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	806	1.4 %
.	-	47338	85.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,530 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1059-1059 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0700: ELECTION: Who Will Be Elected President in November

Who do you think will be elected President in November?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democratic candidate	11187	20.1 %
2	2. Republican candidate	13542	24.3 %
7	7. Other candidate	246	0.4 %
8	8. DK; depends	3135	5.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Pre IW	264	0.5 %
.	-	27300	49.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,110 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1060-1060 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0701: ELECTION: Registered to Vote Pre-Election

Now how about the election this November. (1952-1964: Do you know if you are; 1968-1980: Are you) registered/eligible so that you could vote in the November election if you wanted to?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	2966	5.3 %
2	2. Yes	11060	19.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; form II (1972)	1650	3.0 %
.	-	39998	71.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,026 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1061-1061 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0702: ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote in the National Elections

1948:
In the election, about half the people voted and about half of them didn't. Did you vote?

1962:
One of the things we need to know is whether or not people really did get to vote this fall. In talking to people about the election we find that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't registered or they were sick or something else came up at the last minute. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in the November election?

1952-1960,1964-1998, 2002 VERSION 1, and 2004 VERSION 1:
In talking to people about the election we (1972 AND LATER: often) find that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't registered or they were sick or they just didn't have time. (1956-1960: How about you, did you vote this time?) (1964-1970: How about you, did you vote this time, or did something keep you from voting) (1972-1976: How about you, did you vote in the elections this fall?) (1978 and later: How about you, did you vote in the elections this November?)

2000, 2002 VERSION2, 2004 VERSION 2, 2008 VERSION 'OLD':
In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have time. Which of the following statements best describes you:

One, I did not vote (in the election this November);
Two, I thought about voting this time - but didn't;
Three, I usually vote, but didn't this time; or
Four, I am sure I voted?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, did not vote	15965	28.7 %
2	2. Yes, voted	34851	62.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; refused to say if voted;	3719	6.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	1139	2.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 50,816 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1062-1062 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0703: ELECTION: Register and Turnout SUMMARY

Summary: Did R Register and Vote

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not registered, and did not vote	7329	13.2 %
2	2. Registered, but did not vote	5560	10.0 %
3	3. Voted (registered)	29344	52.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA if voted; DK/NA whether registered (includes	4520	8.1 %
.	-	8921	16.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 42,233 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1063-1063 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0704: ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Candidates

1948:
(IF R VOTED:) Whom did you vote for?

1952-1964:
(IF R VOTED:) Who did you vote for President?

1968-1976:
(IF R VOTED:) Who did you vote for in the election for President?

1980-LATER:
(IF R VOTED:) How about the election for President? Did you vote for a candidate for President? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	11518	20.7 %
2	2. Republican	10699	19.2 %
3	3. Major third party candidate (Wallace 1968/Anderson	584	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if	12149	21.8 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,801 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1064-1064 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0704A: ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Parties

Major party presidential vote (2 party)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	11518	20.7 %
2	2. Republican	10699	19.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if	12733	22.9 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,217 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1065-1065 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0705: ELECTION: Vote for President- Major Parties and Other

Presidential vote (major parties and all "other")

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	11518	20.7 %
2	2. Republican	10699	19.2 %
3	3. Other (incl. 3d/minor party candidates and write-ins)	919	1.7 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Did not vote; DK/NA if voted; refused to say if	11814	21.2 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,136 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1066-1066 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0706: ELECTION: Vote and Nonvote- President

Presidential vote and nonvote

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	11518	20.7 %
2	2. Republican	10699	19.2 %
3	3. Major third party candidate (Wallace 1968/Anderson	584	1.0 %
4	4. Other (incl. 3d/minor party candidates and write-ins)	335	0.6 %
7	7. Did not vote or voted but not for president (exc.1972)	7872	14.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA if voted; refused to say if voted; DK/NA if	3942	7.1 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 31,008 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1067-1067 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0707: ELECTION: Vote for Congressman

1952-1970:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED [NO BALLOT CARD]: How about the vote for Congressman. Did you vote for a candidate for Congress? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?

1972:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED [NO BALLOT CARD]: How about the election for Congressman-- that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington? Which party's candidate did you vote for Congressman?

1974,1976:
COUNTY OF REGISTRATION NOT DETERMINED: [NO BALLOT CARD]: How about the election for Congressman-- that is, for the

House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for Congress? Whom did you vote for? Which party was that?

1978:
ALL CASES [BALLOT CARD]:
Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

I. 1980-LATER - REGISTERED IN IW COUNTY: 1980-1982,1984 PERSONAL,1986-1996,1998 PERSONAL,2000 PERSONAL [BALLOT CARD]: Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

1984 TELEPHONE [NO BALLOT CARD]:
I am going to read a list of candidates for the major races in your district. In the election for the House of Representatives, the ballot listed: [Names and party affiliations of all House candidates on the Ballot Card]. Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

1998 TELEPHONE [BALLOT CARD]:
Please take out the (color) sheet of paper that was folded inside your booklet. There you see a list of candidates for the major race(s) in this district. How about the election for the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

2000 TELEPHONE,2002 [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington. Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? Did you vote for (the Democrat, [NAME], or) (the Republican, [NAME]) (IF IND/3RD PARTY CANDIDATE: or the [PARTY] candidate, [NAME])?

II. 1980-LATER - REGISTERED OUTSIDE IW COUNTY: 1980-1996,1998 PERSONAL,2000,2002 [NO BALLOT CARD]: How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? (2000: Which party was that?)

1998 TELEPHONE [NO BALLOT CARD]:
[TELL RESPONDENT, IF NECESSARY, "We won't need to use the ballot card in your booklet since you are in a different city/town/county)."] How about the election for the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	15997	28.7 %
2	2. Republican	12637	22.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; R did not vote; R refused to say if	25239	45.3 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,634 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1068-1068 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0708: ELECTION: Vote for Senator

1952-1976:
How about the vote for United States Senator? Did you vote for a candidate for Senator? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?

1978-1998,2000 PERSONAL,2000 TELEPHONE IF VOTED OUTSIDE COUNTY OF IW, 2002 VOTED OUTSIDE COUNTY OF IW:
(IF BALLOT CARD [1978-1998,2000 PERSONAL]: Still looking at the list of candidates:) How about the election for the United States Senate? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S./United States Senate? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for?

2000 TELEPHONE IF VOTED IN COUNTY OF IW [NO BALLOT CARD], 2002 VOTED IN COUNTY OF IW [NO BALLOT CARD]:
How about the election for the United States Senate? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S./United States Senate? (IF YES:) Did you vote for (the Democrat, [NAME], or) (the Republican, [NAME]) (IF IND/3RD PARTY CANDIDATE: or the [PARTY] candidate, [NAME])?

1992 CALIFORNIA:
We had two Senate races in California. Which candidate did you vote for?

1996 KANSAS:
How about the two elections for the United States Senate? Did you vote for candidates for the U.S. Senate?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	11027	19.8 %
2	2. Republican	8928	16.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; R did not vote; refused to say if voted;	32621	58.6 %
.	-	3098	5.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,955 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1069-1069 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0709: ELECTION: Vote Ticket-splitting- President/House

Ticket-splitting: President/House

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Dem. Pres. - Dem. Congressional	8101	14.6 %
2	2. Dem. Pres. - Rep. Congressional	1258	2.3 %
3	3. Rep. Pres. - Dem. Congressional	2070	3.7 %
4	4. Rep. Pres. - Rep. Congressional	6856	12.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA who voted for in presidential or congressional	16003	28.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	21386	38.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,285 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1070-1070 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0710: ELECTION: Vote Ticket-splitting- President/Senate

Ticket-splitting: President/Senate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Dem. Pres. - Dem. Senate	6037	10.8 %
2	2. Dem. Pres. - Rep. Senate	809	1.5 %
3	3. Rep. Pres. - Dem. Senate	1407	2.5 %
4	4. Rep. Pres. - Rep. Senate	5052	9.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA who voted for in presidential or congressional	20983	37.7 %
.	-	21386	38.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,305 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1071-1071 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0711: ELECTION: Does Respondent Always Vote for the Same Party

Have you always voted for the same party or have you voted for different parties for President?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Different party	7968	14.3 %
2	2. Same party; mostly same party (1952-1970)	9391	16.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Pre IW; R has never voted	4298	7.7 %
.	-	34017	61.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,359 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1072-1072 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0712: ELECTION: Timing of Respondent's Presidential Vote Decision

How long before the election did you decide that you were going to vote the way you did?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Knew all along (incl.: always vote for same party;	4324	7.8 %
2	2. When candidate announced (exc. 1948)	2911	5.2 %
3	3. During conventions	3440	6.2 %
4	4. Post-convention period	3298	5.9 %
5	5. Last two weeks of campaign	2069	3.7 %
6	6. On election day	852	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; unspecified 'other'; R did not vote; DK/NA	9820	17.6 %
.	-	28960	52.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,894 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 1073-1073 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0713: ELECTION: Respondent Pre-election Intent for Vote for President

ALL YEARS EXC. 1948,1992,2012:
So far as you know now, do you expect to vote in the national elections this coming November or not? (IF YES:) Who do you think you will vote for in the election for President?

1948:
On the coming Presidential election, do you plan to vote? (IF RESPONSE NOT 'NO':) Do you plan to vote Republican, Democrat or something else?

1992 and 1996:
We all know the election is some time away and people are not certain at this point who they will vote for. Still, who do you think you will vote for in the election for President?

2012 PRE-ELECTION: (IF R IS NOT REGISTERED BUT INTENDS TO REGISTER, OR IF R IS REGISTERED BUT DID NOT VOTE YET:) How about the election for President? Do you intend to vote for a candidate for PRESIDENT? (IF YES:) Who do you think you will vote for? [DEM PRES CAND NAME], [REP PRES CAND NAME], or someone else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democratic candidate (with or without qualifications,	12978	23.3 %
2	2. Republican candidate (with or without qualifications,	11671	21.0 %
3	3. Undecided; DK (except 1964)	2049	3.7 %
4	4. R does not intend to vote (incl. 'no, qualified' if	4616	8.3 %
9	9. Other candidate	987	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK (1964 only); NA; no Pre IW; DK/NA/RF (1952	2649	4.8 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 32,301 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1074-1074 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0714: ELECTION: Will the Presidential Election Be Close

(IF R PREDICTS A WINNER IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION:) Do you think it [the presidential race] will be a close race or will [R's predicted winning candidate] win by quite a bit?

1980 AND LATER: (IF R REPLIES "DK" WHO WILL WIN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION:) Do you think the presidential race will be close or will one candidate win by quite a bit?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Will win by quite a bit	12368	22.2 %
2	2. Close race	18358	33.0 %
9	9. DK; pro-con; depends; etc.	2882	5.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; R replies DK who will win	680	1.2 %
.	-	21386	38.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,608 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1075-1075 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0715: ELECTION: State/Local Vote Straight Ticker or Split 5-Category

How about the elections for other state and local offices, did you vote a straight ticket or did you vote for candidates from different parties. (IF STRAIGHT TICKET:) Which party?/ (IF SPLIT TICKET:) How did you split it?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Straight ticket - Democratic	4432	8.0 %
2	2. Split ticket - mostly Democratic	1754	3.2 %
3	3. Split ticket - about half and half, NA how split	2883	5.2 %
4	4. Split ticket - mostly Republican	1603	2.9 %
5	5. Straight ticket - Republican	3188	5.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; R did not vote; DK, NA if voted; refused to	9224	16.6 %
.	-	32590	58.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,860 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1076-1076 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0716: ELECTION: State/Local Vote Straight Ticker or Split 2-Category

1948:
Did you vote a straight ticket or did you vote for some candidates from other parties?

ALL YEARS EXC. 1948:
How about the elections for other state and local offices, did you vote a straight ticket or did you vote for candidates from different parties?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Split-ticket	6450	11.6 %
2	2. Straight ticket	7957	14.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; R did not vote; DK, NA if voted; refused to	9339	16.8 %
.	-	31928	57.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,407 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1077-1077 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF0717: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Try to Influence the Vote of Others During the Campaign

1952,1956,1960-1964:
I have a list of some of the things that people do that help a party or a candidate win an election. I wonder if you could tell me whether you did any of these things.

1968,1972 AND LATER:
Now I'd like to find out (1990 AND LATER: We'd/we would like to find out) about some of the things that people do to help a party or candidate win an election.

ALL YEARS:
During the campaign, did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for (1984 AND LATER: or against) one of the parties or candidates?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	34952	62.8 %
2	2. Yes	14972	26.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);	3949	7.1 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 49,924 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1078-1078 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0718: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Attend Political Meetings/Rallies During the Campaign

Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, (1984 AND LATER: speeches,) (1978,1980,1982: fund raising) dinners, or things like that (1984 AND LATER: in support of a particular candidate)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	43737	78.6 %
2	2. Yes	3484	6.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);	3911	7.0 %
.	-	4542	8.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 47,221 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1079-1079 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0719: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Work for Party or Candidate During the Campaign

Did you do any {other} work for one of the parties or candidates?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	45248	81.3 %
2	2. Yes	1948	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);	3936	7.1 %
.	-	4542	8.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 47,196 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1080-1080 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0720: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Display Candidate Button/Sticker During the Campaign

1956,1960,1962-1982: Did you wear a campaign button or put a campaign sticker on your car?

1984 AND LATER: Did you wear a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on your car, or place a sign in your window or in front of your house?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	40278	72.3 %
2	2. Yes	5218	9.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);	3737	6.7 %
.	-	6441	11.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 45,496 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1081-1081 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0721: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Donate Money to Party or Candidate During the Campaign

1952,1956,1960,1962:
Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help the campaign for one of the parties or candidates?

1964:
Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help a party or candidate pay campaign expenses this year?

1966,1968:
During this last year were you or any member of your household asked to give money or buy tickets to help pay the campaign expenses of a political party or candidate? (IF YES) Did you give any money or buy any tickets?

1972,1974:
Did you give any money to a political party this year?

1976:
Did you give any money to a political party or make any other contribution this year? (responses : 1. yes, 5. no, 7. tax check-off).

1978:
Did you give any money to a political party or candidate this year?

1980,1982:
Now a few questions about giving money during this last election campaign: What about other political contributions [other than tax check-offs]. Did you give any money this year to a candidate running for public office?;Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about contributions to any of the political parties. Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, to a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group? (IF YES: Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about contributions to any political party organization. Did you give money to a political party during this election year? Now, apart from contributions to a political party, did you give any money to an individual candidate running for public office?)

1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization?

1988 AND LATER:
During an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. Did you give money to a political party during this election year? Did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No (includes 'not asked for money' in 1966,1968)	42210	75.8 %
2	2. Yes (includes 'tax check-off' in 1976)	4722	8.5 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972);	3984	7.2 %
.	-	4758	8.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 46,932 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1082-1082 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0722: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Has Respondent Ever Written a Letter to a Public Official

1972,1976:
Aside from this particular election campaign, here are some other ways people can be involved in politics.

ALL YEARS:
Have you ever written a letter to any public officials giving them your opinion about something that should be done?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	5233	9.4 %
2	2. Yes	1649	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1199	2.2 %
.	-	47593	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,882 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1083-1083 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0723: MOBILIZATION: Count of Campaign Participation Activities 6-Category

Campaign participation count [1]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Lowest level of participation (none)	26504	47.6 %
2	-	11169	20.1 %
3	-	3672	6.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1516	2.7 %
5	-	737	1.3 %
6	6. Highest level of participation in campaign activities	440	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA in all questions; no Post IW; form III,IV	3688	6.6 %
.	-	7948	14.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 44,038 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.64
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.00

Location: 1084-1084 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0723A: MOBILIZATION: Count of Campaign Participation Activities 4-Category

Campaign participation count [2]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Lowest level of participation (none)	31385	56.4 %
2	-	12799	23.0 %
3	-	2112	3.8 %
4	4. Highest level of participation in campaign activities	951	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA in all questions; no Post IW; form III,IV	3885	7.0 %
.	-	4542	8.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 47,247 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.42
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00
- Standard Deviation: 0.67

Location: 1085-1085 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0724: MEDIA: Watch TV Programs about the Election Campaigns

1952-1972,1976:
We're (1952: mainly) interested in this interview in finding out whether people paid much attention to the election campaign this year. Did you watch any programs about the campaign on television?

(1952,1960-1972,1976: (IF YES:) How many television programs about the campaign would you say you watched -- a good many, several, or just one or two?

1974:
A lot of people didn't pay much attention to the election campaigns this year. How about you--did you watch any programs about the campaign on television? (IF YES:) How many television programs about the campaign would you say you watched--a good many, several, or just one or two?

1978,1980,1982,1984,1986,1990,1992-LATER EXC. 2008 VERSION 'NEW': (1978,1980,1982,1984: Some people don't pay much attention to campaigns. How about you?) (1986: We're interested in this interview in finding out whether people paid much attention to the election campaign this year.)

Did you watch any programs about the campaigns on television? (1978,1980,1984,1990,1996,2004,2008 VERSION 'OLD': IF YES: Would you say you watched-- a good many, several, or just one or two?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, didn't watch TV programs about the campaign	8275	14.9 %
2	2. Yes, watched TV program(s) about the campaign [a	29108	52.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	5829	10.5 %
.	-	12462	22.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,383 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1086-1086 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0725: MEDIA: Hear Programs about Campaigns on the Radio 2-Category

1952,1956:
How about radio--did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio? (1952 only: IF YES:) Would you say you listened quite a lot or not very much.)

1960-1988,1992,1996:
(1960-1988: How about radio.) Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio?

1960-1980,1984-1988,1992 AND LATER:
Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio? (IF YES:) How many programs about the campaign did you listen to on the radio [1996: Would you say you listened to] --a good many, several, or just one or two?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, didn't listen to radio programs about campaign	15628	28.1 %
2	2. Yes, listened to radio program(s) (quite a lot (1952), not very much (1952), a good many, several, just one or t	12442	22.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	3880	7.0 %
.	-	23724	42.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,070 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1087-1087 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0726: MEDIA: Articles about Election Campaigns in Magazines

How about magazines-- did you read about the campaign in any magazines.

1952 IF YES: Would you say you read quite a lot or not very much?

1960-1980,1984 IF YES:
How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read -- a good many, several, or just one or two?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, didn't read magazines about the campaign	16279	29.2 %
2	2. Yes, read magazine(s) [quite a lot (1952), not very	8069	14.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	3619	6.5 %
.	-	27707	49.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,348 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1088-1088 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0727: MEDIA: Number of Articles about Election Campaigns in Magazines

1952,1956,1960,1964,1968,1972,1976:
We're (1952: mainly) interested in this interview in finding out whether people paid much attention to the election campaign

this year. Take newspapers for instance--did you read (1972 ONLY: much) about the campaign in any newspaper?

1974:
(IF R READS A DAILY NEWSPAPER:) Did you read anything about the campaign this year in any newspaper?

1978-1986,1990:
Did you read about the campaign in any newspapers?

1988,1992 AND LATER:
(IF R HAS READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER IN THE PAST WEEK:) Did you read about the campaign in any newspaper?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, read no newspapers about the campaign	9482	17.0 %
2	2. Yes, read newspaper(s) about the campaign	21252	38.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	7093	12.7 %
.	-	17847	32.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,734 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1089-1089 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0728: MEDIA: Count of Media Exposure Types

Campaign media exposure count

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No media	1764	3.2 %
2	-	4301	7.7 %
3	-	6675	12.0 %
4	-	6745	12.1 %
5	5. All four media	3293	5.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	4724	8.5 %
.	-	28172	50.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,778 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.24
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.15

Location: 1090-1090 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0729: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with House Majority Before the Election

1958-1968: Do you happen to know which party had the most Congressmen in Washington before the election this/last month? (IF NECESSARY:) Which one?

1970 AND LATER:
Do you happen to know which party had the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington before the elections (this/ last) month? (IF NECESSARY:) Which one? (2000, 2004: DON'T PROBE DK)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Incorrect party mentioned; DK; No	17446	31.3 %
2	2. Correct party mentioned	24236	43.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	5658	10.2 %
.	-	8334	15.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 41,682 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1091-1091 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0730: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with House Majority After the Election

1958-1968:
Do you happen to know which party elected the most Congressmen in the elections this/last month? (IF YES:) Which one?

1970-1984:
Do you happen to know which party elected the most members to the House of representatives in the elections this/last month?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Incorrect party mentioned; DK; No	8901	16.0 %
2	2. Correct party mentioned	9251	16.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972);	2951	5.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	34571	62.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,152 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1092-1092 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0731: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Respondent Discuss Politics with Family and Friends

Do you ever discuss politics with your family or friends?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	17818	32.0 %
5	5. No	5950	10.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	6	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	2680	4.8 %
.	-	29220	52.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,768 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1093-1093 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0732: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: How Often Respondent Discusses Politics with Family and Friends

Do you ever discuss politics with your family or friends (RESPONDENT BOOKLET) How often do you discuss politics with your family or friends -- every day, 3 or 4 times a week, once or twice a week, or less often than that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Every day	967	1.7 %
2	2. 3 or 4 times a week	1585	2.8 %
3	3. Once or twice a week	3049	5.5 %
4	4. Less often	3045	5.5 %
5	5. Never/No (to lead-in)	3075	5.5 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. DK/NA how often; DK/NA if ever discuss; no Post	253	0.5 %
.	-	43700	78.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,721 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1094-1094 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0733: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: How Often in the Last Week Respondent Discussed Politics

How many days in the past week did you talk about politics with your family or friend?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None or never discuss politics ('no' to lead-in)	8690	15.6 %
1	1. One day	3247	5.8 %
2	2. Two days	3594	6.5 %
3	3. Three days	2481	4.5 %
4	4. Four days	1434	2.6 %
5	5. Five days	901	1.6 %
6	6. Six days	302	0.5 %
7	7. Every day	2983	5.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK/NA how often; DK/NA if ever discuss; NA how often	2822	5.1 %
.	-	29220	52.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,632 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1095-1095 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0734: ELECTION: Intended Presidential Vote versus Actual Presidential Vote

Reported Pre vote intention/reported Post vote - President

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. INTENDED Democratic: voted Democratic	9497	17.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. INTENDED undecided: voted Democratic;	800	1.4 %
3	3. INTENDED Republican: voted Democratic	453	0.8 %
4	4. INTENDED Democratic: did not vote/voted 'other'	1653	3.0 %
5	5. INTENDED undecided: did not vote/voted 'other'	1000	1.8 %
6	6. INTENDED Republican: did not vote/voted 'other'	1203	2.2 %
7	7. INTENDED Democratic: voted Republican	451	0.8 %
8	8. INTENDED undecided: voted Republican; INTENDED	739	1.3 %
9	9. INTENDED Republican: voted Republican	8868	15.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA who will vote for; no Pre IW; no Post IW;	10286	18.5 %
.	-	20724	37.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,664 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1096-1096 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0735: ELECTION: Vote for U.S. House- Candidate Code

Candidate code of House vote [NOTE: Please refer to the Variable Codebook section of the Original P.I. Documentation within the ICPSR Codebook for further explanation of these values and their labels.]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	31. Democratic candidate	1073	1.9 %
32	32. Republican candidate	995	1.8 %
33	33. Democratic incumbent	6539	11.7 %
34	34. Republican incumbent	4750	8.5 %
35	35. Democratic candidate	1911	3.4 %
36	36. Republican candidate	1863	3.3 %
39	39. Independent/minor party incumbent	2	0.0 %
71	71. Democratic incumbent in district with 2 incumbents (2012)	32	0.1 %
72	72. Republican incumbent in district with 2 incumbents (2012)	9	0.0 %
81	81. Democratic candidate	7	0.0 %
82	82. Republican candidate	11	0.0 %
83	83. Democratic incumbent	49	0.1 %
84	84. Republican incumbent	47	0.1 %
85	85. Democratic challenger	26	0.0 %
86	86. Republican challenger	19	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
91	91. DEMOCRAT -- no name given	247	0.4 %
92	92. REPUBLICAN--no name given	188	0.3 %
97	97. Non-incumbent minor party candidate; non-incumbent	430	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. R did not vote; NA/DK if voted; refused to say if	13588	24.4 %
98	98. DK; refused to name candidate	349	0.6 %
99	99. NA; District of Columbia (1982,1986,1996);	1695	3.0 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,198 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 31.00
• Maximum: 97.00

Location: 1097-1098 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0736: ELECTION: Vote for U.S. House- Party

Congressional vote: including "other" (see also: VCF0707)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	15992	28.7 %
5	5. Republican	12633	22.7 %
7	7. Other	398	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; R did not vote; R refused to say if	24850	44.6 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,023 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1099-1099 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0737: ELECTION: Registered to Vote Post-Election

1948:
Were you registered (eligible) to vote?

All years exc. 1948:

Were you registered to vote in this election?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No	5453	9.8 %
2	2. Yes (includes Rs who reported voting)	22140	39.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington, D.C.; NA if R	2884	5.2 %
.	-	25197	45.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,593 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1100-1100 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0738: ELECTION: Party of Registration Post-election

Were you registered in this election as being a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or what?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democratic party	3335	6.0 %
5	5. Republican party	1922	3.5 %
6	6. Voters: not required to declare party (VOLUNTEERED);	680	1.2 %
7	7. Independent	834	1.5 %
8	8. Other party	28	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R was not registered	2112	3.8 %
9	9. DK; absentee voter; NA; nonvoter who declares	858	1.5 %
.	-	45905	82.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,799 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1101-1101 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0738A: ELECTION: Party of Registration Pre-election

(IF R IS REGISTERED) Are you registered as being a Republican, a Democrat or anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democratic party	1260	2.3 %
5	5. Republican party	805	1.4 %
6	6. No party/none (1976 also includes: none required)	643	1.2 %
8	8. Other	36	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R was not registered	770	1.4 %
9	9. DK; NA; DK/NA if R registered; form II (1972)	1439	2.6 %
.	-	50721	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,744 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1102-1102 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0739: MOBILIZATION: Respondent Made $1 Tax Checkoff for Political Contribution

1980-1984: Now for a few questions about giving money during this last election campaign.

All YEARS:
Did you use the one-dollar check-off option on your Federal income tax return to make a political contribution this year?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3544	6.4 %
2	2. No	8380	15.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2046	3.7 %
.	-	41704	74.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,924 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1103-1103 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0740: MOBILIZATION: Contribute to Political Party During the Campaigns

1980-1982:

Apart from contributions to specific candidates, how about contributions to any of the political parties? Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the last year did you give any money to an individual candidate, a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group? (IF YES:) Apart from contributions to specific candidates, how about contributions to a political party organization? Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization? (IF YES:) Apart from contributions to specific candidates, how about contributions to a political party organization? Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

1988 AND LATER:
Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1805	3.2 %
2	2. No	27258	49.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2463	4.4 %
.	-	24148	43.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,063 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1104-1104 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0741: MOBILIZATION: Contribute to PAC During the Campaigns

1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the last year did you give any money to an individual candidate, a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group? (IF YES:) Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?

1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization? (IF YES:) Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?

ALL OTHER YEARS:
Did you give any money to any other group that supported or opposed candidates?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1114	2.0 %
2	2. No	25026	45.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2354	4.2 %
.	-	27180	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,140 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1105-1105 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0742: MOBILIZATION: Give Money to Individual Candidate During the Campaigns

1980,1982:
What about other political contributions [other than tax check-offs]. Did you give any money this year to a candidate running for public office?

1984:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, to a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group? (IF YES:) Now, apart from contributions to a political party, did you give any money to an individual candidate running for public office?

1986:
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization? (IF YES:) Now, apart from any contributions to a political party, did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office?

1988 AND LATER:
During an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. Did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2149	3.9 %
2	2. No	26905	48.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK; NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2472	4.4 %
.	-	24148	43.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,054 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1106-1106 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0743: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Does R Belong to Political Organization or Club

Do you belong to any political club or organization?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	524	0.9 %
5	5. No	14715	26.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW	871	1.6 %
.	-	39564	71.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,239 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1107-1107 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0744: MEDIA: Have Access to Internet

Do you have access to the Internet or the World Wide Web [exc. 2008: ("the Web")]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4302	7.7 %
5	5. No	3445	6.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW	589	1.1 %
.	-	47338	85.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,747 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1108-1108 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0745: MEDIA: Saw Election Campaign Information on the Internet

1996-2004: (IF R HAS ACCESS TO THE INTERNET/WEB:) Have you seen any information about this election campaign on (the Internet/the Web)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. R does not have access	0	0.0 %
1	1. Yes	1189	2.1 %
5	5. No	4238	7.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; DK/NA if has access; no Post IW	587	1.1 %
.	-	49660	89.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,427 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1109-1109 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0746: MOBILIZATION: Did Religious/Moral Group Try to Influence Respondent Vote

Were there any groups concerned with moral or religious issues that tried to encourage you to vote in a particular way?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, there were groups	571	1.0 %
5	5. No, no groups tried to encourage	3789	6.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW	442	0.8 %
.	-	50872	91.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,360 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1110-1110 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0747: MOBILIZATION: Information about Candidates/Parties/Issues at Church

Was information about candidates, parties, or political issues made available in your place of worship before the election?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	514	0.9 %
5	5. No, no information available	3179	5.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	7. No, don't attend church (VOL)	632	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW	477	0.9 %
.	-	50872	91.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,325 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1111-1111 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0748: ELECTION: Voted on Election Day or Before

Did you vote on election day -- that is [date of election] or did you vote at some time before this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. On election day	5988	10.8 %
5	5. Some time before	1496	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; R did not vote; no Post IW	4158	7.5 %
.	-	44032	79.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,484 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1112-1112 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0749: ELECTION: How Long Before Election Did Respondent Vote

(IF R VOTED BEFORE ELECTION DAY:) How long before [date of election] did you vote?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. Less than one week, 1-6 days	400	0.7 %
2	02. One week; 7 days	389	0.7 %
3	03. 1-2 weeks; 8-14 days	434	0.8 %
4	04. 2-3 weeks; 15-21 days	128	0.2 %
5	05. 3-4 weeks; 22-28 days	21	0.0 %
6	06. One month; 29-31 days	18	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	07. More than one month; 32-60 days	13	0.0 %
11	11. A few days; a couple of days; several days -- NFS	33	0.1 %
12	12. A few weeks; a couple of weeks; several weeks -- NFS	21	0.0 %
91	91. More than a few days -- NFS	3	0.0 %
92	92. More than a few weeks --NFS	0	0.0 %
97	97. Other	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. DK; NA; R did not vote; R did not vote before	10178	18.3 %
.	-	44032	79.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,464 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 97.00

Location: 1113-1114 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0750: ELECTION: Vote in Person Or with Absentee Ballot

(IF R VOTED BEFORE ELECTION DAY:) Did you vote in person or by absentee ballot?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. In person	4029	7.2 %
5	5. Absentee ballot	944	1.7 %
7	7. R volunteers: by mail (OREGON ONLY)	89	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK; NA; R did not vote; R did not vote prior to	11045	19.8 %
.	-	39567	71.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,062 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1115-1115 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0801: IDEOLOGY: Index for Thermometer Rating of Liberals and Conservatives

Liberal/conservative index

1964-1968:

There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	00. Most liberal	170	0.3 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	20	0.0 %
5	-	11	0.0 %
6	-	89	0.2 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	74	0.1 %
9	-	41	0.1 %
10	-	12	0.0 %
11	-	40	0.1 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
13	-	9	0.0 %
14	-	265	0.5 %
15	-	83	0.1 %
16	-	42	0.1 %
17	-	5	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	4	0.0 %
19	-	117	0.2 %
20	-	105	0.2 %
21	-	400	0.7 %
22	-	2	0.0 %
23	-	5	0.0 %
24	-	223	0.4 %
25	-	185	0.3 %
26	-	521	0.9 %
27	-	3	0.0 %
28	-	6	0.0 %
29	-	436	0.8 %
30	-	96	0.2 %
31	-	472	0.8 %
32	-	7	0.0 %
33	-	7	0.0 %
34	-	1016	1.8 %
35	-	108	0.2 %
36	-	532	1.0 %
37	-	2	0.0 %
38	-	14	0.0 %
39	-	1723	3.1 %
40	-	8	0.0 %
41	-	574	1.0 %
42	-	21	0.0 %
43	-	94	0.2 %
44	-	2600	4.7 %
45	-	9	0.0 %
46	-	197	0.4 %
47	-	6	0.0 %
48	-	24	0.0 %
49	49. Neutral	11116	20.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK in VCF0211 or VCF0212; don't recognize OR can't	3153	5.7 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	3806	6.8 %
.	-	11694	21.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 37,021 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 51.88
- Median: 49.00
- Mode: 49.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.23

Location: 1116-1117 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF0803: IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Scale

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

2000 TELEPHONE:
When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?

2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	750	1.3 %
2	2. Liberal	3138	5.6 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	3603	6.5 %
4	4. Moderate, middle of the road	9873	17.7 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	5304	9.5 %
6	6. Conservative	5379	9.7 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	995	1.8 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	9568	17.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972); R not	1748	3.1 %
.	-	15316	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,610 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1118-1118 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0804: IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Scale 1972- COLLAPSED

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 TELEPHONE,2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale
on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would
you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

2000 TELEPHONE:
When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle
of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?

