

# The 1993 Canadian Election Study

Incorporating the 1992 Referendum Survey  
on the Charlottetown Accord

Technical Documentation

The 1993 Canadian Election Study

Incorporating the 1992 Referendum Survey  
on the Charlottetown Accord

Technical Documentation

David A. Northrup  
Anne E. Oram

Institute for Social Research  
York University  
October, 1994

*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 1993 Canadian Election Study 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 numbers 411-92-0019 and 421-92-0026, and was completed for the 1992/93 Canadian Election Team of Richard Johnston (University of British Columbia), André Blais (Université de Montréal), Henry Brady (University of California at Berkeley), Elisabeth Gidengil (McGill University), and Neil Nevitte (University of Calgary). Neither the Institute for Social Research, the SSHRC, nor the Canadian Election 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, North York, Ontario, M3J 1P3 and to Richard Johnston, Dept. of Political Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z1.

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

## ISR Project Team

Data Collection	Tammy Chi John Pollard
Data Set Creation	Anne Oram
CATI Development	Richard Myles John Tibert
Project Management	David Northrup Richard Myles
Field Supervisors	Christine Klucha Angela O'Neill Georgette Wong
Document Preparation	Anita Valencia

## Table of Contents

Conditions of Release .....	ii
ISR Project Team .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Tables .....	vi
List of Figures .....	vi
1. Study Description .....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
2. Sample Design .....	3
2.1 Introduction .....	3
2.2 Sample Components and Re-interview Rates .....	3
2.3 Daily Sample Distribution: The Use of a Rolling Cross Section Sample Release in the Campaign-Period and Pre-Referendum Surveys .....	5
2.4 Selection of Households .....	7
2.5 Selection of Respondents .....	9
2.6 Household Weights .....	9
2.7 Provincial Sample Distribution and National Weights .....	11
2.8 Post-Election and Mail-Back Samples .....	14
2.9 Pre- and Post-Referendum Samples .....	14
3. Data Collection .....	15
3.1 Introduction .....	15
3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Telephone Surveys .....	15
3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey .....	17
3.4 Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey .....	19
3.5 Response and Re-Interview Rates in the Pre- and Post-Referendum Surveys .....	20
3.6 Data Collection Procedures: Mail-Back Survey .....	20
4. Data Processing .....	22
4.1 Introduction .....	22
4.2 Use of the "RTYPE" Variables to Identify Data Sub-Sets .....	22

**Table of Contents (cont'd)**

4.3 Randomization of Question and Response Order ..... 22

    4.31 Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire ..... 23

    4.32 Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire ..... 27

    4.33 Order Experiments in the Pre- and Post-Referendum Questionnaires ..... 27

4.4 Randomization of Question Wording ..... 29

    4.41 Wording Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire ..... 29

    4.42 Wording Experiments in the Pre- and  
        Post-Referendum Questionnaires ..... 30

4.5 Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify" ..... 31

    4.51 Campaign-Period and Post-Election Questionnaires ..... 31

    4.52 Pre- and Post-Referendum Questionnaires ..... 34

4.6 Response Time Measurements ..... 35

4.7 Linking the Data Sets ..... 35

4.8 Map of Variables ..... 36

4.9 Occupational Classification ..... 50

4.10 Listing of Occupations by Occupational Classification Number, CCDO  
    1980 with accompanying Blishen Socio-Economic Index Score, 1981 ..... 51

References ..... 57



## List of Tables

1.1	Description of Five Survey Components .....	1
2.1	Campaign-Period Survey: Calculation of Household Weights .....	10
2.2	Provincial Sample Distribution and Provincial Weights .....	12
2.3	Explanation of Weights: Campaign-Period Data Set .....	13
3.1	Number of Call Attempts: CPS, PES, REF and PR Surveys .....	15
3.2	Final Sample Disposition: Campaign-Period Survey .....	18
3.3	Completed Interviews, Response Rates and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys .....	19
3.4	Completed Interviews, Response Rates and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Pre- and Post-Referendum Surveys .....	20
4.1	Description of "RTYPE" Variables .....	23
4.2	Questions That Include Response Time Measurement .....	35

## List of Figures

2.1	Sample Components: Panel and RDD Interviews by Survey .....	4
2.2	Interviews Per Day: Campaign-Period Survey .....	6
2.3	Interviews Per Day: Pre-Referendum Survey .....	8

# 1. Study Description

## 1.1 Introduction

The 1993 Canadian Election Study included five surveys. The number of completed interviews and the data collection time period for each survey are detailed in Table 1.1. Three of the five surveys were completed just prior to and after the October 25th, 1993 Canadian election and two were completed at the time of the October 26th, 1992 Referendum on the Charlottetown Constitutional Accord. Telephone interviews were used for both referendum surveys and the first two election surveys. The final election survey, a mail-back questionnaire, was sent to respondents about two months after the election. The data set for the 1993 Canadian Election Study includes one or more interviews with 4,871 respondents. Over half of the 2,530 respondents to the first or pre-referendum survey completed all four telephone surveys and provided answers to over 500 survey items. Almost 90 percent of the respondents first interviewed as part of the campaign-period survey also participated in the post-election survey conducted in the six weeks following the election.

Table 1.1 Description of Five Survey Components

Number	Survey Name	Abbreviation	Sample Size	Field Dates
The "Referendum Surveys"				
1	Pre-Referendum	REF	2,530	Sept. 24th - Oct. 25th, 1992
2	Post-Referendum	PR	2,223	Oct. 31st - Dec. 2nd, 1992
The "Election Surveys"				
3	Campaign-Period	CPS	3,775	Sept. 10th - Oct. 24th, 1993
4	Post-Election	PES	3,340	Oct. 27th - Nov. 21st, 1993
5	Mail-Back	MBS	2,209	Nov. 25th - March 5th, 1994



The sample selection methodology used in the 1993 Canadian Election Study was similar to that used in the 1988 Canadian Election Study. Random digit dialing (RDD) procedures were utilized to select households, and, within households, the birthday selection method was used to select respondents. A rolling cross sectional sample release was employed for both the pre-referendum and campaign-period surveys.

All interviewing was completed from Toronto at the Institute's centralized telephone facilities 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 election surveys respondents were asked about their vote intentions, the attention they paid to the campaign, what parties/candidates (if any) contacted them during the campaign; their knowledge and rating of the parties and leaders, and what characteristics they would ascribe to the party leaders; and their position, as well as their reading of the main parties' positions, on several policy issues (efforts on behalf of minorities, women, and natives, free trade, the deficit, the GST, etc.). The mail-back 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. The questionnaires used in the referendum surveys included items measuring respondents' interest in the referendum; their vote intention, prediction of the outcome of the vote, and reaction to the results of the vote; their knowledge about, and opinions of, some of the specific provisions of the Accord (senate reform, recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, etc.); their awareness of the stand taken by political leaders, groups and organizations; and questions about their demographic circumstances (age, education, income, etc.).

(Copies of the five 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 documentation.)

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 Study (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>1</sup> in the ten Canadian provinces). 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>2</sup>

### 2.2 Sample Components and Re-interview Rates

There are two sample components in the 1993 campaign-period survey. The first is the *panel* component. It includes respondents who completed the referendum surveys. The second is the *RDD* component. It includes respondents selected using random digit dialing (RDD) methodology, who were first interviewed in the campaign-period survey. The post-election and mail-back surveys were completed only with respondents who had completed the campaign-period survey. However, because not every respondent completed the post-election and mail-back surveys, *the sample size decreases on each subsequent survey wave.*

The disposition of the two - panel and RDD - sample components, for the five surveys comprising the Canadian Election Study is depicted in Figure 2.1. The panel component started with 2,530 respondents in the pre-referendum survey and 2,223 of these respondents completed the post-referendum survey - a re-interview rate of 88 percent. About a year after completing the pre-referendum survey, an attempt was made to interview the 2,223 post-referendum respondents as part of the 1993 campaign-period survey. Interviews were completed with 1,434 post-referendum respondents - a re-interview rate of 65 percent. The re-interview rates for the post-election and mail-back surveys, the panel component of the sample, were 91 percent (1,312 respondents) and 68 percent (887 respondents) respectively. The re-interview rates for the 2,341 respondents in the RDD sample component were marginally lower. Eighty-seven percent (or 2,028 respondents in the RDD sample component) completed the post-election survey and 65 percent (or 1,322 respondents to the post-election survey) completed the mail-back survey. The largest decrease in the re-interview rate was for the mail-back survey. Almost 90 percent of the 3,775 CPS respondents completed the PES, and 66 percent of the PES respondents completed the mail-back survey.

---

<sup>1</sup> Residents of old age homes, group homes, educational and penal institutions were excluded from the sample.

<sup>2</sup> Using their Household Income, Facilities and Equipment (HIFE) surveys, Statistics Canada estimates that two percent of the private households in Canada do not have a telephone (Ottawa, 1991).



The data set has been constructed to facilitate use of each of the five surveys and for working with various subsets of respondents who completed two or more surveys (see Section 4 of this documentation).

### 2.3 Daily Sample Distribution: The Use of a Rolling Cross Section Sample Release in the Campaign-Period and Pre-Referendum Surveys

The importance of campaign dynamics in understanding election results has been documented by a number of researchers (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 party leaders varied, or remained constant, over the course of the federal election campaign. Similarly, analysts can determine if attitudes towards specific provisions of the Charlottetown Accord, such as support for redefinition of the Senate, varied or stayed constant during the month leading up to the referendum vote.

Also, utilization of a rolling cross section sample release facilitates division of the campaign-period and pre-referendum data sets into temporal components. Analysts can divide the campaign-period data into before and after the leaders' debate, or before and after the initiation of television commercials in the election campaign. Of course, the referendum data set can also be divided into two or more temporal components. For example, before and after former Prime Minister Trudeau made his comments about the Charlottetown Accord, or before and after the television debate in Quebec between Premier Bourassa and the leader of the opposition, Jacques Parizeau.

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 policy issue such as support for the Conservative Party's stand on purchasing helicopters. If most of the interviews at the beginning of data collection were completed with respondents with lower levels of education (and if they were less supportive of the purchase of helicopters), and if most of the interviews at the end of data collection were completed with respondents with high levels of education (and they were more supportive), it would be possible to mistake a change in respondent characteristics for a change in attitudes. Support for the purchase of helicopters would have appeared to have increased; but, in fact, the change would be accounted for by a change in the characteristics of the sample from the beginning to the end of data collection. As much as possible it is important for each day of interviewing to be an independent sample of the population of interest.



The sample for the campaign-period survey was divided equally into 45 days. The ratio of panel and RDD sample components was the same for each day of sample release. Approximately 60 percent of the completions for each day of the CPS were from the RDD sample and the remaining 40 percent were from the panel sample. After two or three days of data collection, interviews were being completed with both new and previously-released sample, ensuring a mix of easy and hard-to-reach respondents (as well as a mix of panel and RDD respondents). Each day's sample remained active for 12 days (excepting sample released near the end of data collection) and each number was called at least twice in the first four days of release and once on each subsequent day. Attempts were made to convert refusals on the last three days that the sample was active. On average, 84 completions were completed each day of the CPS. The daily variation in the number of completed interviews is expected given the small sample for any one day. However, as seen in Figure 2.2, this variation is less pronounced when the number of completed interviews is averaged over a five day period. The increased number of completed interviews on the last day of calling reflects the fact that respondents did not have the option of being called on another day. Given the immediacy of the election many decided to complete the interview, where as earlier in the data collection, they could have delayed the interview for a day or two.

The rolling cross sectional sample for the pre-referendum survey was divided among 32 days. The average number of interviews completed on each day was 79. The pattern of calls was the same as used in the campaign-period survey. The daily variation in the number of completed interviews is depicted in Figure 2.3.

Every day of sample release, for both the CPS and REF, was, within provinces, divided into seven "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

The same sampling procedures were used to select the campaign-period and pre-referendum survey respondents. A two stage probability selection process was utilized. The first stage involved the selection of households by randomly selecting residential telephone numbers. The ideal sampling frame for the campaign-period (and pre-referendum 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 dialing (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) 731-1010, then all numbers from 731-1000 to 731-1999, 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 as well as household numbers (including unlisted household 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. That is, the adult (18 years of age or older) household member, who was a Canadian citizen, and who had the next birthday.<sup>3</sup> The birthday selection method is used as it ensures a random selection of respondents as well as equal probabilities of selection, 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 three-adult household each adult has only a 33 percent chance of selection). As a result, it is possible that analysis based on unweighted estimates are biased, as one adult households are over-represented in the sample. 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 a weight of three, etc.).

---

<sup>3</sup> A discussion of the use of the birthday method of selecting respondents can be found in O'Rourke and Blair, 1983.

<sup>4</sup> 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 2.1.

Table 2.1. Campaign-Period Survey: Calculation of Household Weights

HH Size	No. of HH's	Weighted Cases	Adjustment	Weight	Check
1 adult	1,011	1,011	511.39	0.506	511.39
2 adults	2,115	4,230	2,139.66	1.012	2,139.66
3 adults	449	1,347	681.35	1.517	681.35
4 adults	144	576	291.36	2.023	291.36
5 adults	44	220	111.28	2.529	111.28
6 adults	9	54	27.31	3.035	27.31
7 adults	1	7	3.54	3.541	3.54
8 adults*	1	8	4.05	4.047	4.05
10 adults	1	10	5.06	5.058	5.06
Totals	3,775	7,463	3,775.00		3,775.00

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

In the campaign-period survey there are 3,775 households in the sample and 1,011 are one-adult

---

<sup>4</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.

households, 2,115 are two-adult households, and 449 are three-adult households, etc. (see variable CPSADULT). 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: 449 times 3 which gives 1,347 three-adult households in the weighted sample. In the campaign-period survey there are 7,463 weighted cases. Second, the 7,463 weighted cases are adjusted down to the original sample size of 3,775 (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:  $(1,347/7,463) \times 3,775 = 681.35$ . 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:  $681.35/449 = 1.517$ . Finally, as a check for each household size, we can multiply the weight times the number of cases (for three-adult households this is 1.517 times 449 = 681.35) and sum the results to ensure that the weighted sample size approximates the number of cases.

Weights have also been calculated, using the same procedures, for the pre-referendum survey.

## 2.7 Provincial Sample Distribution and National Weights

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

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

This design facilitates comparison between the five regions as well as the calculation of national estimates. A minimum of 400 interviews were allocated to each region, with a larger allocation of sample going to the larger regions/provinces (Table 2.2). 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. Because the sample distribution is not proportional to the population of the province, the data must be weighted by province before national estimates are derived.

