

---

Canadian Election Survey, 1997

---

Codebook

Andre Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte

ICPSR 2593



CANADIAN ELECTION SURVEY, 1997

(ICPSR 2593)

Principal Investigators

Andre Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau,  
and Neil Nevitte  
York University  
Institute for Social Research  
Canadian Election Survey

Third ICPSR Version

April 2000

Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



#### BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Blais, Andre, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. CANADIAN ELECTION SURVEY, 1997 [Computer file]. 3rd ICPSR version. Toronto, Ontario: York University, Institute for Social Research [producer], 1997. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2000.

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

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

#### DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.



## DATA COLLECTION DESCRIPTION

Andre Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte  
CANADIAN ELECTION SURVEY, 1997 (ICPSR 2593)

**SUMMARY:** For this survey of Canadians' political attitudes and voting behavior, citizens 18 years of age or older who spoke one of Canada's official languages (English or French) and who resided in private homes in the ten Canadian provinces and two territories were eligible to be surveyed. The survey included three components: the Campaign-Period Survey (CPS), the Post-Election Survey (PES), and the Mail-Back Survey (MBS). Approximately 110 interviews were completed each day of the CPS for a total of 3,949 interviews. Eighty percent, or 3,170 of the CPS respondents, completed the PES survey, and 1,857 of the PES respondents completed the MBS. The CPS respondents were queried on their voting intentions; interest in the election and its media coverage; whether parties/candidates had contacted them during the campaign; the state of the economy; knowledge of the parties and leaders; personal stances on major policy issues such as cutting taxes, maintaining social programs, and Quebec; assessment of the Liberal government; and electoral expectations. Specific questions on political actions and personal character were posed regarding Prime Minister Jean Chretien, Conservative Party Leader Jean Charest, New Democratic Party Leader Alexa McDonough, Reform Party Leader Preston Manning, Bloc Quebecois Leader Gilles Duceppe, Premier Lucien Bouchard, and former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. The PES repeated many of the CPS questions, and addressed additional topics such as government spending; social issues including abortion, unions, businesses, education, health care, and capital punishment; Quebec separation; and attitudes towards social groups including big business, feminists, and aboriginal peoples. The MBS dealt with broader political issues and values, including the respondents' confidence in institutions, the distribution of power among various societal groups, and individual rights. Background information on respondents includes age, sex, ethnicity, political party, political orientation, voter participation history, education, marital status, religion, employment status, household income, union membership, country of birth, knowledge of Canadian political history, financial status, and disability status.

**UNIVERSE:** Canadian citizens 18 years of age or older, who spoke one of Canada's official languages (English or French), and resided in private homes with a telephone, in the ten Canadian provinces and two territories.

SAMPLING: A two-stage probability selection process was utilized to select survey respondents. Afterward, a weight was added to the sample, by province.

NOTE: The codebook and data collection instruments are provided as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Adobe Acrobat Reader is provided through the ICPSR Website on the Internet.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION: 1 data file + machine-readable documentation (PDF) + SAS data definition statements + SPSS data definition statements + data collection instruments (PDF)

EXTENT OF PROCESSING: DDEF.ICPSR/ REFORM.DOC

DATA FORMAT: Logical Record Length with SAS and SPSS data definition statements and SPSS export file

File Structure: rectangular

Cases: 3,949

Variables: 626

Record Length: 915

Records Per Case: 1

# The 1997 Canadian Election Survey

## Technical Documentation

# The 1997 Canadian Election Survey

## Technical Documentation

David A. Northrup

Institute for Social Research  
York University  
May 1998

*disponible en français  
de l'Institut*

## **Conditions of Release**

All research based upon these data must include an acknowledgement such as the following:

Data from the 1997 Canadian Election Survey were provided by the Institute for Social Research, York University. The survey was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), grant number 412-96-0007 and was completed for the 1997 Canadian Election Team of André Blais (Université de Montréal), Elisabeth Gidengil (McGill University), Richard Nadeau (Université de Montréal) and Neil Nevitte (University of Toronto). Neither the Institute for Social Research, the SSHRC, nor the Canadian Election Survey Team are responsible for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

Researchers are requested to forward a copy of any publications or scholarly papers to the Director, Institute for Social Research, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3 and to André Blais, Département de Politique Science, Université de Montréal, CP6128 Succ. Centreville, Montréal, H3C 3J7.

Data acquired from the Institute for Social Research may not be re-disseminated outside the recipient institution.

## **ISR Project Team**

Data Collection	Jacqueline Davis Christine Klucha Mike Scott
Data Set Creation	Anne Oram
CATI Development	Richard Myles John Tibert
Project Management	David Northrup

## Table of Contents

Conditions of Release .....	i
ISR Project Team .....	i
Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Tables .....	iv
1. Study Description .....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
2. Sample Design .....	3
2.1 Introduction .....	3
2.2 Provincial Sample Distribution .....	3
2.3 Daily Sample Distribution for the Campaign-Period .....	5
2.4 Selection of Households .....	8
2.5 Selection of Respondents .....	9
2.6 Household Weights .....	9
2.7 Combining Regional and Household Weights for the Campaign-Period Survey .....	11
2.8 Post-Election and Mailback Samples .....	13
3. Data Collection .....	14
3.1 Introduction .....	14
3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys .....	14
3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey .....	16
3.4 Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey .....	19
3.5 Data Collection Procedures: Mailback Survey .....	20
4. Questionnaire Issues and Data Processing .....	21
4.1 Introduction .....	21
4.2 Use of the "RTYPE" and "WAVE" Variables to Identify Data Sub-Sets .....	21
4.3 Province Specific Questions .....	21
4.4 Date Specific Questions .....	22
4.5 Expectations of the Election Outcome: Identification of Winning Party and Opposition Party: Explanation of CATI Code and Errors .....	22
4.6 Randomization of Question Order .....	23

4.61	Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire	24
4.62	Question and Response Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire	27
4.7	Randomization of Question Wording	29
4.8	Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify" Options	31
4.9	Response Time Measurement	36
4.10	Linking Respondents from Three Surveys	37
4.11	Occupational Classification	38
4.12	Listing of Occupations by Occupational Classification Number, CCDO1980 with accompanying Blisshen Socio-Economic Index Score, 1981	39
4.13	Map of Variables	45
	References	57

## List of Tables

2.1	Provincial Sample Distribution and Provincial Weights .....	5
2.2	Completions Per Day: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey .....	7
2.3	Campaign-Period Survey: Calculation of Household Weights .....	10
2.4	Explanation of Weights: Campaign-Period Survey .....	12
3.1	Number of Call Attempts: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys .....	15
3.2	Final Sample Disposition: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey .....	17
3.3	Average Percentage of Completions Per Day for Each of the First 27 Days of the Sample Release for the Campaign-Period Survey .....	18
3.4	Completed Interviews, Response Rates and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Campaign-Period, Post-Election, and Mailback Surveys .....	19

## 1. Study Description

### 1.1 Introduction

The 1997 Canadian Election Survey (CES) included three survey components.<sup>1</sup> The Campaign-Period Survey (CPS) was completed in the 36 days between the election call, on April 27th, and the last day of the campaign, June 1st. The Post-Election Survey (PES) was completed with respondents to the CPS in the eight weeks after the June 2nd election. The Mailback Survey (MBS) was completed with respondents to the PES from June 19 to October 24, 1997.

Approximately 110 interviews were completed each day of the CPS for a total of 3,949 interviews. Eighty percent, or 3,170, of the CPS respondents completed the PES survey, and 1,857 (59 percent) of the PES respondents completed the mailback survey.

A rolling cross sectional sample release was employed for the campaign-period survey. The sample selection methodology used in the 1997 Canadian Election Survey was similar to that used in the 1988 and 1993 Canadian Election Studies (data collection for these surveys was also completed at ISR). Random digit dialling (RDD) procedures were utilized to select households, and, within households, the birthday selection method was used to select respondents.

Both the English and French interviewing was completed at the Institute's centralized telephone facilities in Toronto using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) techniques. The Institute uses software from the Computer-Assisted Survey Methods Program (CSM) at the University of California, Berkeley.

In the campaign-period survey respondents were asked about their:

- vote intention and party identification;
- interest in the election, attention paid to polls and the television debates, and what parties/candidates (if any) contacted them during the campaign;
- personal finances and national economic conditions;

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the surveys described in this documentation, the CES project included semi-structured in-depth interviews with a subset of the campaign-period respondents, interviews with party strategists, cataloging of election advertisements, as well as the collection of media coverage of the election.

- knowledge and rating of the parties and leaders, and how accurately specific terms described party leaders (trustworthy, arrogant, compassionate, in touch with the times, and strong leader);
- personal position, as well as their reading of the main parties' positions, on two key policy issues (cutting taxes or maintaining social programs and how much should be done for Quebec);
- evaluation of how good a job the Liberal government did in a number of policy areas, as well as their review of the performance of the opposition parties;
- expectation about how well each party was doing in the election; and,
- socioeconomic background.

The post-election survey repeated a number of key questions from the CPS, such as leader and party evaluations. Additional topics included government spending (on several social policy areas); attitudes about a number of social issues such as abortion, unions, businesses, education, health care, capital punishment, etc.; a series of questions about support and opposition for Quebec separation, as well as possible outcomes if Quebec did separate; and attitudes towards specific groups in society (big business, unions, feminists, aboriginal peoples, etc.).

The mailback questionnaire dealt primarily with broader political issues and values including questions about respondents' confidence in institutions, the distribution of power between different groups in society, and questions about individual rights and goals of society.

(Copies of the questionnaires are provided under separate cover. Much of the CATI programming language has been omitted, but an explanation of all CATI experiments is included in the questionnaire and in the fourth section of this technical document.)

Details of the sample design, data collection methods, and data set creation are outlined in the remainder of this technical document.

## 2. Sample Design

### 2.1 Introduction

The sample for the Canadian Election Survey (CES) was designed to represent the adult population of Canada (Canadian citizens 18 years of age or older who speak one of Canada's official languages, English or French, and reside in private homes<sup>2</sup> in the ten Canadian provinces and two territories). Because the mode of data collection for the survey was telephone, the small proportion of households in Canada without telephones were excluded from the sample population.<sup>3</sup>

### 2.2 Provincial Sample Distribution and Weights for the Campaign-Period Survey

For purposes of sample design the country was divided into six "regions":

- 1, the East (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick);
- 2, Quebec;
- 3, Ontario;
- 4, the Midwest (Manitoba and Saskatchewan);
- 5, the West (Alberta and British Columbia); and
- 6, the Territories.

Smaller provinces and the territories were, relative to their population, overrepresented in the sample. The overrepresentation of the smaller provinces facilitates comparison between the six regions. A minimum of 400 interviews were allocated to each region, with a larger allocation of sample going to the larger regions/provinces (Table 2.1). The sample was distributed equally among the provinces when there was more than one province in the region. For example, the 400 cases in the Atlantic region were equally distributed among the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Unlike Ontario, Quebec was not under-

---

<sup>2</sup> Residents of old age homes, group homes, educational and penal institutions were excluded from the sample.

<sup>3</sup> Using their Household Inventory and Facilities and Equipment (HIFE) surveys, Statistics Canada estimates that two percent of the private households in Canada do not have a telephone (Ottawa, 1991).

represented in the sample. The larger sample for Quebec (relative to Ontario) ensures enough observations in Quebec so that attitudes towards separation can be factored into analysis.

Because the sample distribution is not proportional to the population of the provinces and territories, the data must be weighted before national estimates are derived. The calculation of the weights to facilitate national estimates is provided in Table 2.1. The weights are calculated by dividing the province or territories' proportion of the households in Canada by the province or territories' proportion of the households in the sample. Ontario has the largest weight (1.5) as the province has 36 percent of Canada's households, but only 24 percent of the sample. In preparing national estimates each Ontario case will count for 1.5 observations in the weighted data set; that is, Ontario is "weighted up" so that the impact of the Ontario sample on national estimates is an accurate reflection of Ontario's proportion of the number of households in Canada. Conversely, for provinces or territories where the weights are very small, for example PEI (.1736) and the Northwest Territories (.0653), the proportion of the sample allocated to the province or territory was greater than that province or territories' proportion of the population. As a result, each case is "weighted down."

Table 2.1. Provincial Sample Distribution and Provincial Weights

Prov/Ter	Population*		Sample		Weight
	HH's (#)	HH's (%)	HH's (#)	HH's (%)	
Nfld.	174,495	1.7	99	2.51	0.6948
PEI	44,478	0.4	101	2.56	0.1736
NS	324,377	3.3	101	2.56	1.2659
NB	253,707	2.5	108	2.73	0.9260
Quebec	2,634,301	26.3	1,034	26.18	1.0040
Ontario	3,638,364	36.3	951	24.08	1.5080
Manitoba	405,120	4.0	203	5.14	0.7866
Sask.	363,149	3.6	211	5.34	0.6784
Alberta	910,391	9.1	481	12.18	0.7461
BC	1,243,894	12.4	473	11.98	1.0366
NWT	16,076	.2	97	.02	.06530
Yukon	10,071	.1	90	.02	.04410
Canada	10,018,423	100.00	3,949	100.00	

\* Statistics Canada, 1992. Dwellings and Households: The Nation. Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology, Catalogue No. 93-111, pp 78-89.

Weights that include a correction factor for the unequal probabilities of selection at the provincial and territorial level have been added to the data set to facilitate the production of national estimates. In addition, to facilitate comparisons between Quebec and the rest of Canada, weights have been calculated for Canada without Quebec.

### 2.3 Daily Sample Distribution for the Campaign-Period Survey

The importance of campaign dynamics in understanding election results has been documented by a number of researchers (Holbrook, 1996; Blais and Boyer, 1996; Johnston, Blais, Gidengil, and Nevitte, 1996; Johnston, Blais, Brady and Crête, 1992; Bartels, 1988; and Brady and Johnston, 1987). By interviewing a cross section of Canadians each day (and including date of

interview as a variable in the data set), it is possible to determine the impact of events during a campaign. Using data from the election survey, the analyst can determine if support for specific policy issues, predictions of the results of the election, or ratings of the Prime Minister or the opposition leaders varied, or remained constant, over the course of the election campaign. Similarly, utilization of a rolling cross section sample release facilitates division of the campaign-period data sets into temporal components. For example, analysts can divide the campaign-period data into before and after the leaders' debates.

It is critical to any analysis which includes date of interview as a continuous or contingent variable, that the sociodemographic characteristics of the survey respondents do not systematically vary over time. Because easy-to-reach respondents (people who are more often home and willing to do the interview when first contacted) have different characteristics than hard-to-reach respondents (Groves, 1989; Hawkins, 1975; and Dunkleberg and Day, 1973), it is important that each day of interviewing include a mix of easy and hard-to-reach people.

Assume, for example, that educational achievement is found to covary with attitudes about a specific election issue such as the importance of creating jobs. If more of the interviews at the beginning of data collection were completed with respondents with lower levels of education (and if they were more supportive of job creation efforts as compared to paying down the debt), and if more of the interviews at the end of data collection were completed with respondents with high levels of education (and they were less supportive of job creation efforts), it would be possible to mistake a change in respondent characteristics for a change in attitudes.

Table 2.2 Completions Per Day: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey

Day	Completions	Three Day Average	Five Day Average
April	27	21	--
	28	85	67
	29	95	91
	30	93	97
May	1	104	95
	2	87	92
	3	86	88
	4	92	98
	5	116	118
	6	147	125
	7	113	124
	8	112	109
	9	103	107
	10	107	106
	11	108	124
	12	157	136
	13	142	142
	14	127	132
	15	126	121
	16	109	113
	17	103	108
	18	112	104
	19	98	107
	20	110	113
	21	132	115
	22	102	118
	23	120	106
	24	96	110
	25	113	110
	26	120	118
	27	122	115
	28	103	113
	29	115	111
	30	114	118
	31	124	124
June	1	135	--

The daily variation in the number of completed interviews is expected given the small sample for any one day. However, as seen in Table 2.2, this variation is less pronounced when the number of completed interviews is averaged over a three or five day period.