2002:
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself
as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative,
or haven't you thought much about this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Liberal	7491	13.5 %
2	2. Moderate, middle of the road	9873	17.7 %
3	3. Conservative	11678	21.0 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	9568	17.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form III,IV (1972)	1748	3.1 %
.	-	15316	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,610 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1119-1119 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0805: ISSUES: Government Assistance with Medical Care

1956,1960:
Around election time people talk about different things that our government in Washington is doing or should be doing. Now
I would like to talk to you about some of the things that our government might do. Of course, different things are important
to different people, so we don't expect everyone to have an opinion about all of these. I would like you to look at this card
as I read each question and tell me how you feel about the question. If you don't have an opinion, just tell me that; if you
do have an opinion, choose one of the other answers.](CARD WITH RESPONSE CHOICES SHOWN TO R: AGREE STRONGLY/
AGREE BUT NOT VERY STRONGLY/ NOT SURE, IT DEPENDS/DISAGREE BUT NOT VERY STRONGLY/DISAGREE VERY
STRONGLY). 'The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.'

1962:
Now on a different problem. 'The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.' Do you have an opinion on this or not? (IF YES:) Do you agree that the government should do this or do you think the government should not do it.

1964,1968:
Some say the government in Washington ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost; others say the government should not get into this. Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other? (IF YES) What is your position?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Opinion: help people get doctors and hospital care at	4016	7.2 %
2	2. Opinion: stay out of this	1847	3.3 %
9	9. No opinion; DK; not sure; depends; no interest; both;	1453	2.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW	52	0.1 %
.	-	48306	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,316 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1120-1120 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0806: ISSUES: Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some (1988,1994-LATER: people) feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1984 AND LATER: for everyone). (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others feel that (1988,1994-1996: all) medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance (1984 AND LATER: plans) like Blue Cross (1984-1994: or [1996:some] other company paid plans). (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And of course, some people have opinions somewhere in between at points 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	4698	8.4 %
2	-	2392	4.3 %
3	-	2551	4.6 %
4	-	4103	7.4 %
5	-	2717	4.9 %
6	-	2530	4.5 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	3432	6.2 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	3168	5.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form II (1972); version NEW (2008); no Post IW;	4719	8.5 %
.	-	25364	45.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,591 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.49
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.59

Location: 1121-1121 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0808: ISSUES: Guaranteed Jobs and Income

1956-1960:
(Same introduction as in VCF0805 [CARD WITH RESPONSES SHOWN]). 'The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.'

1964,1968:
In general, some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his own." Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other. (IF YES:) Do you think that the government --

2002:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has A JOB AND A GOOD STANDARD OF LIVING. Others think the government should just LET EACH PERSON GET AHEAD ON THEIR OWN. Which is closer to the way you feel or haven't you thought much about this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, government should see to it that every person	3751	6.7 %
2	2. Yes, should let each person get ahead on his own	3166	5.7 %
9	9. Depends; other; both; no opinion; DK; no interest;	1903	3.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	212	0.4 %
.	-	46642	83.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,820 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1122-1122 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0809: ISSUES: Guaranteed Jobs and Income Scale

Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. (1972- 1978,1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his/their own. (1972-1978,1996: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at pints 2,3,4,5 or 6.) Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	3526	6.3 %
2	-	2418	4.3 %
3	-	3496	6.3 %
4	-	6904	12.4 %
5	-	5244	9.4 %
6	-	4542	8.2 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on his own	4657	8.4 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	4384	7.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); version NEW (2008);	3676	6.6 %
.	-	16827	30.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 35,171 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.89
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.34

Location: 1123-1123 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0811: ISSUES: Urban Unrest Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with the problem of urban unrest and rioting. Some say it is more important to use all available force to maintain law and order -- no matter what results. Others say it is more important to correct the problems of poverty and unemployment that give rise to the disturbances. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Solve problems of poverty and unemployment	2096	3.8 %
2	-	1061	1.9 %
3	-	1059	1.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1959	3.5 %
5	-	747	1.3 %
6	-	497	0.9 %
7	7. Use all available force	969	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form I,III (1972); short	2436	4.4 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	1253	2.3 %
.	-	43597	78.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,388 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.43
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.98

Location: 1124-1124 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0813: ISSUES: How Much Has the Position of Blacks Changed

1964-1976:
In the past few years we have heard a lot about civil rights groups working to improve the position of the Negro in this country. How much real change do you think there has been in the position of the Negro in the past few years: a lot, some, or not much at all?

1984 AND LATER:
In the past few years, we have heard a lot about improving the position of black people in this country. How much real change do you think there has been in the position of black people in the past few years: a lot, some, or not much at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not much at all	2751	4.9 %
2	2. Some	7570	13.6 %
3	3. A lot	8236	14.8 %
9	9. DK; depends	395	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form A	4660	8.4 %
.	-	32062	57.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,952 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1125-1125 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0814: ISSUES: Civil Rights Pushes Too Fast or Not Fast Enough

Some say that the civil rights people have been trying to push too fast. Others feel they haven't pushed fast enough. How about you: Do you think that civil rights leaders are trying to push too fast, are going too slowly, or are they moving about the right speed?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Too slowly	2044	3.7 %
2	2. About right (1968 only: pro-con)	8737	15.7 %
3	3. Too fast	8146	14.6 %
9	9. DK; depends; other	996	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984); form A	5083	9.1 %
.	-	30668	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,923 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1126-1126 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0815: ISSUES: Segregation or Desegregation

(1964, 1968-1972, 1976: What about you?) Are you in favor of desegregation, strict segregation, or something in between?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Desegregation	4105	7.4 %
2	2. In between	5212	9.4 %
3	3. Strict segregation	1366	2.5 %
9	9. Don't know	306	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	903	1.6 %
.	-	43782	78.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,989 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1127-1127 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0816: ISSUES: Should Government Ensure School Integration

1962:
How about this statement, "The government in Washington should see to it that white and colored children are allowed to go to the same schools." Do you have an opinion on this or not? (IF YES:) Do you agree that the government should do this or do you think that the government should not do it?

1964-1986,1990 AND LATER:
Some people say that the government in Washington should see to it that white and black (1962-1966: colored; 1968,1970: Negro) children go (1964-1970: are allowed to go) to the same schools. Others claim this is not the government's business. Have you been concerned (1986,1990 AND LATER: interested) enough about [in] this question to favor one side over the other? (IF YES) Do you think the government in Washington should ---

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, R has an opinion: see to it that white and black	7396	13.3 %
2	2. Yes, R has an opinion: stay out of this area (except	7926	14.2 %
9	9. No, no opinion; DK; depends; no interest/concern;	6218	11.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form A (1986); form B (1990); no Post IW	3183	5.7 %
.	-	30951	55.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,540 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1128-1128 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0817: ISSUES: School Busing Scale

There is much discussion about the best way to deal with racial problems. Some people think achieving racial integration of schools is so important that it justifies busing children to schools out of their own neighborhoods. Others think letting children go to their neighborhood schools is so important that they oppose busing. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Bus to achieve integration	360	0.6 %
2	-	181	0.3 %
3	-	198	0.4 %
4	-	490	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	410	0.7 %
6	-	922	1.7 %
7	7. Keep children in neighborhood schools	5482	9.8 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	794	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984: See VCF0015)	1562	2.8 %
.	-	45275	81.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,837 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 6.38
- Median: 7.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.76

Location: 1129-1129 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0818: ISSUES: Should Government Ensure Fair Jobs/Housing for Blacks

1956,1960:
If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the government should see to it that they do

1958:
If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the government should see to it that they do. Do you have an opinion on this or not? (IF YES:) Do you think the government should do this.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	1973	3.5 %
2	2. Agree but not very strongly	763	1.4 %
3	3. Not sure; depends; DK; no opinion	816	1.5 %
4	4. Disagree but not very strongly	247	0.4 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	555	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	39	0.1 %
.	-	51281	92.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,354 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1130-1130 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0819: ISSUES: Open Housing

1964,1968-1972,1976:
Which of these statements would you agree with: (STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN CODE CATEGORIES READ TO R)

1966:
Some people say that Negroes should be allowed to live in any part of town they want to. How do you feel? Should Negroes be allowed to live in any part of town they want to, or not?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. White people have a right to keep Negroes out of their	1924	3.5 %
2	2. Negroes have a right to live wherever they can afford	7133	12.8 %
9	9. DK; depends; can't decide; both	1078	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	744	1.3 %
.	-	44795	80.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,135 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1131-1131 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0820: ISSUES: Do Whites in the Area Favor Segregation

How about white people in this area? How many would you say are in favor of strict segregation of the races - all of them, most of them, about half, less than half of them, or none of them?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. None of them	463	0.8 %
2	2. Less than half	1742	3.1 %
3	3. About half	1643	3.0 %
4	4. Most of them	2476	4.4 %
5	5. All of them	802	1.4 %
9	9. DK	1294	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no whites in R's area; Rs erroneously not	1168	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	46086	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,420 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1132-1132 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0821: ISSUES: Do Blacks in the Area Favor Desegregation

In general, how many of the black people (1964,1968,1970: Negroes) in this area would you say are in favor of desegregation -- all of them, most of them, about half, less than half of them, or none of them?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. None of them	211	0.4 %
2	2. Less than half	739	1.3 %
3	3. About half	1048	1.9 %
4	4. Most of them	1548	2.8 %
5	5. All of them	1081	1.9 %
9	9. DK	1519	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Blacks in R's area	3442	6.2 %
.	-	46086	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,146 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1133-1133 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0822: ISSUES: Rating of Government Economic Policy

As to the economic policy of the government -- I mean steps taken to fight inflation or unemployment -- would you say the government is doing a good job, only fair, or a poor job?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Poor job	1447	2.6 %
2	2. Only fair	2347	4.2 %
3	3. Good job	486	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form II,III,IV (1972); no Post IW	1948	3.5 %
9	9. DK	300	0.5 %
.	-	49146	88.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,280 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1134-1134 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0823: ISSUES: Better off if U.S. Unconcerned with Rest of World

1956-1960: (Same introduction as in VCF0805 [CARD WITH RESPONSES SHOWN]).

1968,1980:
Now I'd like to read some of the things people tell us when we interview them (1968: and ask you; 1980: As I read, please tell me) whether you agree or disagree with them.

1972: I'd like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of these next six statements.

1976: I am going to read you two statements about US foreign policy and I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each statement

1984-1988,1992: I am going to read a statement about US foreign policy, and I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree.

1990,1994-LATER: Do you agree or disagree with this statement.

ALL YEARS:
'This country would be better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree (1956-1960: incl. 'agree strongly' and 'agree	9467	17.0 %
2	2. Disagree (1956-1960: incl. 'disagree strongly' and	24623	44.2 %
9	9. DK; depends; not sure; no opinion, can't say; refused	1647	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; telephone IW (1984:	5274	9.5 %
.	-	14663	26.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 35,737 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1135-1135 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0824: ISSUES: If Compelled to Choose Liberal or Conservative

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is (1972,1974: I'm going to show you) a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R). (IF R RESPONDS "DON'T KNOW" OR "HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS" IN 1984 AND LATER; IF R RESPONDS "MODERATE" IN 1988,1992,1996-LATER:) If you had to choose, would you consider yourself a liberal or a conservative?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Liberal	2648	4.8 %
3	3. Moderate ('middle of the road')	2610	4.7 %
5	5. Conservative	4001	7.2 %
7	7. R refuses to choose	489	0.9 %
8	8. DK	1222	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R has made choice on 7pt scale VCF0803	13782	24.8 %
9	9. NA in either question	270	0.5 %
.	-	30652	55.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,970 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1136-1136 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0825: ISSUES: How Likely for U.S. to be at War/in Bigger War

How about the chances of our country getting into a bigger war? Compared to a few years ago, do you think we are more likely, less likely, or have about the same chances to get into a bigger war?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Less likely	1302	2.3 %
2	2. About the same chances	1710	3.1 %
3	3. More likely	1409	2.5 %
9	9. DK; depends	606	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form II (1972)	2033	3.7 %
.	-	48614	87.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,027 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1137-1137 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0826: ISSUES: Did U.S. Do Right Thing Getting Involved in War

1952:
Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in Korea two years ago or should we have stayed out?

1964,1966:
Have you been paying attention to what is going on in Vietnam? (IF YES:) Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in Vietnam or should we have stayed out?

1968-1972:
Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in Vietnam or should we have stayed out?

2008:
Do you think the United States should or should not have sent troops to fight the war in Iraq in 2003?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. No, should have stayed out	5838	10.5 %
2	2. Yes, did right thing	4263	7.7 %
8	8. DK	1516	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; refused to answer	556	1.0 %
9	9. Depends (1964-1972); both (1964-1972); other (1964,	679	1.2 %
.	-	42822	76.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,617 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1138-1138 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0827: ISSUES: How Should U.S. Proceed in Current War

1952:

Which of the following things do you think it would be best for us to do now in Korea? (OPTIONS CORRESPONDING TO CODE CATEGORIES READ TO R)

1964-1970:
Which of the following do you think we should do now in Vietnam? (OPTIONS CORRESPONDING TO CODE CATEGORIES READ OR SHOWN)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Pull out entirely	1201	2.2 %
2	2. Keep trying to get a peaceful settlement (1952); keep	2676	4.8 %
3	3. Take a stronger stand (1952: and bomb Manchuria and	2472	4.4 %
9	9. DK; depends; pro-con; no opinion; other; have not paid	1166	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW	310	0.6 %
.	-	47849	85.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,515 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1139-1139 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0827A: ISSUES: U.S. Stand in Vietnam Scale

(1968,1970: There is much talk about "hawks" and "doves" in connection with Vietnam, and considerable disagreement as to what action the United States should take in Vietnam.) (1972: With regard to Vietnam,) Some people think we should do everything necessary to win a complete military victory, no matter what results. Some people think we should withdraw completely from Vietnam right now, no matter what results. And, of course, other people have opinions somewhere between these two extreme positions. Suppose the people who support an immediate withdrawal are at one end of this scale (show card to R) at point number 1. And suppose the people who support a complete military victory are at the other end of the scale at point number 7. At what point on the scale would you place yourself on this scale (1972 only: or haven't you thought much about this)? [RESPONDENT BOOKLET]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Immediate withdrawal	966	1.7 %
2	-	445	0.8 %
3	-	568	1.0 %
4	-	1297	2.3 %
5	-	541	1.0 %
6	-	351	0.6 %
7	7. Complete military victory	805	1.4 %
8	8. DK	176	0.3 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Haven't thought much about it (1972 only)	155	0.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; assigned to Post administration	465	0.8 %
.	-	49905	89.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,149 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.00
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.12

Location: 1140-1140 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0828: ISSUES: Should Government Cut Military Spending

Some people believe that our armed forces are already powerful enough and that we should spend less money for defense. Others feel that military spending should at least continue at the present level. How do you feel - should military spending be cut, or should it continue at least at the present level?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cut military spending	797	1.4 %
2	2. Continue spending at least at present level	2374	4.3 %
9	9. DK; depends; pro-con; other	230	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form II,IV (1972)	1552	2.8 %
.	-	50721	91.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,401 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1141-1141 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , , .

VCF0829: ISSUES: Is the Government in Washington Too Strong

Some people are afraid the government in Washington is getting too powerful for the good of the country and the individual person. Others feel that the government in Washington is not getting too strong (1964,1966,1970: has not gotten too strong for the good of the country).

1964-1972:

Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other?

1976-1992:
Do you have an opinion on this or not?

ALL YEARS:
(IF YES:) What is your feeling? Do you think the government is too powerful or do you think the government is not getting too strong?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Opinion: the government has not gotten too strong	4425	7.9 %
2	2. Opinion: the government is getting too powerful	7786	14.0 %
9	9. DK; depends; other; pro-con; no interest; no opinion	7428	13.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form I (1972); no Post IW; telephone IW	3747	6.7 %
.	-	32288	58.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,639 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1142-1142 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0830: ISSUES: Aid to Blacks Scale

1970-1984, 1986 FORM B, 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves (1970: but they should be expected to help themselves).

1986 FORM A, 1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every (prior to 1996 only: possible) effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. (1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. (1996-LATER: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6).

ALL YEARS: Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about it? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help minority groups/blacks	3082	5.5 %
2	-	2070	3.7 %
3	-	3628	6.5 %
4	-	8870	15.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	5175	9.3 %
6	-	4831	8.7 %
7	7. Minority groups/ blacks should help themselves	6488	11.7 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	4411	7.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; telephone IW (2000); no Post IW	1799	3.2 %
.	-	15320	27.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,555 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.02
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.24

Location: 1143-1143 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0832: ISSUES: Rights of the Accused Scale

Some people are primarily concerned with doing everything possible to protect the legal rights of those accused of committing crimes. Others feel that it is more important to stop criminal activity even at the risk of reducing the rights of the accused. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Protect rights of accused	1436	2.6 %
2	-	662	1.2 %
3	-	660	1.2 %
4	-	1503	2.7 %
5	-	1230	2.2 %
6	-	1077	1.9 %
7	7. Stop crime regardless of rights of accused	1742	3.1 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	1505	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	524	0.9 %
.	-	45335	81.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,815 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.00

- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.58

Location: 1144-1144 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0833: ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Equal Rights Amendment

1976: An effort is being made to pass an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would guarantee equal rights for all citizens regardless of sex.

ALL YEARS:
Do you approve or disapprove of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution (1978,1980: sometimes called the ERA amendment)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve	3215	5.8 %
5	5. Disapprove	1374	2.5 %
8	8. DK	968	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	609	1.1 %
.	-	49508	88.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,557 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1145-1145 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0834: ISSUES: Women Equal Role Scale

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry and government. (2004: (Suppose these people are at one en of a scale, at point 1)) Others feel that a women's place is in the home. (2004: (Suppose these people are at the other end; at point 7.) And of course, some people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5, or 6.)

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 VERSION 2:
Where would you place yourself on this scale or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

2000 VERSION 2:
Where would you place yourself on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	11241	20.2 %
2	-	3472	6.2 %
3	-	2117	3.8 %
4	-	4190	7.5 %
5	-	1524	2.7 %
6	-	988	1.8 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	1927	3.5 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	1591	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; version NEW (2008); telephone IW (2000)	3707	6.7 %
.	-	24917	44.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,050 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.06
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.40

Location: 1146-1146 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0836: ISSUES: Should Women Stay out of Politics

1952 INTRO:
Now I'd like to read some of the kinds of things people tell me when I interview them, and ask you whether you agree or disagree with them. I'll read them one at a time, and you just tell me whether you agree or disagree with them, and whether you agree or disagree a little or quite a bit.

1972 INTRO:
Do you agree or disagree with each of these two statements:

ALL YEARS:
'Women should stay out of politics'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree (1952: incl. 'agree quite a bit' and 'agree a	701	1.3 %
2	2. Disagree (1952: incl. 'disagree quite a bit' and	2532	4.5 %
9	9. DK	30	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW or Post is not form B (1952: see	1341	2.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	51070	91.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,263 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1147-1147 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0837: ISSUES: When Should Abortion Be Allowed

(1972,1976: Still on the subject of women's rights,) There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years. Which one of the opinions on this page (1972: card) best agrees with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Abortion should never be permitted	871	1.6 %
2	2. Abortion should be permitted only if the life and	3646	6.5 %
3	3. Abortion should be permitted if, due to personal	1364	2.4 %
4	4. Abortion should never be forbidden, since one should	2109	3.8 %
9	9. DK; other	272	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	609	1.1 %
.	-	46803	84.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,262 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1148-1148 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0838: ISSUES: By Law, When Should Abortion Be Allowed

ALL YEARS EXCEPT 2000 TELEPHONE:
There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET) Which one of the opinions on this page best agrees with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.

2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a short list of opinions. Please tell me which one of the opinions best agrees with your view. You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. By law, abortion should never be permitted	3429	6.2 %
2	2. The law should permit abortion only in case of rape,	8333	15.0 %
3	3. The law should permit abortion for reasons other than	4608	8.3 %
4	4. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an	11519	20.7 %
9	9. DK; other	499	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; version NEW (2008)	1627	2.9 %
.	-	25659	46.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,388 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1149-1149 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0839: ISSUES: Government Services-Spending Scale

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. (2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. (2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5, or 6.) Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce	1595	2.9 %
2	-	2371	4.3 %
3	-	3500	6.3 %
4	-	6366	11.4 %
5	-	4135	7.4 %
6	-	2389	4.3 %
7	7. Government should provide many more services: increase	2181	3.9 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	3782	6.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; version NEW (2008); telephone IW (2000)	2082	3.7 %
.	-	27273	49.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,319 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 4.81
• Median: 4.00

- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.29

Location: 1150-1150 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0840: ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Term Limits

A law has been proposed that would limit members of Congress to no more than 12 consecutive years of service in that office. Do you favor or oppose such a law?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Favor	4009	7.2 %
5	5. Oppose	1079	1.9 %
8	8. DK; other (1994,1998)	271	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; short version or Spanish language	202	0.4 %
.	-	50113	90.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,359 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1151-1151 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0841: ISSUES: Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984-1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cooperate more/try to get along with Russia	785	1.4 %
2	-	709	1.3 %
3	-	948	1.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1605	2.9 %
5	-	1040	1.9 %
6	-	784	1.4 %
7	7. Get much tougher/big mistake to try to get along	838	1.5 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	1102	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW	276	0.5 %
.	-	47587	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,811 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.76
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.42

Location: 1152-1152 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0842: ISSUES: Environmental Regulation Scale

Some people think we need much tougher government regulations on business in order to protect the environment. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Other think that current regulations to protect the environment are already too much of a burden on business. (Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5 or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Much tougher regulations to protet the environment	612	1.1 %
2	-	583	1.0 %
3	-	635	1.1 %
4	-	722	1.3 %
5	-	356	0.6 %
6	-	204	0.4 %
7	7. Regulations already too much of a burden on business	140	0.3 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	743	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; telephone IW (2000)	807	1.4 %
.	-	50872	91.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,995 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.32
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 9.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.70

Location: 1153-1153 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0843: ISSUES: Defense Spending Scale

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. (1996,2004: Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) (2004: And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2,3,4,5, or 6). Where would you place yourself on this scale or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	1869	3.4 %
2	-	2266	4.1 %
3	-	3442	6.2 %
4	-	7179	12.9 %
5	-	4347	7.8 %
6	-	2330	4.2 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	1681	3.0 %
9	9. DK; haven't thought much about it	3529	6.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; version NEW (2008); telephone IW (2000)	2091	3.8 %
.	-	26940	48.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,643 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.68
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.24

Location: 1154-1154 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0844: ISSUES: How Willing Should U.S. Be to Use Military Force

In the future, how willing should the United States be to use military force to solve international problems -- extremely willing, very willing, somewhat willing, not very willing, or never willing? (1992,1998: RESPONDENT BOOKLET)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely willing	373	0.7 %
2	2. Very willing	983	1.8 %
3	3. Somewhat willing	2984	5.4 %
4	4. Not very willing	902	1.6 %
5	5. Never willing	153	0.3 %
8	8. DK	76	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	9	0.0 %
.	-	50194	90.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,471 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1155-1155 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0845: RELIGIOSITY: Authority of the Bible 1964-1990

Here are four statements about the Bible and I'd like you to tell me which is closest to your own view. (STATEMENTS SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. The Bible is God's word and all it says is true	5484	9.9 %
2	2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God but it	4456	8.0 %
3	3. The Bible is a good book because it was written by	647	1.2 %
4	4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago	221	0.4 %
9	9. DK; other	355	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984, see	2032	3.6 %
.	-	42479	76.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,163 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1156-1156 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0846: RELIGIOSITY: Is Religion Important to Respondent

(2002: Now on another topic. . .) Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, important	21094	37.9 %
2	2. No, not important	6732	12.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984, see	2187	3.9 %
8	8. DK	95	0.2 %
.	-	25566	45.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,826 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1157-1157 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0847: RELIGIOSITY: How Much Guidance from Religion

(IF RELIGION IS IMPORTANT:) Would you say that (1996-LATER: Would you say your) religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to- day living (1996-LATER: "life")?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Some	4891	8.8 %
2	2. Quite a bit	6059	10.9 %
3	3. A great deal	10088	18.1 %
5	5. Religion not important	6732	12.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; DK/NA if religion important in R's life;	2279	4.1 %
8	8. DK	27	0.0 %
.	-	25598	46.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1158-1158 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0848: ISSUES: Concern about Conventional War

1956:
Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the chances of our country getting into war. Would you say that at the present

time you are pretty worried about this country getting into another war, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?

1960,1964:
How about the chances of our country getting into war. Would you say that at the present time you are pretty worried about this country getting into another war, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?

1982-1992, 2000-2002:
How worried are you about our country (1982: How about the chances of) getting into a conventional war (2000 and 2002: at this time), one in which nuclear weapons are not used (1982: neither side uses nuclear weapons)? Are you very (1982: pretty) worried (1982: about this country getting into such a war at the present time), somewhat worried, or not worried at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not worried	6108	11.0 %
2	2. Somewhat worried	7340	13.2 %
3	3. Very worried (1956-1982: pretty worried)	2910	5.2 %
9	9. DK	116	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Pre IW; no Post IW; form B (1986); form	3714	6.7 %
.	-	35486	63.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,474 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1159-1159 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0848A: ISSUES: Concern about Nuclear War

How worried are you about our country getting into a nuclear war at this time? Are you very worried, somewhat worried, or not worried at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Not worried	2077	3.7 %
3	3. Somewhat worried	3490	6.3 %
5	5. Very worried	4058	7.3 %
8	8. DK	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form A (1990); no Post IW; personal IW	2455	4.4 %
.	-	43594	78.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,625 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1160-1160 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0849: IDEOLOGY: Liberal-Conservative Position 1984- COLLAPSED

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you [1996-LATER: Here is] a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R). (IF R RESPONDS "DON'T KNOW" OR "HAVEN'T THOUGHT MUCH ABOUT THIS"In 1984 AND LATER; IF R RESPONDS "MODERATE" IN 1988, 1992, 1996-LATER:) If you had to choose, would you consider yourself a liberal or a conservative?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Liberal	7648	13.7 %
3	3. Moderate ('middle of the road')	5794	10.4 %
5	5. Conservative	12041	21.6 %
6	6. Refuses to choose (in follow-up (exc. 1988 moderates)), don't know	1732	3.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA to follow-up; R not administered 7pt scale	213	0.4 %
9	9. NA to entire question	1066	1.9 %
.	-	27180	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,215 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 6.00

Location: 1161-1161 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0850: RELIGIOSITY: Authority of the Bible 1984-

2000 TELEPHONE:
I am going to read you a short list of statements. Please tell me, which of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible? You can just give me the number of the statement you choose.

1996,1998,2000 PERSONAL,2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Which of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible? You can just give me the number of your choice. (STATEMENTS SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. The Bible is the actual Word of God and is to be	7005	12.6 %
2	2. The Bible is the Word of God but not everything in	8734	15.7 %
3	3. The Bible is a book written by men and is not the	3082	5.5 %
9	9. Other; DK	335	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; form B (1990); short form or Spanish language	1354	2.4 %
.	-	35164	63.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,156 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1162-1162 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0851: MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Newer Lifestyles Contribute to Society Breakdown

1986,1990,1994,1996:
Now, I am going to read several statements. After each I would like you to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly with this statement. (1986,1990:) You can just give me the number of your choice from the booklet. The first statement is....

1988,1992:
Here are several more statements. As before, you can just give me the number of your choice from the booklet. The first statement is....

1998: (Still on page [page]..)

2000 FACE-TO-FACE:
(Still looking at page [page] in the booklet:)

ALL YEARS:
'The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society.'