The calculation of the weights to facilitate national estimates is provided in Table 2.2. The weights are calculated by dividing the province's proportion of the total number of households in Canada by the province's proportion of the households in the sample. For Quebec (.949) and British Columbia (.996) the weight is close to "one." In these provinces the proportion of households in the sample is close to their proportion in the population. In Ontario the weight is greater than one as the province has 36 percent of Canada's households, but only 25 percent of the sample. Each Ontario case is "weighted up" so that the impact of the Ontario sample on national estimates is a reflection of Ontario's proportion

of the number of households in Canada. Conversely, for provinces where the weights are considerably less than "one," for example Newfoundland (.629) and PEI (.160), the proportion of the sample allocated to the province was greater than that province's proportion of the population and each case is therefore "weighted down."

Table 2.2. Provincial Sample Distribution and Provincial Weights

Province	Population*		Sample		Weight
	No. of HH's	% of HH's	No. of HH's	% of HH's	
Nfld.	174,495	1.8	112	3.0	0.589
PEI	44,478	0.5	100	2.6	0.168
NS	324,377	3.3	98	2.6	1.250
NB	253,707	2.5	108	2.9	0.887
Quebec	2,634,301	26.4	1,007	26.7	0.988
Ontario	3,638,364	36.4	953	25.2	1.442
Manitoba	405,120	4.1	228	6.0	0.671
Sask.	363,149	3.6	212	5.6	0.647
Alberta	910,391	9.1	485	12.8	0.709
British Columbia	1,243,894	12.5	472	12.5	0.996
Canada	9,992,276	100.0	3,775	100.0	

\* 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 both the unequal probabilities of selection at the household and provincial level, have been added to the data set to facilitate the production of national estimates. In addition, to facilitate comparisons between Quebec and the remaining nine Canadian provinces, weights have been calculated for Canada without Quebec.

Although the weights are provided as part of the CES data set, users must specify the weights they wish to use in the appropriate programming language before analyzing the data. Users are advised to use CPSNWGT1 (campaign-period national weight 1) when national estimates are required. See Table 2.3 for an explanation of the weights included in the CPS data set. When comparing Quebec to the other nine provinces, 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 other nine provinces.<sup>5</sup> If weights are not invoked the tabulations produced will be for unweighted data.

Table 2.3. Explanation of Weights: Campaign-Period Data Set

	Variable Name	Explanation	Description
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>all ten Canadian Provinces</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 Canadian Provinces</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

---

<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 nine provinces.

province and, as a result, it is reasonable to use the CPS weights. However, there are separate weights for the pre-referendum survey. Importantly, in the pre- (and post-) referendum survey, a relatively large proportion of the sample (almost 40 percent) was allocated to Quebec. As a result, the provincial weights for the pre-referendum survey are quite different than weights based upon the sample disposition for the campaign-period survey. When using the pre- or post-referendum survey data, the pre-referendum weights should be used. The weights for the pre-referendum survey use the same naming conventions as those used in the campaign-period survey (REFHHWGT replaces CP SHHWGT, REFPWGT1 replaces CPSPWGT1, etc.).

Finally, because the weights include fractions that are rounded and missing values vary by item, there may be minor variation in the number of cases for different analytical procedures and subsets of the data.

## 2.8 Post-Election and Mail-Back Samples

The sample for the post-election survey included respondents from the CPS (both panel and RDD sample components). 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 mail-back survey. Some respondents were not willing to provide an address, but mailing information was provided by 90 percent of the PES respondents.

## 2.9 Pre- and Post-Referendum Samples

The sample for the pre-referendum survey was constructed using the RDD techniques described above for the campaign-period survey. However, a larger proportion of the sample for the REF survey was allocated to Quebec. In the REF survey, almost 40 percent of the sample was allocated to Quebec, but in the CPS this proportion was 26 percent. The proportion of the sample in the other regions/provinces was 2 to 3 percent lower in the REF than it was in the CPS.

The sample for the post-referendum survey included all respondents to the pre-referendum survey.

### 3. Data Collection

#### 3.1 Introduction

A description of the data collection procedures is outlined in this section of the technical documentation. Interviewing for all four telephone surveys 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 answer correctly.

#### 3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Telephone 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 (12 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.

Table 3.1. Number of Call Attempts: CPS, PES, REF, and PR Surveys

Calls	CPS		PES		REF		PR	
	number	(%)	number	(%)	number	(%)	number	(%)
1	687	18	755	23	690	27	718	2
2	735	19	799	24	513	20	489	22
3	654	17	500	15	382	15	300	14
4	436	12	342	10	264	10	189	8
5	270	7	255	8	169	7	134	6
6 - 9	623	17	465	14	339	14	241	11
10 - 14	255	7	170	5	114	5	88	4
15 - 33	115	3	54	1	59	2	64	3

Totals	3,775	100	3,340	100	2,530	100	2,223	100
--------	-------	-----	-------	-----	-------	-----	-------	-----

Not surprisingly, fewer calls were required per completed interview in the PES. 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.

The pattern and number of calls required to complete the pre- and post-referendum surveys is similar to that of the campaign-period and post-election surveys. More calls were required for the rolling cross section sample release (pre-referendum) and fewer calls were required for the re-interview after the vote (post-referendum).

Households who refused to participate in the campaign-period survey were contacted a second time and 12.2 percent of the first refusals (220 or 5.4 percent of all CPS interviews) completed the interview on the second or subsequent contact after the initial refusal. (The variable "CPSREFUS" identifies 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 (Northrup, 1993, pages 13-14; and Northrup and Oram, 1991, pages 6-7). In comparison to the CPS, refusal conversion attempts were almost three times more successful in the PES. While the 70 converted refusals in the PES represent only 1.9 percent of the PES interviews, they account for 24 percent of the initial refusals in the PES survey.

The refusal conversion results for the pre- and post-referendum surveys were similar to the CPS and PES. Ten and one half percent of the refusals were converted in the REF (4.3 percent of all REF interviews). In the post-referendum survey, there were 69 converted refusals which accounted for only 3.1 percent of the PR interviews, but 28 percent of the initial refusals.

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 higher rates. The response rate was defined as the number of completed interviews divided by the estimated number of eligible households times 100 percent.

A response rate of 63.5 percent was obtained for the campaign-period survey. This rate is the weighted average of the 58 percent obtained in the RDD sample component and the 75 percent obtained in the panel sample component. The response rate for the RDD sample component approximates the rate (57 percent) obtained in the campaign-period survey of the 1988 Canadian Election Study.

For purposes of providing details on the calculation of the response rate for the CPS, the RDD and panel components are combined. Of the 10,384 telephone numbers in the sample, 5,693 were determined to be eligible households (Table 3.2). Ineligible households/telephone listings counted for 4,247 of the total sample. (Examples of ineligible numbers include: households where the selected respondent was unable to speak either English or French, was not a Canadian citizen, was not healthy enough to complete the interview, could not be located at the number where they completed the post-referendum survey, and non-residential numbers). Even after repeated call attempts it was not possible to determine the eligibility status for 444 of the numbers included in the sample.

For response rate calculations, it was assumed that the proportion of these 444 numbers, which were household numbers, was the same as it was in the rest of the sample. This proportion is called the "household eligibility rate." The household eligibility rate was  $.573$  (eligible households [5,693]/(eligible households [5,693] + not eligible households and listings [4,247]) =  $.573$ ). The estimated total number of eligibles was then computed as 5,947 (5,693 + [ $.573$  x 444]). Dividing the number of completions (3,775) by the estimated number of eligibles (5,947) gives a final response rate of 63.5 percent.

Variation in the response rate for each day of sample release was limited. As indicated above in Figure 2.2, the number of completed interviews obtained on Thanksgiving Day was considerably less than the average number of completed interviews per day. However, the number of completions was somewhat higher in the days after Thanksgiving and by the end of the 12 day calling period the response rate for the sample released on Thanksgiving was about the same as the other days' sample release. However, the response rate for the sample released in the last few days before the election was lower than sample released earlier in the data collection period as the number of days available for calling was truncated. This is particularly true of the last two to three days' sample release which could be called only on two or three different days rather than the usual twelve days. The response rate for the CPS survey, excluding the last two days of sample release, was 66 percent.

Table 3.2. Final Sample Disposition: Campaign-Period Survey

	Number	Subtotal	Percent	Subtotal
Eligible Households				
Completions	3,775		37	
Refusals and Callbacks*	1,918		18	
Subtotal Eligible Households		5,693		55
Ineligible Households/Telephone Listings				
Ill/Aged/Lang Problem/Absent	322		3	
Not a Canadian Citizen/Not 18	199		2	
Not Traceable	118		1	
Not in Service	1260		12	
Not a Household Number	2348		23	
Subtotal Ineligible Households/Listings		4,247		41
Eligibility Not Determined	444	444	4	4
Total All Numbers	10,384	10,384	100	100

\* Selected respondent not available when interviewer called (after multiple calls to the household)

Regional variation in the response rate was pronounced, with Quebec having the lowest rate (57 percent) and Newfoundland and Nova Scotia (75 and 74 percent respectively) having the highest rates (Table 3.3). The response rate for Canada without Quebec was 67 percent. The variation in response by province parallels the results of the 1988 Canadian Election Study and other surveys conducted at ISR (Bryant, Gold, Northrup and Stevenson, 1990). As found by American researchers, regions with lower proportions of their population living in major urban areas (such as Atlantic Canada) have higher response rates and regions with a higher proportion of their population in major urban areas (like Ontario and Quebec) have lower response rates (Steech, 1981).

All first call attempts to Quebec were made in French by bilingual interviewers. Given the survey topic, calling from Toronto rather than from Quebec may account for some of the difference in response rate between Quebec and Ontario.

Table 3.3. Completed Interviews, Response Rates, and Re-Interview Rates by Province:  
Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys

Province	Campaign-Period		Post-Election	
	Interviews (#)	Response Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)
Newfoundland	112	75	101	90
PEI	100	67	97	97
NS	98	74	90	92
NB	108	69	96	89
Quebec	1,007	57	864	86
Ontario	953	63	843	88
Manitoba	228	68	210	92
Sask.	212	69	185	87
Alberta	485	69	440	91
BC	472	65	414	88
Canada	3,775	64	3,340	88

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

The post-election re-interview rate is 88 percent. Interestingly, the lower response rate for Quebec in the CPS is not duplicated in the re-interview rates (Table 3.3). The 12 percent non-response by CPS respondents to the PES was primarily accounted for by refusals and callbacks (eight percent). The remaining four percent of the 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 misdiallings 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 if they had correctly dialled the number, e.g., 735-5335

rather than 753-5335).

### 3.5 Response and Re-Interview Rates in the Pre- and Post-Referendum Surveys

Using the same method as detailed for the CPS, the response rate to the pre-referendum survey was 65 percent. Also, as was the case in the CPS survey, the response rate was lowest in Quebec and highest in the Atlantic region (Table 3.4). The response rate to the REF survey, after excluding the Quebec sample, was 71 percent. At 88 percent, the post-referendum re-interview rate was the same as that obtained in the post-election survey. And, as was the case in the PES, the re-interview rate for Quebec was about the same as it was for the country as a whole.

Table 3.4. Completed Interviews, Response Rates, and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Pre- and Post-Referendum Surveys

Province	Pre-Referendum		Post-Referendum	
	Interviews (#)	Response Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)
Newfoundland	51	79	47	92
PEI	67	79	60	90
NS	64	75	57	89
NB	53	76	43	81
Quebec	1,001	58	858	86
Ontario	563	68	491	87
Manitoba	124	72	110	89
Sask.	101	70	93	92
Alberta	236	73	220	93
BC	270	70	244	90
Canada	2,530	65	2,223	88

### 3.6 Data Collection Procedures: Mail-Back Survey

At the end of the PES, respondents were asked if they would be willing to provide an address so that a mail-back questionnaire could be sent to them. Ninety percent of the respondents to the PES provided mailing addresses. All of these 3,025 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 during the first two weeks of December 1993. Most of the response from these mailings arrived at the Institute by the end of January 1994, 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 first week of March 1994, telephone calls were made to all non-responders. In total, 73 percent of the respondents who provided addresses (or 66 percent of all PES respondents) completed the mail-back survey.

## 4. Data Processing

### 4.1 Introduction

This section of the technical documentation provides information about the construction of the data set. A brief description is given of the variables, question order and question wording randomization, the coding of open-ended items and the linking of the five data sets. A map of the variables (name and label) is provided. Note that all variables in the pre-referendum survey include the prefix "REF," and variables in the post-referendum survey include the prefix "PR." The prefixes "CPS," "PES," and "MBS" indicate the variable is from the campaign-period, post-election, and mail-back survey (respectively). The procedure for isolating the survey component of interest to the analysis is documented first.

### 4.2 Use of the "RTYPE" 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 2,209 respondents who completed the MBS. A "missing case code" will be assigned to the 2,662 respondents who were part of the Canadian Election Survey but did not complete the MBS. (The 2,209 "valid cases" plus the 2,662 "missing cases" represent the complete sample of 4,871 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 RTYPE5 for example, identifies respondents to the mail-back survey.

Similarly, if there was an interest in examining those respondents who completed all five surveys, the analyst would use RTYPE6 as it identifies those 887 respondents. (The 887 respondents have a value of "1" for the variable RTYPE6 and there are 3,984 missing cases - the sum of these two numbers is, of course, 4,871 - the total sample size for the survey). A list of the RTYPE variables, and the composition of the group identified in each RTYPE variable, is detailed in Table 4.1.

### 4.3 Randomization of Question and Response Order

The logical operators resident in CATI were used to randomize the order in which respondents received sections of the questionnaire, or, within sections, the order in which they received particular items. Prior to the start of the telephone interview, CATI was used to assign values to a series of random numbers. For example, random number 1 had, in equal proportions, a value of "1" or "2." As the interviewer recorded answers, they would activate the CATI logic which in turn would determine the sequence of the questions by referring to the value of random number 1. 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.