Every day of sample release was, within provinces and territories, divided into six "sample replicates." Each sample replicate was a random sample of the day's release. Because response to the survey varied by the day of the week (Friday evenings were often least productive while Sunday afternoons were often most productive), and the sample size for any one day was small, there was some modification to the number of replicates released to ensure the number of completions was close to the desired daily goal.

#### 2.4 Selection of Households

A two-stage probability selection process was utilized to select survey respondents. The first stage involved the selection of households by randomly selecting residential telephone numbers. The ideal sampling frame for the campaign-period survey would have been a complete listing of all residential telephone numbers in Canada. Unfortunately, such a listing does not exist and telephone books are not an acceptable surrogate as unlisted numbers (not published in the telephone book by the owner's choice) and numbers for people who have recently moved are not included. Sampling from telephone books would systematically exclude these people from the sample. People who do not have their name in the telephone book are not a random subset of the population (Tremblay, 1982). As a result, ISR employs random digit dialling (RDD) methodology for selecting the telephone numbers.

Use of RDD for selecting telephone numbers gives all households, not just those listed in telephone directories, an equal and known probability of selection. All telephone numbers in Canada consist of an area code, a central office code or exchange (the first three digits of the telephone number), and a suffix or bank (the last four digits of a telephone number). A list of all possible numbers in Canada can be constructed by referring to all telephone books in the country to determine which area code/exchange/bank combinations are in use. For example, once at least one valid telephone number is found in the directory within an area code/exchange/bank combination, e.g., (416) 769-2203, then all numbers from 769-2200 to 769-2299, within the specific area code, are included in the list of all possible telephone numbers. A computer is then used to generate a random sample of telephone numbers from

this listing. As a result, RDD samples include "not-in-service" and "non-residential" telephone numbers. Typically, these non-productive numbers are identified the first time the interviewer calls and most of the interviewer's subsequent efforts are then directed at encouraging respondents to participate in, and then complete, the interview.

## 2.5 Selection of Respondents

The second stage of the sample selection process was the random selection of a respondent from the selected household. To be eligible for the interview the household member had to be an adult (18 years of age or older) and a Canadian citizen. If there was more than one eligible person in the household, the eligible person who had the next birthday was selected as the survey respondent.<sup>4</sup> The birthday selection method is used as it ensures a random selection of respondents and it is a much less intrusive way to start an interview than more traditional methods that require a listing of household residents. The less intrusive start makes it easier for the interviewer to secure the respondent's cooperation.

## 2.6 Household Weights

The probability of an adult member of the household being selected for an interview varies inversely with the number of people living in that household (in a household with only one adult, that adult has a 100 percent chance of selection, in a two adult household each adult has a 50 percent chance of selection, etc.). As a result, it is possible that analyses based on unweighted estimates are biased, as one adult households are over-represented, and larger households are under-represented in the data set. Most practitioners of survey research "weight the data" in order to compensate for the unequal probabilities of selection (one adult households are given a weight of one, two adult households are given a weight of two, three adult households are given a weight of three, etc.).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See O'Rourke and Blair, 1983; for a review of the birthday selection method.

<sup>5</sup> Weighting to correct for unequal probabilities of selection, stratification, and other factors in order to improve sample estimates is common in survey research. See, for example: Lessler and Kalsbeek, 1992 Chapter 8; Kalton, 1983 Chapter 10; and Babbie, 1992 Chapter 5. Kish, 1965; specifically addresses the issue of weighting to correct for unequal probability of selection at the household level (p. 400) and suggests, unlike most survey researchers, that household weighting may not be necessary.

Conventionally, users of survey data wish to have the same number of observations in the weighted and unweighted data set. This adjustment is made, by determining the number of cases in each household size category that would have been in the sample, if an interview had been completed with each adult member of the household, and then dividing the sample among each household size category according to the proportion of interviews completed in each household size category. The calculation of the household weights for the campaign-period survey is illustrated in Table 2.3

Table 2.3 Campaign-Period Survey: Calculation of Household Weights

HH Size	No. of HH's	Weighted Cases	Adjustment	Weight
1 adult	1,127	1,127	569.78	0.506
2 adults	2,101	4,202	2,124.40	1.011
3 adults	479	1,437	726.50	1.517
4 adults	188	752	380.19	2.022
5 adults	36	180	91.00	2.528
6 adults	15	90	45.50	3.033
7 adults	2	14	7.08	3.539
9 adults*	1	9	4.55	4.550
Totals	3,949	7,811	3,949.00	

\* There were no eight adult households in the sample.

In the campaign-period survey there are 3,949 households in the sample and 1,127 are one-adult households, 2,101 are two-adult households, and 479 are three-adult households, etc. (see variable NADULTS). The weights for each household are calculated as follows. First, the total number of weighted cases is calculated (number of cases times the number of adults in the household). For three-adult households the calculation is: 479 times 3 which gives 1,437 three-adult households in the weighted sample. In the campaign-period survey there are 7,811 weighted cases.

Second, the 7,811 weighted cases are adjusted down to the original sample size of 3,949 (calculated as weighted cases for each household size divided by the weighted sample size times the original sample size). For three-adult households the calculation is:  $(1,437/7,811) * 3,949 = 726.50$ .

Third, the weight for each household size is calculated (for each household size, the adjustment to original sample size/number of cases). For three-adult households the calculation is:  $726.50/479 = 1.517$ .

## 2.7 Combining Regional and Household Weights for the Campaign-Period Survey

Although the weights are provided as part of the data set, users must specify the weights they wish to use in the appropriate programming language before analysing the data. Users are advised to use CPSNWGT1 (campaign-period national weight 1) when national estimates are required, (Table 2.4).

This weight is the product of the household weight and the regional weight. When comparing Quebec to the rest of Canada, the Quebec proportion of the sample should be adjusted using CPSHHWGT (the campaign-period household weight) and CPSNWGT2 (campaign-period national weight 2) should be used for the rest of Canada.<sup>5</sup> If weights are not invoked the tabulations produced will be for unweighted data.

---

<sup>5</sup> The household weights have been calculated using the household size information for the complete sample. Calculations of the household weight variable for Quebec only, or for Canada without Quebec, indicate that the household weight variable need not be recomputed for each sample component. The distribution of the population by household size is approximately the same in Quebec as it is in the other provinces and territories.

Table 2.4. Explanation of Weights: Campaign-Period Data Set

	Variable Name	Variable Description	Explanation/When to Use Weight
1	CPS <u>HH</u> WGT	Campaign-Period Household Weight	this weight corrects for unequal probability of selection at the household level
2	CPS <u>P</u> WGT <u>1</u>	Campaign-Period Provincial Weight Number 1	the first provincial weight corrects for unequal probability of selection at the provincial level for <u>the ten provinces and two territories</u>
3	CPS <u>P</u> WGT <u>2</u>	Campaign-Period Provincial Weight Number 2	the second provincial weight corrects for unequal probability of selection at the provincial level <u>after the Province of Quebec has been excluded</u> from the sample
4	CPS <u>N</u> WGT <u>1</u>	Campaign-Period National Weight Number 1	the first national weight combines the household weight and province weight for <u>all ten provinces and two territories</u>
5	CPS <u>N</u> WGT <u>2</u>	Campaign-Period National Weight Number 2	the second national weight combines the household weight and province weight <u>after the Province of Quebec has been excluded</u> from the sample

Separate weights were not prepared for the PES and MBS data sets. The re-interview rates are reasonably high and sample attrition between the surveys was not associated with household size or province and, as a result, it is reasonable to use the CPS weights. Finally, because the weights include fractions that are rounded and missing values vary by item, there will be minor variation in the number of cases for different analytical procedures and subsets of the data. The extent of the rounding problem varies according to the computing program used for analysis. For example, the PC-based version of SPSS has a less effective method for rounding weighted data than the mainframe-based version of the package.

## 2.8 Post-Election and Mailback Samples

The sample for the post-election survey was comprised of respondents to the CPS. At the end of the CPS, interviewers ensured that they had a first name or some other identifier (such as the respondent's initials or position in the household, e.g., mother). This information, as well as the sex and year of birth of the CPS respondent, and the respondent's telephone number, was recorded on a "cover sheet." At the start of the PES, the cover sheets were put into a random order (shuffled) so that the time of the first call for the PES was not related to the date of interview, or the day of sample release during the CPS.

At the end of the post-election survey, respondents were asked to provide their address so they could be sent the mailback survey. Mailback information was provided by 83 percent of the PES respondents.

### **3. Data Collection**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

A description of the data collection procedures is outlined in this section of the technical documentation. Interviewing was completed from ISR's centralized CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) facilities. Each supervisory station is equipped with a video display terminal that reproduces an image of the interviewer's screen and a ROLM CBX telephone communications system. This allows supervisors to monitor (listen to) interviewers' calls and visually verify that the interviewer has recorded the respondent's answers correctly.

#### **3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys**

In order to maximize the chances of getting a completed interview from each sample number, call attempts were made during the day and the evening - for both week and weekend days. Typically, between two and four call attempts were made each day during the first four days that a sample was released. Although over half of the interviews completed in the CPS took three or fewer call attempts, 10 percent of the completed interviews required ten or more calls (Table 3.1). Given the short time that each daily sample was available for calling (10 days), it was important to follow up all possible leads, and as a result, a small number of interviews were completed only after as many as twenty calls were made. The relationship between the number of call attempts and completed interviews in the 1997 election survey parallels that for the 1988 and 1993 election surveys completed at ISR. (The survey data files and accompanying technical documentation for these studies are available at ISR.)

Because the PES did not employ a rolling cross section, and there were no constraints on the number of interviews required per day, it was possible to manage the flow of the sample to interviewers so that most of the calling was completed during the most productive interviewing times. In addition, the respondent knew that an interviewer would be calling back after the election and was expecting the call. As a result we would expect, as was the case in the previous election studies completed at ISR, that the number of call attempts required to complete the interviewing would be less than that required to complete the CPS. However, as detailed below, the re-interview rate for the PES in the 1997 survey was lower than that for the 1993 survey, but the same as that obtained in the 1988 PES (even though the response rate to the 1997 CPS compares favourably to the previous surveys). In an effort to make up for this lower response rate more effort was made to reach respondents at home (and to convert initial refusals). As a result, the number of calls made to obtain a completion, on average, is higher in 1997 than in previous years. In 1993 sixty-two percent of the PES interviews were completed in the first three call attempts, in 1997 only forty-one percent of the interviews were completed on the first three call attempts. Conversely, in 1997 twenty one percent of the PES surveys were completed on the tenth or subsequent call attempt, whereas this percentage was only six percent in 1993. (The

variables "CPSATTEM" and "PESATTEM" identify the number of calls required to obtain a completion.)

Table 3.1. Number of Call Attempts: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys

Calls	CPS		PES	
	number	percent	number	percent
1	857	22	510	16
2	780	20	400	13
3	549	14	391	12
4	389	10	348	11
5	318	8	277	9
6	202	5	197	6
7	185	5	150	5
8 - 9	228	6	234	7
10 - 14	273	7	322	10
15 - 37	168	3	313	10
38 - 55			28	1
Totals	3,949	100	3,170	100

Households who refused to participate in the campaign-period survey were contacted a second time and nine percent of the first refusals (179 or 4.5 percent of all CPS interviews) completed the interview on the second or subsequent contact after the initial refusal. (The variables "CPSREFUS" and "PESREFUS" identify whether the interview was a "standard" completion or a "converted" refusal.) The limited time that each day's sample was available for calling (as required for the rolling cross section) resulted in a refusal conversion rate considerably lower than the 18 to 23 percent typically achieved in ISR studies. In comparison to the CPS, refusal conversion attempts were almost three times more successful in the PES. While the 118

converted refusals in the PES represent four percent of the PES interviews, they account for twenty-two percent of the initial refusals in the PES survey.

The careful attention to the number and timing of callbacks and refusal conversions is designed to increase the response rate, thereby improving sample representativeness. Many researchers have found that respondents who are "hard-to-reach" and those who "refused" have characteristics that are somewhat different from typical survey responders (Dunkelberg and Day, 1973; Fitzgerald and Fuller, 1982; and McDonald, 1979).

Whether the respondent refused during the initial contact, the number of call attempts, the number of times the telephone was answered and other variables that describe the data collection process are included as part of the data set.

### 3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey

There are numerous ways to calculate response rates in survey research (Groves, 1989; Groves and Lyberg, 1988; Wiseman and Billington, 1984; Frey, 1983; and Dillman, 1978). The method used in this project was conservative; most other ways of calculating the response rate would produce inflated values. The response rate was defined as the number of completed interviews divided by the estimated number of eligible households times 100 percent.

Details on the calculation of the response rate are as follows. Of the 8,748 telephone numbers included in the sample, 6,343 were identified as being eligible households (completions [n=3,949] + refusals [n=2,024] + callbacks [n=370], see Table 3.2). Not eligible households (respondent was unable to speak English or French, was not healthy enough to complete the interview, was not a Canadian citizen, etc. [n=928], and nonresidential and not in service numbers [n=1,071]) accounted for 1,999 of the telephone numbers. It was not possible to determine the eligibility status for 406 of the sample telephone numbers. For response rate calculations, it was assumed that the proportion of these 406 numbers which were eligible household numbers was the same as it was in the rest of the sample.

Table 3.2 Final Sample Disposition: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey

Results	number	percent
completions	3,949	45
refusals	2,024	23
callbacks	370	4
ill/aged/language problem/ absent/not a citizen	928	11
not-in-service & nonresidential	1,071	12
eligibility not determined	406	5
total	8,748	100
participation rate	-	66
completion rate	-	62
household eligibility rate	-	76
estimated number of eligibles	6,651	-
response rate	-	59

This proportion, or "household eligibility rate" was  $.76$  (eligibles [6,343]/(eligibles [6,343] + not eligibles [1,999]) =  $.76$ ). The estimated total number of eligibles was then computed as 6,651 (6,343 + [ $.76 \times 406$ ] = 6,651). Dividing the number of completions (3,949) by the estimated number of eligibles (6,651) gives a final response rate of 59.4 percent. Many organizations would not include "eligibility not determined" numbers in the denominator for the response rate calculations on the argument that few of these numbers would be eligible households. (See: Groves and Lyberg, 1988 for a debate on this issue.) This version of the response rate, sometimes called a completion rate, calculated as completions/known eligibles is 62 percent (3,949/6,343). Other organizations calculate response rates as the number of completions over the number of completions plus refusals. This version of the response rate, which is sometimes known as the participation rate, is 66 percent (3,949/3,949+2,024).

The response rate for the CPS survey is four to eight percent lower than ISR typically obtains for general population surveys that employ RDD and random selection of the respondent from among all adult household members. The short field period likely accounts for much of the

difference as it makes it more difficult to find "hard-to-reach" people at home. The higher than typical percentage of callbacks and eligibility not determined telephone numbers in the sample are evidence of the shorter data collection period. In addition, as mentioned above, the shorter data collection period also reduces the effectiveness of "refusal conversion" attempts. In a typical survey, calls are made to households over a two to three week period, while in the CPS the telephone numbers were active for a maximum of ten days.

Table 3.3 Average Percentage of Completions Per Day for Each of the First 27 Days of the Sample Release for the Campaign-Period Survey

# of days	% of comps.	cumulative percent
one	43	43
two	15	58
three	10	68
four	6	74
five	5	79
six	5	84
seven	3	87
eight	5	92
nine	3	95
ten	5	100

Also, the ten day coverage period was truncated for sample released after day 27 of the CPS - the sample released on day 28 was called each day for nine days, the sample released on day 29 for eight days, etc. The percentage of completions obtained, by the number of days the sample was active, for the first 27 days of the CPS is presented in Table 3.3. If we assume the number of completions per day for the last ten days of sample release, would have been about the same as for the first 27 days of calling, the overall response rate would have been three and one-half points higher.