(2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	6712	12.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	7625	13.7 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	3289	5.9 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	2676	4.8 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	1462	2.6 %
8	8. DK	187	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2775	5.0 %
.	-	30948	55.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,951 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1163-1163 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0852: MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Should Adjust View of Moral Behavior to Changes

ALL YEARS: 'The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes.' (2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	3068	5.5 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6733	12.1 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	2395	4.3 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	4530	8.1 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	5124	9.2 %
8	8. DK	104	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2772	5.0 %
.	-	30948	55.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,954 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1164-1164 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0853: MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Should be More Emphasis on Traditional Values

ALL YEARS: 'This country would have many fewer problems if there were more emphasis on traditional family ties.' (2000,2004: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	10090	18.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6909	12.4 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	2565	4.6 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	1580	2.8 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	705	1.3 %
8	8. DK	106	0.2 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2771	5.0 %
.	-	30948	55.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,955 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1165-1165 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0854: MORAL TRADITIONALISM: Tolerance of Different Moral Standards

ALL YEARS: 'We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if they are very different from our own.' (2000: do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	4736	8.5 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	8434	15.1 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	3482	6.3 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	3373	6.1 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	1791	3.2 %
8	8. DK	129	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2781	5.0 %
.	-	30948	55.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,945 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1166-1166 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0860: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Neighborhood- Respondent Description

1964,1968,1970:
Is this neighborhood you now live in: [CHOICES]

1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is this neighborhood you now live in all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is this neighborhood you live in all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly

black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	5464	9.8 %
2	2. Mostly white	2106	3.8 %
3	3. About half and half	510	0.9 %
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	453	0.8 %
5	5. All Negro/black	271	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	735	1.3 %
8	8. DK	49	0.1 %
.	-	46086	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,804 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1167-1167 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0861: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Grade School- Respondent Description

1964,1968,1970:
Is the grade school nearest you: [CHOICES]

1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is the grade school nearest you all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is the grade school nearest you all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	3100	5.6 %
2	2. Mostly white	3223	5.8 %
3	3. About half and half	906	1.6 %
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	489	0.9 %
5	5. All Negro/black	179	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	741	1.3 %
8	8. DK	950	1.7 %
.	-	46086	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,897 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1168-1168 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0862: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Junior High School

Is the junior high school nearest you: [CHOICES]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	1241	2.2 %
2	2. Mostly white	1448	2.6 %
3	3. About half and half	258	0.5 %
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	186	0.3 %
5	5. All Negro/black	100	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no junior high in area (1964,1968)	872	1.6 %
8	8. DK	530	1.0 %
.	-	51039	91.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,233 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1169-1169 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0863: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of High School- Respondent Description

1964,1968,1970:
Is the high school nearest you: [CHOICES]

1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Is the high school nearest you all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Is the high school nearest you all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	1716	3.1 %
2	2. Mostly white	2717	4.9 %
3	3. About half and half	810	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	367	0.7 %
5	5. All Negro/black	133	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	736	1.3 %
8	8. DK	861	1.5 %
.	-	48334	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,743 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1170-1170 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0864: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Work Place- Respondent Description

1964,1968,1970:
Are the people where you work: [CHOICES]

1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are the people who work where you work all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are the people who work where you work all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	1603	2.9 %
2	2. Mostly white	1611	2.9 %
3	3. About half and half	446	0.8 %
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	140	0.3 %
5	5. All Negro/black	44	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; R doesn't work; R works alone (1968,1972)	3478	6.2 %
8	8. DK	18	0.0 %
.	-	48334	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,844 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1171-1171 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0865: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Where R Shops- Respondent Description

1964,1968,1970:
Are the people where you shop and trade: [CHOICES]

1972:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are the people who shop and trade where you do all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are the people who shop and trade where you do all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	1662	3.0 %
2	2. Mostly white	3544	6.4 %
3	3. About half and half	1182	2.1 %
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	159	0.3 %
5	5. All Negro/black	22	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	733	1.3 %
8	8. DK	38	0.1 %
.	-	48334	86.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,569 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1172-1172 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0866: DEMOGRAPHICS: Racial Composition of Friends

1964,1968,1970:
Are your friends: [CHOICES]

1972,1976:
(IF RESPONDENT IS BLACK:) Are your friends all black, mostly black, about half and half, mostly white, or all white? (IF RESPONDENT IS WHITE:) Are your friends all white, mostly white, about half and half, mostly black, or all black?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. All white	4921	8.8 %
2	2. Mostly white	2746	4.9 %
3	3. About half and half	519	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	4. Mostly Negro/black	413	0.7 %
5	5. All Negro/black	218	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	751	1.3 %
8	8. DK	20	0.0 %
.	-	46086	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,817 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1173-1173 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0867: ISSUES: Affirmative Action in Hiring/Promotion [1 of 2]

Some people say that because of past discrimination blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it gives blacks advantages they haven't earned. What about your opinion-- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. For	3759	6.8 %
5	5. Against	14496	26.0 %
8	8. DK; 1990-1994: refused; 1996 and later: other	984	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form A (1986); form B (1990); no Post IW	3447	6.2 %
.	-	32988	59.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,239 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1174-1174 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0867A: ISSUES: Affirmative Action in Hiring/Promotion [2 of 2]

Some people say that because of past discrimination blacks should be given preference in hiring and promotion. Others say that such preference in hiring and promotion of blacks is wrong because it gives blacks advantages they haven't earned. What about your opinion-- are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks? (IF FAVOR:) Do you favor preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly? (IF OPPOSE:) Do you oppose preference in hiring and promotion strongly or not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Favor strongly	2243	4.0 %
2	2. Favor not strongly	1500	2.7 %
4	4. Oppose not strongly	3782	6.8 %
5	5. Oppose strongly	10637	19.1 %
7	7. DK if favor/oppose; 1990-1994: refused; 1996 and	984	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. Favor/oppose but DK if strongly or not strongly	24	0.0 %
9	9. NA if strongly or not strongly; NA whether favor	3514	6.3 %
.	-	32990	59.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,146 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1175-1175 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0870: ISSUES: Better or Worse Economy in Past Year

How about (1996-LATER: Now thinking about) the economy (1990,1994-later: in the country as a whole)?

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000 VERSION 2:
Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten better, stayed (all yrs. exc 1984: about) the same or gotten worse?

2000 VERSION 2:
Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten worse, stayed about the same, or gotten better?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better	7104	12.8 %
3	3. Stayed same	9616	17.3 %
5	5. Worse	14211	25.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA	81	0.1 %
8	8. DK	514	0.9 %
.	-	24148	43.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,931 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1176-1176 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , .

VCF0871: ISSUES: How Much Better or Worse Economy in Past Year

How about (1996-LATER: Now thinking about) the economy (1990,1994- later: in the country as a whole)? Would you say that over the past year the nation's economy has gotten better, stayed (all yrs. exc 1984: about) the same or gotten worse? (IF BETTER:) Would you say much better or somewhat better? (IF WORSE:) Would you say much worse or somewhat worse?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Much better	1202	2.2 %
2	2. Somewhat better	5892	10.6 %
3	3. Stayed same	9616	17.3 %
4	4. Somewhat worse	7186	12.9 %
5	5. Much worse	6988	12.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/NA if better or worse	575	1.0 %
8	8. DK much or somewhat better/worse	37	0.1 %
9	9. NA much or somewhat better/worse	30	0.1 %
.	-	24148	43.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,884 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1177-1177 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0872: ISSUES: Better or Worse Economy in Next Year

What about the next 12 months (1980,1982: or so)?

ALL YEARS EXC. 2000:
Do you expect the (1986,1988,1992: national) economy to get better, get worse, or stay about the same?

2000 VERSION 1:
Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get better, stay about the same, or get worse?

2000 VERSION 2:
Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get worse, stay about the same, or get better?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Get better	8410	15.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	3. Stay about the same	13053	23.4 %
5	5. Get worse	5979	10.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK; RF; depends (1990); version F (2008)	1303	2.3 %
9	9. NA	1270	2.3 %
.	-	25659	46.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,442 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1178-1178 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0873: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Did R Delay Medical/Dental Treatment Due to the Expense

In the past year did you (or anyone in your family living here/there) put off medical or dental treatment because you didn't have the money?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2692	4.8 %
5	5. No	6524	11.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	17	0.0 %
9	9. NA; short form or spanish-language	323	0.6 %
.	-	46118	82.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,216 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1179-1179 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0875: ISSUES Mention 1: What is the Most Important National Problem

1960:
What would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1964:

As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. The question is, what should be done about them and who should do it. We want to ask you about problems you think the government in Washington should do something about and any problems it should stay out of. First, what would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1966:
What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1968,1980,1982:
As you well know, the government faces many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1970:
As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. We'd like to start out by talking with you about some of them. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1972-1978,1984 AND LATER:
What do you think are the most important problems facing this country? (IF MORE THAN ONE PROBLEM:) Of all you've told me (1996-LATER: Of those you've mentioned), what would you say is the single most important problem the country faces?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	01. AGRICULTURAL	300	0.5 %
2	02. ECONOMICS; BUSINESS; CONSUMER ISSUES	9023	16.2 %
3	03. FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE	6804	12.2 %
4	04. GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING	1032	1.9 %
5	05. LABOR ISSUES	110	0.2 %
6	06. NATURAL RESOURCES	548	1.0 %
7	07. PUBLIC ORDER	3719	6.7 %
8	08. RACIAL PROBLEMS	867	1.6 %
9	09. SOCIAL WELFARE	6877	12.4 %
97	97. Other problems (incl. specific campaign issues)	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. None; 'there were no issues;' 'there was no campaign	2379	4.3 %
98	98. DK (exc. 1960,1964,1966)	93	0.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);	4637	8.3 %
.	-	19168	34.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,397 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 97.00

Location: 1180-1181 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 98 , 99 , .

VCF0875A: ISSUES Mention 2: What is the Most Important National Problem

1960:

What would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1964:

As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. The question is, what should be done about them and who should do it. We want to ask you about problems you think the government in Washington should do something about and any problems it should stay out of. First, what would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1966:

What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1968,1980,1982:

As you well know, the government faces many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1970:

As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. We'd like to start out by talking with you about some of them. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1972-1978,1984 AND LATER:

What do you think are the most important problems facing this country? (IF MORE THAN ONE PROBLEM:) Of all you've told me (1996-LATER: Of those you've mentioned), what would you say is the single most important problem the country faces?

[NOTE: Please refer to the Appendix section of the Original P.I. Documentation within the ICPSR Codebook for value codes and further information.]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	9	0.0 %
5	-	9	0.0 %
10	-	130	0.2 %
11	-	75	0.1 %
12	-	69	0.1 %
20	-	61	0.1 %
21	-	25	0.0 %
22	-	16	0.0 %
30	-	70	0.1 %
31	-	52	0.1 %
32	-	25	0.0 %
33	-	67	0.1 %
34	-	18	0.0 %
40	-	11	0.0 %
41	-	13	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	61	0.1 %
51	-	7	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
52	-	7	0.0 %
60	-	248	0.4 %
61	-	58	0.1 %
62	-	20	0.0 %
63	-	3	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	7	0.0 %
80	-	3	0.0 %
90	-	38	0.1 %
91	-	21	0.0 %
100	-	33	0.1 %
101	-	13	0.0 %
102	-	5	0.0 %
103	-	1	0.0 %
104	-	2	0.0 %
105	-	1	0.0 %
110	-	8	0.0 %
111	-	4	0.0 %
120	-	4	0.0 %
130	-	12	0.0 %
131	-	30	0.1 %
150	-	20	0.0 %
151	-	4	0.0 %
152	-	88	0.2 %
160	-	1	0.0 %
181	-	6	0.0 %
190	-	11	0.0 %
200	-	2	0.0 %
210	-	2	0.0 %
212	-	1	0.0 %
213	-	6	0.0 %
220	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. no Post IW; Form I,III,IV (1972)	1633	2.9 %
991	991. 1968: No problem mentioned; no second or third	41	0.1 %
996	996. No mentions, DK (1960,1964)	391	0.7 %
997	997. No problem mentioned, DK (1966); no second or third	91	0.2 %
998	998. DK (1968,1970,1972)	89	0.2 %
999	999. NA (1960,1964,1966,1968,1970,1972)	62	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	45862	82.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 7,505 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 408.20
- Median: 432.00
- Mode: 500.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 990.00
- Standard Deviation: 205.07

Location: 1182-1184 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 991 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0875B: ISSUES Mention 3: What is the Most Important National Problem

1960:
What would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1964:
As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. The question is, what should be done about them and who should do it. We want to ask you about problems you think the government in Washington should do something about and any problems it should stay out of. First, what would you personally feel are the most important problems the government should try to take care of when the new President and Congress take office in January?

1966:
What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1968,1980,1982:
As you well know, the government faces many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1970:
As you well know, there are many serious problems in this country and in other parts of the world. We'd like to start out by talking with you about some of them. What do you personally feel are the most important problems which the government in Washington should try to take care of?

1972-1978,1984 AND LATER:
What do you think are the most important problems facing this country? (IF MORE THAN ONE PROBLEM:) Of all you've told me (1996-LATER: Of those you've mentioned), what would you say is the single most important problem the country faces?

[NOTE: Please refer to the Appendix section of the Original P.I. Documentation within the ICPSR Codebook for value codes and further information.]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	16	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	26	0.0 %
6	-	7	0.0 %
10	-	2519	4.5 %
11	-	110	0.2 %
12	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	25	0.0 %
19	-	20	0.0 %
20	-	568	1.0 %
21	-	35	0.1 %
29	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	346	0.6 %
31	-	110	0.2 %
32	-	5	0.0 %
35	-	67	0.1 %
39	-	8	0.0 %
40	-	552	1.0 %
41	-	12	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	9	0.0 %
46	-	110	0.2 %
48	-	70	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	236	0.4 %
51	-	8	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	492	0.9 %
61	-	90	0.2 %
62	-	10	0.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
64	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	12	0.0 %
90	-	147	0.3 %
91	-	40	0.1 %
92	-	179	0.3 %
99	-	2	0.0 %
100	-	63	0.1 %
101	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
102	-	24	0.0 %
103	-	9	0.0 %
104	-	3	0.0 %
109	-	16	0.0 %
120	-	44	0.1 %
121	-	5	0.0 %
122	-	3	0.0 %
129	-	1	0.0 %
145	-	1	0.0 %
148	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. no Post IW; R not selected for half-sample	4124	7.4 %
.	-	28980	52.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 22,570 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 364.66
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 999.00
- Standard Deviation: 252.42

Location: 1185-1187 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0876: ISSUES: Law to Protect Homosexuals Against Discrimination

Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Favor	8626	15.5 %
5	5. Oppose	4130	7.4 %
8	8. DK; depends (1988)	528	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	1319	2.4 %
.	-	41071	73.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,284 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1188-1188 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0876A: ISSUES: Strength of Position on Law to Protect Homosexuals Against Discrimination

Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination? Do you favor/oppose such laws strongly or not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Favor strongly	5506	9.9 %
2	2. Favor not strongly	3110	5.6 %
4	4. Oppose not strongly	1610	2.9 %
5	5. Oppose strongly	2499	4.5 %
7	7. DK if favor or oppose; depends (1988); DK if	544	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA if favor or oppose; NA if favor/oppose	1334	2.4 %
.	-	41071	73.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,269 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1189-1189 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0877: ISSUES: Favor or Oppose Gays in the Military

Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces or don't you think so?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, think so	8692	15.6 %
5	5. Don't think so	2831	5.1 %
8	8. DK	339	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	701	1.3 %
.	-	43111	77.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,862 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1190-1190 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0877A: ISSUES: Strength of Position on Gays in the Military

Do you feel strongly or not strongly that homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed forces? Do you feel strongly or not strongly that homosexuals should not be allowed to serve in the United States Armed forces?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Feel strongly should be allowed	5865	10.5 %
2	2. Feel not strongly should be allowed	2806	5.0 %
4	4. Feel not strongly should not be allowed	717	1.3 %
5	5. Feel strongly should not be allowed	2104	3.8 %
7	7. DK if favor or oppose; depends (1988); DK if	363	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA if favor or oppose; NA if favor/oppose	708	1.3 %
.	-	43111	77.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,855 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1191-1191 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0878: ISSUES: Should Gays/Lesbians Be Able to Adopt Children

Do you think gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	6495	11.7 %
5	5. No	6283	11.3 %
8	8. DK	431	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	531	1.0 %
.	-	41934	75.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,209 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

VCF0879: ISSUES: Increase or Decrease Number of Immigrants to U.S. 6-Category

Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be (1992,1994: increased a little, increased a lot, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?) (1996,1998: increased a lot, increased a little, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?) (2004: increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as it is now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased a lot	525	0.9 %
2	2. Increased a little	1137	2.0 %
3	3. Same as now	6133	11.0 %
4	4. Decreased a little	3617	6.5 %
5	5. Decreased a lot	3728	6.7 %
8	8. DK	298	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	1285	2.3 %
.	-	38951	70.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,438 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

VCF0879A: ISSUES: Increase or Decrease Number of Immigrants to U.S. 4-Category

1992,1994:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a little, increased a lot, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?

1996,1998:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a lot, increased a little, decreased a little, decreased a lot, or left the same as it is now?

2000:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased, decreased, or left the same as it is now?

2004:
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as it is now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	1834	3.3 %
3	3. Same as now	6918	12.4 %
5	5. Decreased	8130	14.6 %
8	8. DK	358	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	1290	2.3 %
.	-	37144	66.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,240 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1194-1194 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0880: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Better or Worse Off in Past Year

1962-1998,2004:
We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that (1962,1966-1974: you [and your family]; 1976 and later : you [and your family living here]) are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago.

2000-2002:
Would you say that you (and your family) (2000 FACE-TO-FACE ONLY: living here) are better off, worse off, or just about the same financially as you were a year ago?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better Now	16006	28.7 %
2	2. Same (2004: Volunteered)	13009	23.4 %
3	3. Worse Now	13820	24.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form II,III,IV (1972); R	3139	5.6 %
9	9. DK; uncertain; depends	36	0.1 %
.	-	9664	17.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 42,835 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1195-1195 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0880A: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: How Much Better/Worse Off in Past Year

1984-1998,2004:
We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you and your family living here are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago.

2000-2002:
Would you say that you (and your family) (2000 FACE-TO-FACE ONLY: living here) are better off, worse off, or just about the same financially as you were a year ago? Is that much better/worse off or somewhat better/worse off?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Much better	2700	4.8 %
2	2. Somewhat better	8496	15.3 %
3	3. Same	7793	14.0 %
4	4. Somewhat worse	6308	11.3 %
5	5. Much worse	2829	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	15	0.0 %
9	9. NA; DK/NA if better or worse in past year;	353	0.6 %
.	-	27180	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,126 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1196-1196 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0880B: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Financial Situation Better/Worse in Past Few Years

During the last few years, has your financial situation been getting better, getting worse, or has it stayed the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Getting better	2199	3.9 %
3	3. Stayed the same	2596	4.7 %
5	5. Getting worse	1106	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	15	0.0 %
9	9. NA	48	0.1 %
.	-	49710	89.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,901 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1197-1197 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0881: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Better or Worse Off in Next Year

1956-1960,1964:
Now looking ahead and thinking about the next few years, do you expect your financial situation will stay about the way it is now, get better, or get worse.

1962,1966 AND LATER:
Now looking ahead--do you think that a year from now (1962,1966-1970: you people; 1972,1974: you [and your family]; 1976 AND LATER: you [and your family; 2000 TELEPHONE,2004: living here]) will be better off financially or worse off, or just about the same as now?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better off (1956-1960,1964: get better)	15654	28.1 %
2	2. Same (1956-1960,1964: stay the way it is)	22607	40.6 %
3	3. Worse off (1956-1960,1964: get worse)	5521	9.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; Form B (1986); no Pre IW; no Post IW; form	6346	11.4 %
9	9. DK; both; uncertain	335	0.6 %
.	-	5211	9.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 43,782 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1198-1198 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0886: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Poor/Poor People

1992,1996: poor people

2000,2012: aid to the poor

2002,2004: aid to poor people

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	7900	14.2 %
2	2. Same	6112	11.0 %
3	3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)	1856	3.3 %
8	8. DK	188	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	909	1.6 %
.	-	38709	69.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,056 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1199-1199 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0887: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Child Care

Child care

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	11408	20.5 %
2	2. Same	8134	14.6 %
3	3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)	2559	4.6 %
8	8. DK	415	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	264	0.5 %
.	-	32894	59.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,516 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1200-1200 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0888: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Dealing with Crime

Dealing with crime

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	12751	22.9 %
2	2. Same	6354	11.4 %
3	3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)	1127	2.0 %
8	8. DK	222	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	563	1.0 %
.	-	34657	62.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,454 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1201-1201 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0889: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Aids Research/Fight Aids

1988,1990: fighting the disease AIDS

1992-1996,2000,2002: AIDS research

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	7424	13.3 %
2	2. Same	4219	7.6 %
3	3. Decreased or cut out entirely	1179	2.1 %
8	8. DK	297	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	213	0.4 %
.	-	42342	76.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,119 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1202-1202 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0890: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Public Schools

Public schools

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	15890	28.5 %
2	2. Same	6223	11.2 %
3	3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)	1449	2.6 %
8	8. DK	238	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	1237	2.2 %
.	-	30637	55.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,800 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1203-1203 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0891: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Fin Aid for College Students

Financial aid for college students

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	4108	7.4 %
2	2. Same	3259	5.9 %
3	3. Decreased or cut out entirely	818	1.5 %
8	8. DK	203	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	27	0.0 %
.	-	47259	84.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,388 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1204-1204 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0892: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Foreign Aid

Foreign aid

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	876	1.6 %
2	2. Same	4070	7.3 %
3	3. Decreased or cut out entirely	5192	9.3 %
8	8. DK	199	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	209	0.4 %
.	-	45128	81.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,337 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1205-1205 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0893: ISSUES: Federal Spending- The Homeless

1988: the homeless

1990: government assistance for the homeless

1992,1996: solving the problem of the homeless

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	5312	9.5 %
2	2. Same	2121	3.8 %
3	3. Decreased or cut out entirely	551	1.0 %
8	8. DK	204	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	31	0.1 %
.	-	47455	85.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,188 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1206-1206 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0894: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Welfare Programs

Welfare programs

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	3297	5.9 %
2	2. Same	7471	13.4 %
3	3. Decreased (before 2012: or cut out entirely)	7473	13.4 %
8	8. DK	280	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	239	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	36914	66.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,521 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1207-1207 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0900: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: Congressional District of Residence

Congressional district of interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	6447	11.6 %
2	-	4382	7.9 %
3	-	4899	8.8 %
4	-	5641	10.1 %
5	-	2740	4.9 %
6	-	2766	5.0 %
7	-	3212	5.8 %
8	-	2056	3.7 %
9	-	2296	4.1 %
10	-	1490	2.7 %
11	-	1431	2.6 %
12	-	918	1.6 %
13	-	712	1.3 %
14	-	889	1.6 %
15	-	737	1.3 %
16	-	414	0.7 %
17	-	1176	2.1 %
18	-	1007	1.8 %
19	-	686	1.2 %
20	-	401	0.7 %
21	-	580	1.0 %
22	-	595	1.1 %
23	-	234	0.4 %
24	-	355	0.6 %
25	-	373	0.7 %
26	-	246	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	-	386	0.7 %
28	-	378	0.7 %
29	-	256	0.5 %
30	-	325	0.6 %
31	-	342	0.6 %
32	-	198	0.4 %
33	-	128	0.2 %
34	-	337	0.6 %
35	-	171	0.3 %
36	-	89	0.2 %
37	-	36	0.1 %
38	-	128	0.2 %
39	-	109	0.2 %
40	-	187	0.3 %
41	-	58	0.1 %
42	-	178	0.3 %
43	-	54	0.1 %
44	-	72	0.1 %
45	-	28	0.1 %
46	-	53	0.1 %
47	-	43	0.1 %
48	-	63	0.1 %
49	-	35	0.1 %
50	-	10	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. NA; wrong district identified	176	0.3 %
99	99. District of Columbia	93	0.2 %
.	-	4997	9.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 50,408 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 9.22
- Median: 6.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 53.00
- Standard Deviation: 9.32

Location: 1208-1209 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 99 , .

VCF0900A: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- ICPSR

ICPSR state and Congressional district of interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
101	-	14	0.0 %
102	-	223	0.4 %
103	-	277	0.5 %
104	-	262	0.5 %
105	-	48	0.1 %
106	-	1	0.0 %
201	-	253	0.5 %
202	-	8	0.0 %
301	-	143	0.3 %
302	-	103	0.2 %
303	-	217	0.4 %
304	-	178	0.3 %
305	-	70	0.1 %
306	-	75	0.1 %
307	-	159	0.3 %
308	-	117	0.2 %
309	-	59	0.1 %
310	-	37	0.1 %
311	-	110	0.2 %
312	-	6	0.0 %
401	-	225	0.4 %
402	-	53	0.1 %
501	-	38	0.1 %
502	-	9	0.0 %
601	-	10	0.0 %
1101	-	52	0.1 %
1201	-	123	0.2 %
1202	-	304	0.5 %
1203	-	11	0.0 %
1204	-	124	0.2 %
1205	-	132	0.2 %
1206	-	98	0.2 %
1207	-	125	0.2 %
1208	-	43	0.1 %
1209	-	74	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1210	-	104	0.2 %
1211	-	92	0.2 %
1212	-	189	0.3 %
1213	-	19	0.0 %
1214	-	26	0.0 %
1239	-	2	0.0 %
1301	-	59	0.1 %
1302	-	104	0.2 %
1303	-	67	0.1 %
1304	-	85	0.2 %
1305	-	72	0.1 %
1306	-	97	0.2 %
1307	-	38	0.1 %
1308	-	54	0.1 %
1309	-	93	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9999	9999. 0,98,99 in VCF0900 or 00,99 in VCF0901	667	1.2 %
.	-	4997	9.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 50,010 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3825.29
- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 8202.00
- Standard Deviation: 2037.76

Location: 1210-1213 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9999 , .

VCF0900B: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- FIPS

FIPS state and Congressional district of interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
101	-	30	0.1 %
102	-	243	0.4 %
103	-	139	0.2 %
104	-	23	0.0 %
105	-	77	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
106	-	244	0.4 %
107	-	192	0.3 %
201	-	2	0.0 %
401	-	154	0.3 %
402	-	54	0.1 %
403	-	137	0.2 %
404	-	73	0.1 %
405	-	47	0.1 %
406	-	100	0.2 %
407	-	9	0.0 %
408	-	12	0.0 %
409	-	10	0.0 %
501	-	424	0.8 %
502	-	182	0.3 %
503	-	8	0.0 %
504	-	411	0.7 %
505	-	68	0.1 %
506	-	10	0.0 %
601	-	67	0.1 %
602	-	126	0.2 %
603	-	64	0.1 %
604	-	327	0.6 %
605	-	61	0.1 %
606	-	62	0.1 %
607	-	115	0.2 %
608	-	141	0.3 %
609	-	64	0.1 %
610	-	135	0.2 %
611	-	127	0.2 %
612	-	86	0.2 %
613	-	31	0.1 %
614	-	284	0.5 %
615	-	72	0.1 %
616	-	31	0.1 %
617	-	138	0.2 %
618	-	251	0.5 %
619	-	233	0.4 %
620	-	113	0.2 %
621	-	53	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
622	-	47	0.1 %
623	-	77	0.1 %
624	-	98	0.2 %
625	-	110	0.2 %
626	-	94	0.2 %
627	-	84	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9999	9999. 00,98,99 in VCF0900 or 00,99 in VCF0901a	667	1.2 %
.	-	4997	9.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 50,010 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2814.29
- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 5601.00
- Standard Deviation: 1564.11

Location: 1214-1217 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9999 , .

VCF0900C: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State and Congressional District- Postal Abbrev and CD

Postal code and Congressional district of interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9999	-	5664	10.2 %
AK01	-	2	0.0 %
AL01	-	30	0.1 %
AL02	-	243	0.4 %
AL03	-	139	0.2 %
AL04	-	23	0.0 %
AL05	-	77	0.1 %
AL06	-	244	0.4 %
AL07	-	192	0.3 %
AR01	-	424	0.8 %
AR02	-	182	0.3 %
AR03	-	8	0.0 %
AR04	-	411	0.7 %
AR05	-	68	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
AR06	-	10	0.0 %
AZ01	-	154	0.3 %
AZ02	-	54	0.1 %
AZ03	-	137	0.2 %
AZ04	-	73	0.1 %
AZ05	-	47	0.1 %
AZ06	-	100	0.2 %
AZ07	-	9	0.0 %
AZ08	-	12	0.0 %
AZ09	-	10	0.0 %
CA01	-	67	0.1 %
CA02	-	126	0.2 %
CA03	-	64	0.1 %
CA04	-	327	0.6 %
CA05	-	61	0.1 %
CA06	-	62	0.1 %
CA07	-	115	0.2 %
CA08	-	141	0.3 %
CA09	-	64	0.1 %
CA10	-	135	0.2 %
CA11	-	127	0.2 %
CA12	-	86	0.2 %
CA13	-	31	0.1 %
CA14	-	284	0.5 %
CA15	-	72	0.1 %
CA16	-	31	0.1 %
CA17	-	138	0.2 %
CA18	-	251	0.5 %
CA19	-	233	0.4 %
CA20	-	113	0.2 %
CA21	-	53	0.1 %
CA22	-	47	0.1 %
CA23	-	77	0.1 %
CA24	-	98	0.2 %
CA25	-	110	0.2 %
CA26	-	94	0.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

Location: 1218-1221 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: character

VCF0901: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Code- ICPSR

State of interview - ICPSR code

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	909	1.6 %
2	-	277	0.5 %
3	-	1370	2.5 %
4	-	280	0.5 %
5	-	48	0.1 %
6	-	10	0.0 %
11	-	81	0.1 %
12	-	1552	2.8 %
13	-	3704	6.7 %
14	-	2415	4.3 %
21	-	1909	3.4 %
22	-	1353	2.4 %
23	-	2649	4.8 %
24	-	2542	4.6 %
25	-	1053	1.9 %
31	-	1135	2.0 %
32	-	535	1.0 %
33	-	1318	2.4 %
34	-	1127	2.0 %
35	-	439	0.8 %
36	-	61	0.1 %
37	-	308	0.6 %
40	-	1632	2.9 %
41	-	1034	1.9 %
42	-	1207	2.2 %
43	-	2334	4.2 %
44	-	1631	2.9 %
45	-	815	1.5 %
46	-	438	0.8 %
47	-	1670	3.0 %
48	-	480	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
49	-	3568	6.4 %
51	-	894	1.6 %
52	-	937	1.7 %
53	-	356	0.6 %
54	-	1252	2.2 %
55	-	120	0.2 %
56	-	428	0.8 %
61	-	597	1.1 %
62	-	923	1.7 %
63	-	112	0.2 %
64	-	24	0.0 %
65	-	105	0.2 %
66	-	249	0.4 %
67	-	434	0.8 %
68	-	341	0.6 %
71	-	5253	9.4 %
72	-	860	1.5 %
73	-	1090	2.0 %
81	-	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Wrong district identified (2000)	3	0.0 %
99	99. NA	1	0.0 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 53,869 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 38.20
- Median: 41.00
- Mode: 71.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 82.00
- Standard Deviation: 20.42

Location: 1222-1223 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 99 , .