Table 4.1 Description of RTYPE Variables

Variable Name	Variable Label	Value Label	Surveys Completed	Number of Respondents
RTYPE1	Pre Referendum	Referendum	pre-referendum	2,530
RTYPE2	Post Referendum	Post-Referendum	post-referendum	2,223
RTYPE3	Campaign Period	Campaign	campaign-period	3,775
RTYPE4	Post Election	Post-Election	post-election	3,340
RTYPE5	Mail Back Survey	Mailback	mail-back	2,209
RTYPE6	Panel (REF&PR & CPS&PES&MBS)	Panel: 5 Waves	pre-referendum post-referendum campaign-period post-election mail-back	887
RTYPE7	Panel (REF&PR & CPS&PES)	Panel: 4 Waves	pre-referendum post-referendum campaign-period post-election	1,312
RTYPE8	Panel (REF&PR & CPS)	Panel: 3 Waves	pre-referendum post-referendum campaign-period	1,434
RTYPE9	RDD (CPS&PES&MBS)	RDD: 3 Waves	campaign-period post-election mail-back	1,322
RTYPE10	RDD (CPS&PES)	RDD: 2 Waves	campaign-period post-election	2,028
RTYPE11	RDD (CPS)	RDD: 1 Wave	campaign-period	2,341

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

##### A: Deficits and Higher Taxes

After respondents were told that governments were running deficits (CPSCH60), they were asked two follow-up questions: in the first (CPSL6A), respondents were asked if they were willing to pay higher taxes in order to reduce the deficit; in the second (CPSL6B), they were asked if they were willing to pay higher taxes to maintain social programs. The order in which

the respondent was asked these two questions was determined by the value of "*random number 2*" (the variable CPSRN2 in the data set). When CPSRN2 was "1," CATI produced the version of the questionnaire that asked the respondent about higher taxes to reduce the deficit first, and higher taxes to maintain social programs second. When CPSRN2 had a value of "2," the order of the questions was reversed (social programs preceded the deficit). To determine if the order of the questions had an impact upon responses, the analyst can produce cross tabulations/ contingency tables of CPSL6A by CPSRN2 and CPSL6B by CPSRN2.

B: Abortion

The abortion question (CPSG6A, or CPSG6B, or CPSG6C) asked respondents to choose which "of the following three positions [was] closest to their own view." When CPSRN10 was "1," the respondent received CPSG6A where the options were read to the respondent as: "one, abortion should never be permitted; two, abortion should be permitted only after need has been established; or three, abortion should be a matter of a woman's personal choice." When CPSRN10 was "2," the order was changed so the "never permitted" option was last and the "after need established" option was first (CPSG6B). When CPSRN10 was "3" the order was "personal choice," "never permitted," and "need established" (CPSG6C).

C: Aboriginal People and the Law

The order of presentation of the response options was also randomized for the items asking about Aboriginal People and the law. When CPSRN20 was "1," the respondent received CPSG8A which asked "what comes closer to your own views, Aboriginal People should have the right to make their own laws, or, they should abide by the same laws as other Canadians?" Respondents received the CPSG8B version of the question when CPSRN20 was "2" (in which the order of the options was reversed - same laws/make their own laws).

D: Deficit and Social Programs

When CPSRN7 was "1," CATI delivered CPSL5A which asked the respondent which statement was closer to their own view: "one, we must reduce the deficit even if that means cutting programs; or two, governments must maintain social programs even if that means continuing to run a deficit." When CPSRN7 was "2," the order in which the respondent was read the options was reversed (CPSL5B).



## E: Cutting Government Spending

Respondents were asked about the amount of government spending in seven different areas. When CPSRN19 had a value of "1," the order of the items was defence (CPSL7A), welfare (CPSL7B), pensions and old age security (CPSL7C), health care (CPSL7D), unemployment insurance (CPSL7E), education (CPSL7F), and aid to developing countries (CPSL7G). When CPSRN19 was "2," the first item on the list (defence) was asked last and the second item (welfare) was asked first. When CPSRN19 was "3," pensions and old age security was first and welfare was last. CPSRN19 had seven values allowing each item to occupy each position on the list 1/7th of the time.

## F: Inflation and Unemployment

Respondents were asked to choose between two options: the first, was *reducing unemployment* even if it meant *higher* inflation; and the second, was *controlling inflation* even if it meant *higher unemployment*. The order in which the options were presented varied: when CPSRN21 was "1," the order was as indicated above (CPSL9A), and when CPSRN21 was "2," the order was reversed (CPSL9B).

## G: Universality of Government Services

When CPSRN8 was "1," the respondent was asked to choose between two options (presented in the following order): "the government should not provide services to people who can pay for them out of their own pocket" and "we can only be sure everyone's needs are met if the government provides the same services to all (CPSL10A). When CPSRN8 was "2," the order of presentation was reversed (CPSL10B).

## H: Rating Party Leaders

Each respondent was asked to rate four of the five main party leaders (CPSD2A - CPSD2E) on a 0 to 100 scale (Quebec respondents were not asked to rate Preston Manning and respondents in the other nine provinces were not asked to rate Lucien Bouchard). The order in which the respondent was asked to rate the leaders was determined by CPSRN12. When CPSRN12 had the value "1," respondents (outside of Quebec) were asked to rate the leaders in the following order: Campbell, Chretien, McLaughlin, Manning. When CPSRN12 had the value of "24" the order of presentation was Manning, McLaughlin, Chretien, Campbell. (CPSRN12 included 24 values - "1" to "24" - as there were 24 possible orders.)<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The 24 orders represent all possible order combinations for four items as determined by 4 factorial (4 x 3 x 2 x 1 = (continued...))

I: Rating Parties

The questionnaire also included 24 different orders (CPSRN13) of presentation for the items asking respondents to rate each of the major parties (CPSD2G - CPSD2K). (As was the case in the ratings of leaders, respondents in Quebec were not asked to rate Reform and respondents in the other provinces were not asked to rate the Bloc.) The order that the respondent was asked to rate the parties was independent of the order that they were asked to rate the leaders.

J: Leader Traits: Characteristics of Party Leaders

Each respondent was asked how well a set of words and phrases (intelligent, arrogant, trustworthy, can really speak for women, provides strong leadership, and compassionate) described each party leader (CPSI1A - CPSI5F). The order of presentation of the party leaders in this section was randomized using CPSRN14. Again there were 24 orders and the order of presentation of the leaders was independent of the previous ratings questions.

K: Prediction of Vote Outcome at the Riding Level and for the Country

Respondent were asked what the chances were of each party winning in their riding and the chances of each party winning the election (CPSJ1A - CPSJ2E). When CPSRN15 was "1," respondents were first asked about their riding and second about the country as a whole. The order of presentation was reversed when CPSRN15 was "2." In addition, the order of party presentation was randomized for both the riding and election questions. For example, when CPSRN16 was "16," the respondent was asked the chances of the NDP winning in their riding, followed by the chances for the Conservatives, the Liberals, and Reform (in Quebec, Reform was replaced by Bloc). 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 CPSRN18).

#### 4.32 Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire

A: Parties, Candidates, Leaders, and Leader Traits

---

(...continued)  
24).

The ratings of the party leaders (PESD2A - PESD2E), parties (PESD2G - PESD2K), candidates (PESD5A - PESD5E), and leader traits (PESG1A - PESG5E) were 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).

B: Unemployment Versus the Deficit

Respondents were asked if they thought the "government should *reduce unemployment* even if it means the deficit stays high" or, if "they should *reduce the deficit* even if it means unemployment stays high." The order in which the respondents were read the positions was determined by PESRN2. When it was "1," the order was "reduce unemployment" followed by "reduce deficit" (PESE4A), and when it was "2," the order was reversed (PESE4B).

C: The Universality of Pensions

In the PES respondents were provided with two positions about the universality of pensions. The positions were: "one, we can only be sure if the needs of all elderly people are met if the government gives pensions to all; or two, the government should not provide pensions to elderly people with above average incomes." The order in which the respondent was read the positions was varied according to the value of PESRN3. Half of the respondents were read the positions in the order indicated above (PESRN3 was "1" and the respondent received PESE5A), and half got the opposite order (PESRN3 was "2" and respondent received PESE5B).

#### 4.33 Order Experiments in the Pre- and Post-Referendum Questionnaires

A: Vote Intention Section

The questions in the vote intention section (REFC1 to REFC5) were asked either very early in the questionnaire (the eighth to twelfth questions) or near the end of the questionnaire, just prior to the section on party identification (the last substantive section of the questionnaire). Question order was determined by the value of the REFRN8. When REFRN8 was "1," CATI produced the version of the interview that asked the respondent the vote intention questions early in the interview, and when REFRN8 had a value of "2," CATI ensured the vote intention questions were asked near the end of the interview.

B: Placement of 'Quebec Item' in the Battery of Items About How Respondents Feel About the Accord

The item "No agreement will satisfy Quebec" (REFD1) was either the first or last item in the agree/disagree set of questions (measuring respondents' general feelings about the Accord). When REFRN11 was "1," the "no agreement will satisfy Quebec" item was the first item in the set; and it was the last item in the set when REFRN11 was "2."

For Quebec respondents, REFD2 ["The Agreement will reduce Quebec to the status of a Province like the others"] is the first item in the agree/disagree set when REFRN11 was "1" and the last item when REFRN11 was "2."

C: Self Government for Aboriginal People and Recognition of Quebec as a Distinct Society

The questions asking about the right of Canada's Aboriginal People to govern themselves (REFE9) came before the question asking about recognition of Quebec as a distinct society (REFE10) when REFRN9 was "1." The order was reversed when REFRN9 was "2."

D: Views on Senate Reform

The order in which the response options were read to respondents in the question about the senate was randomized. The three options read to respondents were: a = senate stay as it is, b = change senate as proposed in Accord, and c = do away with the senate. When REFRN4 was "1," the respondent was read the options in the order of a, b, c, (question REFE1). When REFRN4 was "2," the order of presentation was b, c, a (question REFE2); and when REFRN4 was "3," the order was c, a, b (REFE3).<sup>7</sup>

E: Feelings About Canada and Quebec

Respondents were asked how they felt about Canada and how they felt about Quebec (PRH25 and PRH26). When PRRN1 was "1," the Canada question was asked first and the Quebec question second. The order was reversed when PRRN1 was "2."

---

<sup>7</sup> As a result of a sample data layout error, this wording experiment was not used in Ontario. In Ontario, half the respondents received the first order of presentation (when REFRN4 was 1) and half received the second order (when REFRN4 was 2). Only one respondent received the third order of presentation.

#### 4.4 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 both the election and referendum questionnaires.

##### 4.41 Wording Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire

###### A: Promoting the French Language\Promoting Quebec

There were two versions of item CPSF1A. When CPSRN1 was "1," respondents were asked "how much should be done to promote *the French language* in Canada." Alternatively, when CPSRN1 was "2," respondents were asked "how much should be done *for Quebec*." CATI logic was utilized so that the follow-up questions (CSF1B to CPSF1F) were customized to parallel the wording in CPSF1A. For example, when CPSF1A asked about what should be "done for Quebec," the follow-up questions asked about each party position on what should be done for Quebec.

###### B: Taxes: The GST or a Tax like the GST

Half of the respondents were asked if they thought "Canada could get by without the *GST*" (item CPSG4 when CPSRN5 equals "1"). The remaining half were asked if they thought "Canada could get by without *a tax like the GST*" (item CPSG4 when CPSRN5 equals "2").

###### C: Higher Taxes and Social Programs

There were three versions of the question asking about respondents' willingness to pay higher taxes to maintain social programs (CPSL6B). In the first version of the question respondents were asked about their willingness to pay higher taxes to maintain social programs (CPSRN6 was "1"). In the second version of the question, respondents were asked about their willingness to pay higher taxes to maintain social programs *such as health care* (CPSRN6 was "2"). In the third version respondents were asked about their willingness to pay higher taxes to maintain social programs *such as welfare* (CPSRN6 was "3").

D: Paying a Fee for Health Care

There were four different versions of the questions (CPSL11A and CPSL11B) about paying a fee for health care. In the first version of the question, respondents were asked "if making people pay a fee for each visit to a *doctor* would reduce waste in the health care system; or, if paying a fee would mean *some* people would not get the health care they needed." In the second version of the question, doctor was replaced by *hospital*; in the third, some people was changed to *low income* people; and in the fourth, doctor was replaced with *hospital* and some people was replaced with *low income* people. Which of the four versions the respondents received was determined by CPSRN3 and CPSRN4. In addition, the order of the two response options was varied, so half the respondents were given the statement about paying a fee first, and half were given the statement about not getting care first (CPSRN9).

4.42 Wording Experiments in the Pre- and Post-Referendum Questionnaires<sup>8</sup>

A: Referendum Vote Intentions

There were two versions of the referendum vote intention question (REFC2C and REFC2F). In the first version of the question, respondents were read the actual wording of the question on the ballot (when REFRN2 was 1) before being asked how they planned to vote. In the second version of the question, respondents were just asked their vote intention (REFRN2 was 2).<sup>9</sup>

B: Guarantees of Senate Seats

Respondents were asked if women should be guaranteed seats in the senate (REFE6), if women should be guaranteed half the seats in the senate (REFE7), or if Aboriginal people should be guaranteed seats in the senate (REFE8). Which version of the question the

---

<sup>8</sup> There were no question wording experiments in the post-election questionnaire.

<sup>9</sup> As a result of a sample data layout error, this wording experiment was not used in Ontario, where all respondents received the first version of the question. To determine the impact of the wording, the Ontario cases must be dropped from the analysis.

respondent was asked was determined by the value of REFRN14 (when REFRN14 was "1" respondents were asked REFE6, and when REFRN14 was "2" and "3" respondents were asked REFE7 and REFE8, respectively).<sup>10</sup>

C: Provision to Guarantee Quebec One Quarter of the Seats in the Senate

The question asking respondents their opinion on the provision in the Accord guaranteeing Quebec one quarter of the seats in the House of Commons (REFE11) had three variants. When REFRN3 was "1," the question was read without any additional information being offered to the respondent. When REFRN3 was "2," the respondent was told the guarantee was "in return for losing most of its Senate seats;" and when REFRN7 was "2," they were told the guarantee was maintained "regardless of Quebec's population."

D: Quebec Sovereignty Item

Respondents were also randomly assigned one of the two versions of the Quebec sovereignty item (which was only asked of Quebec respondents). When REFRN5 was "1," the item (REFE11) read: "What is your opinion of Quebec sovereignty?" When REFRN5 was "2," the question also included the phrase, "that is; Quebec is no longer a part of Canada", at the end of the question.

#### 4.5 Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify"

##### 4.51 Campaign-Period and Post-Election Questionnaires

The first question in both the campaign-period and post-election interviews was open-ended and asked respondents to identify the issue which was most important to them personally in the (upcoming) 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. Note that the codes are designed to facilitate easy recoding into a smaller set of broader categories.

#### Coding Categories for "Most Important Issue" Questions

##### Representation Issues - Unity and Quebec

---

<sup>10</sup> As a result of a sample data layout error respondents in Ontario were asked REFE6 half the time (when REFRN14 was 1) and REFE7 half the time (when REFRN14 was 2).