There was variation in the response rate by province and territory. The lowest rates were obtained in Saskatchewan (53 percent) and Quebec (54 percent) and the Territories, Alberta and New Brunswick had the highest rates (between 67 and 72 percent, Table 3.4).

Table 3.4. Completed Interviews, Response Rates, and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Campaign-Period, Post-Election, and Mailback Surveys

Prov/Ter	Campaign-Period		Post-Election		Mailback	
	Interviews (#)	Response Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)
Newfoundland	99	66	83	84	48	58
PEI	101	64	86	85	44	51
Nova Scotia	101	67	93	92	64	69
NB	108	68	90	83	58	64
Quebec	1,034	54	801	77	459	57
Ontario	951	59	756	79	453	60
Manitoba	203	62	158	78	89	56
Saskatchewan	211	53	174	82	96	55
Alberta	481	67	407	85	234	57
BC	473	59	371	78	225	61
NWT	97	72	80	82	38	48
Yukon	90	67	71	79	43	61
Canada	3,949	59	3,170	80	1,851	58

### 3.4 Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey

The post-election re-interview rate is 80 percent. This rate is considerably lower than the 88 percent re-interview rate in the 1993 PES, but it approximates that obtained in the 1988 PES. The response rate for Quebec in the PES, while in the lower range, was within one or two percentage points of four other provinces. The highest reinterview rates for the PES were in the Atlantic region and Alberta and Saskatchewan. The lowest reinterview rates for the mailback were in Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories (Table 3.4).

Non-response by CPS respondents to the PES was primarily accounted for by refusals and callbacks. Thirteen percent of all CPS respondents, or just over two thirds of all non-response in the PES, were accounted for by refusals and callbacks. The remaining non-response was accounted for by illness/death of CPS respondents, by never answered telephones, and by changes in telephone numbers (PES respondents had their number changed and the new number was unlisted; the number was changed and the new number listed by the telephone company reached the wrong household; respondent left the household and those remaining in the household either could not or would not provide a new number) or by misdialling in the CPS. (Interviewers are routed, via CATI, to a screen that requests that they verify the telephone number before they proceed to complete the interview; however, given the large volume of calls, some error in dialling is expected and the respondent may not have listened carefully enough to the interviewer when the interviewer asked the respondent if they had correctly dialled the number, e.g., 735-5335 rather than 753-5335).

### 3.5 Data Collection Procedures: Mailback Survey

At the end of the PES, respondents were asked if they would be willing to provide an address so that a mailback questionnaire could be sent to them. Eighty-three percent of the respondents to the PES provided mailing addresses. All of these 2,627 respondents received the first two mail contacts. The first contact included the questionnaire, a covering letter, and a postage-paid pre-addressed return envelope. The second was a reminder/thank you card (physically like an over-sized post card). The first and second mail contacts were sent from June 19 to August 16 (the mailings were staggered as the first mailbacks were sent prior to the completion of the PES telephone interviewing). Most of the response from these mailings arrived at the Institute within a four week period, at which time a second questionnaire (covering letter and return envelope) was sent only to non-responders. One week later a second reminder card was sent. Finally, during the week of October 21, telephone calls were made to all non-responders. In total, 80 percent of the respondents who provided addresses (or 66 percent of all PES respondents) completed the mailback survey.

## 4. Questionnaire Issues and Data Processing

### 4.1 Introduction

This section of the technical documentation provides information about the questionnaire and construction of the data set. A brief description is given of key variables, question order randomization, the coding of open-ended items and the linking of the three data sets. A list of the variables (name and label) is provided. Note that all variables in the Campaign-Period Survey include the prefix "CPS," and the prefixes "PES," and "MBS" are used to indicate that the variable is from the post-election, and mailback survey (respectively).

### 4.2 Use of the "RTYPE" and "WAVE" Variables to Identify Data Sub-Sets

Questions were survey specific. A frequency tabulation (marginal) for an item from the mail-back survey will include valid cases only for the 1,857 respondents who completed the MBS. A "missing case code" will be assigned to the 2,092 respondents who were part of the Canadian Election Survey but did not complete the MBS. (The 1,857 "valid cases" plus the 2,092 "missing cases" represent the complete sample of 3,949 respondents.) An alternative to including the missing cases is to specify that only a subset of the data is to be used in the analysis. A series of "RTYPE" variables has been created. The variable RTYPE3 for example, identifies respondents to the mailback survey (and RTYPE1 and RTYPE2 identify Campaign-Period and Post-Election survey respondents respectively).

If there was an interest in examining those 1,851 respondents who completed all three surveys, the analyst would select for value 111 of the variable WAVE. A value of 100 in the WAVE variable identifies those 779 respondents who only completed the CPS, and a value of 110 identifies respondents who completed both telephone surveys, but not the mailback.

### 4.3 Province Specific Questions

A number of survey questions were province specific. For example, when asked to rate leaders or parties in the CPS, respondents from Quebec were not asked about Preston Manning or the Reform Party, and respondents in the remaining provinces and territories were not asked about Gilles Duceppe and the Bloc Québécois. In other circumstances questions were asked only of

respondents from Quebec. For example, CPSA2H, rating the importance of "defending the interest of Quebec" was only asked of Quebec respondents. CATI code, such as [if prov ne 14] [goto ch18][ endif] (translated as: if province does not equal Quebec go to the next question), as is found in CPSA2H, identified these province specific questions.

#### 4.4 Date Specific Questions

Questions about the three television debates were asked after May 12 (the English debate starting with item CPSL1), May 13 (the first French debate starting with item CPSL2) and May 18 (the second French debate starting with item CPSL2D). A frequency count for the CPS respondents will produce missing data for all respondents interviewed before these dates.

Two party policy questions are also date specific. The item asking respondents if they knew which party promised to cut unemployment by half by the year 2001 (CPSF14) and the item asking if they knew which party was against recognizing Quebec as a distinct society (CPSF15) were asked in all interviews completed after May 1st (thus a frequency count for the CPS data will identify 500 CPS respondents who did not get asked this question).

The final item added to the CPS survey (CPSJ15) on May 8th, was about the government's decision to have an election at this time (referring to the Manitoba flood).

#### 4.5 Expectations of the Election Outcome: Identification of Winning Party and Opposition Party: Explanation of CATI Code and Errors

During the first stage of data collection there were three CATI problems with the expectations section. Items CPSI2A to CPSI3E were affected. Respondents were to be asked each party's chance of "winning the Election in the whole country" (most seats in Quebec for the Bloc Québécois) in items CPSI2A - CPSI2E. The order the parties were presented to the respondent was randomised. The respondents were asked each party's chances of forming the opposition. The party that the respondent rated as having the best chance of winning in the whole country was to be excluded from the list of parties asked about in the opposition items.

On the 15th of May it was discovered that the plan to exclude the highest ranking party from the opposition items had not been implemented and all parties were being asked the opposition

items, regardless of respondent rating. In order to correct this, CATI code was added to the instrument to rank order the parties based on the respondent's answer. This change became effective at the start of interviewing on the 16th of May.

On the 17th of May it became apparent that the rank ordering code was not functioning properly. There were two problems with the code:

- One. In certain circumstances respondents were not being asked to rate a party's chances of forming the opposition, even though that party had not been rated the most likely to form the government. A change to the code which corrected the rank ordering problem was made on the 17th of May. This error affected 26 cases completed on the 16th and 17th of May.
- Two. When a respondent gave two parties equal chances of forming the government, i.e., a tie, the respondent should have been asked both parties' chances of forming the opposition. This functioned correctly, except that when the tie was created as a result of the respondent asking the interviewer to go back and change a previously given rating, the party with the changed rating was excluded from the opposition items. This problem was not corrected until the 26th of May. The "changed answer tie" affected 44 cases from May 16-25.

In short from April 27 to May 15, the party that the respondent rated as having the best chance of winning in the whole country was not excluded from the list of parties asked about in the opposition items. Between May 16 and May 25, a CATI code error affected 70 cases. Researchers might wish to assign a score of 0 (no chance at all) on the opposition item to the party rated as having the best chances of winning in the whole country.

#### 4.6 Randomization of Question Order

The logical operators resident in CATI were used to randomize the order in which respondents received items in several sections of the questionnaire. Given that order effects have been identified in surveys, but are not always easy to predict (Schuman and Presser, 1981), the order

randomization was designed primarily as a precautionary measure to determine what impact, if any, question order had on response.

#### 4.61 Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire

The seven question order experiments in the CPS survey are outlined below. The six question order experiments in the PES and the six question wording experiments in the PES follow.

##### A: Rotating the Rating of Election Issues

The first question in the CPS was open-ended and asked respondents to identify the most important issue in the election to them PERSONALLY (the emphasis on personal was part of the question). After this question, respondents were asked to rate the importance of eight election issues: national unity (CPSA2A), reducing the deficit (CPSA2B), creating jobs (CPSA2C), cutting taxes (CPSA2D), keeping election promises (CPSA2E), protecting social programs (CPSA2F), fighting crime (CPSA2G), and defending the interests of Quebec (CPSA2H).<sup>6</sup> The order in which the respondent was asked these eight items was determined by the value of Random Number 1 (CPSRN1). When CPSRN1 was "1", the respondent was asked about national unity first, reducing the deficit second, creating jobs third, etc. When CPSRN1 was "2" the first item in the list was reducing the deficit, the second creating jobs, the third cutting taxes, and the item about nation unity was asked last. As a result, the number of times an item from the list was asked about first, second, third, etc., was approximately the same for each item in the list. A cross tabulation (contingency table) of one of these items by CPSRN1 will allow the analyst to determine the extent to which response varied by question order.

##### B: Randomization of the Affect of Government Policies on Personal Financial Situation

Respondents were asked if the policies of the federal (CPSC3) or provincial (CPSC4) government made them better off, worse off or if they did not make much difference. Half the

---

<sup>6</sup> Respondents outside of Quebec were not asked how important "defending the interests of Quebec" was to them personally in the election.

respondents were asked about the impact of the federal government's policies on their financial situation first and the provincial government's policies second. This order resulted from CPSRN2 being equal to "1". When CPSRN2 was equal to "2" the order of presentation was reversed so respondents were asked about the affect of the provincial government's policies first and federal government's policies second. Cross tabulations (contingency tables) of CPSRN2 by CPSC3 and CPSRN2 by CPSC4 will allow the analyst to determine what extent, if any, the response to these items varied by question order.

C: Randomization of the Party Leader Ratings

Each respondent was asked to rate four of the five main party leaders (CPSD1A - CPSD1E) on a 0 to 100 scale (Quebec respondents were not asked to rate Preston Manning and respondents in the other nine provinces and two territories were not asked to rate Gilles Duceppe). The order in which the respondent was asked to rate the leaders was determined by CPSRN5. When CPSRN5 had the value "1," respondents (outside of Quebec) were asked to rate the leaders in the following order: Charest, Chrétien, McDonough, Manning. When CPSRN5 had the value of "24" the order of presentation was Manning, McDonough, Chrétien, Charest. (CPSRN5 included 24 values - "1" to "24" - as there were 24 possible orders.)<sup>7</sup>

Prior to the leader ratings items, respondents were asked if they knew "a lot, a little or nothing at all" about each of the leaders (CPSDR1 - CPSDR5). Respondents who knew nothing at all about a leader were not asked to rate that leader nor their opinion on how well different traits described each leader (see section F below).

D: Randomization of Party Ratings

As was the case for the ratings of party leaders, the 0-100 ratings for parties were randomized (CPSD1G - CPSD1K). Again there were 24 orders and respondents in Quebec were not asked to rate the Reform Party and respondents in the rest of Canada were not asked to rate the Bloc

---

<sup>7</sup> The 24 orders represent all possible order combinations for four items as determined by 4 factorial ( $4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 24$ ).

Québécois. The ratings of the parties were controlled by CPSRN6 and the order in which the party ratings were delivered to respondents was independent of the order in which they were asked to rate party leaders.

E:       Rotation of Items Rating the Liberals' Performance

A list of seven items (six outside of Quebec), designed to measure the performance of the Liberal government were asked of each respondent (CPSF10A-CPSF10G). These items, with the exception of cutting taxes, are the same issues asked about in CPSA2B-CPSA2H (see part A above). Again the presentation of the issues was rotated. Thus, about equal numbers of respondents were asked the question about "how good a job the Liberals had done in preserving national unity" first, second, third, etc. The rotation of the seven items was controlled by CPSRN3.

F:       Randomization of the Leader Traits Battery of Questions

Each respondent was asked how well a set of terms (strong leader, trustworthy, arrogant, compassionate, and in touch with the times) described each party leader (CPH1A - CPH5E). The order of presentation of the party leaders in this section was randomized using CPSRN7. Again there were 24 orders and the order of presentation of the leaders was independent of the previous ratings questions. Respondents who, in the leader knowledge questions (CPSDR1 - CPSDR5), said they "knew nothing at all about a leader" or who in the leader ratings questions (CPSD1A - CPSD1E) said they "did not know/could not rate/refused to rate a leader" were not asked the traits questions about that leader.

G:       Expectation of Vote Outcome in the Riding and in the Country

Respondents were asked what the chances were of each party winning in their riding and the chances of each party winning the country as a whole (CPSI1A - CPSJ2E). When CPSRN4 was "1," respondents were first asked about their riding and second about the country as a whole. The order of presentation was reversed when CPSRN4 was "2." In addition, the order of party

presentation was randomized for both the riding and the country questions. For example, when CPSRN8 was "1," (and CPSRN4 was "1") the respondent was asked the chances of the Conservatives winning in their riding, followed by the chances for the Liberals, the NDP, and the Reform (in Quebec, Reform was replaced by Bloc). Conversely when CPSRN8 had a value of 24, the order of parties was reversed (Reform followed by NDP, Liberal, and Conservative). There were 24 different orders for the set of questions about the chances of each party winning in the respondent's riding and 24 orders for the set of questions about the chances of each party winning the country (determined by CPSRN9). Because each respondent was randomly assigned a value for both CPSRN8 and CPSRN9, the order in which they were asked about the party winning their riding was independent of the order they were asked about a party winning the country as a whole.

#### 4.62 Question and Response Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire

##### A: Party Leaders, Parties, and Candidates

The order of presentation of the ratings for the party leaders (PESDR1 - PESDR5), parties (PESC2A - PESC2E), and local candidates (PESC3A - PESC3E) was randomized. As was the case in the CPS, there were 24 unique order presentations for each of these batteries of items (and the order for each battery was independent of the order of the other batteries).

There were important differences between the CPS and PES questionnaires with respect to the party and leader ratings questions. Unlike, as was the case in the CPS, the items measuring knowledge about the party leaders (know a little, a lot, or nothing at all, PESDR1 - PESDR5) were not used as a screen for the leader ratings questions. That is, respondents were asked to rate each leader, even if they answered, in the knowledge questions, that they knew "nothing at all" about a leader. In addition, and also unlike as was the case in the CPS survey, respondents in Quebec were asked how they felt about Preston Manning.<sup>8</sup> The Manning rating always followed the rating of the other four leaders (which were randomized). In the party ratings questions, respondents in Quebec were asked to rate the Reform party, and respondents in the other Canadian provinces and territories were asked to rate the Bloc Québécois. The Reform Party

---

<sup>8</sup> Respondents in provinces other than Quebec were not asked to rate Gilles Duceppe.

rating was always asked last in Quebec and the Bloc Québécois rating was always asked last in the other provinces and territories.