VCF0901A: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Code- FIPS

State of interview - FIPS code

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Alabama	1034	1.9 %
2	Alaska	3	0.0 %
4	Arizona	597	1.1 %
5	Arkansas	1207	2.2 %
6	California	5253	9.4 %
8	Colorado	923	1.7 %
9	Connecticut	909	1.6 %
10	Delaware	81	0.1 %
11	Washington DC	120	0.2 %
12	Florida	2334	4.2 %
13	Georgia	1631	2.9 %
15	Hawaii	7	0.0 %
16	Idaho	112	0.2 %
17	Illinois	1909	3.4 %
18	Indiana	1353	2.4 %
19	Iowa	1135	2.0 %
20	Kansas	535	1.0 %
21	Kentucky	894	1.6 %
22	Louisiana	815	1.5 %
23	Maine	277	0.5 %
24	Maryland	937	1.7 %
25	Massachusetts	1370	2.5 %
26	Michigan	2649	4.8 %
27	Minnesota	1318	2.4 %
28	Mississippi	438	0.8 %
29	Missouri	1127	2.0 %
30	Montana	24	0.0 %
31	Nebraska	439	0.8 %
32	Nevada	105	0.2 %
33	New Hampshire	280	0.5 %
34	New Jersey	1552	2.8 %
35	New Mexico	249	0.4 %
36	New York	3704	6.7 %
37	North Carolina	1670	3.0 %
38	North Dakota	61	0.1 %
39	Ohio	2542	4.6 %
40	Oklahoma	356	0.6 %
41	Oregon	860	1.5 %
42	Pennsylvania	2415	4.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	Rhode Island	48	0.1 %
45	South Carolina	480	0.9 %
46	South Dakota	308	0.6 %
47	Tennessee	1252	2.2 %
48	Texas	3568	6.4 %
49	Utah	434	0.8 %
50	Vermont	10	0.0 %
51	Virginia	1632	2.9 %
53	Washington	1090	2.0 %
54	West Virginia	428	0.8 %
55	Wisconsin	1053	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Wrong district identified (2000)	4	0.0 %
.	-	1801	3.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 53,869 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 56.00

Location: 1224-1225 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 99 , .

VCF0901B: SAMPLE DESCRIPTION: State Postal Abbrev

State of interview - state postal code (abbreviation)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	-	1805	3.2 %
AK	-	3	0.0 %
AL	-	1034	1.9 %
AR	-	1207	2.2 %
AZ	-	597	1.1 %
CA	-	5253	9.4 %
CO	-	923	1.7 %
CT	-	909	1.6 %
DC	-	120	0.2 %
DE	-	81	0.1 %
FL	-	2334	4.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
GA	-	1631	2.9 %
HI	-	7	0.0 %
IA	-	1135	2.0 %
ID	-	112	0.2 %
IL	-	1909	3.4 %
IN	-	1353	2.4 %
KS	-	535	1.0 %
KY	-	894	1.6 %
LA	-	815	1.5 %
MA	-	1370	2.5 %
MD	-	937	1.7 %
ME	-	277	0.5 %
MI	-	2649	4.8 %
MN	-	1318	2.4 %
MO	-	1127	2.0 %
MS	-	438	0.8 %
MT	-	24	0.0 %
NC	-	1670	3.0 %
ND	-	61	0.1 %
NE	-	439	0.8 %
NH	-	280	0.5 %
NJ	-	1552	2.8 %
NM	-	249	0.4 %
NV	-	105	0.2 %
NY	-	3704	6.7 %
OH	-	2542	4.6 %
OK	-	356	0.6 %
OR	-	860	1.5 %
PA	-	2415	4.3 %
RI	-	48	0.1 %
SC	-	480	0.9 %
SD	-	308	0.6 %
TN	-	1252	2.2 %
TX	-	3568	6.4 %
UT	-	434	0.8 %
VA	-	1632	2.9 %
VT	-	10	0.0 %
WA	-	1090	2.0 %
WI	-	1053	1.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 55,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

Location: 1226-1227 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: character

VCF0902: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Type of U.S. House Race

Type of House race (district level)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	12. Democratic incumbent running--Republican challenger	15481	27.8 %
13	13. Democratic incumbent--other challenger	152	0.3 %
14	14. Democratic incumbent running--unopposed	3493	6.3 %
19	19. Democratic incumbent running--Republican challenger and others	278	0.5 %
21	21. Republican incumbent running--Democratic challenger	12274	22.0 %
23	23. Republican incumbent--other challenger	123	0.2 %
24	24. Republican incumbent running--unopposed	1864	3.3 %
29	29. Republican incumbent running--Democratic challenger and others	160	0.3 %
31	31. Other incumbent running--Democratic challenger	3	0.0 %
32	32. Other incumbent running--Republican challenger	3	0.0 %
34	34. Other incumbent running--unopposed	0	0.0 %
35	35. Other incumbent running--Democratic and Republican challengers	0	0.0 %
36	36. Other incumbent running--Republican and other challengers	0	0.0 %
37	37. Other incumbent running--Democratic and other challengers	0	0.0 %
39	39. Other incumbent running -- Democratic, Republican, other challengers	0	0.0 %
40	40. Democratic and Republican incumbents running--no other candidate (see note)	54	0.1 %
41	41. Two Democratic incumbents running (see note)	31	0.1 %
45	45. Two Republican incumbents running (see note)	32	0.1 %
49	49. Democratic and Republican incumbents running--other candidate (see note)	1	0.0 %
51	51. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic candidate unopposed	57	0.1 %
52	52. No incumbent Repr. running--Republican candidate unopposed	1	0.0 %
53	53. No incumbent Repr. running--other candidate unopposed	0	0.0 %
55	55. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and Republican candidates	4172	7.5 %
56	56. No incumbent Repr. running--Republican and other candidates	8	0.0 %
57	57. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and other candidates	10	0.0 %
59	59. No incumbent Repr. running--Democratic and Republican and other candidates	30	0.1 %
83	83. No identifiable incumbent, Democratic cand in open race due to redistricting	7	0.0 %
84	84. No identifiable incumbent, Republican cand in open race due to redistricting	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
85	85. No identifiable incumbent, Dem and Rep cands in open race due to redistricting	221	0.4 %
89	89. No identifiable incumbent, Dem, Rep and other cands in open race due to redistricting	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Washington D.C.; California (1974 only, due to redistricting type of race could not be determined); wrong district	556	1.0 %
99	99. NA	146	0.3 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,458 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 12.00
- Maximum: 89.00

Location: 1228-1229 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 99 , .

VCF0903: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Is House Incumbent Running

Incumbent candidate - checkpoint

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. US House Representative is running for re-election in	32801	58.9 %
2	2. US House Representative is NOT running for re-	4443	8.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);	1916	3.4 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,244 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1230-1230 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0904: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Is House Incumbent Opposed

Incumbent opposed/unopposed - checkpoint

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Running incumbent is unopposed	5646	10.1 %
2	2. Running incumbent is opposed	27368	49.2 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No incumbent running in CD	4455	8.0 %
9	9. Washington D.C.; no Post IW; wrong district	1691	3.0 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,014 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1231-1231 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0905: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Number of Candidates in U.S. House Race

Number of candidates - checkpoint

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Major party candidate, unopposed by 2nd major party candidate	5528	9.9 %
2	2. Two or more major party candidates	31823	57.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);	1809	3.2 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,351 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1232-1232 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0906: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Democratic House Candidate

House Democratic candidate - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	710	1.3 %
1	-	12	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	32	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	7	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	63	0.1 %
11	-	2	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	439	0.8 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	91	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	70	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	718	1.3 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	33	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1148	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	-	65	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	6074	10.9 %
51	-	6	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
55	-	95	0.2 %
57	-	3	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2894	5.2 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	156	0.3 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	2907	5.2 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	387	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No Democratic candidate	1865	3.3 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	5790	10.4 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	2193	3.9 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; wrong	3390	6.1 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 20,592 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 59.48
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00

- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.62

Location: 1233-1235 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0907: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Republican House Candidate

House Republican candidate -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-1	UNDOCUMENTED CODE	75	0.1 %
0	-	687	1.2 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	9	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	5	0.0 %
5	-	23	0.0 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	74	0.1 %
12	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	483	0.9 %
16	-	2	0.0 %
20	-	81	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	68	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.0 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	752	1.4 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	5	0.0 %
35	-	26	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1149	2.1 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	2	0.0 %
45	-	86	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	6	0.0 %
50	-	6166	11.1 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	7	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	87	0.2 %
56	-	3	0.0 %
57	-	2	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	2757	5.0 %
62	-	3	0.0 %
63	-	3	0.0 %
65	-	121	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
66	-	3	0.0 %
67	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No Republican candidate	3016	5.4 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	6665	12.0 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	2274	4.1 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; wrong	3325	6.0 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 18,550 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.09
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: -1.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.86

Location: 1236-1238 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0908: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Incumbent House Candidate

Running House incumbent candidate -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care

too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-1	UNDOCUMENTED CODE	75	0.1 %
0	-	647	1.2 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	8	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	4	0.0 %
5	-	27	0.0 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	4	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	67	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	421	0.8 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	83	0.1 %
25	-	71	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	660	1.2 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	25	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1067	1.9 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	68	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	-	5564	10.0 %
51	-	5	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
55	-	88	0.2 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	4	0.0 %
58	-	2	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	3260	5.9 %
62	-	5	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	153	0.3 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	3382	6.1 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. Incumbent is not running	4264	7.7 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	3294	5.9 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	1505	2.7 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; wrong	3190	5.7 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 21,577 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 61.25
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: -1.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.70

Location: 1239-1241 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0909: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Challenger House Candidate

Challenger to running House incumbent -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1236	2.2 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	5	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	22	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	4	0.0 %
9	-	6	0.0 %
10	-	53	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	361	0.6 %
16	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	64	0.1 %
25	-	51	0.1 %
30	-	555	1.0 %
33	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	23	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	877	1.6 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	54	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	5	0.0 %
50	-	4799	8.6 %
51	-	8	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	64	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1643	3.0 %
63	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	93	0.2 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1379	2.5 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	166	0.3 %
76	-	5	0.0 %
77	-	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. Incumbent is unopposed or not running	7568	13.6 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	7619	13.7 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	2337	4.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; wrong	3091	5.6 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 13,215 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 50.94
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.01

Location: 1242-1244 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF0910: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/ who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	10917	19.6 %
5	5. No, no contact at all	3101	5.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running	1795	3.2 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbreviated IW (1984);	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,018 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1245-1245 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0911: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Met Him

Which ones? RESPONDENT MET [incumbent] PERSONALLY

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their

districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1778	3.2 %
5	5. No	8992	16.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-917;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1246-1246 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0912: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Attended Meeting

Which ones? RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [incumbent] SPOKE

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1522	2.7 %
5	5. No	9248	16.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-917;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1247-1247 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0913: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Talked to Staff

Which ones? RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [incumbent's] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN [incumbent's] OFFICE

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1200	2.2 %
5	5. No	9570	17.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF0917;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1248-1248 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0914: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Received Mail

Which ones? RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [incumbent]

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	7403	13.3 %
5	5. No	3367	6.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF0917;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1249-1249 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0915: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Read About

Which ones? RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [incumbent] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	6978	12.5 %
5	5. No	3792	6.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911-VCF917;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1250-1250 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0916: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Heard on Radio

Which ones? RESPONDENT HEARD [incumbent] ON THE RADIO

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3590	6.4 %
5	5. No	7180	12.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1251-1251 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0917: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Running U.S. House Incumbent: Saw on TV

Which ones? RESPONDENT SAW [incumbent] ON TV

(There are many ways in which (U.S. Representatives/congressional candidates) can have contact with the people from their districts. On this page are some of these ways. Think of [incumbent candidate] (who has been the U.S. Representative/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives) from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways? (LIST SHOWN TO R))

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	6716	12.1 %
5	5. No	4054	7.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running; no contact; only	5043	9.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0910); NA VCF0911	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,770 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1252-1252 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0918: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who have had some contact with [incumbent]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3829	6.9 %
5	5. No	10551	19.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No incumbent candidate running	1870	3.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1819	3.3 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,380 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1253-1253 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0919: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent

How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4128	7.4 %
5	5. No, no contact at all	7016	12.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running;	4631	8.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW	2294	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,144 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1254-1254 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0920: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Met Him

Which ones? RESPONDENT MET [challenger] PERSONALLY

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	344	0.6 %
5	5. No	3654	6.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1255-1255 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0921: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Attended Meeting

Which ones? RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [challenger] SPOKE

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	217	0.4 %
5	5. No	3781	6.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1256-1256 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0922: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Talked to Staff

Which ones? RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [challenger's] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN [challenger's] OFFICE

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	181	0.3 %
5	5. No	3817	6.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1257-1257 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0923: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Received Mail

Which ones? RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [challenger]

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1515	2.7 %
5	5. No	2483	4.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1258-1258 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF0924: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Read About

Which ones? RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [challenger] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2466	4.4 %
5	5. No	1532	2.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

VCF0925: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Heard on Radio

Which ones? RESPONDENT HEARD [challenger] ON THE RADIO

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1181	2.1 %
5	5. No	2817	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0920-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1260-1260 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0926: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Challenger to U.S. House Running Incumbent: Saw on TV

Which ones? RESPONDENT SAW [challenger] ON TV

(How about [challenging candidate] who also ran/has been the U.S. House of Representative from this district. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2355	4.2 %
5	5. No	1643	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running; no	11775	21.1 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0919); NA VCF0919-926;	2296	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,998 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1261-1261 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0927: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who have had some contact with [challenger]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	881	1.6 %
5	5. No	10435	18.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent candidate unopposed or not running;	4840	8.7 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1913	3.4 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,316 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1262-1262 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0928: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/ who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	9849	17.7 %
5	5. No, no contact at all	5189	9.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running	751	1.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW	2280	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,038 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1263-1263 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0929: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Met Him

Which ones? RESPONDENT MET [Democratic candidate] PERSONALLY

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1491	2.7 %
5	5. No	8194	14.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1264-1264 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0930: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Attended Meeting

Which ones? RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [Democratic candidate] SPOKE

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1210	2.2 %
5	5. No	8475	15.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1265-1265 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0931: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Talked to Staff

Which ones? RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [Democratic candidate] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN [Democratic candidate's] OFFI

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	944	1.7 %
5	5. No	8741	15.7 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1266-1266 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0932: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Received Mail

Which ones? RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [Democratic candidate]

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	5759	10.3 %
5	5. No	3926	7.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1267-1267 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0933: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Read About

Which ones? RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [Democratic candidate] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these

ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	6149	11.0 %
5	5. No	3536	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1268-1268 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0934: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Heard on Radio

Which ones? RESPONDENT HEARD [Democratic candidate] ON THE RADIO

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3151	5.7 %
5	5. No	6534	11.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929-VCF935;	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1269-1269 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0935: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Democratic Cand: Saw on TV

Which ones? RESPONDENT SAW [Democratic candidate] ON TV

(Think of [Democratic candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	6089	10.9 %
5	5. No	3596	6.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running; no contact; only	6092	10.9 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0928); NA VCF0929	2292	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,685 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1270-1270 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0936: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who have had some contact with [Democratic candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3161	5.7 %
5	5. No	12154	21.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Democratic candidate running	778	1.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1976	3.5 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,315 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1271-1271 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0937: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/ who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	7394	13.3 %
5	5. No	6241	11.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running	2119	3.8 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone IW	2315	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,635 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1272-1272 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0938: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Met Him

Which ones? RESPONDENT MET [Republican candidate] PERSONALLY

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	874	1.6 %
5	5. No	6364	11.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1273-1273 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0939: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Attended Meeting

Which ones? RESPONDENT ATTENDED A MEETING OR GATHERING WHERE [Republican candidate] SPOKE

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	707	1.3 %
5	5. No	6531	11.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1274-1274 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0940: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Talked to Staff

Which ones? RESPONDENT TALKED TO A MEMBER OF [Republican candidate's] STAFF OR SOMEONE IN [Republican candidate's] OFFICE

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	602	1.1 %
5	5. No	6636	11.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1275-1275 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0941: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Received Mail

Which ones? RESPONDENT RECEIVED SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM [Republican candidate]

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4175	7.5 %
5	5. No	3063	5.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact;	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1276-1276 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0942: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Read About

Which ones? RESPONDENT READ ABOUT [Republican candidate] IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4606	8.3 %
5	5. No	2632	4.7 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1277-1277 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0943: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Heard on Radio

Which ones? RESPONDENT HEARD [Republican candidate] ON THE RADIO

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2300	4.1 %
5	5. No	4938	8.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1278-1278 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0944: CANDIDATE CONTACT: U.S. House Republican Cand: Saw on TV

Which ones? RESPONDENT SAW [Republican candidate] ON TV

(Think of [Republican candidate] [who has been the U.S. Representative from this district/who ran for the U.S. House of Representatives from this district]. Have you come into contact with or learned anything about (him/her) through any of these

ways?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4413	7.9 %
5	5. No	2825	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running; no contact; only	8501	15.3 %
9	9. NA if contact made (9 in VCF0937); NA VCF0938	2330	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1279-1279 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0945: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Know Anyone Who had Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

Do you know anyone, any of your family, friends or people at work, who have had some contact with [Republican candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2089	3.8 %
5	5. No	11802	21.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Republican candidate running	2226	4.0 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1952	3.5 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,891 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1280-1280 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0946: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

Number of specified contacts made with running incumbent candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No contacts	3249	5.8 %
1	1. One contact	2721	4.9 %
2	2. Two contacts	2791	5.0 %
3	3. Three contacts	2337	4.2 %
4	4. Four contacts	1647	3.0 %
5	5. Five contacts	633	1.1 %
6	6. Six contacts	360	0.6 %
7	7. Seven contacts	280	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. Incumbent not running	1795	3.2 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.;	2256	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,018 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1281-1281 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0946A: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

Contact with running incumbent? (YES/NO)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact	10769	19.3 %
5	5. No, no contact	3249	5.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. MD in VCF0946	4051	7.3 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,018 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1282-1282 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0947: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

Number of specified contacts made with challenger to running incumbent candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No contacts	7146	12.8 %
1	1. One contact	1748	3.1 %
2	2. Two contacts	1065	1.9 %
3	3. Three contacts	651	1.2 %
4	4. Four contacts	351	0.6 %
5	5. Five contacts	108	0.2 %
6	6. Six contacts	41	0.1 %
7	7. Seven contacts	34	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. Incumbent not running or running unopposed	4631	8.3 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone	2294	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,144 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1283-1283 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0947A: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with Challenger to Running U.S. House Incumbent Cand

Contact with challenger to running incumbent? (YES/NO)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact	3998	7.2 %
5	5. No, no contact	7146	12.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. MD in VCF0947	6925	12.4 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,144 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1284-1284 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0948: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- U.S. House Democratic Cand

Number of specified contacts made with Democratic candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No contacts	5354	9.6 %
1	1. One contact	2854	5.1 %
2	2. Two contacts	2554	4.6 %
3	3. Three contacts	1996	3.6 %
4	4. Four contacts	1271	2.3 %
5	5. Five contacts	513	0.9 %
6	6. Six contacts	278	0.5 %
7	7. Seven contacts	218	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. Democrat not running	751	1.3 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone	2280	4.1 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,038 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1285-1285 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0948A: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with U.S. House Democratic Cand

Contact with Democratic candidate? (YES/NO)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact	9684	17.4 %
5	5. No, no contact	5346	9.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. MD in VCF0948	3039	5.5 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,030 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1286-1286 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0949: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Count of Contact Types- U.S. House Republican Cand

Number of specified contacts made with Republican candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No contacts	6397	11.5 %
1	1. One contact	2345	4.2 %
2	2. Two contacts	1897	3.4 %
3	3. Three contacts	1464	2.6 %
4	4. Four contacts	937	1.7 %
5	5. Five contacts	299	0.5 %
6	6. Six contacts	169	0.3 %
7	7. Seven contacts	127	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. Republican not running	2119	3.8 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; telephone	2315	4.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,635 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1287-1287 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF0949A: CANDIDATE CONTACT: Yes/No Any Contact with U.S. House Republican Cand

Contact with Republican candidate? (YES/NO)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact	7238	13.0 %
5	5. No, no contact	6397	11.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. MD in VCF0949	4434	8.0 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,635 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1288-1288 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF0950: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2092	3.8 %
5	5. No	12622	22.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent not running	1870	3.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1485	2.7 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,714 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1289-1289 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0951: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Express Opinion

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to express an opinion?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	890	1.6 %
5	5. No	1181	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;	14764	26.5 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1234	2.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,071 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1290-1290 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0952: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Information

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to seek information?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	747	1.3 %
5	5. No	1324	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;	14764	26.5 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1234	2.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,071 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1291-1291 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0953: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Help

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to seek help on a problem (/problem that you had)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	977	1.8 %
5	5. No	1094	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;	14764	26.5 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1234	2.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,071 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1292-1292 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0954: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Response to Contact with Running U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to seek help on a problem (/problem that you had)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1852	3.3 %
5	5. No	192	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent;	14767	26.5 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1258	2.3 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,044 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1293-1293 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0955: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Satisfied w/Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did you get a response from [running U.S. House incumbent] or someone in his/her office? (IF YES:) How satisfied were you with the response: very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very satisfied	1105	2.0 %
2	2. Somewhat satisfied	478	0.9 %
4	4. Not very satisfied	115	0.2 %
5	5. Not at all satisfied	124	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. never (or DK/NA if) received response; never	15004	26.9 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1243	2.2 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,822 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1294-1294 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF0956: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Know Anyone (Else) Who Contacted Running U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2753	4.9 %
5	5. No	11896	21.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent not running	1870	3.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1550	2.8 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,649 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1295-1295 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0957: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Get Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2409	4.3 %
5	5. No	104	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Doesn't know (or DK/NA if knows) of anyone	14103	25.3 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1453	2.6 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,513 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1296-1296 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0958: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Satisfied w/Response from Running U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [running U.S. House incumbent] or anyone in his/her office? Did this (person/group) get a response?

1978-1986: (IF YES:) Was this (person/group) satisfied with the response?

1988-1992: (IF YES:) How satisfied was this (person/group) with the response?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very satisfied (1978-1984: Yes; satisfied)	1555	2.8 %
2	2. Somewhat satisfied	483	0.9 %
4	4. Not very satisfied (1978-1984: Somewhat dissatisfied)	82	0.1 %
5	5. Not at all satisfied (1978-1984: No; not satisfied)	123	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Person/group did not get (or DK/NA if got) a	14447	25.9 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1379	2.5 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,243 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1297-1297 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0959: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Would Running U.S. House Incumbent be Helpful with Problem

If you had (another/a) problem that [running U.S. House incumbent] could do something about, do you think (he/she) would be very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not very helpful?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very helpful	3745	6.7 %
2	2. Somewhat helpful	6422	11.5 %
3	3. Not very helpful	1604	2.9 %
7	7. Depends	505	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent not running	1870	3.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	3923	7.0 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,276 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1298-1298 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0960: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Running U.S. House Incumbent Done Anything Special for District

Do you happen to remember anything special that [running U.S. House incumbent] has done for his/her district or for the people of his/her district while s/he has been in Congress?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2802	5.0 %
5	5. No	12023	21.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Incumbent not running	1870	3.4 %
9	9. NA; DK; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; abbrev	1374	2.5 %
.	-	37605	67.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,825 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1299-1299 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0961: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1151	2.1 %
5	5. No	6564	11.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)	10	0.0 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	349	0.6 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,715 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1300-1300 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0962: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Express Opinion

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to express an opinion?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	475	0.9 %
5	5. No	664	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent	6712	12.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	223	0.4 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,139 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1301-1301 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0963: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Information

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to seek information?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	414	0.7 %
5	5. No	725	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent	6712	12.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	223	0.4 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,139 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1302-1302 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0964: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent to Seek Help

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Was it to seek help on a problem?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	558	1.0 %
5	5. No	581	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent	6712	12.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	223	0.4 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,139 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1303-1303 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0965: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Response to Contact with Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did you get a response from [U.S. House representative] or someone in his/her office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1023	1.8 %
5	5. No	98	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Never (or DK/NA if) contacted incumbent; no recent	6712	12.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	241	0.4 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,121 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

VCF0966: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Satisfied w/Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Have you (or anyone in your family living here) ever contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did you get a response from [U.S. House representative] or someone in his/her office? (IF YES:) How satisfied were you with the response: very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very satisfied	620	1.1 %
2	2. Somewhat satisfied	261	0.5 %
4	4. Not very satisfied	61	0.1 %
5	5. Not at all satisfied	65	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Never (or DK/NA if) received response; never (or	6840	12.3 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	227	0.4 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,007 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

VCF0967: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Know Anyone (Else) Who Contacted Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House representative] or anyone in his/her office?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1511	2.7 %
5	5. No	6163	11.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)	10	0.0 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	390	0.7 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,674 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1306-1306 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0968: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Get Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1326	2.4 %
5	5. No	54	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Doesn't know (or DK/NA if knows) of anyone else; no	6352	11.4 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	342	0.6 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,380 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1307-1307 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0969: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Other Person Satisfied w/Response from Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent

Do you know anyone {else} who has contacted [retiring OR running U.S. House Representative] or anyone in his/her office? (IF YES:) Did this (person/group) get a response?

1978,1980: (IF YES:) Was this (person/group) satisfied with the response?

1986,1990: (IF YES:) How satisfied was this (person/group) with the response?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very satisfied (1978,1980: Yes; satisfied)	873	1.6 %
2	2. Somewhat satisfied	246	0.4 %
4	4. Not very satisfied (1978,1980: Somewhat dissatisfied)	42	0.1 %
5	5. Not at all satisfied (1978,1980: No; not satisfied)	67	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Person/group did not get (of DK/NA if got) a	6537	11.7 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	309	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1308-1308 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0970: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Would Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent be Helpful with Problem

If you had (another/a) problem that [retiring OR running U.S. House representative] could do something about, do you think (he/she) would be very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not very helpful?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very helpful	2015	3.6 %
2	2. Somewhat helpful	3082	5.5 %
3	3. Not very helpful	836	1.5 %
7	7. Depends	305	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)	10	0.0 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia	1826	3.3 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,238 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1309-1309 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0971: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Running or Retiring U.S. House Incumbent Done Anything Special for District

Do you happen to remember anything special that [retiring OR running U.S. House representative] has done for his/her district or for the people of his/her district while s/he has been in Congress?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1404	2.5 %
5	5. No	6383	11.5 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. No recent incumbent (1990, NJ01: 10 cases)	10	0.0 %
9	9. DK; NA; no Post IW; District of Columbia (1986)	277	0.5 %
.	-	47600	85.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,787 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1310-1310 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0972: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Recall Names of U.S. House Candidates

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress-- that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER: Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this district in November?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	13156	23.6 %
5	5. No; DK	17628	31.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.; form II,III,	3743	6.7 %
.	-	21147	38.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 30,784 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1311-1311 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0973: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress-- that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER: Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this district in November? (IF YES:) Who were they? (1996-LATER:) What is [NAME'S] party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME:valid, PARTY: correct	5627	10.1 %
2	2. NAME:valid, PARTY: incorrect	273	0.5 %
3	3. NAME:valid, PARTY: DK/NA	519	0.9 %
4	4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any	1714	3.1 %
5	5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	292	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	6. NAME:DK/NA, PARTY: any	88	0.2 %
7	7. NAME:DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	12689	22.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	1669	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,202 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1312-1312 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0974: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress-- that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER: Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this district in November? (IF YES:) Who were they? (2ND MENTION) [1996-LATER:] What was (NAME'S) party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME:valid, PARTY: correct	2268	4.1 %
2	2. NAME:valid, PARTY: incorrect	112	0.2 %
3	3. NAME:valid, PARTY: DK/NA	157	0.3 %
4	4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any	1322	2.4 %
5	5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	183	0.3 %
6	6. NAME:DK/NA, PARTY: any	366	0.7 %
7	7. NAME:DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	16794	30.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	1669	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,202 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1313-1313 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0975: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Recall Correct Name of U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress-- that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington-- [1996-LATER: Who ran in the November election from this district?] that ran in this district in November? (IF YES:) Who were they? (3RD MENTION) [1996-LATER:] What was (NAME'S) party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME:valid, PARTY: correct	113	0.2 %
2	2. NAME:valid, PARTY: incorrect	6	0.0 %
3	3. NAME:valid, PARTY: DK/NA	9	0.0 %
4	4. NAME:invalid, PARTY: any	258	0.5 %
5	5. NAME:invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	60	0.1 %
6	6. NAME:DK/NA, PARTY: any;	48	0.1 %
7	7. NAME:DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	20708	37.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	1669	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,202 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1314-1314 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0976: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Number of Recalled Names of U.S. House Candidates

Summary: Number of House Candidate Names Correctly Recalled

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	00. R's recall of any name(s) incorrect/DK/NA; any party	14422	25.9 %
10	10. R's recall correct for one name; party mention	661	1.2 %
11	11. R's recall correct for one name; party mention correct	3825	6.9 %
20	20. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions	170	0.3 %
21	21. R's recall correct for 2 names; one party mention	72	0.1 %
22	22. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions	2042	3.7 %
30	30. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions	0	0.0 %
31	31. R's recall correct for 3 names; one party mention	0	0.0 %
32	32. R's recall correct for 3 names; two party mentions	3	0.0 %
33	33. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions	7	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW ;	1669	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,202 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 33.00

Location: 1315-1316 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0977: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Know If One U.S. House Candidate Was Already in the U.S. House

1958,1964,1966:
Do you happen to know if (either/the) candidate is already in Congress?