00 concerned with Canadian unity, stability  
(often one word answer)

01 Quebec independence, separation,  
sovereignty, general mention, often one  
word

02 protection of French language, culture

03 Quebec should stay

04 Quebec should leave

05 wants Bloc to win

06 want representation/recognition for Quebec

07 constitutional issues

08 spoiled ballot

09 future of Quebec

#### Job and Employment Concerns

10 need/create more jobs, reduce  
unemployment

11 need jobs for young people

12 want/need job security

13 lack of jobs in resource industries (fishing,  
farming, logging, mining)

14 need more job training/re-training

#### Financial Concerns

20 general mention (i.e., debt, deficit, budget)

21 debt - reduce/control

22 debt - eliminate, pay off

23 deficit - reduce/control

24 deficit - eliminate, pay off

25 transfer payments

#### Economic Concerns

30 general mention (i.e., economy, economic  
reform)

31 cost of living, inflation, low dollar

32 do something with interest rates,  
raise/lower

33 economic recovery, getting over the  
recession

34 economic stimulation, initiatives

35 farming/fishing issues (i.e., price of grain,  
overfishing, subsidy cuts)

36 promote small business, reduce gov't

interference in, what will be done for

#### High Cost of Government, Government Spending

40 general mention of cost of government  
(i.e., too many civil servants)

41 control government spending

42 reduce perks, high salaries, early retirement

43 government should be accountable for their  
spending, fiscal responsibility

44 immigration costs/cut back on

45 cut back on welfare, social services/ clean  
up abuse of

46 helicopter issues

#### Taxes

50 general mention (i.e., taxes)

51 abolish GST/taxes

52 lower GST/taxes

53 taxes are too high, no new increases

54 give tax breaks for small business

55 fairer taxation

#### Social Programs: Social Security

60 general mention, keep social programs,  
services

61 old age pensions/security, concerned about  
cutbacks, keep as is

62 child-care, increased availability, no  
cutbacks, more subsidies, keep family  
benefits

63 social programmes/services, concern about  
cutbacks (more than one mention)

64 no UIC cutbacks, no welfare cutbacks

#### Social Program: Education, Health Care and Seniors

66 education, concern about cutbacks,  
increases in tuition, access to

67 education, restructure system, no need for  
public/catholic

68 elderly, care of

69 health care, concern about cutbacks,  
availability, affordability, accessibility



### Moral Issues

- 70 lack of family values, morality
- 71 abortion issues
- 72 environmental issues
- 73 minority issues (i.e., equity, aboriginal, gay, women's rights)

### Crime & Punishment

- 76 crime/violence, too high, gun control
- 77 harsher penalties for criminals, more fairness in justice system
- 78 young offenders, revamp, need harsher penalties
- 79 other

### Continentalism

- 80 Free Trade, NAFTA, general mention of NAFTA, Free Trade
- 81 have too much to do with US, must maintain own identity, cultural independence
- 82 free trade/NAFTA - good
- 83 many jobs lost to FT/NAFTA, concern of impact on jobs
- 84 keep business, jobs in Canada
- 85 cancel FT/NAFTA, don't want
- 86 unsure about FT/NAFTA, need to renegotiate

### Representation Issues

- 90 get rid of Kim/Tories, specific mention
- 91 need more integrity, honesty, accountability, credibility from gov't reps at all levels
- 92 need stable gov't, one with foresight, strength, need good gov't, leaders
- 93 revamp election process, senate, structure of gov't
- 94 want Chretien/Liberals to win
- 95 want a change, change of gov't, leader, representative (no specifics), change for the better
- 96 representation for western provinces
- 97 only concerned with who wins, the outcome of the election, no specific mention
- 98 don't know, not codeable, other
- 99 refused

Respondents were asked about the unemployment rate, the inflation rate and the deficit (items CPSH4, CPSH5, and CPSH6 respectively). Answers to these open-ended questions were recorded in percentage terms (unemployment and inflation) or in billions of dollars (the deficit). A small percentage of respondents gave a number rather than a percent when asked about unemployment (e.g., 1.2 million Canadians). Using figures from Statistics Canada these responses were converted to percentage terms. When a respondent gave a range the average figure was coded. (For example, if someone answers that unemployment was between 11 and 12 percent, their response was coded as 11.5.) For all three questions a small set of codes were developed to accommodate non-numerical responses such as "higher than it has been in many years."

Responses to the open-ended question asking about Kim Campbell's cabinet job before she became Prime Minister were coded into nine categories: 01 = defence (includes DND {department of national defence}, head of armed forces, armed forces, military, etc.); 02 = justice (includes attorney general,

law ministry, etc.); 03 = finance; 04 = external affairs (includes foreign affairs); 05 = other federal ministry; 06 = MP (was just an ordinary member of parliament); 07 = municipal politician; 08 = lawyer/judge; and 09 = other responses and not codeable responses.

A number of questions, primarily in the sociodemographics (of both the campaign-period and pre-referendum questionnaires) allowed the interviewer to "write in" responses other than those precoded in the questionnaire. Questions that allowed for an "other" answer are identified by having an "other specify" listed in the response options for the question. (See, for example, CPSO9A, religious affiliation, which listed seven Protestant denominations as well as an "other specify" category.) All of the other specify responses were reviewed. Most often, the responses were recoded into existing precodes; on occasion, new response categories were added.

#### 4.52 Pre- and Post-Referendum Questionnaires<sup>11</sup>

The only open-ended question asked of all respondents was in the PR survey. Item PRA2 asked: "What proposals do you remember the media and politicians talking about before the referendum vote?" The open-ended response was coded to provide two types of information: first, a measure of the respondent's knowledge of the proposals in the Accord; and second, identification of proposals most often mentioned by Canadians.

The respondent's knowledge about the proposals was scored from "0" (no correct proposals mentioned and therefore "0" on the knowledge scale) to "3" (mentioned three correct proposals) and stored in the variable PRA2A. Variables PRA2B to PRA2I indicate whether or not the respondent mentioned 8 specific proposals ("1" = mentioned and "0" = not mentioned). The specific proposals included:

- PRA2B: Aboriginal People
- PRA2C: Senate
- PRA2D: Distinct Society
- PRA2E: Distribution of Seats (including 25% clause)
- PRA2F: Quebec/French issues
- PRA2G: Women's issues
- PRA2H: Veto/unanimity proposal
- PRA2I: Distribution of powers between federal and provincial governments

The post-referendum survey contained a second open-ended question (PRB4C), but it was only asked

---

<sup>11</sup> The open-ended responses were not coded for REFD18, the item asking about "who participated in the referendum debate." There was more than one debate and less than 200 respondents answered the item. As a result, any coding would result in categories with very small percentages of the sample.

of a subset (376) of the respondents. Respondents who indicated in previous questions that they had "changed their mind about how they were going to vote" during the referendum were asked to explain "what made them change their mind." Most of the responses were a version of "I got more information about the Accord during the referendum campaign." However, in an effort to maximize the utility of the responses, a finely graded list of 43 categories is coded in the data set. The small number of responses in each category (no one category counts for more than 10 percent of the responses) and the considerable overlap in many of the categories argues for collapsing of the categories before analysis.

#### 4.6 Response Time Measurements

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, 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. Questions that included response-time measurements, and the variables that indicate the time taken to answer the question, are listed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Questions That Include Response-Time Measurement

	Question	Question Number	Timer
1	party vote intentions for the election	CPSA3	CPSJF1
2	federal party identification	CPSM1	CPSJF2
3	federal party identification	PESL1	PESJF2
4	vote yes or no in the referendum	REFC2C or REFC2F	REFJF1
5	federal party identification	REFI1C	REFJF2
6	vote intentions if federal election held today	REFI4C	REFJF3
7	did you change your mind about how you were going to vote during the referendum campaign	PRB4B	PRJF1
8	how do you feel about Canada	PRH26	PRJF2
9	how do you feel about Quebec	PRH27	PRJF3

## 4.7 Linking the Data Sets

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. The same procedures were used between the pre- and post-referendum surveys, and between the post-referendum and campaign period survey. 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 Study was classified (in the variable RLINK) as being a "goodlink" - including respondents who only completed the CPS - (96 percent), "probably a goodlink" (2.6 percent), "probably a badlink" (0.8 percent), or "mailback badlink" (0.6 percent). The following conventions were used in the classification.

- i. When the name (or identifier), age, and sex were the same in all five surveys the case was classified as a "goodlink."
- ii. When the name was different, or there was change in sex, the case was coded as a "probable badlink."
- iii. When the age was different the case was coded as a "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 mail-back 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. Elimination of bad link cases will result in slightly smaller sample sizes than indicated in Table 4.1.

## 4.8 Map of Variables

NAME	POSITION	LABEL
------	----------	-------

IDNUM	1	Respondent Identification Number
REFPROV	2	Province Of Interview
REFDAY	3	Daily Sample
REFSUBS	4	Sample Replicate
REFAREA	5	Telephone Area Code
REFDATE	6	Date Of Interview <mmddy>
REFLANG	7	Language Of Interview
REFINTN	8	Interviewer's Number
REFATEMP	9	Total Number Of Call Attempts
REFREFUS	10	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
REFCONT	11	Total Times Respondent Contacted
REFANS	12	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
REFRES	13	Result Code
REFRN2	14	Question Ordering
REFRN3	15	Question Wording <REFE11>
REFRN4	16	Question Ordering
REFRN5	17	Question Wording <REFE11>
REFRN7	18	Question Wording <REFE11>
REFRN8	19	Question Ordering
REFRN9	20	Question Ordering
REFRN11	21	Question Ordering
REFRN14	22	Question Wording <REFE6,REFE7,REFE8>
REFJF1	23	Timer <REFC2C,REFC2F>
REFJF2	24	Timer <REFI1C>
REFJF3	25	Timer <REFI4C>
REFADULT	26	Number Of Adults In Household
REFCOMM	27	Comments Recorded By Interviewer
REFRGEN	28	Respondent's Gender
REFINT1	29	Interested In The Referendum Campaign
REFA1	30	Informed About Constitutional Agreement
REFA2	31	# Days In Past Week Watch News On TV
REFA3	32	Past Week See TV Commercials For YES/NO
REFA4	33	Past Week Hear Radio Commercials YES/NO
REFA5	34	# Days Past Week Read A Daily Newspaper
REFA6	35	Past Week Seen,Read,HeardAbout Ref Polls
REFC1	36	Likely To Vote In The Referendum
REFC2C	37	Think You Will Vote YES Or NO <REFRN2>
REFC2F	38	Think You Will Vote YES Or NO <REFRN2>
REFC3	39	Which Way Are You Leaning: YES Or NO
REFC4	40	This Your Final Decision Or Could Change
REFC5	41	Satisfaction With How Agreement Reached
REFD1	42	No Agreement Will Satisfy Quebec
REFD2	43	Agreement Will Reduce Quebec To Province
REFD3	44	Agreement Is Best Compromise We Can Get
REFD4	45	Agreement Allow Us Move On To Other Prob
REFD5	46	NO To Agreement=YES To Que Independence
REFD6	47	In Agreement: Winner Or Loser> Quebec
REFD7	48	Winner Or Loser> Respondent's Province
REFD8	49	Winner Or Loser> Federal Government
REFD9	50	Winner Or Loser> Aboriginal Peoples
REFD10	51	In Agreement: Winner Or Loser> Women
REFD11	52	In Agreement: Winner Or Loser> The West
REFD12	53	Meech Lake Accord> For Or Against

REFD13	54	Constitutional Agreement Vs. Meech Lake
REFD14	55	<Quebec> Vote For/Against Sovereignty
REFD15	56	<Quebec> See TV Debate: Bourassa/Parizeau
REFD16	57	<Quebec> Who Performed Best In Debate
REFD17	58	Seen TV Debate Among Premiers/Leaders
REFD18	59	Who Took Part In TV Debate
REFD19	60	Which Side Performed Best In TV Debate
REFE1	61	Which Prefer> Senate As Now Or Proposed
REFE2	62	Prefer> Senate As Now/Do Away/Proposed
REFE3	63	Prefer>Do Away Senate/As Is Now/Proposed
REFE4	64	Each Prov Equal# Senators Or Bigger More
REFE5	65	Agreement Give Senate Amount Of Power
REFE6	66	Shld Women Be Guaranteed Seats In Senate
REFE7	67	Women Be Guaranteed Half Seats In Senate
REFE8	68	Aboriginal Be Guaranteed Seats In Senate
REFE9	69	Proposal Recognize Aboriginal GovernSelf
REFE10	70	Proposal Recognize Quebec As Distinct
REFE11	71	Proposal Quebec 1/4 Seats In House Of C
REFE12	72	<Quebec> French Language Threatened In Q
REFE13	73	<Quebec>Easier Courts StrikeDown LangLaw
REFF1	74	Likelihood YES Side Will Win <Province>
REFF2	75	Likelihood YES Side Will Win <Quebec>
REFF3	76	Likelihood YES Side Will Win <Canada>
REFF4	77	Agreement Approved=Constitution Settled
REFF6	78	NO=Que&Canada> Constitution Q Disappear
REFF7	79	NO=Que&Canada> Will Quebec Separate
REFF9	80	NO=Que,YES=Canada>ConstitutionQDisappear
REFF10	81	NO=Que,YES=Canada> Will Quebec Separate
REFF11	82	Opinion On Quebec Sovereignty
REFF12	83	Opinion On Quebec Separation
REFF13	84	PQ Separates> Canada Form Economic Assoc
REFF14	85	PQ Separates> Your Standard Of Living
REFF15	86	PQ Separates> SoL: How Much Better
REFF16	87	PQ Separates> SoL: How Much Worse
REFG1A	88	Public Position> Pierre Trudeau
REFG1B	89	For Or Against> Pierre Trudeau
REFG2A	90	Public Position> Business Community
REFG2B	91	For Or Against> Business Community
REFG3A	92	Public Position> Women's Movement
REFG3B	93	For Or Against> Women's Movement
REFG4A	94	Public Position> Union Leaders
REFG4B	95	For Or Against> Union Leaders
REFG5A	96	Public Position> Preston Manning
REFG5B	97	For Or Against> Preston Manning
REFG6A	98	Public Position> Peter Lougheed
REFG6B	99	For Or Against> Peter Lougheed
REFG7A	100	Public Position> Claude Castonguay
REFG7B	101	For Or Against> Claude Castonguay
REFG8A	102	Public Position> Jean Allaire
REFG8B	103	For Or Against> Jean Allaire
REFH1	104	Which Government Looks After Needs Best
REFH2	105	How Do You Feel About> Pierre Trudeau
REFH3	106	How Do You Feel About> Brian Mulroney