B: Spending Cuts

Respondents were asked the extent to which they would cut spending ("a lot, some, or not at all") for seven different areas (defence, welfare, pensions and old age security, health care, unemployment insurance, education, and aid to developing countries, PESE6A - PESE6G). The order in which these areas were presented was rotated, by PESRN9, so that each of the items on the list was asked first-one in seven times, second-one in seven times, etc.

C: Variation in Response Order for the Abortion Item

Respondents were asked which of three positions on abortion (never permitted, permitted after need established, or a woman's personal choice) came closest to their views (PESE5A - PESE5C). Random Number 10 determined in which order these three options were presented to respondents. When PESRN10 was "1" the order was "never, need, choice,", when PESRN10 was "2" the order was "need, choice, never," and when it was "3" the order was "choice, never, need." Frequency counts for the three versions of the questions will allow the analyst to determine the extent (if any) to which the order of the response alternatives affected response.

D: Views on Universality of Government Services

Two positions on universality were offered to respondents (PESE7A and PESE7B). The first suggested government services should not be provided for those who can afford them while the second argued that universality was required to ensure everyone's needs were met. The order in which these two response options were provided to respondents was randomized (PESRN11).

#### 4.7 Randomization of Question Wording

The importance of the way in which issues are framed in question wording has been recognized by survey researchers (Converse and Presser, 1986; and Schuman and Presser, 1981). CATI was also used to vary the wording of several key questions in the Post-Election survey.

##### A: Identification of Voters

There were two versions of the vote question. The first, PESA2A, was short and direct, "Did you vote in the election" (and was asked when PESRN12 was "1"). The second version of the question (PESA2B) included a more lengthy preamble, which mentioned that "in a democracy" people have "the right to vote" or "not vote" and that "some people end up not voting for one reason or another (asked when PESRN12 was "2"). The extent to which the second version of the question decreased the over-reporting of voting common in surveys (Katosh and Traugott, 1981) can be determined by comparing the frequency distributions for PESA2B and PESA2B.

##### B: The Temporal Dimension of the Vote Intentions

Respondents were randomly assigned (PESRN2) to either a close-ended (PESA4C) or open-ended (PESA4D) question about when they made up their mind for which party they were going to vote. While the coding scheme for the open-ended version of the question includes response categories from the close-ended questions, additional codes were used to capture the more extensive range of answers provided in the open ended-version of the question. Most common were respondents who answered "I did not make up my mind because always vote for party X," or respondents who said they "made up their mind years before the election was called, etc."

##### C: Federal/Provincial Government Comparison

There were two versions of the question asking if the respondent's provincial or territorial government, or the federal government, "best looked after the needs of people like you" (PESF14A and PESF14B). The second version of the question (PESF14B) included the

response option "or does it not make much difference." The version of the question assigned to respondents was determined by PESRN4.

D: Federal and Provincial Party Identification

The same wording experiment was used for the set of items used to measure federal (PESH1 - PESH9) and provincial (PESH10 - PESH19) party identification. In the federal version of these questions, when PESRN16 was "1", respondents are asked if they "think of themselves as a Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Reform (Bloc in Quebec), or none of these." In the second version of the question (PESH5), respondents are asked if they think of themselves as close to any particular federal party first and then the party they identified with second. The same format is used for the provincial party (PESH10 - PESH19) identification questions.

Respondents who got the first version of the federal party identification question also got the first version of the provincial party identification question.

E: Ranking Goals

Respondents were asked to rank four goals (PESI5A-PESI5F). There were two versions of the list of goals, the first included:

- 1, maintaining order in the nation;
- 2, giving people more say in important government decisions;
- 3, fighting rising prices; and
- 4, protecting freedom of speech.

All but the third goal were the same on each list. In the second list the third goal was fighting unemployment. Whether the respondent was read the first or second list was determined by Random Number 14 (the first list was read when PESRN14 was "1", the second when it was "2").

#### 4.8 Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify" Options

The first question in both the campaign-period (CPSA1) and post-election (PESA1) interviews was open-ended and asked respondents to identify the issue which was most important to them personally in the election. Almost all respondents provided a single response. If a respondent provided more than one response, that could not be coded into a single category, the first response was coded (unless it was not codeable and then the second response was used). The same set of codes (listed below) was used to code both the CPS and PES responses. The list of categories used is extensive and the number of observations in some categories are quite small. However, the use of a large number of categories makes it easier for the analyst to recode the responses into a smaller set of broader categories. An attempt was made, when possible, to use categories developed for the 1993 Canadian Election Study. However, free trade issues, often mentioned in 1993 were infrequent in 1997 whereas there were more mentions of social programs in 1997 than in 1993.



69 health care concern about availability,  
afford ability, accessibility

#### MORAL ISSUES

70 lack of family values, morality  
71 abortion issues  
72 environmental issues  
73 minority issues (equity, aboriginal, gay,  
women's, human)  
74 poverty issues

#### CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

75 gun control/against gun control- bill C68  
76 crime and violence general mentions  
77 harsher penalties for criminals, more  
fairness in justice system  
78 young offenders, harsher penalties  
79 gun control, no specific mention

#### UNITY/QUEBEC ISSUES

80 general mention Quebec, bilingualism,  
sovereignty/future of Quebec/Canada  
81 general mention of National Unity  
82 maintain National Unity/don't let  
Quebec go/Canada should stay as one  
country  
83 let Quebec go/for separation  
84 for sovereignty/independence  
85 against sovereignty/independence  
86 no distinct society/special status for  
Quebec  
87 yes distinct society/special status for PQ  
88 get rid of Bloc/against Bloc  
89 Bloc good for Quebec/want Bloc to win

#### REPRESENTATION ISSUES

90 get rid of Chrétien/Liberals  
91 need more integrity, honesty,  
accountability from gov't at all levels  
92 need stable government one with  
foresight strength need good gov't

leaders

93 revamp election process/senate  
94 want Chrétien and the liberals to win  
95 want a change of gov't  
96 representation/recognition for west  
97 only concerned with who wins

#### OTHER

98 don't know, not codeable, other  
99 refused

B: Coding Categories for PESA8, "What were the Liberals elected to do?"

The set of codes used for the Post-Election question: "What were the Liberals elected to do?" (PESA8) duplicated some of the codes used for the "most important issues questions" used at the start of both the Campaign-Period and Post-Election questionnaires. Again a large number of categories were used and they are organized in such a fashion as to allow for recoding into larger groupings.

JOBS AND EMPLOYMENT

- 10 create more jobs; reduce unemployment
- 11 jobs for youth
- 12 want/need job security (includes things like keeping fisheries open)
- 13 lack of jobs in the East
- 14 need more job training, re-training
- 15 concentrate on jobs/control unemployment

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

- 20 general mention (debt, deficit, etc.)
- 21 continue reducing debt
- 22 debt - eliminate
- 23 continue reducing deficit
- 24 deficit - eliminate
- 25 continue their fiscal policies/restraints
- 26 balance the budget
- 27 create jobs and reduce deficit/budget (both mentions)

ECONOMIC CONCERNS

- 30 general mention (economy, economic reform)
- 31 fight inflation
- 32 keep interest rates down
- 33 improve economy/bring prosperity
- 34 strengthen/stimulate the economy
- 35 economy/budget and jobs both mentions
- 36 need to stabilize the economy

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 40 general negative comments to lie/screw us around/spend our money)
- 41 nothing/not really sure/not much
- 42 won by default/no choice/best of a bad lot
- 43 cater to Quebec
- 44 cater to Ontario
- 45 elected by Ont/Quebec (one or both)
- 46 to try to keep their promises
- 47 because Chrétien called an early election
- 48 to beat other parties
- 49 to change/get new ideas

TAXES

- 50 general mention
- 51 abolish GST/taxes
- 52 cut GST/ taxes
- 53 keep taxes down
- 54 jobs and taxes both mentions
- 55 fairer taxation

SOCIAL PROGS/ SOCIAL SECURITY

- 57 general mention of health care
- 58 continue the cutbacks
- 59 maintain health care /more health care \$
- 60 protect social programmes/social services
- 61 protect old age pensions/security
- 62 protect child care/family benefits

- 63 jobs and social programmes (both)
- 64 jobs and health care (both)
- 65 health care and budget (both)
- 66 deficit and health care
- 68 elderly, care of
- 69 health care concern about availability, afford ability, accessibility

MORAL ISSUES

- 70 to help Canadians
- 71 to deal with crime and violence
- 72 to deal with poverty

UNITY/QUEBEC ISSUES

- 80 general mention of Quebec, bilingualism, sovereignty, independence/future of Quebec/Canada
- 81 general mention Canadian/National Unity

- 82 maintain National/Canadian Unity
- 83 to stop Quebec Independence
- 84 unity and economy
- 85 unity and jobs
- 86 unity and deficit
- 87 unity and health care
- 88 unity and social programmes

REPRESENTATION ISSUES

- 90 general mention - to carry on
- 91 honesty, fair & accountable gov't
- 92 to form a majority gov't
- 93 to maintain the status quo
- 94 to continue their mandate
- 95 to beat the other parties
- 96 to govern the country
- 97 to represent the people

OTHER

- 98 don't know, not codeable, other
- 99 refused

C: Reasons for Not Voting

Respondents who did not vote in the election were asked if there was a particular reason why they did not do so (PESA3). Five-hundred and twenty-three of the 571 respondents who were asked the question provided an answer that was coded into 13 different categories (including they could not get away from work, had no time, uncertainty with respect to who to vote for, and a sense of cynicism about the whole election process).

D: Respondent's Understanding of What Reform Meant When They Said "All Provinces Should be Treated Equally"

Respondents were asked if they "remembered which party said that all provinces should be treated equally" (PESE29). Those who correctly identified the Reform Party were asked what Reform meant by this (PESE30). The responses were coded into ten categories, the most common four included treat all people equally, all provinces equally, no special status for Quebec, and no distinct status for Quebec.

E:       How to Vote on a Day Other than Election Day

Respondents who thought it was possible for someone to vote on a day other than election day (PESA5), were asked how they would do this (PESA5A). Because many respondents gave more than one response their answers were coded into first (PESA5A) second (PESA5A2) and third (PESA5A3) mentioned. Although several categories were used in the coding, most respondents answered that they could vote in an advance poll.

F:       Other Specifies

In a number of items, particularly questions about political parties, and in the demographics, interviewers had the option of writing in an "other specify" response. The information provided by interviewers was reviewed and placed into existing categories when appropriate. Observations that remain in the other category in the final data set normally are few in number, or cover such a wide range of possible options that it was not sensible to create specific codes. For a number of the demographic questions, such as ethnicity and language spoken at home, response codes have been added to the data set (note how some response options in the data set are not present in the questionnaire).

In three attitudinal items (what were the Liberals elected to do - CPSF7, what is the best way to fight unemployment - CPSF8, the best way to deal with young offenders - CPSJ21, and language usually spoken at home - CPSM14) there were enough other responses to justify the addition of new codes.

#### 4.9       Response Time Measurement

Recent research has explored the relationship between the length of time it takes a respondent to answer a question and how firmly committed they are to their answer (Bassili, 1996; Bassili, 1993; and Bassili and Fletcher, 1991). The questionnaire was programmed, using the clock resident in the CATI system, to measure how long it took respondents to answer a number of questions. The length of time, in hundredths of a second, was stored in a separate variable. Response-time measurement was used for the vote intention question (CPSA4) asked in the CPS (the length of time it took a respondent to answer can be found in variable CPSJF1)

#### 4.10 Linking Respondents from Three Surveys

Considerable effort was made to ensure, within each household, that the same person completed each survey. For example, in the post-election survey, interviewers were provided with the first name, initial, or other identifier (mother, only male in household, etc.) of the respondent who completed the campaign-period survey as well as their sex and year of birth. However, in comparing the name (or identifier), sex, and year of birth for respondents across the surveys, it is possible to isolate cases where there are differences in sex, age, or name (identifier). Each case in the Canadian Election Survey was classified (in the variable RLINK) as being a "goodlink" - including respondents who only completed the CPS - (98 percent), "probable goodlink" (.8 percent), "probable badlink" (0.6 percent), or "Mailback badlink" (0.4 percent). The following conventions were used in the classification.

- i. When the name (or identifier), age, and sex were the same in all three surveys the case was classified as a "goodlink."
- ii. When the name was different, or there was a change in sex, the case was coded as a "probable badlink."
- iii. When the age was different the case was coded as a "probable badlink", with the exception noted in point iv.
- iv. When age was different but there was the possibility of an interviewer entry error (for example, year of birth was recorded as 1945 in the first survey and 1954 in the second survey) and there was strong supporting evidence that the same person was interviewed (for example, there was only one male adult in the household who had the correct name), the case was classified as a "probable goodlink".
- v. When the linking problems were specific to the mailback survey, the case was classified as a "Mailback badlink."

Analysts who are working with the data may wish to consider dropping the "probable badlink" cases from the data set.

#### 4.11 Occupational Classification

Respondents, in the CPS, who were currently working (including self-employed), laid-off, or unemployed (CPSM4) were asked their current or last occupation (CPSM6). The description of their occupation, recorded as open-ended text by the interviewer, was coded into a 4-digit occupation category using Statistics Canada's "Standard Occupational Classification, 1980." For example, respondents who described their occupation as a high school teacher were assigned a code of 2733. Those who described their occupation as a homemaker were assigned a value of 9994; those who described their occupation as being a student were assigned 9995, disabled a 9996, retired a 9997, don't know a 9998 and if the respondent refused to answer, or provided an answer that was not codeable, the variable was assigned a 9999.

The codebook for the 1980 occupation classifications is contained in this section. Appended to each occupation is a socio-economic index score. These indices are commonly referred to as "Blisshen Scores" and are based on the male labour force population who reported an occupation in the 1981 Canadian Census. The development of the scale is reported in Blisshen, Carroll and Moore (1987).

Another well-known socio-economic index was developed by Pineo, Porter and McRoberts (1977), based on the 1971 Canadian Census. This index was updated in 1985 to reflect the 1981 Census and is reported in McMaster University (1985).

The data file contains two socio-economic indices. The Blisshen Scores are contained in the variable "BLISH81R" and are identical to those shown in the detailed codebook. The Pineo/Porter/McRoberts scores are contained in the variable "PINPORR". The full set of SPSS recode statements used to create these two indices is available from the Institute on request.