1968:
Do you happen to know if (either one of these candidates/if he) is already in Congress:

1978 AND LATER:
Do you happen to know if [candidate in district where only 1 candidate ran] / either [first candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] or [second candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] was already in the U.S. House of Representatives before the election?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, candidate was/ one candidate was/ (some years:	16772	30.1 %
3	3. No, candidate wasn't/neither candidate was	1240	2.2 %
5	5. DK	8396	15.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no major party candidate running; no Post	2332	4.2 %
.	-	26934	48.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,408 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1317-1317 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0978: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Correct Whether a U.S. House Candidate Was Already in Office

1958,1964,1966:
Do you happen to know if (either/the) candidate is already in Congress? (IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:) Which {candidate} was that?

1968:
Do you happen to know if (either one of these candidates/if he) is already in Congress? (IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:) Which one?

1978 AND LATER:

Do you happen to know if [candidate in district where only 1 candidate ran] / either [first candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] or [second candidate in district where 2 candidates ran] was already in the U.S. House of Representatives before the election? (IF YES AND 2 MAJOR PARTY CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT:) Which {candidate} was that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. CORRECT: correct incumbency status; correct candidate	16510	29.7 %
2	2. INCORRECT: incorrect incumbency status; incorrect	1339	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK if incumbent; DK which is incumbent; NA if	10891	19.6 %
.	-	26934	48.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,849 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1318-1318 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0980: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	7841	14.1 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	2294	4.1 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	1851	3.3 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	1016	1.8 %
4	4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)	775	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	5091	9.1 %
7	7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked	977	1.8 %
8	8. No Democratic candidate in R's district (includes	1224	2.2 %
9	9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked	1802	3.2 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,777 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1319-1319 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF0981: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is/Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S. House Democratic candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	11362	20.4 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	1591	2.9 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	665	1.2 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	224	0.4 %
4	4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)	107	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	5091	9.1 %
7	7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	789	1.4 %
8	8. No Democratic candidate in R's district (includes	1224	2.2 %
9	9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	1818	3.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,949 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

VCF0982: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Democratic House candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-4	-4. maximum negative	79	0.1 %
-3	-	156	0.3 %
-2	-	435	0.8 %
-1	-	911	1.6 %
0	0. neutral	6685	12.0 %
1	-	2065	3.7 %
2	-	1659	3.0 %
3	-	926	1.7 %
4	+4. maximum positive	620	1.1 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0980,VCF0981)	9335	16.8 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,536 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.60
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -4.00
- Maximum: 4.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.42

Location: 1321-1322 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0983: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Democratic House candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	6297	11.3 %
1	-	2558	4.6 %
2	-	2203	4.0 %
3	-	1312	2.4 %
4	-	792	1.4 %
5	-	267	0.5 %
6	-	72	0.1 %
7	-	29	0.1 %
8	8. Eight or more mentions	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0980,VCF0981)	9335	16.8 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,536 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.19
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.43

Location: 1323-1324 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0984: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Is/Was there anything in particular that you liked about [U.S. House Republican candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	7376	13.2 %
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	1879	3.4 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	1434	2.6 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	707	1.3 %
4	4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)	500	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	5779	10.4 %
7	7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked something	925	1.7 %
8	8. No Republican candidate in R's district (includes	2443	4.4 %
9	9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked	1828	3.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,896 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1325-1325 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0985: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is/Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S. House Republican candidate]? What is/was that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	9893	17.8 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	1395	2.5 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	514	0.9 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	189	0.3 %
4	4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)	112	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	5779	10.4 %
7	7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	707	1.3 %
8	8. No Republican candidate in R's district (includes	2443	4.4 %
9	9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	1839	3.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,103 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1326-1326 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0986: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward Republican House candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-4	-4. Maximum negative	86	0.2 %
-3	-	134	0.2 %
-2	-	349	0.6 %
-1	-	811	1.5 %
0	0. Neutral	6338	11.4 %
1	-	1723	3.1 %
2	-	1306	2.3 %
3	-	611	1.1 %
4	+4. Maximum positive	374	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0984,VCF0985)	11139	20.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,732 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.46
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -4.00
- Maximum: 4.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.33

Location: 1327-1328 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0987: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of Republican House candidate

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	6038	10.8 %
1	-	2224	4.0 %
2	-	1685	3.0 %
3	-	922	1.7 %
4	-	618	1.1 %
5	-	163	0.3 %
6	-	60	0.1 %
7	-	15	0.0 %
8	8. Eight or more mentions	7	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0984,VCF0985)	11139	20.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,732 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.04
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.37

Location: 1329-1330 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0988: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Net affect toward major party House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-8	-8. Maximum Republican	12	0.0 %
-7	-	21	0.0 %
-6	-	51	0.1 %
-5	-	115	0.2 %
-4	-	221	0.4 %
-3	-	381	0.7 %
-2	-	683	1.2 %
-1	-	859	1.5 %
0	0. Neutral	3557	6.4 %
1	-	903	1.6 %
2	-	680	1.2 %
3	-	426	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	238	0.4 %
5	-	123	0.2 %
6	-	64	0.1 %
7	-	31	0.1 %
8	+8. Maximum Democratic	26	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,	14480	26.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,391 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.06
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -8.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.10

Location: 1331-1333 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0989: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes) - Major Party House Candidate Salience

Major party House candidate salience

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	3183	5.7 %
1	-	1249	2.2 %
2	-	1222	2.2 %
3	-	904	1.6 %
4	-	644	1.2 %
5	-	459	0.8 %
6	-	299	0.5 %
7	-	178	0.3 %
8	-	127	0.2 %
9	-	50	0.1 %
10	-	37	0.1 %
11	-	18	0.0 %
12	-	13	0.0 %
13	-	3	0.0 %
14	-	4	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	1	0.0 %
16	16. Sixteen or more mentions	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,	14480	26.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,391 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.98
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 15.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.29

Location: 1334-1335 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0990: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Relative Salience (Major Party House Candidates)

Relative salience of major party House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-8	-8. Eight or more Republican mentions, no Democratic	1	0.0 %
-6	-	4	0.0 %
-5	-	32	0.1 %
-4	-	116	0.2 %
-3	-	260	0.5 %
-2	-	592	1.1 %
-1	-	1032	1.9 %
0	-	3960	7.1 %
1	-	1143	2.1 %
2	-	696	1.3 %
3	-	347	0.6 %
4	-	152	0.3 %
5	-	45	0.1 %
6	-	8	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	+8. Eight or more Democratic mentions, no Republican	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0980,VCF0981,	14480	26.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,391 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.10
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -8.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.53

Location: 1336-1338 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF0991: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve/Disapprove of Running U.S. U.S. House Incumbent

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way [running U.S. House incumbent Representative] has been handling his/her job?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve	13751	24.7 %
5	5. Disapprove	3101	5.6 %
8	8. DK	5745	10.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)	4570	8.2 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; incorrect district assignment ;	2848	5.1 %
.	-	25659	46.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,597 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1339-1339 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF0992: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve/Disapprove of U.S. Congress

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the U.S. Congress has been handling its job?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve	11376	20.4 %
5	5. Disapprove	11505	20.7 %
8	8. DK; pro-con; both	3112	5.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	1262	2.3 %
.	-	28419	51.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,993 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1340-1340 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF0993: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you liked about [U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	7297	13.1 %
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	2851	5.1 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	2454	4.4 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	1323	2.4 %
4	4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)	1004	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	3051	5.5 %
7	7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked something	793	1.4 %
8	8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district	2362	4.2 %
9	9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked	1736	3.1 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,929 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1341-1341 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0994: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you didn't like about [U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	12405	22.3 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	1643	3.0 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	687	1.2 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	262	0.5 %
4	4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)	127	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	3051	5.5 %
7	7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	590	1.1 %
8	8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district	2362	4.2 %
9	9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	1744	3.1 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,124 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1342-1342 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0995: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward incumbent House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-4	-4. Maximum negative	91	0.2 %
-3	-	177	0.3 %
-2	-	436	0.8 %
-1	-	847	1.5 %
0	0. Neutral	6278	11.3 %
1	-	2644	4.7 %
2	-	2251	4.0 %
3	-	1205	2.2 %
4	+4. Maximum positive	803	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0993,VCF0994)	8139	14.6 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,732 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.77
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -4.00
- Maximum: 4.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.48

Location: 1343-1344 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0996: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of incumbent House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	5856	10.5 %
1	-	3022	5.4 %
2	-	2733	4.9 %
3	-	1622	2.9 %
4	-	1053	1.9 %
5	-	317	0.6 %
6	-	89	0.2 %
7	-	32	0.1 %
8	8. Eight or more mentions	8	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0993,VCF0994)	8139	14.6 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,732 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.36
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.46

Location: 1345-1346 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF0997: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Likes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you liked about [challenger to U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero positive mentions (likes)	5917	10.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. One positive mention (likes)	844	1.5 %
2	2. Two positive mentions (likes)	489	0.9 %
3	3. Three positive mentions (likes)	218	0.4 %
4	4. Four or more positive mentions (likes)	155	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	6697	12.0 %
7	7. DK if liked anything about candidate; liked	822	1.5 %
8	8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district	6064	10.9 %
9	9. NA if liked anything about candidate; liked	1665	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,623 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1347-1347 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0998: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: What Respondent Dislikes - Number of Mentions

Is there anything in particular that you didn't like about [challenger to U.S. House incumbent candidate] What is that? Anything else?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero negative mentions (dislikes)	6364	11.4 %
1	1. One negative mention (dislikes)	896	1.6 %
2	2. Two negative mentions (dislikes)	333	0.6 %
3	3. Three negative mentions (dislikes)	103	0.2 %
4	4. Four or more negative mentions (dislikes)	61	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
6	6. 'I don't know anything about this candidate'	6697	12.0 %
7	7. DK if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	676	1.2 %
8	8. No running incumbent candidate in R's district	6064	10.9 %
9	9. NA if disliked anything about candidate; disliked	1677	3.0 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,757 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00

• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1348-1348 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF0999: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Affect toward challenger to incumbent House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-4	-4. Maximum negative	49	0.1 %
-3	-	78	0.1 %
-2	-	235	0.4 %
-1	-	613	1.1 %
0	0. Neutral	5089	9.1 %
1	-	711	1.3 %
2	-	406	0.7 %
3	-	185	0.3 %
4	+4. Maximum positive	107	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0997,VCF0998)	15398	27.7 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,473 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 0.13
• Median: 0.00
• Mode: 0.00
• Minimum: -4.00
• Maximum: 4.00
• Standard Deviation: 1.07

Location: 1349-1350 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF1000: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand: Salience (Likes-Dislikes)

Salience of challenger to incumbent House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	4912	8.8 %
1	-	1160	2.1 %
2	-	712	1.3 %
3	-	378	0.7 %
4	-	215	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	59	0.1 %
6	-	27	0.0 %
7	-	6	0.0 %
8	8. Eight or more mentions	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in VCF0997,VCF0998)	15398	27.7 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,473 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.68
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.18

Location: 1351-1352 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF1001: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Affect (Likes-Dislikes)

Net affect toward incumbent and challenger House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-8	-8. Maximum challenger	12	0.0 %
-7	-	20	0.0 %
-6	-	45	0.1 %
-5	-	63	0.1 %
-4	-	126	0.2 %
-3	-	223	0.4 %
-2	-	389	0.7 %
-1	-	523	0.9 %
0	0. Neutral	2992	5.4 %
1	-	956	1.7 %
2	-	780	1.4 %
3	-	467	0.8 %
4	-	267	0.5 %
5	-	140	0.3 %
6	-	55	0.1 %
7	-	22	0.0 %
8	+8. Maximum incumbent	16	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
999	999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,	15775	28.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,096 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.42
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -8.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.05

Location: 1353-1355 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF1002: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Salience (Likes-Dislikes) - Incumbent and Challenger House Candidate Salience

Incumbent and challenger House candidate salience

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Zero mentions	2680	4.8 %
1	-	1055	1.9 %
2	-	1046	1.9 %
3	-	770	1.4 %
4	-	556	1.0 %
5	-	381	0.7 %
6	-	249	0.4 %
7	-	151	0.3 %
8	-	105	0.2 %
9	-	41	0.1 %
10	-	30	0.1 %
11	-	17	0.0 %
12	-	10	0.0 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	3	0.0 %
15	-	1	0.0 %
16	16. Sixteen or more mentions	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,	15775	28.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,096 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.98
- Median: 1.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 15.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.28

Location: 1356-1357 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF1003: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Relative Salience (Incumbent and Challenger House Candidates)

Relative salience of Incumbent and challenger House candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-8	-8. Eight or more challenger mentions, no incumbent	0	0.0 %
-7	-	1	0.0 %
-6	-	1	0.0 %
-5	-	9	0.0 %
-4	-	26	0.0 %
-3	-	75	0.1 %
-2	-	210	0.4 %
-1	-	537	1.0 %
0	-	3327	6.0 %
1	-	1277	2.3 %
2	-	892	1.6 %
3	-	457	0.8 %
4	-	213	0.4 %
5	-	59	0.1 %
6	-	9	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
8	+8. Eight or more incumbent mentions, no challenger	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
999	999. MD (codes 6-9 in any of: VCF0993,VCF0994,	15775	28.3 %
.	-	32803	58.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,096 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 0.61
- Median: 0.00
- Mode: 0.00
- Minimum: -7.00
- Maximum: 8.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.43

Location: 1358-1360 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 999 , .

VCF1004: PARTISANSHIP: Party of Respondent/Party of U.S. House Incumbent

Party ID of respondent and House incumbent

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R is:Democrat; INCUMBENT:Democrat	11153	20.0 %
2	2. R is:Republican; INCUMBENT:Republican	6368	11.4 %
3	3. R is:Democrat; INCUMBENT:Republican	6161	11.1 %
4	4. R is:Republican; INCUMBENT:Democrat	5657	10.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. R does not have major party partisanship or NA if has	9821	17.6 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 29,339 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1361-1361 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1005: PARTISANSHIP: Party of Voting Respondent/Party of U.S. House Incumbent

Voter from same major party as House incumbent?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R Voted: R is partisan of same party as incumbent	10550	18.9 %
2	2. R Voted: R is partisan of same major party as	6760	12.1 %
3	3. R is major party partisan but R did not vote, DK/NA	11047	19.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. R does not have major party partisanship or NA if has	10803	19.4 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,357 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1362-1362 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1006: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington --who ran in this district this November [1996-LATER: the November election from this district]? (IF YES:) Who were they?

1996-LATER: What was [House candidate's] party? FIRST HOUSE CANDIDATE RECALL-- CANDIDATE CODE

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	31. Democratic candidate in race without running	353	0.6 %
32	32. Republican candidate in race without running	374	0.7 %
33	33. Democratic incumbent	3693	6.6 %
34	34. Republican incumbent	2540	4.6 %
35	35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent	307	0.6 %
36	36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent	241	0.4 %
39	39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	1	0.0 %
80	80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
97	97. Name given not on candidate list for House	2269	4.1 %
99	99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name	16171	29.0 %
.	-	29721	53.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,513 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 80.00

Location: 1363-1364 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 97 , 99 , .

VCF1007: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington --who ran in this district this November [1996-LATER: the November election from this district]? (IF YES:) Who were they?

1996-LATER: What was [House candidate's] party? SECOND HOUSE CANDIDATE RECALL-- CANDIDATE CODE

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	31. Democratic candidate in race without running	256	0.5 %
32	32. Republican candidate in race without running	264	0.5 %
33	33. Democratic incumbent	337	0.6 %
34	34. Republican incumbent	369	0.7 %
35	35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent	834	1.5 %
36	36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent	929	1.7 %
39	39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	1	0.0 %
80	80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	23	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
97	97. Name given not on candidate list for House	1692	3.0 %
99	99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name	21248	38.2 %
.	-	29721	53.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,013 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 80.00

Location: 1365-1366 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 97 , 99 , .

VCF1008: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Candidate Code of Correctly Recalled U.S. House Candidate

Do you happen to remember the names of the candidates for Congress--that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington --who ran in this district this November [1996-LATER: the November election from this district]? (IF YES:) Who were they?

1996-LATER: What was [House candidate's] party? THIRD HOUSE CANDIDATE RECALL-- CANDIDATE CODE

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	31. Democratic candidate in race without running	14	0.0 %
32	32. Republican candidate in race without running	12	0.0 %
33	33. Democratic incumbent	30	0.1 %
34	34. Republican incumbent	31	0.1 %
35	35. Democratic challenger to Republican incumbent	16	0.0 %
36	36. Republican challenger to Democratic incumbent	25	0.0 %
39	39. Incumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	0	0.0 %
80	80. Nonincumbent Independent/liberal/conservative/minor	28	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
97	97. Name given not on candidate list for House	348	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99	99. R says s/he remembers names but when asked for name	25449	45.7 %
.	-	29721	53.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 156 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 31.00
- Maximum: 80.00

Location: 1367-1368 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 97 , 99 , .

VCF1009: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party of Recalled U.S. House Candidate Name(s)

Recall Summary: House Candidates by Party

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 1 Recall: Democratic candidate	3131	5.6 %
2	2. 1 Recall: Republican candidate	2078	3.7 %
3	3. 2 Recalls: both major party candidates (in races	2702	4.9 %
4	4. 0 Recalls: no major party candidate recall	16347	29.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. Washington D.C.; no Post IW; short form	1695	3.0 %
.	-	29721	53.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,258 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1369-1369 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1010: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Did Respondent Recall U.S. House Candidate Name From Respondent's Own Party

Recall summary: does R recall own/other major party candidate?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 1 Recall: Own major party's candidate	3207	5.8 %
2	2. 1 Recall: Other major party's candidate	1529	2.7 %
3	3. 2 Recalls: both major party candidates (in races	2492	4.5 %
4	4. 0 Recall: no major party candidate recall	13808	24.8 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. Washington D.C.; no Post IW; short form	4917	8.8 %
.	-	29721	53.4 %
	Total	55,674	100%

Based upon 21,036 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1370-1370 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1011: ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for U.S. House Candidate From Own Party

1968,1970:
How about the vote for Congressman. Did you vote for a candidate for Congress? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?

1972:
How about the election for Congressman--that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington? Which party's candidate did you vote for Congressman?

1974,1976:
How about the election for Congressman--that is, for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for Congress? Whom did you vote for? Which party was that?

1978 AND LATER:
Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington. Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? Who did you vote for? (BALLOT CARD SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R's Vote: for major party candidate from party same	16993	30.5 %
2	2. R's Vote: for major party candidate from party	3864	6.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but not (or	22565	40.5 %
.	-	12252	22.0 %
	Total	55,674	100%

Based upon 20,857 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1371-1371 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1012: ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for Incumbent U.S. House Candidate

Did R vote for incumbent?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R's Vote: for incumbent candidate in race involving	13073	23.5 %
2	2. R's Vote: for candidate other than incumbent in race	4736	8.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but	21351	38.4 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,809 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1372-1372 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1013: ELECTION: Did Respondent Vote for Winning U.S. House Candidate

Did R vote for winner?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. R's Vote: for winner	14412	25.9 %
2	2. R's Vote: for candidate other than the winner (incl	5832	10.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. R did not vote or DK/NA if voted; R voted but not	18916	34.0 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,244 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1373-1373 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1014: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Candidate Code of Winning U.S. House Candidate

Who won House race?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. WINNER: incumbent, Democrat	18758	33.7 %
2	2. WINNER: incumbent, Republican	13800	24.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	3. WINNER: challenger, Republican (loser: Democratic	647	1.2 %
4	4. WINNER: challenger, Democrat (loser: Republican	618	1.1 %
5	5. WINNER: open-seat candidate, Democrat (race	2078	3.7 %
6	6. WINNER: open-seat candidate, Republican (race	2391	4.3 %
7	7. WINNER: uncontested open-seat candidate, Democrat	59	0.1 %
8	8. WINNER: uncontested open-seat candidate, Republican	3	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. Washington D.C.; California (1974 only, due to	806	1.4 %
.	-	16514	29.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,354 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1374-1374 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF1015: STUDY ADMIN: Number of Days Pre-Election IW Conducted Before Election

Number of days from Pre-election IW until day of election

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	118	0.2 %
1	-	502	0.9 %
2	-	369	0.7 %
3	-	511	0.9 %
4	-	478	0.9 %
5	-	504	0.9 %
6	-	512	0.9 %
7	-	562	1.0 %
8	-	661	1.2 %
9	-	459	0.8 %
10	-	806	1.4 %
11	-	1062	1.9 %
12	-	1329	2.4 %
13	-	986	1.8 %
14	-	798	1.4 %
15	-	772	1.4 %
16	-	512	0.9 %
17	-	888	1.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	464	0.8 %
19	-	793	1.4 %
20	-	796	1.4 %
21	-	745	1.3 %
22	-	715	1.3 %
23	-	341	0.6 %
24	-	656	1.2 %
25	-	552	1.0 %
26	-	716	1.3 %
27	-	764	1.4 %
28	-	779	1.4 %
29	-	757	1.4 %
30	-	360	0.6 %
31	-	629	1.1 %
32	-	554	1.0 %
33	-	695	1.2 %
34	-	653	1.2 %
35	-	691	1.2 %
36	-	692	1.2 %
37	-	332	0.6 %
38	-	528	0.9 %
39	-	479	0.9 %
40	-	686	1.2 %
41	-	594	1.1 %
42	-	693	1.2 %
43	-	718	1.3 %
44	-	316	0.6 %
45	-	544	1.0 %
46	-	483	0.9 %
47	-	650	1.2 %
48	-	579	1.0 %
49	-	502	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. NA; no Pre IW; abbrev. Pre IW (1980, see	2178	3.9 %
.	-	17895	32.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 35,601 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 28.06
- Median: 27.00
- Mode: 12.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 67.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.43

Location: 1375-1376 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF1016: STUDY ADMIN: Number of Days Post-Election IW Conducted After Election

Number of days from day of election until day of Post-election IW

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	6	0.0 %
1	-	1004	1.8 %
2	-	1392	2.5 %
3	-	1346	2.4 %
4	-	1331	2.4 %
5	-	795	1.4 %
6	-	1879	3.4 %
7	-	1940	3.5 %
8	-	1687	3.0 %
9	-	1886	3.4 %
10	-	1224	2.2 %
11	-	1435	2.6 %
12	-	769	1.4 %
13	-	1742	3.1 %
14	-	1548	2.8 %
15	-	1074	1.9 %
16	-	759	1.4 %
17	-	787	1.4 %
18	-	1073	1.9 %
19	-	607	1.1 %
20	-	1466	2.6 %
21	-	1294	2.3 %
22	-	922	1.7 %
23	-	2224	4.0 %
24	-	1008	1.8 %
25	-	1062	1.9 %
26	-	586	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	-	1247	2.2 %
28	-	1585	2.8 %
29	-	1171	2.1 %
30	-	929	1.7 %
31	-	622	1.1 %
32	-	779	1.4 %
33	-	474	0.9 %
34	-	834	1.5 %
35	-	705	1.3 %
36	-	639	1.1 %
37	-	534	1.0 %
38	-	389	0.7 %
39	-	414	0.7 %
40	-	252	0.5 %
41	-	397	0.7 %
42	-	365	0.7 %
43	-	304	0.5 %
44	-	225	0.4 %
45	-	172	0.3 %
46	-	155	0.3 %
47	-	78	0.1 %
48	-	120	0.2 %
49	-	83	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. NA; no Post IW	3373	6.1 %
.	-	4997	9.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 47,304 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 20.42
- Median: 18.00
- Mode: 23.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 98.00
- Standard Deviation: 14.63

Location: 1377-1378 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF1017: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Thermometer Avg

Thermometers -- both major party Congressional candidates

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	35	0.1 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	6	0.0 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	18	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	3	0.0 %
13	-	3	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	34	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.0 %
20	-	22	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	18	0.0 %
24	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	117	0.2 %
26	-	2	0.0 %
28	-	35	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	119	0.2 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	84	0.2 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	155	0.3 %
37	-	4	0.0 %
38	-	131	0.2 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	269	0.5 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	243	0.4 %
45	-	535	1.0 %
46	-	4	0.0 %
48	-	52	0.1 %
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	2034	3.7 %
51	-	15	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	69	0.1 %
54	-	5	0.0 %
55	-	1272	2.3 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	245	0.4 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1197	2.2 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	290	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK in VCF0906 or VCF0907	5820	10.5 %
999	999. NA; no Post IW	12379	22.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	27758	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,717 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.12
- Median: 55.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 13.79

Location: 1379-1381 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF1018: CANDIDATES: U.S. House Candidate Thermometer Index

Major party Congressional candidate thermometer index

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. Most Republican	51	0.1 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	87	0.2 %
10	-	11	0.0 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
13	-	12	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	143	0.3 %
18	-	7	0.0 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	76	0.1 %
21	-	2	0.0 %
23	-	117	0.2 %
24	-	2	0.0 %
25	-	181	0.3 %
26	-	2	0.0 %
28	-	138	0.2 %
30	-	164	0.3 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	296	0.5 %
34	-	4	0.0 %
35	-	304	0.5 %
36	-	2	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	189	0.3 %
40	-	666	1.2 %
42	-	3	0.0 %
43	-	183	0.3 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	866	1.6 %
46	-	2	0.0 %
47	-	3	0.0 %
48	-	64	0.1 %
49	-	8	0.0 %
50	50. Neutral	2076	3.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	3	0.0 %
53	-	52	0.1 %
55	-	920	1.7 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	206	0.4 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	746	1.3 %
61	-	5	0.0 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
63	-	226	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
998	998. DK in VCF0906 or VCF0907	5820	10.5 %
999	999. NA; no Post IW	12379	22.2 %
.	-	27758	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 9,717 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 50.84
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 16.32

Location: 1382-1384 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 998 , 999 , .

VCF1020: CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	5987	10.8 %
5	5. No	12934	23.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	948	1.7 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short	4385	7.9 %
.	-	31420	56.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,921 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1385-1385 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF1021A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	29	0.1 %
8889	Refused	25	0.0 %
.	-	49687	89.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 5,933 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 1297.00

Location: 1386-1389 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF1021B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	863	1.6 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	1283	2.3 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1796	3.2 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	431	0.8 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	116	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	264	0.5 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	516	0.9 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	52	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	433	0.8 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	179	0.3 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	29	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	25	0.0 %
.	-	49687	89.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,933 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1390-1391 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF1022A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52032	93.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 3,642 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 171.00
- Maximum: 1235.00

Location: 1392-1395 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1022B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	472	0.8 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	861	1.5 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	968	1.7 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	150	0.3 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	126	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	208	0.4 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	382	0.7 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	39	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	314	0.6 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	122	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	52032	93.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,642 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

VCF1023A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53882	96.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,792 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1297.00

Location: 1398-1401 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1023B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	203	0.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	395	0.7 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	498	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	50	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	74	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	123	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	198	0.4 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	28	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	152	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	71	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53882	96.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,792 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1402-1403 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1024A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54898	98.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 776 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1297.00

Location: 1404-1407 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1024B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	89	0.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	176	0.3 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	203	0.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	25	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	25	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	47	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	117	0.2 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	14	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	60	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	20	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54898	98.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 776 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1408-1409 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1025A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55458	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 216 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 201.00
• Maximum: 1225.00

Location: 1410-1413 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1025B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	38	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	32	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	53	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	5	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	6	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	21	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	35	0.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	1	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	13	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	12	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	55458	99.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 216 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 21.00
• Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1414-1415 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1026: CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2622	4.7 %
5	5. No	11363	20.4 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	774	1.4 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short	4400	7.9 %
.	-	36515	65.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,985 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1416-1416 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF1027A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	15	0.0 %
8889	Refused	20	0.0 %
.	-	53052	95.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,587 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1417-1420 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF1027B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	231	0.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	350	0.6 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	566	1.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	536	1.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	117	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	270	0.5 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	328	0.6 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	41	0.1 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	56	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	92	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	15	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	20	0.0 %
.	-	53052	95.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,587 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1421-1422 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF1028A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54678	98.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 996 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 201.00
• Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1423-1426 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1028B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	92	0.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	143	0.3 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	224	0.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	78	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	59	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	140	0.3 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	152	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	20	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	51	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	37	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54678	98.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 996 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1427-1428 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1029A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55343	99.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 331 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1429-1432 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1029B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	30	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	38	0.1 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	61	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	34	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	16	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	44	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	70	0.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	8	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	21	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	9	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55343	99.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 331 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1433-1434 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1030A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55567	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 107 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1228.00

Location: 1435-1438 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1030B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	3	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	11	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	16	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	12	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	10	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	17	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	26	0.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	4	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	6	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	2	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55567	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 107 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1439-1440 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1031A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55650	100.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 203.00
- Maximum: 1044.00

Location: 1441-1444 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1031B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Democratic U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Democratic candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	5	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	3	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	2	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	2	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	4	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	0	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	7	0.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	0	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	0	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	1	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
.	-	55650	100.0 %
Total		**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1445-1446 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1032: CANDIDATES: Likes anything about Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4576	8.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. No	13158	23.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	892	1.6 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short	4410	7.9 %
.	-	32638	58.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 17,734 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1447-1447 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF1033A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	33	0.1 %
8889	Refused	22	0.0 %
.	-	51098	91.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 4,521 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 171.00

- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1448-1451 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF1033B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	752	1.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	762	1.4 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	1318	2.4 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	440	0.8 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	146	0.3 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	357	0.6 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	399	0.7 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	21	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	170	0.3 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	153	0.3 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	33	0.1 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	22	0.0 %
.	-	51101	91.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,518 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1452-1453 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF1034A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53033	95.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,641 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 42.00
- Maximum: 1297.00

Location: 1454-1457 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1034B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	1	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	382	0.7 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	563	1.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	717	1.3 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	124	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	118	0.2 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	204	0.4 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	295	0.5 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	24	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	114	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	99	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	53033	95.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,641 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1458-1459 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1035A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54467	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1460-1463 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1035B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	119	0.2 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	224	0.4 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	338	0.6 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	56	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	77	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	131	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	141	0.3 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	19	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	68	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	33	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54468	97.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1464-1465 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1036A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55174	99.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 500 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1235.00

Location: 1466-1469 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1036B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	45	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	85	0.2 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	157	0.3 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	19	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	24	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	49	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	76	0.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	5	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	29	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	11	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55174	99.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 500 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1470-1471 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1037A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
.	-	55541	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 133 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1233.00

Location: 1472-1475 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1037B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Like About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you liked about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you liked about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	16	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	21	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	40	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	4	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	11	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	8	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	24	0.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	0	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	5	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	4	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55541	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 133 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1476-1477 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1038: CANDIDATES: Dislikes anything about Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	2237	4.0 %
5	5. No	9893	17.8 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	698	1.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984); short	4426	7.9 %
.	-	38420	69.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,130 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1478-1478 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF1039A: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8888	DK	10	0.0 %
8889	Refused	20	0.0 %
.	-	53437	96.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 2,207 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 101.00
- Maximum: 8877.00

Location: 1479-1482 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8888 , 8889 , .