REFH4	107	How Do You Feel About> Robert Bourassa
REFH5	108	How Do You Feel About> Jean Chretien
REFH6	109	How Do You Feel About> Audrey McLaughlin
REFH7	110	How Do You Feel About> Your Premier
REFH8	111	How Do You Feel About> Preston Manning
REFH9	112	How Do You Feel About> Peter Lougheed
REFH10	113	How Do You Feel About> Lucien Bouchard
REFH11	114	How Do You Feel About> Jacques Parizeau
REFH12	115	Up To Government Ensure Basic Needs Met
REFH13	116	Make Sure Something Works Before Chance
REFH14	117	Need Quotas Increase Women In Good Jobs
REFH15	118	People Like Me NotHave Say What Gov Does
REFH16	119	Canada Has 2 Founding Peoples:Fr & Eng
REFH17	120	Canada Has 3 Founding Peoples:Fr,Eng,Ab
REFH18	121	Make No Distinctions: We All Canadians
REFH19	122	People Come Canada Try Harder BeLike Cdn
REFH20	123	More Important In Democratic Society:
REFH21	124	Comes To Politics, Where Place Self
REFH22	125	How Much Feel Either Left Or Right
REFH23	126	Should Be Done Promote Women's Interests
REFH24	127	ShouldBeDonePromote Aboriginal Interests
REFH26	128	How Do You Feel About> Canada
REFH27	129	How Do You Feel About> Quebec
REFH28	130	How Do You Feel About> R's Province
REFH29	131	How Do You Feel About> English Canadians
REFH30	132	How Do You Feel About> Immigrants
REFH31	133	How Do You Feel About> Women's Movement
REFH32	134	How Do You Feel About>Business Community
REFH33	135	How Do You Feel About> The Media
REFH34	136	How Do You Feel About> Unions
REFI1C	137	Federal Party Affiliation
REFI2	138	Vote In Last Federal Election In 1988
REFI3	139	Party Vote For In Last Federal Election
REFI4C	140	Federal Election Held Today,Who Vote For
REFI5	141	<If D.K. In REFI4C> Party Leaning Toward
REFI6	142	Vote In Last Provincial Election In <>
REFI7	143	Party VoteFor In LastProvincial Election
REFI8	144	Provincial Election Held Today, Vote For
REFI10	145	<If D.K. In REFI8> Party Leaning Toward
REFN1	146	Respondent's Year Of Birth
REFN2	147	Highest Level Of Education Completed
REFN3	148	Respondent's Present Employment Status
REFN4	149	Respondent's Main Occupation
REFN5	150	Self-Employed Or Work For Someone Else
REFN6	151	Type Of Organisation Work For
REFN7	152	Type Of Government Work For
REFN8	153	R/Hhld Member Belong To A Union
REFN9	154	Religious Affiliation
REFN10	155	Importance Of God In Respondent's Life
REFN12	156	Respondent's Country Of Birth
REFN13	157	Ethnic Or Cultural Group
REFN14	158	Importance Of Ethnic Background To R
REFN15	159	Language Usually Speak At Home

REFN16	160	Language First Learned&Still Understand
REFN17	161	<If English> Carry A Conversation In Fr
REFN18	162	Total Household Income <Thousands>
REFN19	163	Total Household Income <Categories>
REFN20	164	How Many Separate Phone #s In Residence
REFN21	165	# Phone #s For Children,Fax,Computer,Etc
REFPOST	166	Postal Code <First 3 Digits>
REFINTER	167	Interest Of Questions
REFLENG	168	R's Perceived Interview Time <Minutes>
REFBLISH	169	Occupation:Respondent> Blishen 1981 SES
REFPINPR	170	Respondent> Pineo-Porter 1981 Category
PRPROV	171	Province Of Interview
PRDAY	172	Daily Sample
PRSUBS	173	Sample Replicate
PRAREA	174	Telephone Area Code
PRDATE	175	Date Of Interview <mmddy>
PRLANG	176	Language Of Interview
PRINTN	177	Interviewer's Number
PRATEMPT	178	Total Number Of Call Attempts
PRREFUS	179	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
PRCONT	180	Total Times Respondent Contacted
PRANS	181	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
PRTIME	182	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
PRRES	183	Result Code
PRRN1	184	Question Ordering
PRJF1	185	Timer <PRB4B>
PRJF2	186	Timer <PRH26>
PRJF3	187	Timer <PRH27>
PRCOMM	188	Comments Recorded By Interviewer
PRRGEN	189	Respondent's Gender
PRA1	190	How Feel About Outcome Of Referendum
PRA2	191	Proposals Mentioned By Media&Politicians
PRA2A	192	Amt Of Knowledge Re Proposals Mentioned
PRA2B	193	Specific Proposal> Aboriginal People
PRA2C	194	Specific Proposal> Senate
PRA2D	195	Specific Proposal> Distinct Society
PRA2E	196	Specific Proposal> Distribution of Seats
PRA2F	197	Specific Proposal> Quebec/French
PRA2G	198	Specific Proposal> Women's Issues
PRA2H	199	Specific Proposal> Veto/Unanimity
PRA2I	200	Specific Proposal> Powers=Federal & Prov
PRB1	201	Did You Vote In The Referendum
PRB2	202	<If NOT Vote> Why Did You Not Vote
PRB3	203	Did You Vote YES Or Did You Vote NO
PRB4A	204	Preference For The <YES/NO> Vote
PRB4B	205	Change Mind On How Vote During Campaign
PRB4C	206	What Made You Change Your Mind
PRB5	207	<Quebec> See TV Debate:Bourassa/Parizeau
PRC1	208	Proposal Recognize Aboriginal GovernSelf
PRC2	209	Proposal Quebec 1/4 Seats In House Of C
PRC3	210	Proposal Recognize Quebec As Distinct
PRC4	211	Quebec As Distinct, Agree Go:
PRC6	212	Each Prov Equal# Senators Or Bigger More



PRC7	213	Agreement Give Senate Amount Of Power
PRC8	214	Should We Recognize Aboriginal SelfGov
PRD1	215	Have Final Say In Changing Constitution
PRD2	216	What Do Now> Better Deal Or Put Aside
PRD3	217	Agreement CouldBeReached Acceptable Most
PRD4	218	Shld Quebec Have Ref=Whether Stay Canada
PRD5	219	<Quebec> Federalism AsIs Now/Sovereignty
PRD8	220	Quebec Separate From Canada
PRD9	221	PQ Separates> Canada Form Economic Assoc
PRH2	222	How Do You Feel About> Pierre Trudeau
PRH3	223	How Do You Feel About> Brian Mulroney
PRH4	224	How Do You Feel About> Robert Bourassa
PRH5	225	How Do You Feel About> Jean Chretien
PRH6	226	How Do You Feel About> Audrey McLaughlin
PRH7	227	How Do You Feel About> Your Premier
PRH8	228	How Do You Feel About> Preston Manning
PRH10	229	How Do You Feel About> Lucien Bouchard
PRH11	230	How Do You Feel About> Jacques Parizeau
PRH26	231	How Do You Feel About> Canada
PRH27	232	How Do You Feel About> Quebec
PRH1	233	How Do You Feel About> Politicians
PRF1	234	Better/Worse Off Financially Than Yr Ago
PRF2	235	Better/Worse Off Financially Yr From Now
PRF3	236	Respondent's Year Of Birth
PRINTER	237	Interest Of Questions
PRLENG	238	R's Perceived Interview Time <Minutes>
REFTYPE	239	Interview Type - Referendum
REFLINK	240	Link Between Pre & Post Referendum
REFHHWGT	241	Household Weight - Referendum
REFPWGT1	242	Provincial Weight <All> - Referendum
REFPWGT2	243	Provincial Weight <No Quebec>-Referendum
REFNWGT1	244	National Weight - Referendum
REFNWGT2	245	National Weight <No Quebec> - Referendum
CPSPROV	246	Province Of Interview
CPSDAY	247	Day Of Sample Release
CPSSUBS	248	Sample Subsets <Replicate>
CPSAREA	249	Telephone Area Code
CPSDATE	250	Date Of Interview <mmddyy>
CPSPANEL	251	RDD Respondent Or Panel Respondent
CPSIGEN	252	Interviewer's Gender
CPSLANG	253	Language Of Interview
CPSADULT	254	Number Of Adults <Cdn Citizens> In Hhld
CPSCOMM	255	Comments Recorded By Interviewer
CPSINTN	256	Interviewer's Number <800-899=French>
CPSATEMP	257	Total Number Of Call Attempts
CPSREFUS	258	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
CPSCONT	259	Total Times Respondent Contacted
CPSANS	260	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
CPSTIME	261	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
CPSRES	262	Outcome Of Interview
CPSRN1	263	Question Wording <CPSF1A--CPSF1F>
CPSRN2	264	Question Ordering <CPSL6A,CPSL6B>
CPSRN3	265	Question Wording <CPSL11A,CPSL11B>

CPSRN4	266	Question Wording <CPSL11A,CPSL11B>
CPSRN5	267	Question Wording <CPSG4>
CPSRN6	268	Question Wording <CPSL6B>
CPSRN7	269	Question Ordering <CPSL5A,CPSL5B>
CPSRN8	270	Question Ordering <CPSF10A,CPSF10B>
CPSRN9	271	Question Ordering <CPSF11A,CPSF11B>
CPSRN10	272	Question Ordering <CPSG6A,CPSG6B,CPSG6C>
CPSRN11	273	Question Ordering <CPSL7A--L7E,CPSL8A--L8E> (IGNORE)
CPSRN12	274	Question Ordering <CPSD2A--CPSD2E>
CPSRN13	275	Question Ordering <CPSD2G--CPSD2K>
CPSRN14	276	Question Ordering <CPSI1A,I2A,I3A,I4A>
CPSRN15	277	Question Ordering <CPSJ1A--D,CPSJ2A--D>
CPSRN16	278	Question Ordering <CPSJ1A,J1B,J1C,J1D>
CPSRN18	279	Question Ordering <CPSJ2A,J2B,J2C,J2D>
CPSRN19	280	Question Ordering <CPSL7A--G,CPSL8A--E>
CPSRN20	281	Question Ordering <CPSL7A--G,CPSL8A--E>
CPSRN21	282	Question Ordering <CPSL9A,CPSL9B>
CPSJF1	283	Timer <CPSA3>
CPSJF2	284	Timer <CPSM1>
CPSRGEN	285	Respondent's Gender
CPSA1	286	Most Important Issue To You Personally
CPSA2	287	How Likely Will Vote On Election Day
CPSA3	288	Party Think Will Vote For <CPSJF1>
CPSA4	289	Don't Know,NoParty> Party Leaning Toward
CPSA5	290	Final Choice, Or May Still Change Mind
CPSA6	291	If <Party> Not Have Candidate, Vote For
CPSA7A	292	Party Definitely Would Not Vote For-1st
CPSA7B	293	Party Definitely Would Not Vote For-2nd
CPSB1	294	Interested In Federal Election Campaign
CPSB2	295	Contacted By Local Candidate/PartyWorker
CPSB2A	296	Party Candidate/Worker From -1st Mention
CPSB2B	297	Party Candidate/Worker From -2nd Mention
CPSB2C	298	Party Candidate/Worker From -3rd Mention
CPSB3	299	Past Week>Discussed Politics With Others
CPSB4	300	Informed About Issues In The Campaign
CPSC1	301	Better/Worse Off Financially Than Yr Ago
CPSC1A	302	Much/Somewhat Better Off Than Year Ago
CPSC1B	303	Much/Somewhat Worse Off Than Year Ago
CPSC2	304	Better/Worse Off Financially Yr From Now
CPSC2A	305	Much/Somewhat Better Off Year From Now
CPSC2B	306	Much/Somewhat Worse Off Year From Now
CPSC3	307	Economic Policies FederalGovt Made You:
CPSD1A	308	How Well Informed About> Kim Campbell
CPSD1B	309	How Well Informed About> Jean Chretien
CPSD1C	310	Informed About> Audrey McLaughlin
CPSD1D	311	Informed About> Preston Manning
CPSD1E	312	Informed About> Lucien Bouchard
CPSD2A	313	Rating> Kim Campbell
CPSD2B	314	Rating> Jean Chretien
CPSD2C	315	Rating> Audrey McLaughlin
CPSD2D	316	Rating> Preston Manning
CPSD2E	317	Rating> Lucien Bouchard
CPSD2G	318	Rating> Federal Conservative Party

CPSD2H	319	Rating> Federal Liberal Party
CPSD2I	320	Rating> Federal New Democratic Party
CPSD2J	321	Rating> Reform Party
CPSD2K	322	Rating> Bloc Quebecois
CPSD2F	323	Rating> Brian Mulroney
CPSD3	324	Importance PM Speaks French Really Well
CPSE1	325	Past Year>Economic Condition In Province
CPSE1A	326	Economic Conditions> How Much Better
CPSE1B	327	Economic Conditions> How Much Worse
CPSE2	328	Federal Economic Policies Influence Prov
CPSE2A	329	Fed. Policies Influence> How Much Better
CPSE2B	330	Fed. Policies Influence> How Much Worse
CPSF1A	331	How Much Shld Be Done Promote <CPSRN1>
CPSF1B	332	Liberals> How Much Want To Do <CPSRN1>
CPSF1C	333	PC> How Much Want To Do <CPSRN1>
CPSF1D	334	NDP> How Much Want To Do <CPSRN1>
CPSF1E	335	Reform Party> HowMuch WantTo Do <CPSRN1>
CPSF1F	336	Bloc Quebecois>HowMuch WantToDo <CPSRN1>
CPSF2A	337	Think Canada Shld Have Closer Ties To US
CPSF2B	338	Liberals> Canada Should Be Closer To US
CPSF2C	339	PC> Canada Should Be Closer To US
CPSF2D	340	NDP> Canada Should Be Closer To US
CPSF2E	341	Reform> Canada Should Be Closer To US
CPSF2F	342	Bloc Que> Canada Should Be Closer To US
CPSF3A	343	Should Be Done For Business People
CPSF3B	344	Liberals> Want To Do For Business People
CPSF3C	345	PC> Want To Do For Business People
CPSF3D	346	NDP> Want To Do For Business People
CPSF3E	347	Reform> Want To Do For Business People
CPSF3F	348	Bloc Que> Want To Do For Business People
CPSG1	349	Favour Or Oppose Goods And Services Tax
CPSG2A	350	GST Is Necessary To Reduce The Deficit
CPSG2B	351	GST Is Unfair To Poor People
CPSG3A1	352	Which Federal Party Supports GST - 1st
CPSG3A2	353	Which Federal Party Supports GST - 2nd
CPSG3A3	354	Which Federal Party Supports GST - 3rd
CPSG3A4	355	Which Federal Party Supports GST - 4th
CPSG3A5	356	Which Federal Party Supports GST - 5th
CPSG3B1	357	Which Federal Party Opposes GST - 1st
CPSG3B2	358	Which Federal Party Opposes GST - 2nd
CPSG3B3	359	Which Federal Party Opposes GST - 3rd
CPSG3B4	360	Which Federal Party Opposes GST - 4th
CPSG3B5	361	Which Federal Party Opposes GST - 5th
CPSG4	362	Think Canada Get By Without GST<CPSRN5>
CPSG5	363	Canada Admit More Immigrants or Fewer
CPSG6A	364	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <CPSRN10>
CPSG6B	365	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <CPSRN10>
CPSG6C	366	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <CPSRN10>
CPSG7A	367	Better Off Women StayedHome WithChildren
CPSG7B	368	Homosexual Couples Allowed Legally Marry
CPSG7C	369	Capital Punishment Never Justified
CPSG7D	370	Woman MoreLikely AssaultedBy MalePartner
CPSG7E	371	Only Legally Married Shld Have Children