4.12 Listing of Occupations by Occupational Classification Number, CCDO  
1980 with accompanying Blisshen Socio-Economic Index Score, 1981

CCDO Number	Description	Blisshen Score	CCDO Number	Description	Blisshen Score
1111	Members of legislative bodies	55.08	2119	Physical sciences:n.e.c.	41.81
1113	Government administrators	66.84	2131	Agriculturists and related scientists	62.19
1115	Post office management	38.19	2133	Biologists and related scientists	65.63
1116	Inspectors+regulatory officers, gov't	56.42	2135	Life sciences:technologists+technicians	52.86
1119	Officials,admin. unique to gov't:n.e.c.	59.94	2139	Life sciences:n.e.c.	51.01
1130	General managers,other senior officials	71.62	2141	Architects	68.12
1131	Mgmt:natural sciences and engineering	79.23	2142	Chemical engineers	72.47
1132	Mgmt:social sciences+related fields	62.53	2143	Civil engineers	71.70
1133	Adminis. in teaching, related fields	78.34	2144	Electrical engineers	70.48
1134	Adminis. in medicine and health	68.89	2145	Industrial engineers	64.07
1135	Financial management	60.65	2146	Agricultural engineers	64.22
1136	Personnel, industrial relations mgmt	62.87	2147	Mechanical engineers	68.37
1137	Sales and advertising management	50.07	2151	Metallurgical engineers	71.05
1141	Purchasing management	50.83	2153	Mining engineers	72.80
1142	Services management	40.99	2154	Petroleum engineers	74.67
1143	Production management	57.57	2155	Aerospace engineers	65.79
1145	Management:construction operations	55.91	2156	Nuclear engineers	75.44
1146	Farm management	32.06	2157	Community planners	65.11
1147	Management:transport and commun- ications operations	61.01	2159	Professional engineers:n.e.c.	70.27
1151	Other management:mines+oil wells	66.39	2160	Supervis.:oth. occup.in architec.+ engin	62.97
1152	Other mgmt:durable goods manuf.	56.56	2161	Surveyors	46.22
1153	Other mgmt:non-durable goods manuf.	54.91	2163	Draughting	53.83
1154	Other management:construction	49.40	2164	Architectural technolog.+technic.	55.82
1155	Oth. mgmt:transp.+commun.	56.38	2165	Engineering technologists+technicians	56.57
1156	Other management:trade	47.79	2169	Oth. occup. in architec.+engineer.:n.e.c.	35.47
1157	Other management:service	52.49	2181	Math.,statisticians+actuaries	61.91
1158	Other mgmt:other industries	56.83	2183	Systems analysts,computer prog..., rel.	60.73
1171	Accountants, auditors and other financial officers	59.44	2189	Math.,stat.,systems analysis, rel.:n.e.c.	48.24
1173	Organization and methods analysts	65.98	2311	Economists	69.18
1174	Personnel and related officers	57.19	2313	Socio.,anthropologists+rel. social sci.	63.09
1175	Purchasing officers+buyers,except wholesale+retail trade	52.23	2315	Psychologists	65.36
1176	Inspectors+regulatory officers:n.e.c.	52.51	2319	Social sciences:n.e.c.	49.87
1179	Related to mgmt and admin:n.e.c.	57.55	2331	Social workers	60.11
2111	Chemists	63.47	2333	Welfare and community services	36.89
2112	Geologists	71.01	2339	Social work and related fields:n.e.c.	44.39
2113	Physicists	73.00	2341	Judges and magistrates	93.27
2114	Meteorologists	70.66	2343	Lawyers and notaries	75.60
2117	Physical sci.:technologists+technicians	54.05	2349	In law and jurisprudence:n.e.c.	48.72
			2350	Superv.:library,museum+archival sci.	57.97
			2351	Librarians,archivists+conservators	55.40
			2353	Techn. in library,museum+archival sci.	51.11

2359 Library,museum+archival sci.:n.e.c.	37.70	3332 Musicians and singers	36.58
2391 Educational+vocational counsellors	67.61	3333 Music+musical entertain. rel.:n.e.c.	32.35
2399 Other social sci.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	51.54	3334 Dancers and choreographers	32.94
2511 Ministers of religion	52.84	3335 Actors/actresses	42.94
2513 Nuns and brothers	42.17	3337 Radio and television announcers	46.43
2519 Religion:n.e.c.	43.27	3339 Performing and audio-visual arts:n.e.c.	37.54
2711 University teachers	75.87	3351 Writers and editors	54.58
2719 University teaching+related:n.e.c.	46.83	3355 Translators and interpreters	57.30
2731 Elementary+kindergarten teachers	63.64	3359 Writing:n.e.c.	50.15
2733 Secondary school teachers	70.19	3360 Supervisors:sports and recreation	38.48
2739 Elemen./secon. teach.+rel.:n.e.c.	43.38	3370 Coach.,train.,instr.+manag.:sport+rec.	36.71
2791 Comm. college+vocat. school teach.	66.03	3371 Referees and related officials	23.77
2792 Fine arts school teachers:n.e.c.	40.93	3373 Athletes	40.36
2793 Post-secondary school teachers:n.e.c.	67.05	3375 Attendants:sport and recreation	24.93
2795 Teachers of exceptional students:n.e.c.	58.09	3379 Sport and recreation:n.e.c.	25.74
2797 Instructors and training officers:n.e.c.	49.94	4110 Supervisors:stenographic and typing	46.00
2799 Other teaching and related:n.e.c.	53.23	4111 Secretaries and stenographers	41.82
3111 Physicians and surgeon	101.32	4113 Typists and clerk-typists	38.47
3113 Dentists	101.74	4130 Supervis.:bookkeep.,account-rec.+rel.	45.39
3115 Veterinarians	72.24	4131 Bookkeepers and accounting clerks	40.28
3117 Osteopaths and chiropractors	70.24	4133 Cashiers and tellers	28.31
3119 Health diagnosing and treating:n.e.c.	57.21	4135 Insurance,bank and other finance clerks	40.51
3130 Supervisors:nursing,therapy+rel.assis.	63.51	4137 Statistical clerks	41.79
3131 Nurses,regist.,grad.+nurses-in-train.	55.26	4139 Bookkeep.,account-record.+rel.:n.e.c.	40.23
3132 Orderlies	38.68	4140 Supervis.:office mach.+e.d.p.equ.oper.	51.16
3134 Registered nursing assistants	46.51	4141 Office machine operators	37.39
3135 Nursing attendants	33.60	4143 Electronic data-processing equip. oper.	41.93
3136 Audio and speech therapists	62.36	4150 Supervisors:mat. record.,sched.+dist.	44.50
3137 Physiotherapists	56.56	4151 Production clerks	43.11
3138 Occupational therapists	55.23	4153 Shipping and receiving clerks	34.11
3139 Nursing,therapy+rel. assisting:n.e.c.	40.44	4155 Stock clerks and related	35.46
3151 Pharmacists	64.39	4157 Weighers	32.07
3152 Dietitians and nutritionists	59.31	4159 Mater. recording,sched.,distrib.:n.e.c.	31.89
3153 Optometrists	79.63	4160 Superv.:library,file+corres. clerks+rel.	50.57
3154 Dispensing opticians	48.55	4161 Library and file clerks	34.85
3155 Radiolog. technologists+technicians	56.78	4169 Library,file and corres.clerks+rel.:n.e.c.	43.50
3156 Med lab. technologists+technicians	55.79	4170 Superv.:recep.,info.,mail+message dist.	46.46
3157 Denturists	59.02	4171 Receptionists and information clerks	35.04
3158 Dental hygienists+dental assistants	45.02	4172 Mail carriers	42.29
3161 Dental laboratory technicians	45.15	4173 Mail and postal clerks	38.15
3162 Respiratory technicians	59.05	4175 Telephone operators	33.25
3169 Other in medicine and health:n.e.c.	39.86	4177 Messengers	28.82
3311 Painters,sculptors and related artists	36.88	4179 Recep.,info.,mail+mes. distrib.:n.e.c.	34.90
3313 Product and interior designers	43.47	4190 Supervis.:other clerical+related:n.e.c.	47.88
3314 Advertising and illustrating artists	47.23	4191 Collectors	43.10
3315 Photographers and cameramen	44.66	4192 Claim adjusters	41.70
3319 Fine+com. art,phot.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	40.57	4193 Travel clerks,ticket,station, freight agen.	44.92
3330 Prod.+direct.,perf.+audio-vis. arts	57.04	4194 Hotel clerks	31.63
3331 Conductors,composers+arrangers	42.01	4195 Personnel clerks	45.22

4197 General office clerks	37.93	6191 Janitors, charworkers and cleaners	26.36
4199 Other clerical and related:n.e.c.	39.01	6193 Elevator-operating	32.21
5130 Supervisors:sales:commodities	41.01	6198 Labouring+oth. elemental:oth. serv.	21.24
5131 Technical sales and related advisers	57.89	6199 Other service:n.e.c.	27.60
5133 Commercial travellers	50.52	7113 Livestock farmers	29.59
5135 Sales clerks, salesp.:commod.:n.e.c.	30.93	7115 Crop farmers	31.32
5141 Street vendors+door-to-door sales	29.95	7119 Farmers:n.e.c.	27.92
5143 Newspaper carriers and vendors	17.81	7180 Fore./w:oth. farm.,hort.+ anim. husb.	38.95
5145 Service station attendants	21.47	7183 Livestock farm workers	25.36
5149 Sales:commodities:n.e.c.	29.16	7185 Crop farm workers	22.04
5170 Supervisors:sales:services	56.44	7195 Nursery and related workers	26.99
5171 Insurance sales	50.18	7196 I.t.g.+s.:other farm.,horticul.+anim. husb	25.71
5172 Real estate sales	49.99	7197 Farm machinery operators	23.76
5173 Sales agents+ traders:securities	58.62	7199 Other farming,horti.+animal husb.n.e.c.	23.34
5174 Advertising sales	47.26	7311 Captains+other officers:fishing vessels	36.35
5177 Business services sales	52.09	7313 Net,trap and line fishing	24.59
5179 Sales:services:n.e.c.	44.56	7315 Trapping and related	19.02
5190 Supervisors:other sales	44.32	7319 Fishing,trapping and related:n.e.c.	22.73
5191 Buyers,wholesale and retail trade	46.08	7510 Foremen/women:forestry and logging	45.16
5193 Route drivers	35.73	7511 Forestry conservationist	34.14
5199 Other sales:n.e.c.	32.84	7513 Timber cutting and related	25.23
6111 Fire-fighting	51.17	7516 Log inspecting,grading,scaling+rel.	44.19
6112 Police officers+detectives,gov't	58.78	7517 Log hoisting,sorting,moving+ rel.	34.57
6113 Police agents+investigators,private	46.60	7518 Labour.+oth. elemental:forestry, log.	25.34
6115 Guards and related security	31.95	7519 Forestry and logging:n.e.c.	32.30
6116 Commissioned officers,armed forces	62.19	7710 Forem/w:min.+quar. incl.oil+gas field	54.07
6117 Other ranks,armed forces	41.69	7711 Rotary well-drilling and related	42.43
6119 Protection service:n.e.c.	33.20	7713 Rock and soil-drilling	40.23
6120 Supervis.:food+bev. prep.+rel. serv.	34.64	7715 Blasting	40.43
6121 Chefs and cooks	25.56	7717 Min.+quarry.:cut.,handl.+loading	39.56
6123 Bartenders	29.24	7718 Lab.+oth. elem. min + quarry incl. oil+gas	34.73
6125 Food and beverage serving	23.31	7719 Min.&quarry. incl. oil&gas field:n.e.c.	40.74
6129 Food and bev. prep.+ rel. serv.:n.e.c.	26.52	8110 Foremen/women:mineral ore treating	51.56
6130 Supervis.:in lodging+oth. accom.	31.36	8111 Crushing and grinding:mineral ores	39.45
6133 Lodg. cleaners,except priv. househo.	21.37	8113 Mix.,separat.,filter.&rel.:mineral ores	42.59
6135 Sleeping-car and baggage porters	27.46	8115 Melting and roasting:mineral ores	43.35
6139 Lodging and other accom.:n.e.c.	26.13	8116 I.t.g.+s.:mineral ore treating	45.92
6141 Funeral directors,embalmers+ rel.	47.32	8118 Labour.+oth. element.:miner. ore treat.	37.94
6142 Housekeepers,servants and related	22.08	8119 Mineral ore treating:n.e.c.	40.81
6143 Barbers,hairstylists and related	35.62	8130 Foremen/women:metal processing+rel.	51.27
6144 Guides	32.87	8131 Metal smelting,converting and refining	40.30
6145 Travel+rel. attend.,exc. food+bev.	48.83	8133 Metal heat-treating	39.33
6147 Child-care occupations	23.70	8135 Metal rolling	41.18
6149 Personal service:n.e.c.	25.53	8137 Moulding,coremaking and metal casting	36.45
6160 Supervis.:apparel+furnishings ser.	34.28	8141 Metal extruding and drawing	36.41
6162 Laundering and dry cleaning	25.90	8143 Plating,metal spraying and related	33.89
6165 Pressing	24.49	8146 I.t.g.+s.:metal processing	44.50
6169 Apparel+furnishings service:n.e.c.	24.49	8148 Labouring&other elemental:metal proc.	36.06
6190 Supervisors:other service	37.46	8149 Metal processing and related:n.e.c.	38.29

8150 Forem./w:clay,glass+stone pro.,for.+rel	44.48	8261 Textile fibre preparing	29.13
8151 Furnacemen,kiln work.:clay,glass,stone	36.43	8263 Textile spinning and twisting	28.74
8153 Separ.,grind.,crush.,mix.:clay,glass,stone	34.81	8265 Textile winding and reeling	27.90
8155 Forming:clay,glass and stone	34.85	8267 Textile weaving	30.36
8156 I.t.g.+s.:clay,glass+stone process.+form	37.98	8271 Knitting	27.82
8158 Labour.+oth. elem.:clay,glass+stone process.+form.	31.45	8273 Textile bleaching and dyeing	32.29
8159 Clay,glass+stone proc.,form.+rel.:n.e.c.	36.07	8275 Textile finishing and calendering	29.16
8160 Forem./w:chem.,petrol,rubb., plast. +rel.mat.proc.	49.77	8276 I.t.g.+s.:textile processing	30.21
8161 Mixing,blending:chemicals&rel. mat.	36.19	8278 Labour+oth. elemental:textile proc.	27.40
8163 Filter.,strain.+separat.:chem.+rel.mat.	40.14	8279 Textile processing:n.e.c.	29.65
8165 Distill.,subl.+carbon.:chem.+rel.mat.	51.21	8290 Foremen/women:other processing	43.35
8167 Roasting,cook.,dry.:chem.+rel.mat.	39.76	8293 Tobacco processing	36.65
8171 Crushing,grinding:chem.+rel.mat.	34.69	8295 Hide and pelt processing	28.42
8173 Coating,calendering:chem.rel.mat.	32.40	8296 I.t.g.+s.:other processing	35.64
8176 I.t.g.+s:chem.,petrol.rubber,plast.+ el.mat.process.	43.64	8298 Labouring+other elemental:other proc.	28.78
8178 Labour.+oth.elem.:chemicals,petr.rub. plas.+rel.mat.proc.	32.50	8299 Other processing:n.e.c.	38.18
8179 Chem.,petrol.,rubber,plast.+rel.mat. process.n.e.c.	40.75	8310 Foremen/women:metal machining	50.89
8210 Foremen/w:food,bev.+rel. processing	41.92	8311 Tool and die making operations	48.15
8211 Flour and grain milling	34.77	8313 Machinist and machine tool setting-up	43.99
8213 Baking,confectionery making and rel.	30.55	8315 Machine tool operating	38.43
8215 Slaughtering,meat cut.,can.,cur.+pack.	33.82	8316 I.t.g.+s.:metal machining	42.47
8217 Fish canning,curing and packing	20.38	8319 Metal machining:n.e.c.	36.62
8221 Fruit+veg. canning,preserv.+pack.	23.18	8330 Forem./w:metal shap.,form.,exc. machin	49.19
8223 Milk processing and rel. occup.	37.03	8331 Forging	37.68
8225 Sugar processing and rel.	36.76	8333 Sheet metal workers	40.36
8226 I.t.g.+s.:food,beverage+rel. process.	34.09	8334 Metalworking-machine operators:n.e.c.	34.06
8227 Beverage processing and related	40.13	8335 Welding and flame cutting	41.42
8228 Lab.+oth. elem.:food,bev.+rel. proc.	24.92	8336 I.t.g.+s.:metal shap.,form.,exc. machining	43.19
8229 Food,beverage and rel. proc.:n.e.c.	32.32	8337 Boilermakers,platers+struct metal work	43.58
8230 Forem./w:wood proc.,exc. pulp+paper	44.20	8339 Metal shap.+form.,except mach.:n.e.c.	34.61
8231 Sawmill sawyers and related	33.71	8350 Foremen/women:wood machining	41.47
8233 Plywood making and related	34.66	8351 Wood patternmaking	42.52
8235 Wood treating	35.92	8353 Wood sawing and related:n.e.c.	30.68
8236 I.t.g.+s.:wood proc.,exc. pulp+paper	38.91	8355 Planing,turning,shaping+rel wood mach	31.62
8238 Labour.+oth. elem.:wood proc.,except pulp+paper	29.71	8356 I.t.g.+s.:wood machining	34.03
8239 Wood process.,exc. pulp+paper:n.e.c.	34.87	8357 Wood sanding	27.51
8250 Foremen/women:pulp+paper+rel.	52.46	8359 Wood machining:n.e.c.	31.82
8251 Cellulose pulp preparing	44.18	8370 Forem./w.:clay, glass, sto.+rel.mat. mach.	43.15
8253 Papermaking and finishing	43.92	8371 Cutting+shap.:clay,glass,stone+rel. mat	33.26
8256 I.t.g.+s.:pulp and papermaking	46.10	8373 Abra.+pol.:clay, glass, sto.+rel. mat.:n.e.c.	32.88
8258 Labour.+oth. elem. work:pulp+paper	39.32	8376 I.t.g.+s.:clay,glass,stone+rel. mat.mach.	36.21
8259 Pulp+papermaking and related:n.e.c.	39.74	8379 Clay,glass,stone+rel.mat. mach.:n.e.c.	35.01
8260 Foremen/women:textile processing	40.71	8390 Foremen/women:other mach+rel.:n.e.c.	46.88
		8391 Engravers,etchers and rel.:n.e.c.	32.27
		8393 Filing,grind.,buff.,clean.+polish.:n.e.c.	35.40
		8395 Patternmakers and mouldmakers:n.e.c.	42.82
		8396 I.t.g.+s.:other machining and related	33.55
		8399 Other machining and related:n.e.c.	32.48
		8510 Forem./w:fabr.+ assam.:metal prod.n.e.c.	49.97