VCF1039B: CANDIDATES Mention 1: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	200	0.4 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	273	0.5 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	422	0.8 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	623	1.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	54	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	187	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	232	0.4 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	25	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	87	0.2 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	103	0.2 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
88	88. DK (mention 1 only)	10	0.0 %
89	89. RF; NA (mention 1 only)	20	0.0 %
.	-	53438	96.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,206 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1483-1484 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 88 , 89 , .

VCF1040A: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54859	98.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 815 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 131.00
- Maximum: 1300.00

Location: 1485-1488 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1040B: CANDIDATES Mention 2: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	58	0.1 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	108	0.2 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	166	0.3 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	100	0.2 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	35	0.1 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	98	0.2 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	120	0.2 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	17	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	83	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	30	0.1 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	54859	98.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 815 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1489-1490 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1041A: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	1	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55373	99.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 301 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 35.00
- Maximum: 1241.00

Location: 1491-1494 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1041B: CANDIDATES Mention 3: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	1	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	25	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	27	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	58	0.1 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	30	0.1 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	9	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	33	0.1 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	68	0.1 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	5	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	31	0.1 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	14	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
.	-	55373	99.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 301 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 11.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1495-1496 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1042A: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55562	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 112 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1233.00

Location: 1497-1500 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1042B: CANDIDATES Mention 4: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	9	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	11	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	21	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	9	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	1	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	14	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	27	0.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	3	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	9	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	8	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55562	99.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 112 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1501-1502 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1043A: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Johnson	0	0.0 %
2	Kennedy, John; JFK	0	0.0 %
3	Kennedy, Robert; RFK	0	0.0 %
4	Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"	0	0.0 %
5	Kennedy, NA which	0	0.0 %
6	Truman	0	0.0 %
7	Roosevelt; "FDR"	0	0.0 %
8	McGovern; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
9	Carter; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
10	Mondale; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	McCarthy, Eugene	0	0.0 %
12	Humphrey	0	0.0 %
13	Muskie	0	0.0 %
14	Dukakis, Michael	0	0.0 %
15	Wallace	0	0.0 %
16	Jackson, Jesse	0	0.0 %
17	Clinton, Bill	0	0.0 %
18	Clinton, Hillary	0	0.0 %
19	Gore, Al	0	0.0 %
20	Lieberman, Joseph	0	0.0 %
21	Kerry, John	0	0.0 %
22	Edwards, John	0	0.0 %
23	Shriver; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
24	Eagleton (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
25	Lindsay (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
26	Mitchell, John (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
27	Mitchell, Martha (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
28	Laird (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
31	Eisenhower; Ike	0	0.0 %
32	Nixon; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
33	Agnew; good/bad choice for nominee (1972,1974 ONLY)	0	0.0 %
34	Rockefeller	0	0.0 %
35	Reagan	0	0.0 %
36	Ford; good/bad choice for nominee	0	0.0 %
37	Bush, Sr., George (except 1976); 1976: Bob Dole	0	0.0 %
38	Connally	0	0.0 %
39	Kissinger	0	0.0 %
40	McCarthy, Joseph	0	0.0 %
41	Buchanan, Pat	0	0.0 %
42	Dole, Robert or Dole good/bad choice for nominee (exc. 1976)	0	0.0 %
43	Gingrich, Newt	0	0.0 %
44	Cheney, Dick	0	0.0 %
45	Bush, Jr. George W.	0	0.0 %
46	McCain, John	0	0.0 %
51	Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)	0	0.0 %
52	Local party figures (city, state, etc.)	0	0.0 %
53	Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket	0	0.0 %
54	Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket	0	0.0 %
55	Reference to vice-presidential candidate	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
97	Other people within party reasons	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55634	99.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 40 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 201.00
- Maximum: 1234.00

Location: 1503-1506 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF1043B: CANDIDATES Mention 5: 1972-2004 Dislike About Republican U.S. House Cand COLLAPSED

Was there anything in particular that you didn't like about {NAME}, the Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? What was that? Anything else [that you didn't like about this candidate]?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	11. People within party (0001-0097)	0	0.0 %
12	12. Party characteristics (0101-0197)	0	0.0 %
21	21. Candidate experience, ability (0201-0297)	3	0.0 %
22	22. Candidate leadership qualities (0301-0397)	3	0.0 %
23	23. Candidate personal qualities (0401-0498)	4	0.0 %
24	24. Candidate party connections (0500-0597)	2	0.0 %
31	31. Government management (0601-0697)	1	0.0 %
32	32. Government activity/philosophy (0801-0897)	8	0.0 %
33	33. Domestic policies (0901-1097)	11	0.0 %
34	34. Foreign policies (1101-1199,1300-1310)	0	0.0 %
35	35. Group connections (1201-1299)	6	0.0 %
40	40. Miscellaneous (0701-0797,8877)	2	0.0 %
50	50. Events unique to one campaign (5001-5004)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
.	-	55634	99.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 40 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 21.00
- Maximum: 40.00

Location: 1507-1508 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF9001: DEMOGRAPHICS: Length of Residence in Community

How long have you lived here in (1986 AND LATER: your present) (1984: this) city/town/township/county (2002: community) ?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. 1 Year or less (2002,2004: less than 1 year)	2887	5.2 %
1	1. 13-23 Mos. (1988-1992 only) (2002,2004: 12-18 months)	452	0.8 %
2	2. 2 Years (1994-later: includes 13-23 months)	1528	2.7 %
3	3. 3 Years	1532	2.8 %
4	-	1230	2.2 %
5	-	1208	2.2 %
6	-	980	1.8 %
7	-	866	1.6 %
8	-	919	1.7 %
9	-	612	1.1 %
10	-	1082	1.9 %
11	-	606	1.1 %
12	-	734	1.3 %
13	-	519	0.9 %
14	-	577	1.0 %
15	-	802	1.4 %
16	-	528	0.9 %
17	-	455	0.8 %
18	-	651	1.2 %
19	-	378	0.7 %
20	-	1005	1.8 %
21	-	406	0.7 %
22	-	537	1.0 %
23	-	441	0.8 %
24	-	402	0.7 %
25	-	695	1.2 %
26	-	378	0.7 %
27	-	349	0.6 %
28	-	377	0.7 %
29	-	251	0.5 %
30	-	822	1.5 %
31	-	237	0.4 %
32	-	311	0.6 %
33	-	255	0.5 %
34	-	267	0.5 %
35	-	422	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
36	-	237	0.4 %
37	-	211	0.4 %
38	-	239	0.4 %
39	-	178	0.3 %
40	-	503	0.9 %
41	-	170	0.3 %
42	-	216	0.4 %
43	-	174	0.3 %
44	-	165	0.3 %
45	-	245	0.4 %
46	-	125	0.2 %
47	-	166	0.3 %
48	-	134	0.2 %
49	-	107	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. DK; NA; Panel (2002)	1479	2.7 %
.	-	18166	32.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 36,029 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 28.77
- Median: 18.00
- Mode: 90.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 90.00
- Standard Deviation: 29.40

Location: 1509-1510 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF9002: DEMOGRAPHICS: Length of Residence in Home

How long have you lived in this house (condo/apartment) (2002: your current home)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. 4 years or less	16399	29.5 %
2	2. 5-9 years	6999	12.6 %
3	3. 10-19 years	7232	13.0 %
4	4. 20-29 years	3380	6.1 %
5	5. 30 or more years (2004: includes 76 years or more)	2882	5.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	6. 'All of life' (regardless of number of years)	436	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Panel (2002)	1187	2.1 %
9	9. DK; NA	224	0.4 %
.	-	16935	30.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 37,328 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 6.00

Location: 1511-1511 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9003: GROUP THERMOMETER: Evangelical Groups

Evangelical groups active in politics -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	576	1.0 %
1	-	4	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	14	0.0 %
10	-	64	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	298	0.5 %
20	-	53	0.1 %
25	-	44	0.1 %
30	-	404	0.7 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	22	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	521	0.9 %
45	-	23	0.0 %
50	-	1216	2.2 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	12	0.0 %
60	-	464	0.8 %
65	-	22	0.0 %
70	-	330	0.6 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	51	0.1 %
76	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	56	0.1 %
85	-	204	0.4 %
90	-	28	0.1 %
95	-	9	0.0 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	116	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)	539	1.0 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	1969	3.5 %
.	-	48624	87.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,542 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 43.28

- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 25.19

Location: 1512-1513 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF9004: GROUP THERMOMETER: Elderly

Older people (or the elderly) -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	11	0.0 %
1	-	2	0.0 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	4	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	3	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	11	0.0 %
15	-	7	0.0 %
20	-	10	0.0 %
25	-	2	0.0 %
30	-	30	0.1 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	73	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	10	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	1105	2.0 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	26	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1187	2.1 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	104	0.2 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	2532	4.5 %
72	-	2	0.0 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	452	0.8 %
77	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	707	1.3 %
81	-	1	0.0 %
82	-	3	0.0 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	3781	6.8 %
86	-	2	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
89	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	587	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
93	-	1	0.0 %
94	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	149	0.3 %
96	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)	194	0.3 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	3147	5.7 %
.	-	36762	66.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 15,571 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 80.74
- Median: 85.00
- Mode: 97.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 15.69

Location: 1514-1515 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF9005: GROUP THERMOMETER: Supreme Court

The Supreme Court -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care

too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	246	0.4 %
1	-	10	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	3	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	16	0.0 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	5	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	45	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	242	0.4 %
20	-	48	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	52	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	508	0.9 %
32	-	2	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	43	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.0 %
38	-	1	0.0 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1216	2.2 %
41	-	1	0.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	4	0.0 %
45	-	117	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
48	-	5	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	4221	7.6 %
51	-	10	0.0 %
52	-	5	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	135	0.2 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	3009	5.4 %
62	-	4	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	217	0.4 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1980 and later)	597	1.1 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	3375	6.1 %
.	-	34144	61.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 17,558 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 61.20
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 19.29

Location: 1516-1517 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF9006: GROUP THERMOMETER: Women

Women -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:

There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	13	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	2	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	7	0.0 %
15	-	6	0.0 %
20	-	3	0.0 %
25	-	13	0.0 %
30	-	27	0.0 %
35	-	4	0.0 %
40	-	75	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.0 %
50	-	769	1.4 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	14	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	589	1.1 %
65	-	21	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1167	2.1 %
75	-	141	0.3 %
80	-	219	0.4 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1404	2.5 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	178	0.3 %
95	-	48	0.1 %
97	97. 97-100 Degrees	1790	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1988,2004)	138	0.2 %
99	99. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2254	4.0 %
.	-	46778	84.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,504 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 77.55
- Median: 85.00
- Mode: 97.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00
- Standard Deviation: 17.67

Location: 1518-1519 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF9007: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Jesse Jackson

Jesse Jackson -- feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1859	3.3 %
1	-	17	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	8	0.0 %
4	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	64	0.1 %
6	-	4	0.0 %
7	-	1	0.0 %
8	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	172	0.3 %
12	-	4	0.0 %
15	-	1040	1.9 %
16	-	3	0.0 %
18	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	159	0.3 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	98	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	1223	2.2 %
35	-	64	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1535	2.8 %
45	-	61	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	7	0.0 %
50	-	2935	5.3 %
51	-	12	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	54	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	2154	3.9 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
65	-	66	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1534	2.8 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	3	0.0 %
74	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	120	0.2 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
78	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	141	0.3 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
83	-	1	0.0 %
Missing Data			
98	98. DK; don't recognize (1984,1986,1988,1990,1992,1996)	682	1.2 %
99	99. NA	1211	2.2 %
.	-	38577	69.3 %
Total		**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 15,204 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 46.32
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 97.00

- Standard Deviation: 27.02

Location: 1520-1521 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 98 , 99 , .

VCF9008: PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Most Important Problem mentioned by Respondent

Which party do you think would do a better job of handling the problem of pollution and (1990,1994: protection of) the environment?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better by Democrats	1705	3.1 %
3	3. Same by both	2591	4.7 %
5	5. Better by Republicans	509	0.9 %
8	8. DK	227	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	24	0.0 %
.	-	50618	90.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,032 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1522-1522 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9009: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Approve of President Performance on Economy

Do you approve or disapprove of the way [president] is handling the economy? (IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE:) Do you approve/disapprove strongly or not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve strongly	7316	13.1 %
2	2. Approve not strongly	6463	11.6 %
4	4. Disapprove not strongly	3855	6.9 %
5	5. Disapprove strongly	9391	16.9 %
8	8. DK if approve/disapprove strongly or not strongly;	382	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA if approve/disapprove strongly or not strongly	1087	2.0 %
.	-	27180	48.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,407 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1523-1523 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9010: PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Inflation

Do you think inflation would be handled better by the Democrats, by the Republicans, or about the same by both?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better by Democrats	1373	2.5 %
3	3. Same by both	4044	7.3 %
5	5. Better by Republicans	1574	2.8 %
8	8. DK	563	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	1169	2.1 %
.	-	46951	84.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,554 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1524-1524 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9011: PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Unemployment

Do you think the problems of unemployment would be handled better by the Democrats, by the Republicans, or about the same by both?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better by Democrats	2022	3.6 %
3	3. Same by both	4145	7.4 %
5	5. Better by Republicans	856	1.5 %
8	8. DK	522	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	1178	2.1 %
.	-	46951	84.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,545 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00

- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1525-1525 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9012: PARTIES: Which Would Best Handle Pollution

(IF R HAS MENTIONED A 'MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM' IN THE NATION:) Which political party do you think would be most likely to get the government to do a better job in dealing with this problem (1972: to be helpful on this problem) --the Republicans, the Democrats, or wouldn't there be much difference between them?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrats	6878	12.4 %
3	3. Not much difference	11618	20.9 %
5	5. Republicans	5733	10.3 %
8	8. DK; other (1972 only); neither	899	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R has not identified any problem	968	1.7 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form I, II, IV (1972); short	6801	12.2 %
.	-	22777	40.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,128 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1526-1526 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9013: EQUALITARIANISM: Society Ensure Equal Opportunity to Succeed

1988 AND LATER:
Using page [page] for our choice of answers, I would like you to tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)

1984,1986,1990,1996:
I am going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. I am going to read severalmore statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree.

ALL YEARS:
'Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	13513	24.3 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6106	11.0 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	1593	2.9 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	1153	2.1 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	536	1.0 %
8	8. DK	69	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2732	4.9 %
.	-	29972	53.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,970 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1527-1527 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9014: EQUALITARIANISM: We Have Gone Too Far Pushing Equal Rights

'We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	3702	6.6 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6534	11.7 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	4090	7.3 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	4929	8.9 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	4830	8.7 %
8	8. DK	143	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2755	4.9 %
.	-	28691	51.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,228 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1528-1528 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9015: EQUALITARIANISM: Big Problem that Not Everyone Has Equal Chance

ALL YEARS: 'One of the big problems in this country is that we don't give everyone an equal chance.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	5053	9.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6875	12.3 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	3289	5.9 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	5167	9.3 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	2450	4.4 %
8	8. DK	106	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2762	5.0 %
.	-	29972	53.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,940 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1529-1529 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9016: EQUALITARIANISM: Not Big Problem if Some Have More Chance in Life

ALL YEARS: 'It is not really that big a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	1721	3.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	5265	9.5 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	4520	8.1 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	6424	11.5 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	4805	8.6 %
8	8. DK	199	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2768	5.0 %
.	-	29972	53.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,934 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1530-1530 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9017: EQUALITARIANISM: Should Worry less about How Equal People Are

ALL YEARS: 'The (2004: This_ country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	3947	7.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6373	11.4 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	3878	7.0 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	4788	8.6 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	3790	6.8 %
8	8. DK	166	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2760	5.0 %
.	-	29972	53.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 22,942 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1531-1531 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9018: EQUALITARIANISM: U.S. Fewer Problems if Everyone Treated Equally

ALL YEARS: 'If people were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	7602	13.7 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	8112	14.6 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	3609	6.5 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	3461	6.2 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	1309	2.4 %
8	8. DK	126	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form B (1990)	2764	5.0 %
.	-	28691	51.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,219 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1532-1532 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF9019: CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Most Desirable Goal for the Nation: #1

For a nation, it is not always possible to obtain everything one might wish. On this page (1988,1992: on page [PAGE] of the booklet) (1972, 1976: on this card), several different goals are listed. If you had to choose among them, which one would seem most desirable to you? (RESPONDENT BOOKLET OR SHOW CARD SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Maintaining order in the nation	2916	5.2 %
2	2. Giving the people more say in important political	2336	4.2 %
3	3. Fighting rising prices	2434	4.4 %
4	4. Protecting freedom of speech	1482	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	165	0.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	4016	7.2 %
.	-	42325	76.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,168 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1533-1533 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9020: CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Most Desirable Goal for the Nation: #2

(IF FIRST CHOICE GIVEN:) Which one {goal for our nation} would be your second choice?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Maintaining order in the nation	2434	4.4 %
2	2. Giving the people more say in important political	2229	4.0 %
3	3. Fighting rising prices	2355	4.2 %
4	4. Protecting freedom of speech	2039	3.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK 2nd choice	85	0.2 %
9	9. NA 2nd choice; no Post IW; NA or DK 1st choice	4207	7.6 %
.	-	42325	76.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,057 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 4.00

Location: 1534-1534 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF9021: MOBILIZATION: Did Anyone Talk to R about Voting or Registering

During the campaign this year, did anyone talk to you about registering to vote or getting out to vote (1984,1986: or about voting)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	9727	17.5 %
5	5. No	15461	27.8 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	28	0.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	2066	3.7 %
.	-	28392	51.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,188 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1535-1535 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9022: ELECTION: Voter Strength of Preference- Presidential Cand

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED): How about the election for president? Did you vote for a candidate for president? (IF YES) Who did you vote for? Would you say that your preference for this candidate was strong or not strong?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Strong	10809	19.4 %
5	5. Not strong	3054	5.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R did not vote or DK/NA/refused to say if voted; R	3638	6.5 %
8	8. DK	25	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	3839	6.9 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,863 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1536-1536 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9023: ELECTION: Nonvoter Strength of Preference- Presidential Cand

(ALL YEARS: ASKED OF Rs WHO DID NOT VOTE):

1948,1952,1956,1960,1964,1968:
Who (1948: whom) would you have voted for if you had voted?

1980,1984,1988,1992,1996:
How about the election for president? Did you prefer one of the candidates for president? (IF YES:) Who did you prefer?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Preference: Democrat	2612	4.7 %
2	2. Preference: Republican	1966	3.5 %
3	3. Preference: Other	223	0.4 %
7	7. No preference (1968 and later)	799	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R voted or DK/NA/refused to say if voted (for	20766	37.3 %
9	9. DK; NA; refused; no Post IW	2969	5.3 %
.	-	26339	47.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,600 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1537-1537 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9024: ELECTION: Voter Strength of Preference- U.S. House Cand

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED): Here is a list of candidates for the major races in this district. How about the election for the House of Representative in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Would you say that your preference for this candidate was strong or not strong?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Strong	3634	6.5 %
5	5. Not strong	2440	4.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R did not vote or DK/NA/refused to say if voted; R	5100	9.2 %
8	8. DK	81	0.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);	1425	2.6 %
.	-	42994	77.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,074 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1538-1538 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9025: ELECTION: Vote for Governor- Party

(ASKED OF Rs WHO VOTED): How about the vote/election for Governor (1952, 1958: here in [state])? Did you vote for a candidate for Governor? (IF YES:) Who did you vote for? Which party was that?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democrat	5221	9.4 %
2	2. Republican	4386	7.9 %
3	3. Other	112	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No gubernatorial race in state (includes Washington	15634	28.1 %
9	9. DK; NA; did not vote; DK/NA/refused to say if	8932	16.0 %
.	-	21389	38.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,719 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1539-1539 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9026: ELECTION: Vote in Presidential Primary- Party

1972:
(ASKED OF Rs WHO SAID THEY WERE REGISTERED/ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER): How about the primary election this year. Did you vote in a presidential primary this spring or summer? (IF YES:) Which party's primary did you vote in?

1976:
(ASKED OF Rs WHO SAID THEY WERE REGISTERED/ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER): How about the primary election this year? Do you happen to recall if there was a presidential primary election here in [state] this spring or summer? (IF YES:) Did you vote in the presidential primary election? (IF YES:) Which party's primary did you vote in?

1980:
Your state held a primary election on [date]. Did you vote in that election, or were you unable to do so? (IF VOTED:) Did you vote in the Republican primary or the Democratic primary? (SEE NOTE FOR ARKANSAS, SOUTH CAROLINA, MISSISSIPPI)

1988:
This state held a presidential primary/caucus election in [month]. In talking to people about elections, we find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they didn't meet party qualifications, they were sick or just didn't have the time. How about you--did you vote in that primary election/ caucus? (IF YES:) Did you vote in the Republican or the Democratic primary/caucus?

1992:

This state held a Presidential (primary/caucus) election in [month]. In talking to people about elections, we find that many people did not vote for a variety of reasons. How about you--did you vote in that primary (election/caucus)? (IF YES:) Did you vote in the Republican or Democratic (primary/caucus)?

2012:

Did you vote in a Presidential primary election or caucus this year?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Voted: Democratic Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)	1698	3.0 %
2	2. Voted: Republican Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)	3233	5.8 %
3	3. Voted: DK/NA/Refused which Pres. Primary (1988: or	82	0.1 %
5	5. Voted: 'Other' (minor party) Pres. Primary (1972,1976)	4	0.0 %
7	7. Did not vote in Pres. Primary (1988: or caucus)	8188	14.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. DK/NA/refused to say if voted in primary/caucus;	3801	6.8 %
.	-	38668	69.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,205 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1540-1540 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9027: ELECTION: Vote in Previous Presidential Election - Party

1948:

Do you remember whether you voted in [year] when [Democratic presidential candidate] ran against [Republican Presidential candidate]? (IF YES:) Whom did you vote for then?

1952-1962:

(1958,1962: Two years ago,) In [year], you remember that [Democratic presidential candidate] ran against [Republican presidential candidate] (1958: for the 2nd time). Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election? (IF YES, VOTED:) Which one did you vote for?/(1958: Did you vote for [Democratic presidential candidate] or [Republican presidential candidate]?)

1964 FORM 1:

Now, the last presidential election was four years ago, in 1960. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election? (IF YES, VOTED:) Did you vote Republican or Democratic in that election?

1964 FORM 2,1966-1972,1976,1980,1982,1988-2002:

In [year], {you remember that} [Republican presidential candidate] ran on the Republican ticket against [Democratic presidential candidate] for the Democrats/ (1970,1972: against Mr. Humphrey on the Democratic ticket and Mr. Wallace on the Independent ticket; 1982: against Jimmy Carter for the Democrats and John Anderson as an independent candidate). Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted for in that election? (IF YES, VOTED:) Which one did you vote for?

2004:

In 2000 Al Gore ran on the Democratic ticket against George W. Bush for the Republicans and Ralph Nader as the Reform party candidate. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Voted: Democratic Pres. Candidate	12434	22.3 %
2	2. Voted: Republican Pres. Candidate	12734	22.9 %
3	3. Voted: DK/NA/Refused which Pres. Candidate	464	0.8 %
5	5. Voted: Other candidate	1338	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R did not vote in previous election; R has never voted	10720	19.3 %
9	9. DK/NA/refused to say if voted in previous presidential	2247	4.0 %
.	-	15737	28.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,970 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1541-1541 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9028: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Which Presidential Candidate Will Win in State

How [1996,2004: What] about here in [R's state]. Which candidate for President do you think will carry this state? (1984,1988,1992, 2004: IF NECESSARY: Which candidate will win in this state?)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Democratic Pres. candidate	11952	21.5 %
2	2. Republican Pres. candidate	11348	20.4 %
3	3. Other Pres. candidate	173	0.3 %
8	8. DK	2612	4.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Pre IW; Washington D.C.	325	0.6 %
.	-	29264	52.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,085 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1542-1542 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9029: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Which Presidential Race in State Be Close

How about here in [R's state]. Which candidate for President do you think will carry this state? (1988,1984, IF NECESSARY: Which candidate will win in this state?) Do you think (1972: it) (1988,1996,2004: the Presidential race) will be close here in [R's state] or will [name given] win by quite a bit? 1980,1984,1988,1992 ONLY: (IF DK) Do you think the Presidential race will be close here in [R's state] or will one candidate win by quite a bit?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Close race	12961	23.3 %
3	3. Win by quite a bit	9680	17.4 %
8	8. DK; depends	869	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; NA who R thinks will carry R's state (9 in	1001	1.8 %
.	-	31163	56.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,510 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1543-1543 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9030: MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Which Major Party

(1956,1960,1964,1966,1968: You know that) (other years exc. 1988,1996: As you know,) The political parties try to talk to as many people as they can to get them to vote for their candidate(s). Did anyone from one (1956,1960,1964,1966,1968: either) of the political parties call you up or come around and talk to you about the (1956,1960, 1964,1966,1968: during the) campaign (1976ff: this year)? (IF YES:) Which party was that (1956,1960: were they from)?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact: Democratic party	4193	7.5 %
2	2. Yes, contact: Republican party	3603	6.5 %
3	3. Yes, contact: both major parties	4197	7.5 %
4	4. Yes, contact: other	201	0.4 %
5	5. Yes, contact: DK which party	719	1.3 %
6	6. Yes, contact: NA which party	31	0.1 %
7	7. No contact	29856	53.6 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if contact	107	0.2 %
9	9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV	4813	8.6 %
.	-	7954	14.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 42,800 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1544-1544 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9030A: MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Any Major Party

Did PARTY contact R about election campaign?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact by major party	12689	22.8 %
2	2. No contact by major party	30041	54.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party	174	0.3 %
9	9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV	5955	10.7 %
.	-	6815	12.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 42,730 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1545-1545 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9030B: MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Democratic Party

Did Democratic Party contact R about election campaign?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact by Democratic party	8390	15.1 %
2	2. No contact by Democratic party	30588	54.9 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party	851	1.5 %
9	9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV	9030	16.2 %
.	-	6815	12.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,978 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1546-1546 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9030C: MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Republican Party

Did Republican Party contact R about election campaign?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, contact by Republican party	7800	14.0 %
2	2. No contact by Republican party	31178	56.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if contact; contact but DK/NA which party	851	1.5 %
9	9. NA if contact; no Post IW; form II,III,IV	9030	16.2 %
.	-	6815	12.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 38,978 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1547-1547 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9031: MOBILIZATION: Contacted By Anyone Other than Parties

1980-2004: Other than someone from the two major parties, did anyone else call you up or come around and talk to you about supporting specific candidates in this last election?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	3367	6.0 %
5	5. No	22922	41.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	51	0.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984);	2257	4.1 %
.	-	27077	48.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,289 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1548-1548 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9032: MEDIA: Hear Programs about Campaigns on the Radio 4-Category

Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio? (IF YES:) Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None ('No')	16841	30.2 %
1	1. Good many	2732	4.9 %
3	3. Several	4808	8.6 %
5	5. One or two	4266	7.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK how many	40	0.1 %
9	9. NA how many; DK/NA whether listened to any; no	4098	7.4 %
.	-	22889	41.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,647 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1549-1549 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9033: MEDIA: Number of Days Read Newspaper in Last Week

How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper? [2012: During a typical week, how many days do you read news in a printed newspaper, not including sports?]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	4988	9.0 %
1	1. One day	2360	4.2 %
2	-	2003	3.6 %
3	-	1576	2.8 %
4	-	999	1.8 %
5	-	928	1.7 %
6	-	538	1.0 %
7	7. Every day	7808	14.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	22	0.0 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); short form or Spanish	1358	2.4 %
.	-	33094	59.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,200 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.66
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 0.00

- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.93

Location: 1550-1550 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9034: MEDIA: Read Daily Newspaper

1974,1978,1980:
Now let's switch to newspapers.

1976:
How about newspapers.

ALL YEARS:
Do you read a daily newspaper?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	5078	9.1 %
5	5. No	2113	3.8 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	1	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	549	1.0 %
.	-	47933	86.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,191 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1551-1551 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9035: MEDIA: Number of Days Watched National TV News in Past Week

How many days in the past week did you watch national news (1986: a national news program) (1984,1990-1994: the news; 1996-2000: the national news) (2002,2004: the national network news) on TV? [2012: During a typical week, how many days do you watch national news on TV, not including sports?]

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. None	3336	6.0 %
1	1. One day	1494	2.7 %
2	-	2028	3.6 %
3	-	1984	3.6 %
4	-	1411	2.5 %
5	-	1633	2.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	-	543	1.0 %
7	7. Every day	8750	15.7 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	49	0.1 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); short form or Spanish	1352	2.4 %
.	-	33094	59.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,179 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.24
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 2.73

Location: 1552-1552 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9036: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Party with Senate Majority Before the Election

Do you happen to know which party had the most members in the U.S. Senate before the election this/last month? (IF NECESSARY:) Which one?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Republicans - correct	5298	9.5 %
2	2. Democrats - correct	4111	7.4 %
4	4. Republicans - incorrect	883	1.6 %
5	5. Democrats - incorrect	1598	2.9 %
7	7. Other (comments)	0	0.0 %
8	8. DK (No)	6817	12.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	1458	2.6 %
.	-	35509	63.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,707 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1553-1553 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9037: ISSUES: Government Should Ensure Fair Jobs for Blacks

Some people feel that if black people (1964,1968: Negroes) are not getting fair treatment in jobs, the government in Washington ought to see to it that they do. Others feel that this is not the federal government's business. Have you had enough interested in this question to favor one side over the other?