CPSG7F	372	Decision New Helicopters The Right One
CPSG7G	373	Politicians Say Anything To Get Elected
CPSG7H	374	Politicians No More Corrupt Than Others
CPSG7I	375	Gov Can't Do Much Solve Economic Probs
CPSG8A	376	Aboriginal Own Law/SameAsOthers<CPSRN20>
CPSG8B	377	Aboriginal SameAsOthers/Own Law<CPSRN20>
CPSG11	378	<PQ Only> Opinion On Quebec Sovereignty
CPSG12	379	<PQ Only> Separation=Standard Of Living
CPSG13	380	<PQ Only> Standard Of Living Better
CPSG14	381	<PQ Only> Standard Of Living Worse
CPSG15	382	<PQ Only> French Language Threatened
CPSH1	383	Past Year> Economy Of The Country
CPSH1A	384	Canada's Economy> How Much Better
CPSH1B	385	Canada's Economy> How Much Worse
CPSH2	386	Next 12 Months> Economy Of The Country
CPSH3	387	Federal Policies Made Canada's Economy:
CPSH3A	388	Federal Policies> How Much Better
CPSH3B	389	Federal Policies> How Much Worse
CPSH4	390	Unemployment Rate InCanada These Days<%>
CPSH5	391	Inflation Rate In Canada These Days <%>
CPSH6	392	Federal Government's Deficit <Billions>
CPSI1A	393	Describe> Campbell> Intelligent
CPSI1B	394	Describe> Campbell> Arrogant
CPSI1C	395	Describe> Campbell> Trustworthy
CPSI1D	396	Describe> Campbell> Speak For Women
CPSI1E	397	Describe> Campbell> Strong Leadership
CPSI1F	398	Describe> Campbell> Compassionate
CPSI1I	399	Kim Campbell Speaks French:
CPSI1J	400	Know Campbell's Cabinet Job Before PM
CPSI2A	401	Describe> Chretien> Intelligent
CPSI2B	402	Describe> Chretien> Arrogant
CPSI2C	403	Describe> Chretien> Trustworthy
CPSI2D	404	Describe> Chretien> Speak For Women
CPSI2E	405	Describe> Chretien> Strong Leadership
CPSI2F	406	Describe> Chretien> Compassionate
CPSI3A	407	Describe> McLaughlin> Intelligent
CPSI3B	408	Describe> McLaughlin> Arrogant
CPSI3C	409	Describe> McLaughlin> Trustworthy
CPSI3D	410	Describe> McLaughlin> Speak For Women
CPSI3E	411	Describe> McLaughlin> Strong Leadership
CPSI3F	412	Describe> McLaughlin> Compassionate
CPSI4A	413	Describe> Manning> Intelligent
CPSI4B	414	Describe> Manning> Arrogant
CPSI4C	415	Describe> Manning> Trustworthy
CPSI4D	416	Describe> Manning> Speak For Women
CPSI4E	417	Describe> Manning> Strong Leadership
CPSI4F	418	Describe> Manning> Compassionate
CPSI5A	419	Describe> Bouchard> Intelligent
CPSI5B	420	Describe> Bouchard> Arrogant
CPSI5C	421	Describe> Bouchard> Trustworthy
CPSI5D	422	Describe> Bouchard> Speak For Women
CPSI5E	423	Describe> Bouchard> Strong Leadership
CPSI5F	424	Describe> Bouchard> Compassionate

CPSI6	425	Party Leader Make Best Prime Minister
CPSJ1A	426	PC Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSJ1B	427	Lib Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSJ1C	428	NDP Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSJ1D	429	Reform Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSJ1E	430	Bloc Q Chances> Winning In Your Riding
CPSJ2A	431	PC Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSJ2B	432	Lib Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSJ2C	433	NDP Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSJ2D	434	Reform Chances> Winning In Whole Country
CPSJ2E	435	Bloc Q Chances> Winning MajoritySeats PQ
CPSJ3	436	<Prov> Represented By Strong C.Minister
CPSK1A	437	How Much Power Should Trade Unions Have
CPSK1B	438	Liberals> Power Want Unions To Have
CPSK1C	439	Conservatives> Power Want Unions To Have
CPSK1D	440	NDP> Power Want Unions To Have
CPSK1E	441	Reform> Power Want Unions To Have
CPSK1F	442	Bloc Quebecois>Power Want Unions To Have
CPSK2A	443	How Much Think Should Be Done For Women
CPSK2B	444	Liberals> Want To Do For Women
CPSK2C	445	Conservatives> Want To Do For Women
CPSK2D	446	NDP> Want To Do For Women
CPSK2E	447	Reform> Want To Do For Women
CPSK2F	448	Bloc Quebecois> Want To Do For Women
CPSK3A	449	What ShouldBe Done For Racial Minorities
CPSK3B	450	Liberals> Want To Do For Minorities
CPSK3C	451	Conservatives> Want To Do For Minorities
CPSK3D	452	NDP> Want To Do For Racial Minorities
CPSK3E	453	Reform> Want To Do For Racial Minorities
CPSK3F	454	Bloc Quebecois>Want To Do For Minorities
CPSL1	455	Free Trade Agreement With United States
CPSL2A	456	Agreement Necessary Ensure Large Market
CPSL2B	457	Unemployment GoneUp Because Of Agreement
CPSL3	458	Free Trade Agreement With US And Mexico
CPSL3A	459	How Strongly Support/Oppose Agreement
CPSL3B	460	Had To Choose, Support/Oppose Agreement
CPSL4A	461	New Agreement Necessary MaintainPosition
CPSL4B	462	Unemployment Go Up Because New Agreement
CPSL6A	463	Pay Higher Taxes Reduce Deficit <CPSRN2>
CPSL6B	464	Pay Higher Taxes Maintain Pgms <CPSRN6>
CPSL5A	465	Reduce Deficit/Maintain Pgms <CPSRN7>
CPSL5B	466	Maintain Pgms/Reduce Deficit <CPSRN7>
CPSL7A	467	Cut Spending> Defence
CPSL7B	468	Cut Spending> Welfare
CPSL7C	469	Cut Spending> Pensions&Old Age Security
CPSL7D	470	Cut Spending> Health Care
CPSL7E	471	Cut Spending> Unemployment Insurance
CPSL7F	472	Cut Spending> Education
CPSL7G	473	Cut Spending> Aid To DevelopingCountries
CPSL8A	474	Conservatives Win>What HappensTo Deficit
CPSL8B	475	Liberals Win> What Happens To Deficit
CPSL8C	476	NDP Win> What Happens To Deficit
CPSL8D	477	Reform Party Win>What Happens To Deficit

CPSL8E	478	Bloc Quebecois Win>What HappenTo Deficit
CPSL9A	479	Views: Unemployment/Inflation <CPSRN21>
CPSL9B	480	Views: Unemployment/Inflation <CPSRN21>
CPSL10A	481	Views On Government Services <CPSRN8>
CPSL10B	482	Views On Government Services <CPSRN8>
CPSL11A	483	Views:Health Care System<CPSRN3,RN4,RN9>
CPSL11B	484	Views:Health Care System<CPSRN3,RN4,RN9>
CPSM1	485	Federal Party Identification <CPSJF2>
CPSM2	486	How Strongly <Federal Party ID>
CPSM3	487	A Little Closer To One Federal Party
CPSM4	488	Which Federal Party Closer To
CPSM5	489	Vote In Last Federal Election - 1988
CPSM6	490	Party Voted For> Last Federal Election
CPSM7	491	Provincial Party Identification
CPSM8	492	How Strongly <Provincial Party ID>
CPSM9	493	A Little Closer To One Provincial Party
CPSM10	494	Which Provincial Party Closer To
CPSM11	495	Vote In Last Provincial Election
CPSM12	496	Party Voted For>Last Provincial Election
CPSM13	497	Provincial Election Held Today,Vote For:
CPSM14	498	Provincial Party Leaning Toward
CPSM15	499	Vote Constitutional Referendum Oct26/92
CPSM16	500	How Vote On Constitutional Referendum
CPSN1	501	# Days In Past Week Watch News On TV
CPSN1A	502	See TV Commercials For A Political Party
CPSN2	503	# Days Past Week Listen To News On Radio
CPSN2A	504	Hear RadioCommercials For PoliticalParty
CPSN3	505	# Days In Past Week Read Newspaper
CPSN3A	506	<Atlantic>Paper Read Most>Natnl Politics
CPSN3B	507	<Quebec> Paper Read Most>Natnl Politics
CPSN3C	508	<Ontario> Paper Read Most>Natnl Politics
CPSN3D	509	<Prairies>Paper Read Most>Natnl Politics
CPSN3E	510	<BC> Newspaper Read Most>Natnl Politics
CPSN4	511	See English TV Debate Among PartyLeaders
CPSN4A	512	Which Leader Performed Best In Debate
CPSN4B	513	Which Leader Performed Worst In Debate
CPSN5	514	See French TV Debate Among Party Leaders
CPSN5A	515	Which Leader Performed Best In Debate
CPSN5B	516	Which Leader Performed Worst In Debate
CPSN6	517	Past Week Heard/Read Polls About Parties
CPSN7	518	Main Source Information About Election
CPSN8	519	Which Source Is Most Important
CPSAGE	520	Respondent's Year Of Birth
CPSO2	521	Respondent's Marital Status
CPSO3	522	Highest Level of Education Completed
CPSJOB1	523	Employment Status
CPSJOB2	524	<If CPSJOB1=5,6,7> Main Income Earner
CPSJOB3	525	Are You/Main Wage Earner Self-Employed
CPSJOB4	526	Occupation <Stats Canada CCDO Code>
CPSJOB5	527	Work For Private Firm/Public/Government
CPSJOB5A	528	Work For Federal/Provincial Government
CPSJOB6	529	Do You/Hhld Member Belong To A Union
CPSJOB7	530	Out Of Work/Laid Off During Last Year

CPSO9	531	Religious Affiliation
CPSO9A	532	Church Or Denomination
CPSO10	533	In Your Life, Importance Of God
CPSO11	534	Country Of Birth
CPSO12	535	Year Come To Live In Canada
CPSO13	536	Ethnic Or Cultural Group
CPSO13A	537	Importance Of Ethnic Background
CPSO14	538	Language Usually Speak At Home
CPSO15	539	Language First Learned&Still Understand
CPSO16	540	Can You Carry A Conversation In French
CPSO18	541	Total Household Income <Thousands>
CPSO18A	542	Total Household Income <Category>
CPSO19	543	# Of Children Under 18 Live In Home
CPSO20	544	# Separate Residential Phone Numbers
CPSO21	545	# Phone Numbers For Children/Fax/PC,etc.
CPSPOST	546	Postal Code <Forward Sortation Area>
CPSINTER	547	Interest Of Questions
CPSLENG	548	R's Perceived Interview Length <Minutes>
CPSKNOW	549	Interviewer Rating> Level Of Knowledge
CPSBLISH	550	Occupation:Respondent> Blishen 1981 SES
CPSPINPR	551	Respondent> Pineo-Porter 1981 Category
PESPROV	552	Province Of Interview
PESCODE	553	Telephone Area Code
PESDATE	554	Date Of Interview <mmddy>
PESPANEL	555	RDD Respondent Or Panel Respondent
PESIGEN	556	Interviewer's Gender
PESLANG	557	Language Of Interview
PESCOMM	558	Comments Recorded By Interviewer
PESINTN	559	Interviewer's Number <800-899=French>
PESATEMP	560	Total Number Of Call Attempts
PESREF	561	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
PESCONT	562	Total Times Respondent Contacted
PESANS	563	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
PESTIME	564	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
PESRES	565	Outcome Of Interview
PESRN2	566	Question Ordering <PESE4A,PESE4B>
PESRN3	567	Question Ordering <PESE5A,PESE5B>
PESRN12	568	Question Ordering <PESD2A--PESD2E>
PESRN13	569	Question Ordering <PESD2G--PESD2K>
PESRN14	570	Question Ordering <PESG1A,G2A,G3A,G4A>
PESRN18	571	Question Ordering <PESD5A--PESD5E>
PESJF2	572	Timer <PESL1>
PESRGEN	573	Respondent's Gender
PESA1	574	Most Important Issue To You In Campaign
PESA2	575	Did You Vote In The Election
PESA4	576	Which Party Did You Vote For
PESA4A	577	Preference For <Party>
PESA4B	578	When Decide That You Were Going To Vote
PESA5A	579	If Had Voted, Party Would Have Voted For
PESA6	580	Election Day> Party Think Win In Riding
PESA7	581	Election Day> Party Think 2nd In Riding
PESA8	582	How Close Think Election Be In Riding
PESA9	583	Election Day> Party Think Win In Country