8511 Engine+rel.equip. fab.+assam.:n.e.c.	36.00	8576 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assam.+repair.:rubber, plastics+rel.	36.98
8513 Motor vehicle fabricating+assam.:n.e.c.	36.86	8578 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.assam.+rep.: rubber, plastics+rel.	30.37
8515 Aircraft fabricating+assembling:n.e.c.	43.57	8579 Fab.,assam.+rep.:rubber,plas.+rel.n.e.c.	31.23
8523 Ind.,farm,const.+oth.make.equip.+mach.: fab.+assam:n.e.c.	36.35	8580 Foremen/w:mechan.+repairers:n.e.c.	48.51
8525 Bus.+ comm. mach. :fabric.+ assam. n.e.c.	35.56	8581 Motor vehicle:mechanics and repairers	39.19
8526 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.+assam.metal prod.n.e.c.	43.88	8582 Aircraft:mechanics and repairers	49.42
8527 Prec. instr.+rel.equip:fab.+assam.n.e.c.	36.24	8583 Rail transport equip.:mechan.+repair.	42.57
8528 Lab.+oth.el.fabri+assam.met. prodn.e.c.	31.03	8584 Indus.,farm+constr. mach.:mechan.+rep.	46.70
8529 Other fabric.+assam.:metal prod.:n.e.c.	33.83	8585 Bus.,comm. mach.:mechan.+rep.	48.13
8530 Fore./w.:fab.,ass.,inst.+rel.ele.+rel.eg.	50.36	8586 I.t.g.+s.:equipment repair:n.e.c.	43.87
8531 Elect.+rel. equip.:fabric.+assembl.	33.31	8587 Watch and clock:repairers	39.87
8533 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	48.14	8588 Precision instrument:make.+repairers	53.83
8534 Electronic+rel. equip.:fabric.+assam.	32.33	8589 Other mechanics and repairers:n.e.c.	38.25
8535 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	52.85	8590 Forem./w:oth prod:fab.,ass.+rep.:n.e.c.	42.99
8536 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assam.,inst.+rep:el., electron.+rel.eg.	42.52	8591 Jewelry,silverw.:fabric.,assam.+repair.	33.35
8537 Radio and television repairers	43.76	8592 Marine craft:fabricating,assam.+repair.	37.66
8538 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,ass.,i.,+r.:el. electron.+rel.eg.	29.59	8593 Paper product:fabricating + assembling	32.93
8539 Fab.,assemb.i.+r.:electric.,electron.+ rel. equip.:n.e.c.	34.62	8595 Painting and decorating:n.e.c.	33.30
8540 Forem./w:fabri.,assam.+rep.:wood prod	39.87	8596 I.t.g.+s.:other prod. fabric.,assam. +repair.	33.38
8541 Cabinet and wood furniture makers	32.57	8598 Labour.+oth.elem.:oth. prod.:fab., assam.+repair.	30.01
8546 I.t.g.+s.:fab.,ass.+repair.wood prod.	31.98	8599 Oth. prod.:fabricat.,assam.+repair.n.e.c.	30.36
8548 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,assam., +repair: wood products	27.61	8710 Foremen/w:excavat.,grading,paving+rel.	42.54
8549 Fab.,assam.+repair.:wood prod.:n.e.c.	29.04	8711 Excavating,grading and related	35.29
8550 Forem./w.:fab.,assam.+repair.:textile, fur+leather prod.	34.53	8713 Paving,surfacing and related	30.71
8551 Patternmaking,marking+cutting:textile fur+leather prod.	30.32	8715 Railway section and track workers	32.64
8553 Tailors and dressmakers	28.52	8718 Lab.+oth.elem.:excav.,grad.,pav.+rel.	28.33
8555 Furriers	28.91	8719 Excav.,grading,paving and rel.:n.e.c.	37.36
8557 Milliners,hat and cap makers	22.71	8730 Forem./w:el.pow.,light.+wire com. eg. erecting,i.+rep.	57.39
8561 Shoemaking and repairing	25.37	8731 Electrical power line workers and rel.	51.09
8562 Upholsterers	31.22	8733 Construction electrician and repair.	47.94
8563 Sewing mach. oper.:textile+similar mat.	25.00	8735 Wire comm.+rel. equip.:install.+rep.	50.71
8566 Itg.+s.:fabric.,assam.,+repair:textile, fur+leather	26.78	8736 I.t.g.+s.:el.power,light.+wire comm eg.erecting,i.+rep.	53.53
8568 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,assam,+repair: text.,fur+leather	24.81	8738 Labour.+oth.el.:el.power,light.+wire comm.eg.:er.i.+rep.	36.61
8569 Fabric.assam.+repair.:text.,fur+leath.	26.36	8739 El.power,light.+wire comm.eg.: erecting, ins.+rep: n.e.c.	47.31
8570 Foremen/w:fab.,assam.+repair.:rubber, plastics+rel.	42.59	8780 Foremen/women:other constr. trades	44.75
8571 Bond.,cement.:rubber,plastics+rel. prod	33.27	8781 Carpenters and related	34.86
8573 Moulding:rubber,plastics+ rel. prod.	30.45	8782 Brick and stone masons+tile setters	36.21
8575 Cut., finish.rubber,plastics+rel. prod.	31.37	8783 Concrete finishing and related	33.46
		8784 Plasterers and related	34.15
		8785 Painters,paperhangers and related	31.94
		8786 Insulating:construction	34.34

8787 Roofing,waterproofing and related	29.83	9539 Station. eng.+util. eg.:oper.+rel.:n.e.c.	47.63
8791 Pipefitting,plumbing and related	45.04	9550 Forem/w.:elect.+rel.com.eg.:oper.:n.e.c.	57.85
8793 Structural metal erectors	40.78	9551 Radio+tel. broadcas. equip. operators	50.27
8795 Glaziers	35.07	9553 Telegraph operators	44.38
8796 I.t.g.+s.:other construction trades	48.79	9555 Sound+video record.+repr. equip. oper	49.49
8798 Lab.+oth. elemen.:oth.const. trades	28.13	9557 Motion picture projectionists	43.65
8799 Other construction trades:n.e.c.	33.43	9559 Oth. elec.+rel. com.equip.:oper.:n.e.c.	45.78
9110 Foremen/w:air transport operating	58.01	9590 Foremen/w:oth. crafts+equ.:oper.:n.e.c.	50.82
9111 Air pilots,navigat.+flight engineers	64.07	9591 Photographic processing	37.19
9113 Air transport operating support	53.64	9599 Other crafts and equipment:oper.:n.e.c.	44.12
9119 Air transport operating:n.e.c.	45.16	9910 Supervisors and foremen/women:n.e.c.	48.27
9130 Foremen/w:railway transp. operat.	48.23	9916 Inspect.,test.,grading+sampling:n.e.c.	42.68
9131 Locomotive operating	49.25	9919 Oth. occup.:not elsewhere classified	34.90
9133 Conductors+brake workers:railway	44.28	9921 Labour.+other elemental:manu.	28.97
9135 Railway transp. operating support	42.87	9922 Labour.+oth. elemental:trans.+comm.	31.28
9139 Railway transp. operating:n.e.c.	37.35	9923 Labour.+other elemental:trade	23.41
9151 Deck officers:ship	56.36	9924 Labour.+other elemental:service	21.26
9153 Engineering officers:ship	55.32	9925 Labour.+oth. elem.:public admin.+def.	26.16
9155 Deck crew:ship	36.31	9926 Labour.+other elemental:other indus.	24.11
9157 Engine and boiler-room crew:ship	38.48		
9159 Water transport operating:n.e.c.	37.15		
9170 Foremen/w:motor transport oper.	40.79		
9171 Bus drivers	34.93		
9173 Taxi drivers and chauffeurs	30.92		
9175 Truck drivers	34.45		
9179 Motor transport operating:n.e.c.	36.04		
9190 Foremen/w:oth. transp. equip. oper.	47.31		
9191 Subway+street railway operating	45.62		
9193 Rail vehicle oper.,exc. rail transport	40.79		
9199 Other transport equip. oper.:n.e.c.	31.93		
9310 Foremen/w:mat. handl.+rel.:n.e.c.	42.33		
9311 Hoisting:n.e.c.	40.73		
9313 Longsho. work.,stevedo.+frei. handl.	32.59		
9314 Parcel carriers:n.e.c.	21.86		
9315 Material handling equip. oper.:n.e.c.	35.21		
9317 Packaging:n.e.c.	25.79		
9318 Labour.+oth. elem.:mat. handl.+rel.	28.56		
9319 Other material handling+rel.:n.e.c.	31.99		
9510 Foremen/women:printing+related	46.36		
9511 Typesetting and composing	42.35		
9512 Printing press	40.66		
9513 Stereotyping and electrotyping	36.43		
9514 Print.,engrav.,exc. photo-engraving	48.79		
9515 Photo-engraving and related	44.92		
9517 Bookbinding and related	30.30		
9518 Labouring+other elemental:printing+ rel.	26.37		
9519 Printing and related:n.e.c.	31.69		
9530 Forem./w.:stat. engine+util.eg.oper.+rel.	56.59		
9531 Power station operators	54.46		



CPSB6 See TV Commercials For A Political Party  
 CPSB7 Hear RadioCommercials For PoliticalParty  
 CPSB8 Talked About Election With Friends/Rels  
 CPSB8A Talked About Election With Other People  
 CPSB8B Disagreed With People You Talked With  
 CPSB9 Satisfaction>Way Democracy WorksInCanada  
 CPSB10A Elected To Parliament Lose Touch People  
 CPSB10B People Like Me NotHave Say What Gov Does  
 CPSB10C Politics&Government Seem So Complicated  
 CPSB10D Not Think Gov't Cares What People Think  
 CPSB10E Politicians Ready To Lie To Get Elected

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION C: PERSONAL FINANCES AND THE ECONOMY

Name Label

CPSC1 Better/Worse Off Financially Than Yr Ago  
 CPSC1A Much/Somewhat Better Off Than Year Ago  
 CPSC1B Much/Somewhat Worse Off Than Year Ago  
 CPSC2 Better/Worse Off Financially Yr From Now  
 CPSC2A Much/Somewhat Better Off Year From Now  
 CPSC2B Much/Somewhat Worse Off Year From Now  
 CPSC3 Policies Of Federal Government Made You:  
 CPSC4 Policies Provincial Government Made You:  
 CPSC5 Unemployment Since Liberals CameToPower  
 CPSC6 Next Few Years Unemployment Will Go Up

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION D: LEADER AND PARTY EVALUATION

Name Label

CPSDR1 How Much Know About> Jean Chrétien  
 CPSDR2 How Much Know About> Jean Charest  
 CPSDR3 How Much Know About> Alexa McDonough  
 CPSDR4 How Much Know About> Preston Manning  
 CPSDR5 How Much Know About> Gilles Duceppe  
 CPSD1A Rating> Jean Charest  
 CPSD1B Rating> Jean Chrétien  
 CPSD1C Rating> Alexa McDonough  
 CPSD1D Rating> Preston Manning  
 CPSD1E Rating> Gilles Duceppe <Que Only>  
 CPSD1G Rating> Federal Conservative Party  
 CPSD1H Rating> Federal Liberal Party  
 CPSD1I Rating> Federal New Democratic Party  
 CPSD1J Rating> Reform Party  
 CPSD1K Rating> Bloc Quebecois  
 CPSD1L Rating> Politicians In General  
 CPSD1F Rating> Brian Mulroney  
 CPSD1N Rating> Lucien Bouchard

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION E: PLACEMENTS

Name Label

CPSE1A Cut Taxes=CutSocialPgms/ Increase=Improve  
 CPSE1B Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1C Increase Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1D Liberal Party Wants To Cut Taxes  
 CPSE1E Liberals Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1F Liberals Increase Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1G Conservatives Want To Cut Taxes  
 CPSE1H Conservatives Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1I Conservatives Increase Taxes>By How Much  
 CPSE1J New Democratic Party Wants To Cut Taxes  
 CPSE1K NDP Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1L NDP Increase Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1M Reform Party Wants To Cut Taxes  
 CPSE1N Reform Party Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1O Reform Party Increase Taxes> By How Much

CPSE1P Bloc Quebecois Wants To Cut Taxes  
 CPSE1Q Bloc Quebecois Cut Taxes> By How Much  
 CPSE1R Bloc Quebecois Increase Taxes>By How Much  
 CPSE3A How Much Should Be Done For Quebec  
 CPSE3B More Done For Quebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3C More Done For Quebec> How Much Less  
 CPSE3D How Much Liberals Want To Do For Quebec  
 CPSE3E Liberals Do For Quebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3F Liberals Do For Quebec> How Much Less  
 CPSE3G How Much Conservatives WantDo For Quebec  
 CPSE3H Conservatives DoForQuebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3I Conservatives DoForQuebec> How Much Less  
 CPSE3J How Much NDP Want To Do For Quebec  
 CPSE3K NDP Do For Quebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3L NDP Do For Quebec> How Much Less  
 CPSE3M How Much Reform Party WantsDo For Quebec  
 CPSE3N Reform Party Do ForQuebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3O Reform Party Do ForQuebec> How Much Less  
 CPSE3P How Much BlocQuebecois WantDo For Quebec  
 CPSE3Q BlocQuebecois DoForQuebec> How Much More  
 CPSE3R BlocQuebecois DoForQuebec> How Much Less

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION F: POLICY I

Name Label

CPSF1 How Much ShldBeDoneFor Racial Minorities

CPSF2 Only Married People Be Having Children  
 CPSF3 Better Off Women StayedHome WithChildren  
 CPSF4 Not Much Any Gov DoTo Solve Unemployment  
 CPSF5 Maintain Social Pgms=Eliminate Deficit  
 CPSF6 Gov Leave To Private Sector Create Jobs  
 CPSF7 Liberals Elected To Do In 1993  
 CPSF8 Best Way To Fight Unemployment  
 CPSF10A Liberals> Preserving National Unity  
 CPSF10B Liberals> Reducing The Deficit  
 CPSF10C Liberals> Creating Jobs  
 CPSF10D Liberals> Keeping Election Promises  
 CPSF10E Liberals> Defending Interests Quebec  
 CPSF10F Liberals> Fighting Crime  
 CPSF10G Liberals> Protecting Social Programs  
 CPSF11 Job By Reform Party In Parliament  
 CPSF12 Job By Bloc Quebecois In Parliament  
 CPSF13 Party PromisingTo Lower Income Taxes 10%  
 CPSF14 Promising Cut UnemploymentInHalf By 2001  
 CPSF15 Party Against Quebec As Distinct Society