1964,1968,1972:
(IF YES) How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or should the government in Washington leave these matters to the states and local communities?

1986 AND LATER:
(IF YES) How do you feel? Should the government in Washington see to it that black people get fair treatment in jobs or is this not the federal government's business?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. See to it that black people get fair treatment in	8735	15.7 %
5	5. 1992 and later: Not the federal government's	7887	14.2 %
9	9. Other; depends; DK; no interest	7861	14.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA opinion; DK/NA whether 'interested enough;'	1020	1.8 %
.	-	30171	54.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,483 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1554-1554 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF9038: ISSUES: Guaranteed Equal Opportunity Is Not Government Job

1986:
Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R) Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with that statement?)

1988:
Now looking again at [respondent booklet] for your choices, here are several more statements.
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)

ALL YEARS;
'Equal opportunity for blacks and whites is very important but it's not really the government's job to guarantee it.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	962	1.7 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	1272	2.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	458	0.8 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	715	1.3 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	461	0.8 %
8	8. DK	58	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	290	0.5 %
.	-	51458	92.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,926 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1555-1555 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9039: RACIAL RESENTMENT: Conditions Make it Difficult for Blacks to Succeed

1986,1990,1994:
In past studies we have asked people why they think white people seem to get more of the good things in life in America--such as better jobs and more money--than black people do. These are some of the reasons given by both blacks and whites. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each reason as to why white people seem to get more of the good things in life. (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R).

1988,1992:
Now looking again at [respondent booklet] for your choices, here are several more statements.
(RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R).

ALL YEARS:
'Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	2635	4.7 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	5640	10.1 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	2201	4.0 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	4166	7.5 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	3275	5.9 %
8	8. DK	117	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)	3697	6.6 %
.	-	33943	61.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,034 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1556-1556 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9040: RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Should Not Have Special Favors to Succeed

2004: Now I'm going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. The first statement is:

ALL YEARS:
'Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	6743	12.1 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	6218	11.2 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	2611	4.7 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	2423	4.4 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	1207	2.2 %
8	8. DK	103	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)	3707	6.7 %
.	-	32662	58.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,305 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1557-1557 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9041: RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Must Try Harder to Succeed

'It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	4056	7.3 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	5779	10.4 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	2979	5.4 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	3340	6.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	5. Disagree strongly	1750	3.1 %
8	8. DK	113	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)	3714	6.7 %
.	-	33943	61.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,017 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1558-1558 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9042: RACIAL RESENTMENT: Blacks Gotten Less than They Deserve Over the Past Few Years

'Over the past few years blacks have gotten less than they deserve.'

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agree strongly	1619	2.9 %
2	2. Agree somewhat	3773	6.8 %
3	3. Neither agree nor disagree	4099	7.4 %
4	4. Disagree somewhat	5551	10.0 %
5	5. Disagree strongly	4083	7.3 %
8	8. DK	184	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form A (1986); form B (1990)	3703	6.7 %
.	-	32662	58.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,309 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1559-1559 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9043: ISSUES: School Prayer Allowed 4-Category

Which of the following views comes closest to your opinion on the issue of school prayer? [1996-LATER: Just give me the number of your choice] (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. By law, prayer should not be allowed in public	1416	2.5 %
2	2. The law should allow public schools to schedule time	5863	10.5 %
3	3. The law should allow public schools to schedule time	2836	5.1 %
4	4. By law, public schools should schedule a time when	1107	2.0 %
9	9. Other, DK	332	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. NA; no Post IW; form A (1990); short form IW	1917	3.4 %
.	-	42203	75.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,554 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 9.00

Location: 1560-1560 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF9043A: ISSUES: Strength of Opinion When School Prayer Allowed 4-Category

Which of the following views comes closest to your opinion on the issue of school prayer? [1996-LATER: Just give me the number of your choice] (RESPONDENT BOOKLET SHOWN TO R)] Do you favor that choice strongly or not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Strongly	8917	16.0 %
5	5. Not strongly	2325	4.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	13	0.0 %
9	9. NA; other/DK/NA opinion (except 1990,1996);	2216	4.0 %
.	-	42203	75.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,242 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1561-1561 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9044: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Effect of Federal Economic Policies 7-Category

(1988 AND LATER: Over the past year) Would you say that the economic policies of the federal government have made the nation's economy better, worse, or haven't they made much difference either way? (IF BETTER/WORSE:) Would you say the economy is much better/worse or somewhat better/worse?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Much better	320	0.6 %
2	2. Somewhat better	2117	3.8 %
3	3. Same ('haven't made much difference')	6340	11.4 %
4	4. Somewhat worse	1937	3.5 %
5	5. Much worse	1032	1.9 %
6	6. Better, DK/NA how much	2	0.0 %
7	7. Worse, DK/NA how much	6	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if better/worse/same	677	1.2 %
9	9. NA if better/worse/same	36	0.1 %
.	-	43207	77.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,754 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1562-1562 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9044A: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Effect of Federal Economic Policies 3-Category

(1988,1992-LATER: Over the past year) Would you say that the economic policies of the federal government have made the nation's economy better, worse, or haven't they made much difference either way?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Better	2439	4.4 %
2	2. Same ('haven't made much difference')	6340	11.4 %
3	3. Worse	2975	5.3 %
8	8. DK	677	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	36	0.1 %
.	-	43207	77.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,431 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1563-1563 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9045: CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Position of the U.S. Weaker/Stronger in the Past Year

1958,1960,1964,1968:
Would you say that in the past year or so our position in the world has become stronger, less strong, or has it stayed about the same?

1984 AND 1984-LATER:
(2002,2004: Turning to some other issues facing the country) During the past year, would you say that the United States' position in the world has grown weaker, stayed about the same, or has it grown stronger?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Weaker (1958,1960,1964,1968: less strong)	12659	22.7 %
3	3. Same	12869	23.1 %
5	5. Stronger	7156	12.9 %
8	8. DK	1414	2.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA	155	0.3 %
.	-	21421	38.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 34,098 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1564-1564 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9046: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Food Stamps

Food stamps

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	2685	4.8 %
2	2. Same	7387	13.3 %
3	3. Decreased	5103	9.2 %
7	7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)	32	0.1 %
8	8. DK	639	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	408	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
.	-	39420	70.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,846 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1565-1565 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9047: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Improve and Protect the Environment

Improving and protecting the environment [2012: protecting the environment]

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	12467	22.4 %
2	2. Same	10314	18.5 %
3	3. Decreased	2193	3.9 %
7	7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)	5	0.0 %
8	8. DK	461	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	561	1.0 %
.	-	29673	53.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 25,440 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1566-1566 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9048: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Space/Science/Technology

1984,1992,2004: Science and technology

1986,1988: Space and scientific research

1990: the space program

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	8128	14.6 %
2	2. Same	8225	14.8 %
3	3. Decreased	3141	5.6 %
7	7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)	7	0.0 %
8	8. DK	493	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	392	0.7 %
.	-	35288	63.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,994 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1567-1567 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9049: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Social Security

Social Security

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	14923	26.8 %
2	2. Same	10212	18.3 %
3	3. Decreased	1100	2.0 %
7	7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)	25	0.0 %
8	8. DK	354	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW (1984); abbrev. telephone IW	599	1.1 %
.	-	28461	51.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 26,614 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1568-1568 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9050: ISSUES: Federal Spending- Assistance to Blacks

Programs that assist blacks

1984: assistance to blacks

2002: aid to blacks

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which (1986 AND LATER: of the following) programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased: Should federal spending on [ITEM] be increased, decreased or kept about the same?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Increased	3017	5.4 %
2	2. Same	7340	13.2 %
3	3. Decreased	2688	4.8 %
7	7. Cut out entirely (volunteered)	41	0.1 %
8	8. DK	552	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW; abbrev. telephone IW (1984)	618	1.1 %
.	-	41418	74.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,638 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1569-1569 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9051: ISSUES: School Prayer Allowed 2-Category

Some people think it is all right for the public schools to start each day with a prayer. Others feel that religion does not belong in the public schools but should be taken care of by the family and the church. Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other? (IF YES) Which do you think--schools should be allowed to start each day with a prayer or religion does not belong in the schools?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Schools should be allowed to start with prayer	5001	9.0 %
5	5. Religion does not belong in the school	1286	2.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. Other; depends; both (1964-1968); DK; no interest	1238	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA opinion; DK/NA if interested; no Post IW;	765	1.4 %
.	-	47384	85.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,525 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1570-1570 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9052: CONDITION/GOALS OF U.S.: Are Things in U.S. Going Well or Not

Let's talk about the country as a whole. Would you say that things in the country are generally going very well, fairly well, not too well or not well at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Very well	326	0.6 %
2	2. Fairly well	3182	5.7 %
4	4. Not too well	1286	2.3 %
5	5. Not well at all	492	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	81	0.1 %
9	9. NA; Form B (1986)	1106	2.0 %
.	-	49201	88.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,286 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1571-1571 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9053: ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: Income Kept Up with Costs in Last Year

Do you think that over the last year your/your family's income has gone up more than the cost of living, has it fallen behind, or has it stayed about even with the cost of living? (IF GONE UP OR FALLEN BEHIND) Has it (gone up/fallen behind) a lot or (gone up/fallen behind) a little?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gone up a lot	401	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	2. Gone up a little	726	1.3 %
3	3. Same	3403	6.1 %
4	4. Fallen behind a little	1824	3.3 %
5	5. Fallen behind a lot	1365	2.5 %
6	6. Gone up, DK/NA how much	4	0.0 %
7	7. Fallen behind, DK/NA how much	8	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK if gone up/fallen behind/stayed same	126	0.2 %
9	9. NA if gone up/fallen behind/stayed same; Form B	1101	2.0 %
.	-	46716	83.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,731 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1572-1572 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9054: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Senate Race in State

Checkpoint: Senate race in state of IW?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. U.S. Senate race in state	18303	32.9 %
2	2. No U.S. Senate race in state	9863	17.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. no Post IW; Washington D.C.	5664	10.2 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 28,166 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 2.00

Location: 1573-1573 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9055: ELECTION/RACE DESCRIPTION: Type of U.S. Senate Race

Type of Senate race - state of IW

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	12. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER	9245	16.6 %
13	13. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- OTHER CHALLENGER	0	0.0 %
14	14. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- UNOPPOSED	240	0.4 %
19	19. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER	448	0.8 %
21	21. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER	7071	12.7 %
23	23. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- OTHER CHALLENGER	13	0.0 %
24	24. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- UNOPPOSED	160	0.3 %
29	29. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER	52	0.1 %
32	32. OTHER INCUMBENT- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER	7	0.0 %
51	51. DEMOCRATIC CAND UNOPPOSED (Democratic incumbent not	59	0.1 %
52	52. REPUBLICAN CAND UNOPPOSED (Democratic incumbent not	0	0.0 %
55	55. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (Democratic	2731	4.9 %
59	59. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDS (Democratic	54	0.1 %
61	61. DEMOCRATIC CAND UNOPPOSED (Republican incumbent not	0	0.0 %
62	62. REPUBLICAN CAND UNOPPOSED (Republican incumbent not	0	0.0 %
65	65. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (Republican	1865	3.3 %
69	69. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDS (Republican	92	0.2 %
75	75. DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDS (other incumbent not	29	0.1 %
81	81. 2 DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS: NO RACE IN STATE	3720	6.7 %
82	82. 2 REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS: NO RACE IN STATE	2580	4.6 %
83	83. 1 DEMOCRATIC AND 1 OTHER INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN STATE	32	0.1 %
84	84. 1 REPUBLICAN AND 1 OTHER INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN STATE	48	0.1 %
85	85. 1 DEMOCRATIC AND 1 REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT: NO RACE IN	4889	8.8 %
95	95. 2 Senate elections in state (regular Senate election and special Senate election) (1992: CA ONLY; note that re	304	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	00. Washington D.C.; no Post IW	191	0.3 %
.	-	21844	39.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 33,639 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 12.00
- Maximum: 95.00

Location: 1574-1575 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF9056: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Democratic Candidate

Senate Democratic candidate - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:

There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:

(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:

We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:

(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:

([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	807	1.4 %
1	-	14	0.0 %
2	-	10	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	31	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	69	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	601	1.1 %
16	-	1	0.0 %
19	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	81	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	61	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	788	1.4 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	3	0.0 %
35	-	37	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	1114	2.0 %
42	-	2	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	67	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	3377	6.1 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	7	0.0 %
53	-	2	0.0 %
55	-	69	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	4	0.0 %
60	-	2252	4.0 %
62	-	2	0.0 %
63	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	109	0.2 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	2147	3.9 %
71	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No Democratic candidate	162	0.3 %
996	996. No race in state; Washington D.C.	8699	15.6 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	1975	3.5 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	1016	1.8 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	2748	4.9 %
.	-	25815	46.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 15,259 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 56.78
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 24.71

Location: 1576-1578 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9057: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Republican Candidate

Senate Republican candidate - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.) (1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	863	1.6 %
1	-	16	0.0 %
2	-	7	0.0 %
3	-	4	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	24	0.0 %
7	-	3	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	68	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	557	1.0 %
17	-	1	0.0 %
20	-	101	0.2 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
23	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	61	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	914	1.6 %
31	-	1	0.0 %
32	-	1	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	36	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	1210	2.2 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
44	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	58	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	2	0.0 %
49	-	8	0.0 %
50	-	3969	7.1 %
51	-	9	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	63	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58	-	3	0.0 %
59	-	3	0.0 %
60	-	2214	4.0 %
61	-	1	0.0 %
64	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	99	0.2 %
66	-	2	0.0 %
68	-	3	0.0 %
69	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	1915	3.4 %
72	-	4	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No Republican candidate	368	0.7 %
996	996. No race in state; Washington D.C.	8693	15.6 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	2383	4.3 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	1079	1.9 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	2772	5.0 %
.	-	25815	46.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 14,564 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 53.04
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 23.31

Location: 1579-1581 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9058: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Incumbent Candidate

Senate incumbent candidate - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you

don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	423	0.8 %
1	-	8	0.0 %
2	-	5	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	3	0.0 %
5	-	13	0.0 %
7	-	4	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	34	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	337	0.6 %
20	-	49	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.0 %
25	-	35	0.1 %
30	-	504	0.9 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	17	0.0 %
40	-	741	1.3 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	26	0.0 %
47	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
49	-	4	0.0 %
50	-	1902	3.4 %
51	-	7	0.0 %
52	-	6	0.0 %
53	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	38	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
57	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	2	0.0 %
60	-	1710	3.1 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	71	0.1 %
70	-	1714	3.1 %
71	-	1	0.0 %
72	-	4	0.0 %
75	-	214	0.4 %
77	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	205	0.4 %
84	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1356	2.4 %
86	-	3	0.0 %
88	-	2	0.0 %
90	-	120	0.2 %
91	-	1	0.0 %
92	-	2	0.0 %
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	26	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No incumbent candidate	3426	6.2 %
996	996. No race in state; Washington D.C.	7881	14.2 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	710	1.3 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	511	0.9 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	1131	2.0 %
.	-	31729	57.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 10,286 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 59.33
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 23.90

Location: 1582-1584 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9059: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senate Challenger

Senate challenger to incumbent candidate - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	395	0.7 %
1	-	5	0.0 %
2	-	3	0.0 %
3	-	2	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	14	0.0 %
6	-	2	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
9	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	34	0.1 %
15	-	292	0.5 %
20	-	49	0.1 %
25	-	34	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.0 %
30	-	466	0.8 %
31	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	21	0.0 %
40	-	642	1.2 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	34	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	2321	4.2 %
51	-	3	0.0 %
52	-	4	0.0 %
55	-	26	0.0 %
56	-	1	0.0 %
58	-	1	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	1150	2.1 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	44	0.1 %
68	-	2	0.0 %
70	-	910	1.6 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	138	0.2 %
76	-	1	0.0 %
77	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	89	0.2 %
85	-	572	1.0 %
90	-	48	0.1 %
91	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	12	0.0 %
96	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
98	-	1	0.0 %
99	-	2	0.0 %
100	-	213	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
990	990. No incumbent candidate; incumbent candidate is	3659	6.6 %
996	996. No race in state; Washington D.C.	7881	14.2 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	2539	4.6 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	1061	1.9 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	1256	2.3 %
.	-	31729	57.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 7,549 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 52.49
- Median: 50.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.27

Location: 1585-1587 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 990 , 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9060: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: (State w/Race) Senator

Senator not up for re-election in state with Senate race - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to

rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	287	0.5 %
1	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	5	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
7	-	2	0.0 %
10	-	16	0.0 %
15	-	283	0.5 %
20	-	22	0.0 %
25	-	17	0.0 %
30	-	411	0.7 %
33	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	11	0.0 %
37	-	1	0.0 %
40	-	657	1.2 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
45	-	11	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	2324	4.2 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	2	0.0 %
54	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	28	0.1 %
60	-	1692	3.0 %
65	-	51	0.1 %
70	-	1560	2.8 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	99	0.2 %
77	-	5	0.0 %
80	-	119	0.2 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	1140	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
87	-	1	0.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	57	0.1 %
95	-	10	0.0 %
98	-	1	0.0 %
100	-	547	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
996	996. No race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 senate	6678	12.0 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	1266	2.3 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	738	1.3 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	1295	2.3 %
.	-	36328	65.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,369 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 58.96
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.87

Location: 1588-1590 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9061: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senator 1 (State w/o Race)

First Senator in state without Senate race - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:

We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	167	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
5	-	2	0.0 %
8	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	12	0.0 %
12	-	1	0.0 %
15	-	167	0.3 %
20	-	14	0.0 %
25	-	8	0.0 %
30	-	253	0.5 %
35	-	2	0.0 %
40	-	373	0.7 %
45	-	5	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
49	-	2	0.0 %
50	-	1245	2.2 %
55	-	9	0.0 %
59	-	1	0.0 %
60	-	928	1.7 %
65	-	24	0.0 %
67	-	1	0.0 %
68	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	873	1.6 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	46	0.1 %
77	-	2	0.0 %
80	-	55	0.1 %
85	-	630	1.1 %
90	-	24	0.0 %
92	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
93	-	1	0.0 %
95	-	4	0.0 %
99	-	1	0.0 %
100	-	278	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
996	996. Race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 Senate	11947	21.5 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	645	1.2 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	403	0.7 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	1216	2.2 %
.	-	36328	65.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,135 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 58.35
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 22.06

Location: 1591-1593 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9062: POLITICAL FIGURE THERMOMETER: Senator 2 (State w/o Race)

Second Senator in state without Senate race - feeling thermometer

1964-1968:
There are many groups in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a "feeling thermometer" because it measures your feelings towards groups. Here's how it works. If you don't know too much about a group or don't feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don't feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don't care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees.

1970-1974:
(1970: As you know, there are many groups and persons in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. Please use the thermometer again--this time to indicate your feelings toward these groups or persons.)
(1972,1974: We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society, using the feeling thermometer just as we did for the [1972: candidates; 1974: leaders]. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.)

1976:
We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care

too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

1978-1984:
(1980-1984: And still using the thermometer, how would you rate the following.)

1986-LATER:
([And] still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	176	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.0 %
3	-	1	0.0 %
4	-	1	0.0 %
5	-	2	0.0 %
6	-	1	0.0 %
10	-	2	0.0 %
15	-	145	0.3 %
20	-	9	0.0 %
25	-	6	0.0 %
30	-	241	0.4 %
35	-	6	0.0 %
40	-	407	0.7 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
50	-	1335	2.4 %
55	-	11	0.0 %
60	-	882	1.6 %
62	-	1	0.0 %
65	-	15	0.0 %
66	-	1	0.0 %
70	-	893	1.6 %
72	-	1	0.0 %
73	-	1	0.0 %
75	-	55	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.0 %
80	-	38	0.1 %
82	-	1	0.0 %
85	-	580	1.0 %
88	-	1	0.0 %
90	-	33	0.1 %
95	-	4	0.0 %
99	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
100	-	243	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
996	996. Race in state; Washington D.C.; 2 Senate	11947	21.5 %
997	997. R doesn't recognize name	692	1.2 %
998	998. DK where to rate; can't judge	391	0.7 %
999	999. NA; refused; no Post IW	1219	2.2 %
.	-	36328	65.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,097 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 57.84
- Median: 60.00
- Mode: 50.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 100.00
- Standard Deviation: 21.59

Location: 1594-1596 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 996 , 997 , 998 , 999 , .

VCF9063: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Recall Names of U.S. Senate Candidates

ALL YEARS EXCEPT 1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:
How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were?

1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:
As you know, there were two Senate races in California this year. Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	4931	8.9 %
5	5. No; DK	4681	8.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Senate race in state	5188	9.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; Washington D.C.	792	1.4 %
.	-	40082	72.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,612 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1597-1597 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF9064: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 1: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were? / (1992 CALIFORNIA ONLY:) As you know, there were two Senate races in California this year. Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were?

ALL YEARS:
Who were they? (1ST MENTION)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME: valid, PARTY: correct	3381	6.1 %
2	2. NAME: valid, PARTY: incorrect	140	0.3 %
3	3. NAME: valid, PARTY: DK/NA	302	0.5 %
4	4. NAME: invalid, PARTY: any	336	0.6 %
5	5. NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	88	0.2 %
6	6. NAME: DK/NA, PARTY: any	27	0.0 %
7	7. NAME: DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	4187	7.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Senate race in state	4773	8.6 %
9	9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	783	1.4 %
.	-	41657	74.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,461 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1598-1598 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9065: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 2: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were? Who were they? (2ND MENTION)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME: valid, PARTY: correct	2161	3.9 %
2	2. NAME: valid, PARTY: incorrect	89	0.2 %
3	3. NAME: valid, PARTY: DK/NA	160	0.3 %
4	4. NAME: invalid, PARTY: any	213	0.4 %
5	5. NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	37	0.1 %
6	6. NAME: DK/NA, PARTY: any	167	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	7. NAME: DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	5636	10.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Senate race in state	4773	8.6 %
9	9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	781	1.4 %
.	-	41657	74.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,463 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1599-1599 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9066: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE Mention 3: Recall Correct Name of U.S. Senate Candidate

How about the candidates who ran in this state for the United States Senate in Washington? Do you happen to remember what the candidates' names were? Who were they? (3RD MENTION)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. NAME: valid, PARTY: correct	77	0.1 %
2	2. NAME: valid, PARTY: incorrect	9	0.0 %
3	3. NAME: valid, PARTY: DK/NA	8	0.0 %
4	4. NAME: invalid, PARTY: any	48	0.1 %
5	5. NAME: invalid, PARTY: DK/NA	13	0.0 %
6	6. NAME: DK/NA, PARTY: any	18	0.0 %
7	7. NAME: DK, PARTY: DK/NA;	8290	14.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No Senate race in state	4773	8.6 %
9	9. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	781	1.4 %
.	-	41657	74.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,463 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1600-1600 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9067: POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: Number of Recalled Names of U.S. Senate Candidates

Summary: number of corrent recalls-- U.S. Senate candidates

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	00. R's recall of any name(s) incorrect/DK/NA and any	4536	8.1 %
10	10. R's recall correct for one name; party mention	263	0.5 %
11	11. R's recall correct for one name; party mention correct	1322	2.4 %
20	20. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions	171	0.3 %
21	21. R's recall correct for 2 names; one party mention	72	0.1 %
22	22. R's recall correct for 2 names; both party mentions	2041	3.7 %
30	30. R's recall correct for 3 names; all party mentions	1	0.0 %
31	31. R's recall correct for 3 names; one party mention	8	0.0 %
32	32. R's recall correct for 3 names; two party mentions	12	0.0 %
33	33. R's recall correct for 3 names; three party mentions	37	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
97	97. No Senate race in state	4773	8.6 %
99	99. Abbrev. telephone IW (1984); no Post IW;	781	1.4 %
.	-	41657	74.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,463 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 33.00

Location: 1601-1602 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 97 , 99 , .

VCF9069: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Strength Approve/Disapprove Running U.S. U.S. House Incumbent

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way [running U.S. House incumbent Representative] has been handling his/her job? (IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE) Do you approve/disapprove strongly or approve/ disapprove not strongly?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Approve strongly	6118	11.0 %
2	2. Approve not strongly	5731	10.3 %
4	4. Disapprove not strongly	1497	2.7 %
5	5. Disapprove strongly	1330	2.4 %
8	8. DK strongly or not strongly; DK if approve/	4907	8.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)	4570	8.2 %
9	9. NA strongly or not strongly; NA if approve/	2873	5.2 %
.	-	28648	51.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,583 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1603-1603 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .

VCF9070: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Agreement w/ Running House Incumbent's Legislative Votes

Now we would like your opinion about the way [running U.S. House incumbent representative] has voted on bills that have come up in the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington.

1982:
Would you say that you generally agreed or generally disagreed with the way he/she has voted on bills, have you agreed sometimes but disagreed others, or haven't you thought much about this?

1986,1988:
Would you say that you have generally agreed with the way he/she has voted on bills, agreed and disagreed about equally, generally disagreed, or haven't paid much attention to this?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agreed	877	1.6 %
3	3. Agreed and disagreed about equally (1982: Agree	786	1.4 %
5	5. Disagreed	161	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.)	440	0.8 %
8	8. Haven't paid much attention (1986,1988); haven't	3051	5.5 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	319	0.6 %
.	-	50040	89.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,824 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1604-1604 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9071: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Remember Running House U.S. House Incumbent Vote on Any Bill

Was there any bill in particular that you remember how [House running incumbent] voted on in the last couple of years?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	627	1.1 %
5	5. No	4796	8.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
0	0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.);	463	0.8 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	310	0.6 %
.	-	49478	88.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,423 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1605-1605 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9072: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT: Agree With Running House U.S. House Incumbent Vote on Bill

Was there any bill in particular that you remember how s/he [House running incumbent] voted on in the last couple of years? (IF YES) Did you agree or disagree with the way s/he voted on that bill?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Agreed	442	0.8 %
5	5. Disagreed	177	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. No running incumbent (includes Washington D.C.); R	3704	6.7 %
8	8. DK	3	0.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	1870	3.4 %
.	-	49478	88.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 619 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1606-1606 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9073: ISSUES: President on Defense Spending Scale

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense.

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3,

4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [president] on this issue?

ALL YEARS:
Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Where would you place [president] on this scale?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	1045	1.9 %
2	-	1494	2.7 %
3	-	2315	4.2 %
4	-	3518	6.3 %
5	-	3659	6.6 %
6	-	4010	7.2 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	3582	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	2008	3.6 %
8	8. DK	958	1.7 %
9	9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)	221	0.4 %
.	-	32864	59.0 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,623 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.71
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 6.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.74

Location: 1607-1607 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9074: ISSUES: President on Cooperation with USSR Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cooperate more/try to get along with Russia	500	0.9 %
2	-	637	1.1 %
3	-	694	1.2 %
4	-	722	1.3 %
5	-	769	1.4 %
6	-	693	1.2 %
7	7. Get much tougher/big mistake to try to get along	443	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about it'	952	1.7 %
8	8. DK	290	0.5 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	211	0.4 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,458 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.00
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.85

Location: 1608-1608 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9075: ISSUES: President on Women's Equal Role Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [president] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	2716	4.9 %
2	-	2246	4.0 %
3	-	2233	4.0 %
4	-	2719	4.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	1171	2.1 %
6	-	740	1.3 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	599	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	844	1.5 %
8	8. DK	2673	4.8 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	595	1.1 %
.	-	39138	70.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 12,424 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.16
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.71

Location: 1609-1609 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9076: ISSUES: President on Aid to Blacks Scale

1970-1984,1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves.

1988 FORM A, 1990 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [president] on this issue?

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help minority blacks/minorities	2950	5.3 %
2	-	3117	5.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	4413	7.9 %
4	-	6349	11.4 %
5	-	3588	6.4 %
6	-	2401	4.3 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	1799	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	2647	4.8 %
8	8. DK	3276	5.9 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)	1550	2.8 %
.	-	23584	42.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 24,617 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.77
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.70

Location: 1610-1610 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9077: ISSUES: President on Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some people feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses (1994: for everyone). Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance[1996: plans] like Blue Cross (1994: or [1996:some] other company paid plans). Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	4003	7.2 %
2	-	2282	4.1 %
3	-	1935	3.5 %
4	-	2124	3.8 %
5	-	1237	2.2 %
6	-	893	1.6 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	869	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	1499	2.7 %
8	8. DK	1936	3.5 %
9	9. NA; Form II (1972)	1409	2.5 %
.	-	37487	67.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,343 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.03
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.88

Location: 1611-1611 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9078: ISSUES: President on Government Spending/Services Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [president] on this issue?

ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education, in order to reduce spending. Other people feel that it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should provide many fewer services: Reduce	1839	3.3 %
2	-	2579	4.6 %
3	-	3235	5.8 %
4	-	4105	7.4 %
5	-	3865	6.9 %
6	-	3169	5.7 %
7	7. Government should provide many more services:	2707	4.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about	2331	4.2 %
8	8. DK	1200	2.2 %
9	9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992);	1049	1.9 %
.	-	29595	53.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 21,499 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.21
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.81

Location: 1612-1612 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9079: ISSUES: President on Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Please look at page 9 of the booklet. Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [president] on this issue?

ALL YEARS:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person ahead on his own. And, of course, other people have opinions somewhere in between. Where would you place [president] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	2019	3.6 %
2	-	2342	4.2 %
3	-	3418	6.1 %
4	-	5000	9.0 %
5	-	3959	7.1 %
6	-	3560	6.4 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on his own	3110	5.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	3070	5.5 %
8	8. DK; haven't thought much about it	2298	4.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; form II (1972); short-form or	1786	3.2 %
.	-	25112	45.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,408 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.27
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.80

Location: 1613-1613 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF9080: ISSUES: President on Liberal-Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to [1996-LATER: Here is a] show you a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R) Where would you place [president] on this scale?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	2696	4.8 %
2	2. Liberal	4180	7.5 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	3608	6.5 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	5046	9.1 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	3946	7.1 %
6	6. Conservative	5946	10.7 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	2237	4.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. DK/Haven't thought about self-rating on same 7pt	5045	9.1 %
8	8. DK	2300	4.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; forms III, IV (1972); R	1521	2.7 %
.	-	19149	34.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,659 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1614-1614 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9081: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Defense Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate](on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	1464	2.6 %
2	-	2597	4.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	3778	6.8 %
4	-	4282	7.7 %
5	-	2453	4.4 %
6	-	1157	2.1 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	642	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	1183	2.1 %
8	8. DK	1631	2.9 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); short-form or Spanish	2178	3.9 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,373 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.59
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1615-1615 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9082: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. R self-rating is DK or "haven't thought much about it"	952	1.7 %
1	1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/	582	1.0 %
2	-	809	1.5 %
3	-	966	1.7 %
4	-	916	1.6 %
5	-	412	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	-	200	0.4 %
7	7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big	103	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
8	8. DK	759	1.4 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	212	0.4 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,940 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.58
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 3.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.85

Location: 1616-1616 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 8 , 9 , .