PESA10	584	Election Day> Party Think 2nd In Country
PESA11	585	Better Have Majority/Minority Government
PESA12	586	B.Q. ShldBe Allowed Official Opposition
PESB1	587	Interested In Federal Election Campaign
PESB2	588	Attention Pay To TV News About Campaign
PESB3	589	Attention Pay Newspapers About Campaign
PESB4	590	Attention Pay Radio News About Campaign
PESB5	591	See French TV Debate Among Party Leaders
PESB5A	592	Leader Performed Best In French Debate
PESB5B	593	Leader Performed Worst In French Debate
PESB6	594	See EnglishTV Debate Among Party Leaders
PESB6A	595	Leader Performed Best In English Debate
PESB6B	596	Leader Performed Worst In English Debate
PESC1	597	During Campaign> Discuss Politics:Others
PESC2	598	During Campaign> Help A Party
PESC2A	599	During Campaign> Which Party Helped
PESC2B	600	During Campaign> Help Any Other Party
PESC3	601	During Campaign> Contacted By Candidates
PESC3A	602	During Campaign> Party Contacted By-1st
PESC3B	603	During Campaign> Party Contacted By-2nd
PESC3C	604	During Campaign> Party Contacted By-3rd
PESC3D	605	During Campaign> Party Contacted By-4th
PESC5	606	Informed About Issues In The Campaign
PESD1A	607	How Well Informed About> Kim Campbell
PESD1B	608	How Well Informed About> Jean Chretien
PESD1C	609	Informed About> Audrey McLaughlin
PESD1D	610	Informed About> Preston Manning
PESD1E	611	Informed About> Lucien Bouchard
PESD2A	612	Rating> Kim Campbell
PESD2B	613	Rating> Jean Chretien
PESD2C	614	Rating> Audrey McLaughlin
PESD2D	615	Rating> Preston Manning
PESD2E	616	Rating> Lucien Bouchard
PESD2G	617	Rating> Federal Conservative Party
PESD2H	618	Rating> Federal Liberal Party
PESD2I	619	Rating> Federal New Democratic Party
PESD2J	620	Rating> Reform Party
PESD2K	621	Rating> Bloc Quebecois
PESD4A	622	Informed About> Conservative Candidate
PESD4B	623	Informed About> Liberal Candidate
PESD4C	624	Informed About> NDP Candidate
PESD4D	625	Informed About> Reform Party Candidate
PESD4E	626	Informed About> Bloc Quebecois Candidate
PESD5A	627	Rating> Conservative Candidate
PESD5B	628	Rating> Liberal Candidate
PESD5C	629	Rating> NDP Candidate
PESD5D	630	Rating> Reform Candidate
PESD5E	631	Rating> Bloc Quebecois Candidate
PESD5F	632	Rating> Provincial Premier
PESD5G	633	Rating> Pierre Trudeau
PESD5H	634	Rating> Jean Charest
PESE1A	635	Federal Government Attention To <Prov>
PESE2B	636	<PQ Only> Opinion On Quebec Sovereignty



PESE4A	637	Reduce Unemploy/Reduce Deficit <PESRN2>
PESE4B	638	Reduce Deficit/Reduce Unemploy <PESRN2>
PESE5A	639	Views On Pensions To Elderly <PESRN3>
PESE5B	640	Views On Pensions To Elderly <PESRN3>
PESE8	641	Only Way Create Jobs=Eliminate Deficit
PESE9	642	Maintain Social Pgms=Eliminate Deficit
PESE12	643	NDP Provincial Proves Can't Govern
PESE13	644	Government Accepts High Unemploy=Defeat
PESE15	645	Government Leave Job Creation To Private
PESE15B	646	Crack Down On Crime Even If Lose Rights
PESE16	647	<PQ Only> Jean Chretien Betrayed Quebec
PESE17A	648	Which Party Promised Do Away With NAFTA
PESE17B	649	Which Party Promised Do Away With NAFTA
PESE17C	650	Which Party Promised Do Away With NAFTA
PESE17D	651	Which Party Promised Do Away With NAFTA
PESE18A	652	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 3Yrs
PESE18B	653	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 3Yrs
PESE18C	654	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 3Yrs
PESE18D	655	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 3Yrs
PESE19A	656	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 5Yrs
PESE19B	657	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 5Yrs
PESE19C	658	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 5Yrs
PESE19D	659	Party Promised Eliminate Deficit In 5Yrs
PESE20A	660	Promised Increase Spending Public Works
PESE20B	661	Promised Increase Spending Public Works
PESE20C	662	Promised Increase Spending Public Works
PESE20D	663	Promised Increase Spending Public Works
PESF1	664	Rating> How Feel About Canada
PESF2	665	Rating> How Feel About Quebec
PESF4	666	Rating> How Feel About United States
PESF6	667	Rating> How Feel About Racial Minorities
PESF7	668	Rating> How Feel About Aboriginal Peoples
PESG1A	669	Describe> Campbell> Arrogant
PESG1B	670	Describe> Campbell> Trustworthy
PESG1C	671	Describe> Campbell> Strong Leadership
PESG1D	672	Describe> Campbell> Aggressive
PESG2A	673	Describe> Chretien> Arrogant
PESG2B	674	Describe> Chretien> Trustworthy
PESG2C	675	Describe> Chretien> Strong Leadership
PESG2D	676	Describe> Chretien> Aggressive
PESG3A	677	Describe> McLaughlin> Arrogant
PESG3B	678	Describe> McLaughlin> Trustworthy
PESG3C	679	Describe> McLaughlin> Strong Leadership
PESG3D	680	Describe> McLaughlin> Aggressive
PESG4A	681	Describe> Manning> Arrogant
PESG4B	682	Describe> Manning> Trustworthy
PESG4C	683	Describe> Manning> Strong Leadership
PESG4D	684	Describe> Manning> Aggressive
PESG5A	685	Describe> Bouchard> Arrogant
PESG5B	686	Describe> Bouchard> Trustworthy
PESG5C	687	Describe> Bouchard> Strong Leadership
PESG5D	688	Describe> Bouchard> Aggressive
PESH1	689	Rating> How Feel About Farmers

PESH2	690	Rating> How Feel About People On Welfare
PESH3	691	Rating> How Feel About Small Business
PESH4	692	Rating> How Feel About Labour Unions
PESH5	693	Rating> How Feel About Old People
PESH6	694	Rating> How Feel About Big Business
PESH7	695	Rating> How Feel About Feminists
PESH8	696	Rating> How Feel About The Police
PESH9	697	Rating> How Feel About Homosexuals
PESH10	698	Rating> How Feel About Anti-Abortion Grp
PESL1	699	Federal Party Identification <PESJF2>
PESL2	700	How Strongly <Federal Party ID>
PESL3	701	A Little Closer To One Federal Party
PESL4	702	Which Federal Party Closer To
PESL5	703	Satisfaction With Democracy In Canada
PESAGE	704	Respondent's Year Of Birth
PESINTER	705	Interest Of Questions
PESLENG	706	R's Perceived Interview Length <Minutes>
PESPOST	707	Postal Code <Forward Sortation Area>
PESKNOW	708	Interviewer Rating> Level Of Knowledge
MBSANEL	709	CPS RDD Respondent Or Panel Respondent
MBSA1	710	Gone Too Far Pushing Equal Rights
MBSA2	711	Not Get Ahead Have Only Selves To Blame
MBSA3	712	Big Problem Canada:Not Give Equal Chance
MBSA4	713	People Work Hard = Get What They Want
MBSA5	714	Not Big Problem Some Have More Chance
MBSA6	715	Lay Off Women Whose Husbands Have Jobs
MBSA7	716	Too Much Emphasis On Individual Freedom
MBSA8	717	Gov Do More Reduce Income Gap Rich&Poor
MBSA9	718	Use Of Strikes Ends Up Hurting Workers
MBSA10	719	Difficult:Women Get Jobs = Abilities
MBSA11	720	Private Enterprise:Not Get Fair Share
MBSA12	721	Protect Env. More Imp Than Creating Jobs
MBSA13	722	Businesses Allowed Make Much Money Can:
MBSA14	723	Welfare Make LessWilling Look After Self
MBSA15	724	Pornographic Films/Mags Should Be Banned
MBSA16	725	Public Money Not Used Any Religious Schl
MBSA17	726	People NotHave Respect TraditionalValues
MBSA18	727	Bible Actual Word Of God, Take Literally
MBSA19	728	Look After Cdns BornHere First,Others2nd
MBSB1	729	Fact Some Regions In Canada Are Poorer:
MBSB2	730	A Person's Wage Should Depend On:
MBSB3	731	System Of Private Enterprise Abolished:
MBSB4	732	Government Should <Standard Of Living>:
MBSB5	733	Government Should <Environment>:
MBSB6	734	Workers And Management:
MBSB7	735	Competition:
MBSB8	736	When It Comes To Job Hiring:
MBSB9	737	Closer To Your View <People On Welfare>:
MBSB10	738	Resolving Conflict:
MBSC1A	739	Influence Has> Labour Unions
MBSC1B	740	Influence ShldHave> Labour Unions
MBSC2A	741	Influence Has> Farmers
MBSC2B	742	Influence ShldHave> Farmers

MBSC3A	743	Influence Has> Big Business
MBSC3B	744	Influence ShldHave> Big Business
MBSC4A	745	Influence Has> Media
MBSC4B	746	Influence ShldHave> Media
MBSC5A	747	Influence Has> Intellectuals
MBSC5B	748	Influence ShldHave> Intellectuals
MBSC6A	749	Influence Has> Banks
MBSC6B	750	Influence ShldHave> Banks
MBSC7A	751	Influence Has> Consumers
MBSC7B	752	Influence ShldHave> Consumers
MBSC8A	753	Influence Has> Feminists
MBSC8B	754	Influence ShldHave> Feminists
MBSC9A	755	Influence Has> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC9B	756	Influence ShldHave> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC10A	757	Influence Has> Racial Minorities
MBSC10B	758	Influence ShldHave> Racial Minorities
MBSC11A	759	Influence Has> People On Welfare
MBSC11B	760	Influence ShldHave> People On Welfare
MBSC12A	761	Influence Has> Small Business
MBSC12B	762	Influence ShldHave> Small Business
MBSC13A	763	Influence Has> Old People
MBSC13B	764	Influence ShldHave> Old People
MBSC14A	765	Influence Has> The Police
MBSC14B	766	Influence ShldHave> The Police
MBSC15A	767	Influence Has> Homosexuals
MBSC15B	768	Influence ShldHave> Homosexuals
MBSC16A	769	Influence Has> Anti-Abortion Groups
MBSC16B	770	Influence ShldHave> Anti-Abortion Groups
MBSD1	771	Elected To Parliament Lose Touch People
MBSD2	772	Rather Trust Down-To-Earth Thinking
MBSD3	773	Politics&Government Seem So Complicated
MBSD4	774	Most People Not Know What Best For Them
MBSD5	775	Not Think Gov't Cares What People Think
MBSD6	776	People Have Sense Tell Gov't Do Good Job
MBSD7	777	Major Issues Too Complicated For Voters
MBSD8	778	People Like Me NotHave Say What Gov Does
MBSD9	779	Solve National Prob=GrassRoots Decisions
MBSD10	780	Gov ShldPay Most Attention Well-Informed
MBSD11	781	All Provinces Should Be Treated The Same
MBSD12	782	In Democracy No Decisions Made In Secret
MBSD13	783	All Federal Parties Basically The Same
MBSD14	784	Parties Spend TooMuch Time Re Minorities
MBSD15	785	People In PQ Talk Separation,Not Mean It
MBSD16	786	Gov Services: French In PQ/English Rest
MBSE1	787	Your View> Treatment Of People:
MBSE2	788	The Feminist Movement:
MBSE3	789	More Important In Democratic Society:
MBSE4	790	Your View> Equality Of Men & Women:
MBSE5	791	Prov Law Conflicts Charter, Final Say
MBSE6	792	Your View> Marital Violence:
MBSE7	793	Members Of The RCMP:
MBSE8	794	Feminist Movement Encourages Women:
MBSE9	795	Your View> Aboriginal Peoples:

MBSE10	796	Fed Elections=Politicians Pay Attention
MBSE11	797	Stopped Having Elections,Life Would Be:
MBSF1	798	Confidence> Organised Religion
MBSF2	799	Confidence> Armed Forces
MBSF3	800	Confidence> Education System
MBSF4	801	Confidence> Legal System
MBSF5	802	Confidence> Social Security System
MBSF6	803	Confidence> Civil Service
MBSF7	804	Confidence> Newspapers
MBSF8	805	Confidence> Labour Unions
MBSF9	806	Confidence> Police
MBSF10	807	Confidence> Federal Government
MBSF11	808	Confidence> Provincial Government
MBSF12	809	Confidence> Big Business
MBSF13	810	Confidence> TV News
MBSG1	811	Participate Peacekeeping Even If Risk
MBSG2	812	Society BetterOff If Have Similar Values
MBSG3	813	Respect For Authority Children ShldLearn
MBSG4	814	Most French Cdns Support Bilingualism
MBSG5	815	Most English Cdns Support Bilingualism
MBSG6	816	Too Many Recent Immigrants NotWant Fit
MBSG7	817	Most Questions Just One Right Answer
MBSG8	818	Caring For Children, Men Less Patient
MBSG9	819	Something Wrong Woman Not Want Children
MBSG10	820	Ethnic Minorities NotWant Special Pgms
MBSH1	821	Do You Think That People Running Gov't:
MBSH2	822	Think That People In The Government:
MBSH3	823	Trust Gov't In Ottawa Do What Is Right:
MBSH4	824	Do You Feel That People Running Gov't:
MBSI1A1	825	Goal> Maintain High Rate Economic Growth
MBSI1A2	826	Goal> Maintain High Rate Economic Growth
MBSI1B1	827	Goal> Country Has Strong Defence Forces
MBSI1B2	828	Goal> Country Has Strong Defence Forces
MBSI1C1	829	Goal>People Have More Say:Work/Community
MBSI1C2	830	Goal>People Have More Say:Work/Community
MBSI1D1	831	Goal> Make Cities/Countryside Beautiful
MBSI1D2	832	Goal> Make Cities/Countryside Beautiful
MBSI2A1	833	Goal> Maintaining Order In The Nation
MBSI2A2	834	Goal> Maintaining Order In The Nation
MBSI2B1	835	Goal> Give People More Say Gov Decisions
MBSI2B2	836	Goal> Give People More Say Gov Decisions
MBSI2C1	837	Goal> Fighting Rising Prices
MBSI2C2	838	Goal> Fighting Rising Prices
MBSI2D1	839	Goal> Protecting Freedom Of Speech
MBSI2D2	840	Goal> Protecting Freedom Of Speech
MBSI3A1	841	Goal> Maintaining A Stable Economy
MBSI3A2	842	Goal> Maintaining A Stable Economy
MBSI3B1	843	Goal>Less Impersonal,More Humane Society
MBSI3B2	844	Goal>Less Impersonal,More Humane Society
MBSI3C1	845	Goal> The Fight Against Crime
MBSI3C2	846	Goal> The Fight Against Crime
MBSI3D1	847	Goal>Society:Ideas Count More Than Money
MBSI3D2	848	Goal>Society:Ideas Count More Than Money