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION G: NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Name Label

CPSG1 Over The Past Year Canada's Economy  
 CPSG1A Federal Policies=Canada's Economy Better  
 CPSG1B Federal Policies=Canada's Economy Worse  
 CPSG2 Over The Past Year <Prov>'s Economy  
 CPSG2A Federal Policies <Prov>'s Economy Better  
 CPSG2B Federal Policies <Prov>'s Economy Worse  
 CPSG3A Next 12 Months Canada's Economy  
 CPSG3B Next 12 Months <Prov>'s Economy

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION H: LEADER TRAITS - RANDOMIZE ORDER OF LEADERS

Name Label

CPSH1A Describe> Charest> Strong Leader  
 CPSH1B Describe> Charest> Trustworthy  
 CPSH1C Describe> Charest> Arrogant  
 CPSH1D Describe> Charest> Compassionate

CPSH1E Describe> Charest> In Touch With Times  
 CPSH2A Describe> Chrétien> Strong Leader  
 CPSH2B Describe> Chrétien> Trustworthy  
 CPSH2C Describe> Chrétien> Arrogant  
 CPSH2D Describe> Chrétien> Compassionate  
 CPSH2E Describe> Chrétien> In Touch With Times  
 CPSH3A Describe> McDonough> Strong Leader  
 CPSH3B Describe> McDonough> Trustworthy  
 CPSH3C Describe> McDonough> Arrogant  
 CPSH3D Describe> McDonough> Compassionate  
 CPSH3E Describe> McDonough> In Touch With Times  
 CPSH4A Describe> Manning> Strong Leader  
 CPSH4B Describe> Manning> Trustworthy  
 CPSH4C Describe> Manning> Arrogant  
 CPSH4D Describe> Manning> Compassionate  
 CPSH4E Describe> Manning> In Touch With Times  
 CPSH5A Describe> Duceppe> Strong Leader  
 CPSH5B Describe> Duceppe> Trustworthy  
 CPSH5C Describe> Duceppe> Arrogant  
 CPSH5D Describe> Duceppe> Compassionate  
 CPSH5E Describe> Duceppe> In Touch With Times

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION I: PARTY CHANCES -  
 RANDOMIZE ORDER OF PARTIES

Name	Label
CPSI1A	PC Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSI1B	Lib Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSI1C	NDP Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSI1D	Reform Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSI1E	Bloc Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSI2A	PC Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSI2B	Lib Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSI2C	NDP Chances> Winning In Whole Country

CPSI2D	Reform Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSI2E	Bloc Chances>Majority Of Seats In Quebec
CPSI3A	Lib Chances> Forming Official Opposition
CPSI3B	PC Chances> Forming Official Opposition
CPSI3C	NDP Chances> Forming Official Opposition
CPSI3D	Reform Chances> Form Official Opposition
CPSI3E	Bloc Chances>Forming Official Opposition

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
 SECTION J: POLICY II

Name	Label
CPSJ1A	Party Best At> Preserving National Unity
CPSJ1B	Party Best At> Creating Jobs
CPSJ1C	Party Best At> Cutting Taxes
CPSJ1D	Party Best At> Keeping Promises
CPSJ1E	Party Best At>Defending Interests Quebec
CPSJ1F	Party Best At> Protecting Social Pgms
CPSJ1G	Party Best At> Fighting Crime
CPSJ2	1993 Campaign> Liberals Promise No GST
CPSJ2B	Liberals Really Try Keep GST Promise
CPSJ2C	Liberals Not Try Keep Promise, How Feel
CPSJ3	Quebec Be Recognized As Distinct Society
CPSJ3C	Change Mind If Distinct Keeps Quebec Can
CPSJ3A	Favourable To Quebec Sovereignty <Que>
CPSJ4	How Likely That Quebec Will Separate
CPSJ4A	Possibility Of Separation Worry You
CPSJ5	Gap Between Rich And Poor In Canada
CPSJ5A	Gap Between Rich And Poor Increased
CPSJ6	Federal Spending Cuts Been Fair/Unfair
CPSJ7	Who Has Been Hardest Hit By SpendingCuts
CPSJ9	Aboriginal Peoples Compared Other Cdns
CPSJ10	Federal Spending For Aboriginal Peoples
CPSJ18	Canada Should Admit More Immigrants
CPSJ19	Think Pollution In Canada Has Got Worse
CPSJ20	Think That Crime In Canada Has Gone Up
CPSJ21	Deal With Young Offenders=Violent Crime
CPSJ12	Federal Gov Treat <Prov> As Other Parts
CPSJ13	Political Parties Keep Election Promises
CPSJ14	Have You Heard About The Somalia Affair
CPSJ14A	How Federal Gov't Handled Somalia Affair
CPSJ15	Gov's Decision Hold Election AtThis Time

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
SECTION K: PARTY IDENTIFICATION AND  
VOTE HISTORY

Name	Label
CPSK1	Federal Politics Think Of Self As<Party>
CPSK2	How Strongly <Federal Party> Do You Feel
CPSK3	A Little Closer To One Federal Party
CPSK4	Which Federal Party Closer To
CPSK5	Vote In Last Federal Election - 1993
CPSK6	Party Voted For> Last Federal Election
CPSK13	Provincial Election Held Today, Vote For:
CPSK14	Provincial Party Leaning Toward
CPSK15	Vote In Quebec Referendum On Sovereignty
CPSK16	Vote Yes Or No In 1995 Quebec Referendum

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
SECTION L: DEBATE

Name	Label
CPSL1	See English TV Debate Among Party Leaders
CPSL1A	See All Of The English TV Debate
CPSL1B	Which Party Leader Did Best In TV Debate
CPSL1C	Which Party Leader Did Worst In TV Debate
CPSL2	See French TV Debate Among Party Leaders
CPSL2A	See All Of The French TV Debate
CPSL2B	Which Party Leader Did Best In TV Debate
CPSL2C	Which Party Leader Did Worst In TV Debate
CPSL3	Past Week> See/Hear Polls How Well Doing
CPSL4	Where Get Most Information Re Election
CPSL5	Most Important Source Of Election Info
CPSL6	Recall The Name Of The President Of USA

CPSL11	Recall Name> Federal Minister Finance
CPSL12	Recall Name> Premier Of <Province/Terr>
CPSL13	Recall Name> First Woman PM Of Canada

CAMPAIGN PERIOD  
SECTION M: BACKGROUND

Name	Label
CPSAGE	Respondent's Year Of Birth
CPSM2	Respondent's Marital Status
CPSM3	Highest Level Of Education Completed
CPSM4	Present Employment Status
CPSM4A	<If CPSM4=4,5,6,7> Main Income Earner
CPSM6	Occupation <Stats Canada 1980 CCDO Code>
CPSM7	Work For Private Firm/Public/ Government
CPSM7A	Work For Federal/Provincial Government
CPSM8	Out Of Work/Laid Off During Last Year
CPSM8A	Worried About Job In The Near Future
CPSM9	Do You/Hhld Member Belong To A Union
CPSM10	Religious Affiliation
CPSM10A	Church Or Denomination
CPSM11	Respondent's Country Of Birth
CPSM12	Year Come To Live In Canada
CPSM13	To What Ethnic Or Cultural Group Belong
CPSM14	Language Usually Speak At Home
CPSM15	Language First Learned&Still Understand
CPSM16	Total Household Income <Thousands>
CPSM16A	Total Household Income <Category>
CPSM17	# Of Children Under 18 Live In Home
CPSM18	R Have Long-Term Disability/Handicap
CPSM19	Long-Term Disability/Handicap Affect:
CPSKNOW	R's General Level Of Knowledge&Info
POSTCODE	Postal Code <Forward Sortation Area>
BLISH81R	Occupation:Respondent> Blishen 1981 SES
PINPORR	Respondent> Pineo-Porter 1981 Category

WEIGHT VARIABLES

Name	Label
CPSHHWGT	Household Weight - CES Campaign

CPSPWGT1 Provincial Weight <All> - CES  
Campaign  
CPSPWGT2 Provincial Weight <No PQ> - CES  
Campaign  
CPSNWGT1 National Weight <All> - CES  
Campaign  
CPSNWGT2 National Weight <No PQ> - CES  
Campaign

PESRN9 Question Order/Random  
Delivery<E6A--E6G>  
PESRN3 Question Wording <E11B>  
PESRGEN Respondent's Gender

POST ELECTION  
SECTION A: THE VOTE

POST ELECTION: FRONT END VARIABLES

Name	Label
PESAMP	Day Of Sample Release
PESREP	Sample Subsets <Replicate>
PESTIME	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
PESRES	Outcome Of Interview
PESATTEM	Total Number Of Call Attempts
PESCONT	Total Times Respondent Contacted
PESANS	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
PESREFUS	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
PESDATE	Date Of Interview <MMDDYY>
PESINUM	Interviewer's Number (# Of Interviews)
PESIGEN	Interviewer's Gender (# Of Interviews)
PESLANG	Language Of Interview
PESRN12	Question Order/Random Delivery <A2A,A2B>
PESRN2	Question Order/Random Delivery <A4C,A4D>
PESRN10	Question Order/Random Delivery<E5A--E5C>
PESRN11	Question Order/Random Delivery<E7A,E7B>
PESRN4	Question Order/Random Delivery <F14A,F14B>
PESRN16	Question Order/Random Delivery <H1-5H10-14>
PESRN14	Question Order/Random Delivery<I5A--I5F>
PESRN5	Randomize Party Leaders <C1A--C1E>
PESRN6	Randomize Federal Parties <C2A--C2E>
PESRN8	Randomize Parties In Riding <C3A--C3E>

Name	Label
PESA1	Most Important Issue To You Personally
PESA2A	Did You Vote In The Election
PESA2B	<Democracy> Did You Vote In Election
PESA3	Particular Reason Why You Did Not Vote
PESA4	Which Party Did You Vote For
PESA4A	Your Preference For The <Voted> Party
PESA4B	Which Party Was Your Second Choice
PESA4C	When Decide You Were Going To Vote<Party>
PESA4D	When Decide You Were Going To Vote<Party>
PESA5B	Satisfaction> Way Democracy Works Canada
PESA6	Having Reform As The Official Opposition
PESA7A	Conservatives And Reform Joined Together
PESA8	What Have The Liberals Been Elected ToDo

POST ELECTION  
SECTION B: INTEREST AND MEDIA

Name	Label
PESB1	Attention Paid>News About Election On TV
PESB2	Attention Paid>Election News In Newspaper
PESB3	Attention Paid>Election News On The Radio
PESB4	How Rate Interest In Election Campaign
PESB5	Talked About Election With Friends/Rel
PESB6	Talked About Election With Other People

POST ELECTION  
SECTION C: LEADER, PARTY, CANDIDATE  
EVALUATION

Name	Label
PESDR1	How Much Know About> Jean Chrétien
PESDR2	How Much Know About> Jean Charest
PESDR3	How Much Know About> Alexa McDonough
PESDR4	How Much Know About> Preston Manning
PESDR5	How Much Know About> Gilles Duceppe
PESFLAG1	Party Leader Randomization
PESC1A	Rating> Jean Charest
PESC1B	Rating> Jean Chrétien
PESC1C	Rating> Alexa McDonough
PESC1D	Rating> Preston Manning
PESC1E	Rating> Gilles Duceppe <Que Only>
PESFLAG2	Political Party Randomization
PESC2A	Rating> Federal Conservative Party
PESC2B	Rating> Federal Liberal Party
PESC2C	Rating> Federal New Democratic Party
PESC2D	Rating> Reform Party
PESC2E	Rating> Bloc Quebecois
PESC2F	Rating> Politicians In General
PESC3A	Rating> Conservative Candidate
PESC3B	Rating> Liberal Candidate
PESC3C	Rating> NDP Candidate
PESC3D	Rating> Reform Candidate <ROC Only>
PESC3E	Rating> Bloc Candidate <Que Only>
PESC4	Rating> Paul Martin
PESC5	Rating> Provincial Premier
PESC6	Rating> Pierre Elliott Trudeau

POST ELECTION  
SECTION E: POLICY

Name	Label
PESE6A	Cut Spending> Defence
PESE6B	Cut Spending> Welfare
PESE6C	Cut Spending> Pensions/Old Age Security

PESE6D	Cut Spending> Health Care
PESE6E	Cut Spending> Unemployment Insurance
PESE6F	Cut Spending> Education
PESE6G	Cut Spending> Aid Developing Countries
PESE3	How Much Power Think Unions Should Have
PESE2	How Much Should Be Done For Business
PESE1	How Much Should Be Done For Women
PESE4	Canada's Ties With The United States
PESE5A	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE5B	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE5C	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE7A	Opinion> Government Services <PESRN11>
PESE7B	Opinion> Government Services <PESRN11>
PESE9A	Last Five Years, Quality Of Education
PESE9B	Quality Of Education How Much Worse
PESE9C	Last Five Years, Quality Of Health Care
PESE9D	Quality Of Health Care How Much Worse
PESE9E	Most Responsible For Cuts To Health Care
PESE10	Favourable To Quebec Sovereignty <Que>
PESE11B	Likely Canada Become Part Of U.S. <ROC>
PESE10A	Standard Of Living If Quebec Separates
PESE10B	Standard Of Living How Much Better
PESE10C	Standard Of Living How Much Worse
PESE10D	French Language Threatened In Quebec
PESE10E	Que Separates, French Language In Quebec
PESE10F	Language Situation How Much Better
PESE10G	Language Situation How Much Worse
PESE11D	Que Separates, Close Economic Union Canada
PESE12	Only Police & Military Allowed Have Guns
PESE13	Capital Punishment Is Never Justified
PESE15	Politicians Ready To Lie To Get Elected
PESE16	Gov Accepts High Level Unemploy=Defeated
PESE18	Everyone Should Be Forced Retire At 65
PESE28	Issues That Matter To Women Not Discussed

PESE25 Good Thing Canada&USA Become  
One Country  
PESE19 Not Get Ahead, Blame Self, Not System  
PESE20 Businesses Make Money, Everyone  
Benefits  
PESE21 Trust Down-To-Earth People Than  
Experts  
PESE22 Party Promised Lower Personal Tax 10  
%  
PESE23 Party Promised Cut Unemployment In  
Half  
PESE29 Party Said All Provinces Treated  
Equally  
PESE30 What Meant By Provinces Treated  
Equally  
PESE24 Party Against Quebec As Distinct  
Society

POST ELECTION  
SECTION F: COLLECTIVITIES

Name	Label
PESF1	Rating> How Feel About Big Business
PESF2	Rating> How Do You Feel About Unions
PESF3	Rating> How Do You Feel About Feminists
PESF5	Rating> How Feel About People On Welfare
PESF6	Rating>How Feel About Aboriginal Peoples
PESF7	Rating> How Do You Feel About The Police
PESF8	Rating> How Feel About Racial Minorities
PESF9	Rating>How Do You Feel About Babyboomers
PESF10	Rating> How Feel About Gays & Lesbians
PESF11A	Rating> How Do You Feel About Canada
PESF11B	Rating> How Do You Feel About Province
PESF12	Rating> How Do You Feel About Quebec
PESF13	Rating> How Feel About The United States

PESF14A Government Looks After People  
<PESRN4>  
PESF14B Government Looks After People  
<PESRN4>