VCF9083: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale?(7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	2699	4.8 %
2	-	2173	3.9 %
3	-	1879	3.4 %
4	-	1873	3.4 %
5	-	602	1.1 %
6	-	282	0.5 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	199	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	579	1.0 %
8	8. DK	2816	5.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); no Post IW; telephone IW	2560	4.6 %
.	-	40012	71.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,707 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.71
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 1.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1617-1617 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9084: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

1972,1976,1980,1984 and 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every (1972, 1976: possible) effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other minorities)(1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves.

1988 Form A, 1996 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic presidential candidate](on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	3593	6.5 %
2	-	3464	6.2 %
3	-	4000	7.2 %
4	-	4212	7.6 %
5	-	1565	2.8 %
6	-	819	1.5 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	652	1.2 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much	1458	2.6 %
8	8. DK	2552	4.6 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)	1518	2.7 %
.	-	31841	57.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,305 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.10
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.58

Location: 1618-1618 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9085: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses. Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	3876	7.0 %
2	-	2386	4.3 %
3	-	1905	3.4 %
4	-	1722	3.1 %
5	-	769	1.4 %
6	-	513	0.9 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	466	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. 'Haven't thought much about it' for Democratic	751	1.3 %
8	8. DK	2018	3.6 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); Form II (1972)	2537	4.6 %
.	-	38731	69.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,637 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.70
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 1.00

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.70

Location: 1619-1619 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9086: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer servcies, reduce spending	329	0.6 %
2	-	471	0.8 %
3	-	978	1.8 %
4	-	2665	4.8 %
5	-	3953	7.1 %
6	-	3798	6.8 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	3020	5.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about	1248	2.2 %
8	8. DK	1107	2.0 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); short-form or Spanish	2182	3.9 %
.	-	35923	64.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,214 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.16
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.44

Location: 1620-1620 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9087: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his (1988: their) own. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	3394	6.1 %
2	-	3827	6.9 %
3	-	4310	7.7 %
4	-	4081	7.3 %
5	-	1759	3.2 %
6	-	859	1.5 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	609	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'Haven't thought much	1251	2.2 %
8	8. DK	2491	4.5 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); Form II (1972); no Post IW;	3737	6.7 %
.	-	29356	52.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,839 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.11
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 3.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.56

Location: 1621-1621 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9088: CANDIDATES: Democratic Presidential Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place [the Democratic Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	3193	5.7 %
2	2. Liberal	5621	10.1 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	4180	7.5 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	3941	7.1 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	1528	2.7 %
6	6. Conservative	1283	2.3 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	622	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R did not rate self on same 7pt scale (see above)	2272	4.1 %
8	8. DK	2109	3.8 %
9	9. NA; mail questionnaire; no Post IW; R	1569	2.8 %
.	-	29356	52.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,368 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1622-1622 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9089: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Defense Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	471	0.8 %
2	-	646	1.2 %
3	-	1118	2.0 %
4	-	2730	4.9 %
5	-	4099	7.4 %
6	-	4421	7.9 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	3117	5.6 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'Haven't thought much	1183	2.1 %
8	8. DK	1394	2.5 %
9	9. NA; version OLD (2008); short-form or Spanish	2186	3.9 %
.	-	34309	61.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,602 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.11
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 6.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.50

Location: 1623-1623 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9090: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Cooperation with U.S.S.R. Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/	215	0.4 %
2	-	298	0.5 %
3	-	510	0.9 %
4	-	867	1.6 %
5	-	1004	1.8 %
6	-	825	1.5 %
7	7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big	481	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about	952	1.7 %
8	8. DK	549	1.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW;	210	0.4 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,200 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.56
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.62

Location: 1624-1624 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9091: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that a woman's place is in the home. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Republican presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	1541	2.8 %
2	-	1446	2.6 %
3	-	1750	3.1 %
4	-	2566	4.6 %
5	-	1398	2.5 %
6	-	774	1.4 %
7	7. Women's palce is in the home	548	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'Haven't thought much	579	1.0 %
8	8. DK	2497	4.5 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; version NEW (2008) telephone IW	2563	4.6 %
.	-	40012	71.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,023 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.53
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.69

Location: 1625-1625 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9092: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

1972,1976,1980,1984 and 1988 FORM B:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every (1972, 1976: possible) effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other minorities) (1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves.

1988 Form A, 1996 AND LATER:
Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. (Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1.) Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. (Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7.) And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [the Republican presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	571	1.0 %
2	-	776	1.4 %
3	-	1687	3.0 %
4	-	4460	8.0 %
5	-	3763	6.8 %
6	-	3445	6.2 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	3575	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'Haven't thought much	1458	2.6 %
8	8. DK	2571	4.6 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; telephone IW (2000)	1527	2.7 %
.	-	31841	57.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 18,277 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.90
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.57

Location: 1626-1626 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9093: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Government Health Insurance Scale

There is much concern about the rapid rise in medical and hospital costs. Some feel there should be a government insurance plan which would cover all medical and hospital expenses. Others feel that medical expenses should be paid by individuals, and through private insurance like Blue Cross. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government insurance plan	437	0.8 %
2	-	388	0.7 %
3	-	802	1.4 %
4	-	2013	3.6 %
5	-	2276	4.1 %
6	-	2583	4.6 %
7	7. Private insurance plan	3053	5.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. 'Haven't thought much about it' for Republican	751	1.3 %
8	8. DK	2095	3.8 %
9	9. NA; Form II (1972); version NEW (2008)	2545	4.6 %
.	-	38731	69.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,552 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.19
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 7.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.61

Location: 1627-1627 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9094: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people

feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Republican presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending	2626	4.7 %
2	-	3490	6.3 %
3	-	3574	6.4 %
4	-	2949	5.3 %
5	-	1471	2.6 %
6	-	740	1.3 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	475	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about it'	1248	2.2 %
8	8. DK	996	1.8 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); short-form or Spanish	2182	3.9 %
.	-	35923	64.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 15,325 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Mean: 3.08
• Median: 3.00
• Mode: 3.00
• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00
• Standard Deviation: 1.55

Location: 1628-1628 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9095: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place [the Republican presidential candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his (1988 and after: their) own. Where would you place

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	614	1.1 %
2	-	739	1.3 %
3	-	1480	2.7 %
4	-	3453	6.2 %
5	-	4016	7.2 %
6	-	4509	8.1 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	4260	7.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating is DK or 'haven't thought much about it'	1251	2.2 %
8	8. DK	2261	4.1 %
9	9. NA; version NEW (2008); Form II (1972); no Post IW;	3735	6.7 %
.	-	29356	52.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 19,071 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.10
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 6.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.57

Location: 1629-1629 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9096: CANDIDATES: Republican Presidential Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place [the Republican Presidential Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	727	1.3 %
2	2. Liberal	1152	2.1 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	1424	2.6 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	2919	5.2 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	3888	7.0 %
6	6. Conservative	7521	13.5 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	2841	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R did not rate self on same 7pt scale (see above)	2272	4.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK	1989	3.6 %
9	9. NA; mail questionnaire; no Post IW; R	1585	2.8 %
.	-	29356	52.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 20,472 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1630-1630 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9097: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place [the Democratic House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	539	1.0 %
2	-	393	0.7 %
3	-	421	0.8 %
4	-	584	1.0 %
5	-	164	0.3 %
6	-	67	0.1 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	55	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	838	1.5 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	3307	5.9 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	249	0.4 %
.	-	49057	88.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,223 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 2.94
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.54

Location: 1631-1631 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9098: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks (1970: Negroes) and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving them preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves. Where would you place [the Democratic House candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	174	0.3 %
2	-	259	0.5 %
3	-	427	0.8 %
4	-	610	1.1 %
5	-	252	0.5 %
6	-	106	0.2 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	51	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	888	1.6 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	2331	4.2 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	238	0.4 %
.	-	50338	90.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,879 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.55
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.42

Location: 1632-1632 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9099: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Democratic house candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending	105	0.2 %
2	-	166	0.3 %
3	-	508	0.9 %
4	-	1687	3.0 %
5	-	1570	2.8 %
6	-	848	1.5 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	369	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	2938	5.3 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	5079	9.1 %
9	9. NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW; telephone	2370	4.3 %
.	-	40034	71.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 5,253 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.61
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.27

Location: 1633-1633 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9100: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his own. Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	310	0.6 %
2	-	484	0.9 %
3	-	826	1.5 %
4	-	1141	2.0 %
5	-	422	0.8 %
6	-	199	0.4 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	123	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1750	3.1 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	3857	6.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW	1557	2.8 %
.	-	45005	80.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,505 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.56
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.43

Location: 1634-1634 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9101: CANDIDATES: Democratic U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place [the Democratic U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	284	0.5 %
2	2. Liberal	1271	2.3 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	1725	3.1 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	2214	4.0 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	956	1.7 %
6	6. Conservative	568	1.0 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	156	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	3136	5.6 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	6265	11.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW (1980,2000); telephone IW (2000)	726	1.3 %
.	-	38373	68.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,174 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1635-1635 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9102: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

Recently there has been a lot of talk about women's rights. Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry, and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	279	0.5 %
2	-	253	0.5 %
3	-	344	0.6 %
4	-	558	1.0 %
5	-	257	0.5 %
6	-	97	0.2 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	76	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1140	2.0 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	3355	6.0 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	258	0.5 %
.	-	49057	88.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,864 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.46
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.58

Location: 1636-1636 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9103: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every (1978: possible) effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks and other minority groups (1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	49	0.1 %
2	-	81	0.1 %
3	-	209	0.4 %
4	-	517	0.9 %
5	-	345	0.6 %
6	-	162	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	67	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1312	2.4 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	2353	4.2 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	241	0.4 %
.	-	50338	90.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,430 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.25
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.32

Location: 1637-1637 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9104: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

2004:
Please look at page [page] of the booklet. Some people think the government should provide fewer services even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. house candidate] (on this issue)?

ALL YEARS:
Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending	244	0.4 %
2	-	644	1.2 %
3	-	1169	2.1 %
4	-	1535	2.8 %
5	-	720	1.3 %
6	-	204	0.4 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	86	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	3229	5.8 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	5412	9.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW	2397	4.3 %
.	-	40034	71.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,602 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.61
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.28

Location: 1638-1638 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9105: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his own. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	103	0.2 %
2	-	147	0.3 %
3	-	421	0.8 %
4	-	964	1.7 %
5	-	768	1.4 %
6	-	473	0.8 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	237	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1983	3.6 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	4022	7.2 %
9	9. NA; telephone IW (1984); no Post IW	1551	2.8 %
.	-	45005	80.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,113 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.45
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.40

Location: 1639-1639 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF9106: CANDIDATES: Republican U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a 7-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place [the Republican U.S. House Candidate] on this scale? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	89	0.2 %
2	2. Liberal	235	0.4 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	533	1.0 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	1626	2.9 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	1850	3.3 %
6	6. Conservative	1809	3.2 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	303	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	3661	6.6 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize (incl. no recognition on	6164	11.1 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching	1031	1.9 %
.	-	38373	68.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,445 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1640-1640 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

VCF9107: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

Women's equal role -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	508	0.9 %
2	-	418	0.8 %
3	-	515	0.9 %
4	-	767	1.4 %
5	-	274	0.5 %
6	-	111	0.2 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	90	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	980	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	2706	4.9 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	248	0.4 %
.	-	49057	88.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,683 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.21
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.57

Location: 1641-1641 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9108: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

Aid to blacks -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	158	0.3 %
2	-	231	0.4 %
3	-	426	0.8 %
4	-	733	1.3 %
5	-	393	0.7 %
6	-	179	0.3 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	81	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1137	2.0 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	1763	3.2 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	235	0.4 %
.	-	50338	90.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,201 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.83
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.44

Location: 1642-1642 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

VCF9109: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Government Services-Spending Scale

Govt services/spending -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should provide many fewer services: reduce	208	0.4 %
2	-	482	0.9 %
3	-	1002	1.8 %
4	-	2119	3.8 %
5	-	1557	2.8 %
6	-	714	1.3 %
7	7. Government should provide many more services: increase	306	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	2865	5.1 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	3806	6.8 %
9	9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW	2280	4.1 %
.	-	40335	72.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,388 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.21
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.35

Location: 1643-1643 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9110: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Guaranteed jobs/living -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	308	0.6 %
2	-	416	0.7 %
3	-	806	1.4 %
4	-	1298	2.3 %
5	-	765	1.4 %
6	-	435	0.8 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	222	0.4 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	2047	3.7 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	2825	5.1 %
9	9. NA; telephone (1984); no Post IW	1547	2.8 %
.	-	45005	80.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,250 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.94
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1644-1644 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9111: CANDIDATES: Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

Liberal/conservative -- incumbent House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	247	0.4 %
2	2. Liberal	952	1.7 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	1387	2.5 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	2477	4.4 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	1825	3.3 %
6	6. Conservative	1601	2.9 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	306	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	3540	6.4 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	4041	7.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching	624	1.1 %
.	-	38674	69.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 8,795 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1645-1645 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9112: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Women Equal Role Scale

Women's equal role -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Women and men should have an equal role	205	0.4 %
2	-	160	0.3 %
3	-	174	0.3 %
4	-	274	0.5 %
5	-	116	0.2 %
6	-	41	0.1 %
7	7. Women's place is in the home	32	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	2179	3.9 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	3186	5.7 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	250	0.4 %
.	-	49057	88.1 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,002 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.19
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.60

Location: 1646-1646 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9113: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Aid to Blacks Scale

Aid to blacks -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help Blacks/minorities	42	0.1 %
2	-	69	0.1 %
3	-	153	0.3 %
4	-	281	0.5 %
5	-	147	0.3 %
6	-	72	0.1 %
7	7. Blacks/minorities should help themselves	30	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	1904	3.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	2399	4.3 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	239	0.4 %
.	-	50338	90.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 794 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.95
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.38

Location: 1647-1647 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9114: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Government Services- Spending Scale

Govt services/spending -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending	109	0.2 %
2	-	238	0.4 %
3	-	492	0.9 %
4	-	805	1.4 %
5	-	510	0.9 %
6	-	219	0.4 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	89	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	5415	9.7 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	5320	9.6 %
9	9. NA; telephone IW (1984,2000); no Post IW	1981	3.6 %
.	-	40496	72.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,462 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.97
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.37

Location: 1648-1648 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9115: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Guaranteed jobs/living -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	67	0.1 %
2	-	146	0.3 %
3	-	323	0.6 %
4	-	560	1.0 %
5	-	292	0.5 %
6	-	162	0.3 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	104	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	3406	6.1 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	4056	7.3 %
9	9. NA;telephone(1984); no Post IW	1553	2.8 %
.	-	45005	80.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 1,654 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.07
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.43

Location: 1649-1649 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9116: CANDIDATES: Challenger to Incumbent U.S. House Cand- Liberal-Conservative Scale

Liberal/conservative -- challenger House cand placement on 7-point scale

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Extremely liberal	82	0.1 %
2	2. Liberal	338	0.6 %
3	3. Slightly liberal	568	1.0 %
4	4. Moderate; middle of the road	926	1.7 %
5	5. Slightly conservative	729	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	6. Conservative	612	1.1 %
7	7. Extremely conservative	115	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK or 'haven't thought much about	5886	10.6 %
8	8. DK/Don't Recognize	6889	12.4 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; R selected for branching	694	1.2 %
.	-	38835	69.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 3,370 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1650-1650 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9117: ISSUES: Federal Government on Cooperation with USSR Scale

1980:
Some people feel it is important for us to try very hard to get along with Russia. Others feel it is a big mistake to try too hard to get along with Russia.

1984,1988:
Some people feel it is important for us to try to cooperate more with Russia, while others believe we should be much tougher in our dealings with Russia.

ALL YEARS:
Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Try to cooperate more with Russia (1984,1988)/	301	0.5 %
2	-	479	0.9 %
3	-	815	1.5 %
4	-	1251	2.2 %
5	-	783	1.4 %
6	-	446	0.8 %
7	7. Get much tougher with Russia (1984,1988)/Big	185	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK/'haven't thought much about it'	952	1.7 %
8	8. DK	485	0.9 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	214	0.4 %
.	-	49763	89.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 4,260 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.90
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.50

Location: 1651-1651 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9118: ISSUES: Federal Government on Defense Spending Scale

Some people believe that we should spend much less money for defense. Others feel that defense spending should be greatly increased. Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Greatly decrease defense spending	189	0.3 %
2	-	453	0.8 %
3	-	1018	1.8 %
4	-	2410	4.3 %
5	-	2971	5.3 %
6	-	2381	4.3 %
7	7. Greatly increase defense spending	1294	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK/'haven't thought much about it'	2008	3.6 %
8	8. DK	1035	1.9 %
9	9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)	211	0.4 %
.	-	41704	74.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 10,716 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.85
- Median: 5.00
- Mode: 5.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.40

Location: 1652-1652 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9119: ISSUES: Federal Government on Aid to Blacks Scale

1980,1982, 1984 and 1988 FORM B: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks and other minority groups (1988 B: other minorities) (1980: even if it means giving the preferential treatment). Others feel that the government should not make any 1988 Form A,1990 AND LATER: Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves.

ALL YEARS: Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government should help blacks (1988a)/minorities	458	0.8 %
2	-	869	1.6 %
3	-	1436	2.6 %
4	-	1955	3.5 %
5	-	1189	2.1 %
6	-	700	1.3 %
7	7. Blacks (1988a)/Minorities (1988b)/Minority groups	331	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK/'haven't thought much about it'	1201	2.2 %
8	8. DK	946	1.7 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW	224	0.4 %
.	-	46365	83.3 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 6,938 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.86
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.51

Location: 1653-1653 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9120: ISSUES: Federal Government on Government Services/Spending Scale

Some people think the government should provide fewer services, even in areas such as health and education in order to reduce spending. Other people feel it is important for the government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending. Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gov't provide many fewer services, reduce spending a	631	1.1 %
2	-	1109	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	2212	4.0 %
4	-	2624	4.7 %
5	-	1462	2.6 %
6	-	719	1.3 %
7	7. Gov't provide many more services, increase spending	402	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK/'haven't thought much about it'	2103	3.8 %
8	8. DK	892	1.6 %
9	9. NA; short-form or Spanish language IW (1992)	202	0.4 %
.	-	43318	77.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 9,159 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 3.76
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.47

Location: 1654-1654 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9121: ISSUES: Federal Government on Guaranteed Jobs and Living Scale

Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on his (1988: their) own. Where would you place what the Federal Government is doing at the present time? (7-POINT SCALE SHOWN TO R)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Government see to job and good standard of living	211	0.4 %
2	-	466	0.8 %
3	-	998	1.8 %
4	-	2026	3.6 %
5	-	1499	2.7 %
6	-	1099	2.0 %
7	7. Government let each person get ahead on own	790	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. R self-rating was DK/'haven't thought much about it'	1602	2.9 %
8	8. DK	921	1.7 %
9	9. NA; no Post IW; short-form or Spanish language	202	0.4 %
.	-	45860	82.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 7,089 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.49
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 4.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 1.50

Location: 1655-1655 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9122: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: Number of Politically Eligible Adults in HH

Household composition, number of politically eligible adults

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. One politically eligible adult	10655	19.1 %
2	-	20125	36.1 %
3	-	3420	6.1 %
4	-	985	1.8 %
5	-	191	0.3 %
6	-	54	0.1 %
7	7. Seven or more politically eligible adults	9	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Panel (1992,1996)	7767	14.0 %
.	-	12468	22.4 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 35,439 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 1.87
- Median: 2.00
- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00
- Standard Deviation: 0.76

Location: 1656-1656 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9123: STUDY ADMIN: Number of Pre-Election Interviewer Calls

Call number of last interviewer call to housing unit, pre-election.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	2343	4.2 %
2	-	3027	5.4 %
3	-	2339	4.2 %
4	-	1753	3.1 %
5	-	1234	2.2 %
6	-	932	1.7 %
7	-	761	1.4 %
8	-	671	1.2 %
9	-	566	1.0 %
10	-	574	1.0 %
11	-	423	0.8 %
12	-	416	0.7 %
13	-	315	0.6 %
14	-	301	0.5 %
15	-	242	0.4 %
16	-	172	0.3 %
17	-	148	0.3 %
18	-	116	0.2 %
19	-	112	0.2 %
20	-	99	0.2 %
21	-	63	0.1 %
22	-	48	0.1 %
23	-	46	0.1 %
24	-	45	0.1 %
25	-	87	0.2 %
26	-	20	0.0 %
27	-	11	0.0 %
28	-	11	0.0 %
29	-	9	0.0 %
30	-	10	0.0 %
31	-	6	0.0 %
32	-	8	0.0 %
33	-	5	0.0 %
34	-	5	0.0 %
35	-	4	0.0 %
36	-	5	0.0 %
37	-	4	0.0 %
38	-	6	0.0 %
41	-	1	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	1	0.0 %
48	-	1	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. NA	22	0.0 %
.	-	38712	69.5 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,940 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 5.83
- Median: 4.00
- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 48.00
- Standard Deviation: 5.31

Location: 1657-1658 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF9124: STUDY ADMIN: Number of Post-Election Interviewer Calls

Call number of last interviewer call to housing unit, post-election.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3	0.0 %
1	-	3541	6.4 %
2	-	5944	10.7 %
3	-	4678	8.4 %
4	-	3308	5.9 %
5	-	2333	4.2 %
6	-	1693	3.0 %
7	-	1241	2.2 %
8	-	1000	1.8 %
9	-	713	1.3 %
10	-	562	1.0 %
11	-	396	0.7 %
12	-	356	0.6 %
13	-	266	0.5 %
14	-	201	0.4 %
15	-	161	0.3 %
16	-	113	0.2 %
17	-	91	0.2 %
18	-	96	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	78	0.1 %
20	-	54	0.1 %
21	-	52	0.1 %
22	-	43	0.1 %
23	-	39	0.1 %
24	-	37	0.1 %
25	-	79	0.1 %
26	-	15	0.0 %
27	-	11	0.0 %
28	-	9	0.0 %
29	-	7	0.0 %
30	-	6	0.0 %
31	-	7	0.0 %
32	-	8	0.0 %
33	-	2	0.0 %
34	-	1	0.0 %
35	-	4	0.0 %
36	-	3	0.0 %
37	-	3	0.0 %
38	-	5	0.0 %
39	-	2	0.0 %
42	-	1	0.0 %
43	-	1	0.0 %
47	-	2	0.0 %
51	-	1	0.0 %
52	-	1	0.0 %
55	-	2	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
99	99. NA	747	1.3 %
.	-	27758	49.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 27,169 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 4.67
- Median: 3.00
- Mode: 2.00
- Minimum: 0.00
- Maximum: 55.00
- Standard Deviation: 4.18

Location: 1659-1660 (width: 2; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 99 , .

VCF9125: STUDY ADMIN: Post-Election Persuasion Letter

Was a persuasion letter requested/sent to the respondent?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	1450	2.6 %
5	5. No	22241	39.9 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; no Post IW	4348	7.8 %
.	-	27635	49.6 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 23,691 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1661-1661 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9131: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Less Government Better OR Government Do More

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your (2000: own) views: ONE, the less government the better; or TWO, there are more things that government should be doing.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Less government the better	5502	9.9 %
2	2. More things government should be doing	7601	13.7 %
8	8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)	299	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2318	4.2 %
.	-	39954	71.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,402 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1662-1662 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9132: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Govt Handle Economy OR Free Market Can Handle

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your (2000: own) views: ONE, we need a strong government to handle today's complex economic problems; or TWO, the free market can handle these problems without government being involved.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Strong government	8794	15.8 %
2	2. Free market	4226	7.6 %
8	8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)	389	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2311	4.2 %
.	-	39954	71.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,409 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1663-1663 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9133: SYSTEM SUPPORT: Govt Too Involved in Things OR Problems Require

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your (2000: own) views: ONE, the main reason government has become bigger over the years is because it has gotten involved in things that people should do for themselves; or TWO, government has become bigger because the problems we face have become bigger.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Gotten involved in things	5787	10.4 %
2	2. Problems we face are bigger	7323	13.2 %
8	8. DK; both, depends (1990,1992)	306	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	2304	4.1 %
.	-	39954	71.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,416 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1664-1664 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9134: AUTHORITARIANISM: More Important to Be Cooperative OR Self-reliant

Next, I am going to ask you to choose which of two statements I read comes closer to your own opinion. You might agree to some extent with both, but we want to know which one is closer to your (2000: own) views: ONE, it is more important to be a cooperative person who works well with others; or TWO, it is more important to be a self-reliant person able to take care of oneself.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Cooperative	1374	2.5 %
2	2. Self-reliant	1020	1.8 %
8	8. DK; both, depends (1990)	149	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
9	9. NA; Form B (1990); no Post IW	1244	2.2 %
.	-	51887	93.2 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 2,543 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

• Minimum: 1.00
• Maximum: 8.00

Location: 1665-1665 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 9 , .

VCF9149: VOTE VALIDATION: Election Office Number

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	47	0.1 %
2	-	51	0.1 %
3	-	29	0.1 %
4	-	25	0.0 %
5	-	10	0.0 %
6	-	27	0.0 %
7	-	23	0.0 %
8	-	22	0.0 %
9	-	205	0.4 %
10	-	88	0.2 %
11	-	20	0.0 %
12	-	15	0.0 %
13	-	2	0.0 %
14	-	33	0.1 %
15	-	32	0.1 %
16	-	5	0.0 %
17	-	7	0.0 %
18	-	15	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	5	0.0 %
20	-	17	0.0 %
21	-	6	0.0 %
22	-	17	0.0 %
23	-	19	0.0 %
24	-	16	0.0 %
25	-	17	0.0 %
26	-	23	0.0 %
27	-	24	0.0 %
28	-	26	0.0 %
29	-	47	0.1 %
30	-	153	0.3 %
31	-	21	0.0 %
32	-	13	0.0 %
33	-	7	0.0 %
34	-	28	0.1 %
35	-	15	0.0 %
36	-	22	0.0 %
37	-	22	0.0 %
38	-	62	0.1 %
39	-	15	0.0 %
40	-	23	0.0 %
41	-	64	0.1 %
42	-	20	0.0 %
43	-	17	0.0 %
44	-	28	0.1 %
45	-	33	0.1 %
46	-	28	0.1 %
47	-	30	0.1 %
48	-	23	0.0 %
49	-	120	0.2 %
50	-	18	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	000. Records not checked (1984,1986 only)	1030	1.9 %
998	998. R self-report registered outside of area, attempt	73	0.1 %
.	-	47221	84.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 7,350 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Mean: 82.82
- Median: 87.00
- Mode: 114.00
- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 182.00
- Standard Deviation: 40.12

Location: 1666-1668 (width: 3; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 998 , .

VCF9150: VOTE VALIDATION: R Registration Status (Self-reported)

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, implicit (R self-report voted)	6990	12.6 %
2	2. Yes, explicit	1766	3.2 %
3	3. No, not registered; DK; NA; etc.	2876	5.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW (no self-report of registration)	739	1.3 %
.	-	43303	77.8 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 11,632 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 3.00

Location: 1669-1669 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF9151: VOTE VALIDATION: R Turnout (Self-reported)

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, voted	9540	17.1 %
5	5. No, did not vote	5432	9.8 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. no Post IW (no self-report of vote)	1199	2.2 %
8	8. DK; NA; refused	18	0.0 %
9	9. 1976 non-Panel Rs	1	0.0 %
.	-	39484	70.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 14,972 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1670-1670 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9152: VOTE VALIDATION: Attempted Validation of Registration

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, attempted	13292	23.9 %
2	2. No: R says is not registered (1984-1990);	1860	3.3 %
3	3. No: No respondent named and/or insufficient address	499	0.9 %
4	4. No: Same-day registration (1964,1980)	105	0.2 %
5	5. No: Records not sent out due to: Office error (1980);	407	0.7 %
7	7. No: Office refuses all access to registration records	26	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. 1976 non-Panel Rs	1	0.0 %
.	-	39484	70.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 16,189 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 7.00

Location: 1671-1671 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , .

VCF9153: VOTE VALIDATION: Status of Office Voting Records

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Office records appear to be adequate, no information	12439	22.3 %
2	2. Some office voting records not accessible	499	0.9 %
3	3. R's name unknown and/or insufficient address and/or	225	0.4 %
5	5. No office voting records accessible	106	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. Office not identified (0 in VCF9149: 1984,1986 only);	1030	1.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	8. DK (1980: 0,9 in orig. dataset var 1207: 27 cases	317	0.6 %
9	9. Office refused (7 in VCF9152)	3	0.0 %
.	-	41055	73.7 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,269 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1672-1672 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9154: VOTE VALIDATION: Was R Registration Validated

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes, a registration record was found that matches	10161	18.3 %
2	2. A registration record was found but it is inactive/	274	0.5 %
5	5. No registration record was found	2857	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. 3,7 in VCF9152 (all years); 2 in VCF9152 (1984	2897	5.2 %
9	9. 1976 non-Panel Rs	1	0.0 %
.	-	39484	70.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,292 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1673-1673 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 8 , 9 , .

VCF9155: VOTE VALIDATION: Was R Vote Validated

VOTE VALIDATION STUDY:

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1. Yes	8054	14.5 %
3	3. Registration record was found, no record of R voting	2398	4.3 %
5	5. No registration record found; no record of voting	2846	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
0	0. 3,7 in VCF9152 (all years); 2 in VCF9152 (1984	2891	5.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9. 1976 non-Panel Rs	1	0.0 %
.	-	39484	70.9 %
	Total	**55,674**	**100%**

Based upon 13,298 valid cases out of 55,674 total cases.

- Minimum: 1.00
- Maximum: 5.00

Location: 1674-1674 (width: 1; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: 0 , 9 , .