POST ELECTION  
SECTION H: PARTY IDENTIFICATION AND  
VOTE HISTORY

Name	Label
PESH1	Federal Politics Think Of Self As<Party>
PESH2	How Strongly <Federal Party> Do You Feel
PESH3	A Little Closer To One Federal Party
PESH4	Which Federal Party Closer To
PESH5	Federal Politics Close To Any Party
PESH6	Which Federal Party Close To
PESH7	Do You Feel How Close To <Federal Party>
PESH8	Feel A Little Closer To One Party
PESH9	Which Party Feel A Little Closer To
PESH21	Federal Political Party Too Extreme
PESH10	Prov Politics Think Of Self As <Party>
PESH11	How Strongly <Prov Party> Do You Feel
PESH12	A Little Closer To One Provincial Party
PESH13	Which Provincial Party Closer To
PESH14	Provincial Politics Close To Any Party
PESH15	Which Provincial Party Close To
PESH16	Do You Feel How Close To <Prov Party>
PESH17	Feel A Little Closer To One Party
PESH18	Which Party Feel A Little Closer To
PESH19	Vote In The Last Provincial Election
PESH20	Party Voted For>Last Provincial Election
PESA5	Vote Federal Elections If Unable On Day
PESA5A	How Vote Fed Election If Unable On Day-1
PESA5A2	How Vote Fed Election If Unable On Day-2
PESA5A3	How Vote Fed Election If Unable On Day-3

POST ELECTION  
SECTION I: MEDIA HABITS

Name	Label
PESI1	# Hours A Day Usually Watch TV
PESI2	Do You Watch Canadian Stations
PESI3	# Hours A Day Listen To The Radio
PESI4	# Days A Week Read A Newspaper
PESB7	See English TV Debate Among

Party Leaders  
 PESB7A See All Of The English TV Debate  
 PESB7B Which Leader Did Best In English Debate  
 PESB7C Which Leader Did Worst In English Debate  
 PESB8 See First French TV Debate (May 13)  
 PESB8A See All Of First French TV Debate  
 PESB8B Who Did The Best In First French Debate  
 PESB8C Who Did The Worst In First French Debate  
 PESB9 See Second French TV Debate (May 19)  
 PESB9B Who Did The Best In Second French Debate  
 PESB9C Who Did The Worst In Second French Debate  
 PESE21A Chrétien Betrayed Quebec Constitutional  
 PESE21C Reform Party Only Speaks For The West  
 PESE21D Charest Has Style, But Not Much To Say  
 PESE21E Manning Is Threat To Canadian Unity  
 PESE21F NDP Is Out Of Touch With The Times  
 PESE21G No Reason Sovereignist Party In Ottawa  
 PESE21H Best Way Defend West=Elect Reform Mps  
 PESE21J Jean Charest Was A One Man Show  
 PESE21K Jean Charest Too Close To Brian Mulroney  
 PESE27 QueSeparates,Canada Close Economic Union  
 PESI5A Four Goals> Most Important <PESRN14>  
 PESI5B Four Goals> Next Most Important To You  
 PESI5C Four Goals> Least Most Important To You  
 PESI5D Four Goals> Most Important <PESRN14>  
 PESI5E Four Goals> Next Most Important To You  
 PESI5F Four Goals> Least Most Important To You

POST ELECTION  
 SECTION M: BACKGROUND

Name	Label
PESAGE	Respondent's Year Of Birth
PESM10B	In Your Life, Importance Of Religion
PESM12	Respondent's Province/Territory Of Birth
PESM20	# Of Years Lived In <Province/Territory>

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
 SECTION A

Name	Label
MBSQLANG	Language Of Questionnaire
MBSA1	Gone Too Far In Pushing Equal Rights
MBSA2	Be More Tolerant People Choose Standards
MBSA3	Lay Off Women Whose Husbands Have Jobs
MBSA4	Gov Do More Reduce Income Gap Rich&Poor
MBSA5	Difficult Women Get Jobs Equal Abilities
MBSA6	Protect Env. More Imp Than Creating Jobs
MBSA7	NewerLifestyles Contrib BreakdownSociety
MBSA8	Change=Adapt Our View Of Moral Behaviour
MBSA9	Fewer Problems=Traditional Family Values
MBSA10	Not Big Problem Some Have More Chance
MBSA11	Look After Cdns BornHere First,Others2nd
MBSA12	People Really Want Work, Can Find A Job
MBSA13	Tough For Young Because Of Babyboomers
MBSA14	Minority Groups Need Special Rights
MBSA15	DoMore Protect Cdn Business From Foreign

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION B

Name	Label
MBSB1	Government Should <Standard Of Living>:
MBSB2	Government Should <Environment>:
MBSB3	Workers And Management <Conflict>:
MBSB4	When It Comes To Job Hiring <Quotas>:
MBSB5	Closer To Your View <People On Welfare>:
MBSB6	People In Government <Waste Tax Money>:

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION C

Name	Label
MBSC1A	Influence Has> Unions
MBSC2A	Influence Has> Farmers
MBSC3A	Influence Has> Big Business
MBSC4A	Influence Has> Media
MBSC5A	Influence Has> Public Sector Workers
MBSC6A	Influence Has> Banks
MBSC7A	Influence Has> Consumers
MBSC8A	Influence Has> Feminists
MBSC9A	Influence Has> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC10A	Influence Has> Racial Minorities
MBSC11A	Influence Has> People On Welfare
MBSC12A	Influence Has> Small Business
MBSC13A	Influence Has> Senior Citizens
MBSC14A	Influence Has> Gays And Lesbians
MBSC15A	Influence Has> Babyboomers
MBSC16A	Influence Has> Environmentalists
MBSC1B	Influence ShldHave> Unions
MBSC2B	Influence ShldHave> Farmers
MBSC3B	Influence ShldHave> Big Business
MBSC4B	Influence ShldHave> Media
MBSC5B	Influence ShldHave>Public Sector Workers
MBSC6B	Influence ShldHave> Banks
MBSC7B	Influence ShldHave> Consumers
MBSC8B	Influence ShldHave> Feminists

MBSC9B	Influence ShldHave> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC10B	Influence ShldHave> Racial Minorities
MBSC11B	Influence ShldHave> People On Welfare
MBSC12B	Influence ShldHave> Small Business
MBSC13B	Influence ShldHave> Senior Citizens
MBSC14B	Influence ShldHave> Gays And Lesbians
MBSC15B	Influence ShldHave> Babyboomers
MBSC16B	Influence ShldHave> Environmentalists

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION D

Name	Label
MBSD1	Most People Not Know What Best For Them
MBSD2	People Have Sense Tell Gov't Do Good Job
MBSD3	Solve National Prob=GrassRoots Decisions
MBSD4	Gov ShldPay Most Attention Well-Informed
MBSD5	All Federal Parties Basically The Same
MBSD6	Parties Spend TooMuch Time Re Minorities
MBSD7	Gone Too Far Pushing Bilingualism
MBSD8	Protect Women's Interests=More In Parlia
MBSD9	Profits Cdn Banks Making Are A Scandal
MBSD10	Unemployed Move To Regions Where Jobs
MBSD11	International Trade Creates More Jobs
MBSD12	Immigrants Make Important Contribution

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION E

Name	Label
MBSE1	Your Opinion> Treatment Of People:
MBSE2	Your Opinion> The Feminist Movement:
MBSE3	More Important In Democratic Society:
MBSE4	Your View> Equality Of Men & Women:
MBSE5	Law Conflicts Charter, Have Final Say:
MBSE6	Your View> Marital Violence:
MBSE7	Feminist Movement Encourages Women:
MBSE8	Your View> Aboriginal Peoples:
MBSE9	Think That> People Running Gov Crooked

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION F

Name	Label
MBSF1	Confidence> Organised Religion
MBSF2	Confidence> The Armed Forces
MBSF3	Confidence> Public Schools
MBSF4	Confidence> The Courts
MBSF5	Confidence> The Civil Service
MBSF6	Confidence> Unions
MBSF7	Confidence> The Police
MBSF8	Confidence> The Federal Government
MBSF9	Confidence> Provincial/Terr Government
MBSF10	Confidence> Big Business
MBSF11	Confidence> The Media

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION G

Name	Label
MBSG1	Participate Peacekeeping Even If Risk
MBSG2	Respect For Authority Children ShldLearn
MBSG3	Homosexual Couples Allowed Legally Marry
MBSG4	Too Many Recent Immigrants Not Want Fit
MBSG5	Caring For Children, Men Less Patient
MBSG6	Anglos In Que Better Treated Fr In ROC
MBSG7	Quebec Has Right To Separate
MBSG8	Quebec Separates,Aboriginals Remain Part
MBSG9	Have Right To Work In Region Where Born
MBSG10	Free Trade With U.S. Has Been Good

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION H

Name	Label
MBSH1	Political Parties/Cands Spend MuchAsWant
MBSH2	YourView>Allowed AdvertiseDuringCampaign

MBSH3	Limit Individuals/Groups Spending On Ads
MBSH4	Individuals/Groups Can Advertise, Spend:
MBSH5	Referendums On Important Questions Held:
MBSH6	Have Referendums Same Time As Elections
MBSH7	Win Majority Seats W/O Majority Of Votes

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION I

Name	Label
MBSI1	Satisfaction Way Democracy Works Canada
MBSI2	Last Election In Canada Conducted Fairly
MBSI3	Think Of Self As Close To PoliticalParty
MBSI3A	Which Political Party Closer To
MBSI3B	Feel Very Close To This Political Party
MBSI4	Parties In Canada Care What People Think
MBSI5	Parties Necessary To Make System Work
MBSI6	Name Candidate Ran In Your Riding
MBSI7A	Rate> Liberal Party
MBSI7B	Rate> Progressive Conservative Party
MBSI7C	Rate> New Democratic Party
MBSI7D	Rate> Reform Party
MBSI7E	Rate> Bloc Quebecois
MBSI8A	Rate> Jean Chrétien
MBSI8B	Rate> Jean Charest
MBSI8C	Rate> Alexa McDonough
MBSI8D	Rate> Preston Manning
MBSI8E	Rate> Gilles Duceppe
MBSI9	State Of Economy These Days In Canada
MBSI10	Past 12 Mos> State Of Economy In Canada
MBSI11	Members Parliament Know Ordinary Think
MBSI12	Past 12 Mos> Contact Member Parliament
MBSI13	Makes A Difference Who Is In Power
MBSI14	Who People Vote For Can Make Difference
MBSI15	People In Canada Say What Think:Politics
MBSI16A	Scale> Where Place Self In Politics
MBSI16B	Scale> Where Place Liberal Party
MBSI16C	Scale> Where Place Conservative Party
MBSI16D	Scale> Where Place NDP
MBSI16E	Scale> Where Place Reform Party
MBSI16F	Scale> Where Place Bloc Quebecois

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION J

Name	Label
MBSJ1	Respondent's Year Of Birth
MBSJ2	Respondent's Gender

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE  
SECTION K

Name	Label
MBSK1A	Voting From Home By Mail
MBSK1B	Voting From Home By Telephone
MBSK1C	Voting From Home By Computer
MBSK1D	Voting At Station: Touch Computer Screen
MBSK1E	Voting At Station:Ballots MachineCounted
MBSK2A1	Most Likely> Home By Mail
MBSK2A2	Most Likely> Home By Telephone
MBSK2A3	Most Likely> Home By Computer
MBSK2A4	Most Likely> Touch Computer Screen
MBSK2A5	Most Likely> Ballots Machine Counted
MBSK2B1	Least Likely> Home By Mail
MBSK2B2	Least Likely> Home By Telephone
MBSK2B3	Least Likely> Home By Computer
MBSK2B4	Least Likely> Touch Computer Screen
MBSK2B5	Least Likely> Ballots Machine Counted
MBSK3A	Reason For Your Least Likely Choice-1st
MBSK3B	Reason For Your Least Likely Choice-2nd
COMMENTS	Any Further Comments <Mailback Survey>
SENTQ	Respondents To Whom Questionnaire Mailed

ANALYSIS ASSISTANCE VARIABLES

Name	Label
RTYPE1	Respondent <Campaign>
RTYPE2	Respondent <Post Election>
RTYPE3	Respondent <Mailback>
RLINK	Linking CPS/PES/MBS Respondents
WAVE	Responded To What Wave Of The Survey

## References

- Babbie, Earl. 1992. The Practice of Survey Research (6th Edition). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1988. Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bassili, John N. 1993. "Response Latency versus Certainty." Public Opinion Quarterly, 57 (1) 54-61.
- Bassili, John N. 1996. "The How and Why of Response Latency Measurement in Surveys." In: Answering Questions, eds., Norbert Schwarz and Seymour Sudman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bassili, John N. and Joseph F. Fletcher. 1991. "Response-Time Measurement in Surveys." Public Opinion Quarterly, 55 (3) 331-346.
- Blais, André and Martin Boyer. 1996. "Assessing the Impact of Televised Debates: The Case of the 1988 Canadian Election." British Journal of Political Science, 26: 143-164.
- Blishen, Bernard, Bill Carroll and Catherine. Moore. 1987. "The 1981 Socioeconomic Index for Occupations in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24 (4), 465-488.
- Brady, Henry E. and Richard Johnston. 1987. "What's the Primary Message: Horse Race or Issue Journalism?" In Gary R. Orren and Nelson P. Polsby, eds., The New Hampshire Primary and Nomination Politics. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House.
- Converse, Jean M. And Stanley Presser. 1986. Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. Beverley Hills: Sage
- Dillman, Don A. 1978. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dunkelberg, William C. and George S. Day. 1973. "Nonresponse Bias and Callbacks in Sample Surveys." Journal of Marketing Research, 10, 160-168.

- Fitzgerald, Robert and Linda Fuller. 1982. "I Hear You Knocking But You Can't Come In: The Effects of Reluctant Respondents and Refusers on Sample Survey Estimates." Sociological Methods and Research, 11 (1), 3-32.
- Frey, James H. 1983. Survey Research by Telephone. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Groves, Robert M. and Lars E. Lyberg. 1988. "An Overview of Nonresponse Issues in Telephone Surveys." In Telephone Survey Methodology, Editors: Robert M. Groves, Paul P. Biemer, Lars E. Lyberg, James T. Massey, William L. Nicholls II and Joseph Waksberg. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 191-212.
- Groves, Robert M. 1989. Survey Errors and Survey Costs. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hawkins, Darnell F. 1975. "Estimation of Nonresponse Bias." Sociological Methods and Research, 3 (4) 461-488.
- Holbrook, Thomas M. 1996. Do Campaigns Matter? Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 1996. The Challenge of Direct Democracy. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.
- Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Henry E. Brady, and Jean Crête. 1992. Letting the People Decide: Dynamics of a Canadian Election. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.
- Kalton, Graham. 1983. Introduction to Survey Sampling. Newbury Park, California: Sage.
- Katosh, John P., and Michael Traugott. 1981. "The consequences of validated and self-reported voting measures." Public Opinion Quarterly, 57(1): 1-28.
- Kish, Leslie. 1965. Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lessler, Judith T. and William D. Kalsbeek. 1992. Nonsampling Errors in Surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- McDonald, P. 1979. "Noncontact and Refusal Rates in Consumer Telephone Surveys." Journal of Marketing Research, 16, 478-484.
- O'Rourke, D. and J. Blair. 1983. "Improving Random Respondent Selection in Telephone Surveys." Journal of Marketing Research, 20, 428-432.

Pineo, P., J. Porter and H. McRoberts. 1985. "Revisions of the Pineo-Porter-McRoberts Socio-economic Classification of Occupations for the 1981 Census", Program for Quantitative Studies in Economics and Population Report. No. 125. McMaster University.

Schuman, Howard and Stanley Presser. 1981. Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys. Orlando: Academic Press.

Tremblay, Victor. 1982. "Selection from Telephone Directories: Importance and Consequences of Unlisted Numbers." New Surveys, 7 (1) 8-14.

Wiseman, Frederick and Marilyn Billington. 1984. "Comment on a Standard Definition of Response Rates." Journal of Marketing Research, 21, 336-338.