MBSJA	849	Group Closest To You Re Views/Feelings
MBSJB	850	Other Group CloseToYou Re Views/Feelings
MBSAGE	851	Respondent's Year Of Birth
MBSRGEN	852	Respondent's Gender
MBSQLANG	853	Language Of Questionnaire
MBSPROV	854	Province Of Interview
CESTYPE	855	Interview Type-Canadian Election Survey
CPSHHWGT	856	Household Weight - CES Campaign
CPSPWGT1	857	Provincial Weight <All> - CES Campaign
CPSPWGT2	858	Provincial Weight <No PQ> - CES Campaign
CPSNWGT1	859	National Weight <All> - CES Campaign
CPSNWGT2	860	National Weight <No PQ> - CES Campaign
RTYPE1	861	Respondent <Pre Referendum>
RTYPE2	862	Respondent <Pre & Post Referendum>
RTYPE3	863	Respondent <CES/Campaign Period>
RTYPE4	864	Respondent <CES/Post Election>
RTYPE5	865	Respondent <CES/Mail Back Survey>
RTYPE6	866	Respondent <Panel: REF&PR&CPS&PES&MBS>
RTYPE7	867	Respondent <Panel: REF&PR&CPS&PES>
RTYPE8	868	Respondent <Panel: REF&PR&CPS>
RTYPE9	869	Respondent <RDD: CPS&PES&MBS>
RTYPE10	870	Respondent <RDD: CPS&PES>
RTYPE11	871	Respondent <RDD: CPS>
RLINK	872	Linking REF/PR/CPS/PES/MBS Respondents

## 4.9 Occupational Classification

All respondents were asked to describe their current or last occupation. Respondents in the panel sample component were asked their occupation in the pre-referendum survey (REFN4) and respondents from the RDD sample component were asked their occupation in the campaign-period survey (CPSJOB4). Respondents who, when asked their employment status (item REFN3 in the pre-referendum and item CPSJOB1 in the campaign-period), described themselves as disabled, a student, or a homemaker were asked about the occupation of the main wage earner. 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 Blishen Scores are contained in the variable "REFBLISH" and "CPSBLISH" and are identical to those shown in the detailed codebook. The Pineo/Porter/McRoberts scores are contained in the variable "REFPINPR" and "CPSPINPR." The full set of SPSS<sup>x</sup> recode statements used to create these two indices is available from the Institute on request.

#### 4.10 Listing of Occupations by Occupational Classification Number, CCDO 1980 with accompanying Blishen Socio-Economic Index Score, 1981

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

2341 Judges and magistrates	93.27	3319 Fine+com. art,phot.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	40.57
2343 Lawyers and notaries	75.60	3330 Prod.+direct.,perf.+audio-vis. arts	57.04
2349 In law and jurisprudence:n.e.c.	48.72	3331 Conductors,composers+arrangers	42.01
2350 Superv.:library,museum+archival sci.	57.97	3332 Musicians and singers	36.58
2351 Librarians,archivists+conservators	55.40	3333 Music+musical entertain. rel.:n.e.c.	32.35
2353 Techn. in library,museum+archival sci.	51.11	3334 Dancers and choreographers	32.94
2359 Library,museum+archival sci.:n.e.c.	37.70	3335 Actors/actresses	42.94
2391 Educational+vocational counsellors	67.61	3337 Radio and television announcers	46.43
2399 Other social sci.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	51.54	3339 Performing and audio-visual arts:n.e.c.	37.54
2511 Ministers of religion	52.84	3351 Writers and editors	54.58
2513 Nuns and brothers	42.17	3355 Translators and interpreters	57.30
2519 Religion:n.e.c.	43.27	3359 Writing:n.e.c.	50.15
2711 University teachers	75.87	3360 Supervisors:sports and recreation	38.48
2719 University teaching+related:n.e.c.	46.83	3370 Coach.,train.,instr.+manag.:sport+rec.	36.71
2731 Elementary+kindergarten teachers	63.64	3371 Referees and related officials	23.77
2733 Secondary school teachers	70.19	3373 Athletes	40.36
2739 Elemen./secon. teach.+rel.:n.e.c.	43.38	3375 Attendants:sport and recreation	24.93
2791 Comm. college+vocat. school teach.	66.03	3379 Sport and recreation:n.e.c.	25.74
2792 Fine arts school teachers:n.e.c.	40.93	4110 Supervisors:stenographic and typing	46.00
2793 Post-secondary school teachers:n.e.c.	67.05	4111 Secretaries and stenographers	41.82
2795 Teachers of exceptional students:n.e.c.	58.09	4113 Typists and clerk-typists	38.47
2797 Instructors and training officers:n.e.c.	49.94	4130 Supervis.:bookkeep.,account-rec.+rel.	45.39
2799 Other teaching and related:n.e.c.	53.23	4131 Bookkeepers and accounting clerks	40.28
3111 Physicians and surgeon	101.31	4133 Cashiers and tellers	28.31
3113 Dentists	101.74	4135 Insurance,bank and other finance clerks	40.51
3115 Veterinarians	72.24	4137 Statistical clerks	41.79
3117 Osteopaths and chiropractors	70.24	4139 Bookkeep.,account-record.+rel.:n.e.c.	40.23
3119 Health diagnosing and treating:n.e.c.	57.21	4140 Supervis.:office mach.+e.d.p.equ.oper.	51.16
3130 Supervisors:nursing,therapy+rel.assis.	63.51	4141 Office machine operators	37.39
3131 Nurses,regist.,grad.+nurses-in-train.	55.26	4143 Electronic data-processing equip. oper.	41.93
3132 Orderlies	38.68	4150 Supervisors:mat. record.,sched.+dist.	44.50
3134 Registered nursing assistants	46.51	4151 Production clerks	43.11
3135 Nursing attendants	33.60	4153 Shipping and receiving clerks	34.11
3136 Audio and speech therapists	62.36	4155 Stock clerks and related	35.46
3137 Physiotherapists	56.56	4157 Weighers	32.07
3138 Occupational therapists	55.23	4159 Mater. recording,sched.,distrib.:n.e.c.	31.89
3139 Nursing,therapy+rel. assisting:n.e.c.	40.44	4160 Superv.:library,file+corres. clerks+rel.	50.57
3151 Pharmacists	64.39	4161 Library and file clerks	34.85
3152 Dietitians and nutritionists	59.31	4169 Library,file and corres.clerks+rel.:n.e.c.	43.50
3153 Optometrists	79.63	4170 Superv.:recep.,info.,mail+message dist.	46.46
3154 Dispensing opticians	48.55	4171 Receptionists and information clerks	35.04
3155 Radiolog. technologists+technicians	56.78	4172 Mail carriers	42.29
3156 Med lab. technologists+technicians	55.79	4173 Mail and postal clerks	38.15
3157 Denturists	59.02	4175 Telephone operators	33.25
3158 Dental hygienists+dental assistants	45.02	4177 Messengers	28.82
3161 Dental laboratory technicians	45.15	4179 Recep.,info.,mail+mes. distrib.:n.e.c.	34.90
3162 Respiratory technicians	59.05	4190 Supervis.:other clerical+related:n.e.c.	47.88
3169 Other in medicine and health:n.e.c.	39.86	4191 Collectors	43.10
3311 Painters,sculptors and related artists	36.88	4192 Claim adjusters	41.70
3313 Product and interior designers	43.47	4193 Travel clerks,ticket,station, freight agen.	44.92
3314 Advertising and illustrating artists	47.23	4194 Hotel clerks	31.63
3315 Photographers and cameramen	44.66	4195 Personnel clerks	45.22

4197 General office clerks	37.93	6199 Other service:n.e.c.	27.60
4199 Other clerical and related:n.e.c.	39.01	7113 Livestock farmers	29.59
5130 Supervisors:sales:commodities	41.01	7115 Crop farmers	31.32
5131 Technical sales and related advisers	57.89	7119 Farmers:n.e.c.	27.92
5133 Commercial travellers	50.52	7180 Fore./w:oth. farm.,hort.+ anim. husb.	38.95
5135 Sales clerks, salesp.:commod.:n.e.c.	30.93	7183 Livestock farm workers	25.36
5141 Street vendors+door-to-door sales	29.95	7185 Crop farm workers	22.04
5143 Newspaper carriers and vendors	17.81	7195 Nursery and related workers	26.99
5145 Service station attendants	21.47	7196 I.t.g.+s.:other farm.,horticul.+anim. husb	25.71
5149 Sales:commodities:n.e.c.	29.16	7197 Farm machinery operators	23.76
5170 Supervisors:sales:services	56.44	7199 Other farming,horti.+animal husb.n.e.c.	23.34
5171 Insurance sales	50.18	7311 Captains+other officers:fishing vessels	36.35
5172 Real estate sales	49.99	7313 Net,trap and line fishing	24.59
5173 Sales agents+ traders:securities	58.62	7315 Trapping and related	19.02
5174 Advertising sales	47.26	7319 Fishing,trapping and related:n.e.c.	22.73
5177 Business services sales	52.09	7510 Foremen/women:forestry and logging	45.16
5179 Sales:services:n.e.c.	44.56	7511 Forestry conservations	34.14
5190 Supervisors:other sales	44.32	7513 Timber cutting and related	25.23
5191 Buyers,wholesale and retail trade	46.08	7516 Log inspecting,grading,scaling+rel.	44.19
5193 Route drivers	35.73	7517 Log hoisting,sorting,moving+ rel.	34.57
5199 Other sales:n.e.c.	32.84	7518 Labour.+oth. elemental:forestry, log.	25.34
6111 Fire-fighting	51.17	7519 Forestry and logging:n.e.c.	32.30
6112 Police officers+detectives,gov't	58.78	7710 Forem/w:min.+quar. incl.oil+gas field	54.07
6113 Police agents+investigators,private	46.60	7711 Rotary well-drilling and related	42.43
6115 Guards and related security	31.95	7713 Rock and soil-drilling	40.23
6116 Commissioned officers,armed forces	62.19	7715 Blasting	40.43
6117 Other ranks,armed forces	41.69	7717 Min.+quarry.:cut.,handl.+loading	39.56
6119 Protection service:n.e.c.	33.20	7718 Lab.+oth. elem. min + quarry incl.	
6120 Supervis.:food+bev. prep.+rel. serv.	34.64		oil+gas
6121 Chefs and cooks	25.56		34.73
6123 Bartenders	29.24	7719 Min.&quarry. incl. oil&gas field:n.e.c.	40.74
6125 Food and beverage serving	23.31	8110 Foremen/women:mineral ore treating	51.56
6129 Food and bev. prep.+ rel. serv.:n.e.c.	26.52	8111 Crushing and grinding:mineral ores	39.45
6130 Supervis.:in lodging+oth. accom.	31.36	8113 Mix.,separat.,filter.&rel.:mineral ores	42.59
6133 Lodg. cleaners,except priv. househo.	21.37	8115 Melting and roasting:mineral ores	43.35
6135 Sleeping-car and baggage porters	27.46	8116 I.t.g.+s.:mineral ore treating	45.92
6139 Lodging and other accom.:n.e.c.	26.13	8118 Labour.+oth. element.:miner. ore treat.	37.94
6141 Funeral directors,embalmers+ rel.	47.32	8119 Mineral ore treating:n.e.c.	40.81
6142 Housekeepers,servants and related	22.08	8130 Foremen/women:metal processing+rel.	51.27
6143 Barbers,hairstylists and related	35.62	8131 Metal smelting,converting and refining	40.30
6144 Guides	32.87	8133 Metal heat-treating	39.33
6145 Travel+rel. attend.,exc. food+bev.	48.83	8135 Metal rolling	41.18
6147 Child-care occupations	23.70	8137 Moulding,coremaking and metal casting	36.45
6149 Personal service:n.e.c.	25.53	8141 Metal extruding and drawing	36.41
6160 Supervis.:apparel+furnishings ser.	34.28	8143 Plating,metal spraying and related	33.89
6162 Laundering and dry cleaning	25.90	8146 I.t.g.+s.:metal processing	44.50
6165 Pressing	24.49	8148 Labouring&other elemental:metal proc.	36.06
6169 Apparel+furnishings service:n.e.c.	24.49	8149 Metal processing and related:n.e.c.	38.29
6190 Supervisors:other service	37.46	8150 Forem./w:clay,glass+stone pro.,for.+rel	44.48
6191 Janitors, charworkers and cleaners	26.36	8151 Furnacemen,kiln work.:clay,glass,stone	36.43
6193 Elevator-operating	32.21	8153 Separ.,grind.,crush.,mix.:clay,glass,stone	34.81
6198 Labouring+oth. elemental:oth. serv.	21.24	8155 Forming:clay,glass and stone	34.85



8156 I.t.g.+s.:clay,glass+stone process.+form	37.98	8276 I.t.g.+s.:textile processing	30.21
8158 Labour.+oth. elem.:clay,glass+stone process.+form.	31.45	8278 Labour+oth. elemental:textile proc.	27.40
8159 Clay,glass+stone proc.,form.+rel.:n.e.c.	36.07	8279 Textile processing;n.e.c.	29.65
8160 Forem./w:chem.,petrol,rubb., plast.+rel.mat.proc.	49.77	8290 Foremen/women:other processing	43.35
8161 Mixing,blending:chemicals&rel. mat.	36.19	8293 Tobacco processing	36.65
8163 Filter.,strain.+separat.:chem.+rel.mat.	40.14	8295 Hide and pelt processing	28.42
8165 Distill.,subl.+carbon.:chem.+rel.mat.	51.21	8296 I.t.g.+s.:other processing	35.64
8167 Roasting,cook.,dry.:chem.+rel.mat.	39.76	8298 Labouring+other elemental:other proc.	28.78
8171 Crushing,grinding:chem.+rel.mat.	34.69	8299 Other processing;n.e.c.	38.18
8173 Coating,calendering:chem.rel.mat.	32.40	8310 Foremen/women:metal machining	50.89
8176 I.t.g.+s:chem.,petrol.rubber,plast.+rel.mat.process.	43.64	8311 Tool and die making operations	48.15
8178 Labour.+oth.elem.:chemicals,petr.rub.plas.+rel.mat.proc.	32.50	8313 Machinist and machine tool setting-up	43.99
8179 Chem.,petrol.,rubber,plast.+rel.mat.process.n.e.c.	40.75	8315 Machine tool operating	38.43
8210 Foremen/w:food,bev.+rel. processing	41.92	8316 I.t.g.+s.:metal machining	42.47
8211 Flour and grain milling	34.77	8319 Metal machining;n.e.c.	36.62
8213 Baking,confectionery making and rel.	30.55	8330 Forem./w:metal shap.,form.,exc. machin	49.19
8215 Slaughtering,meat cut.,can.,cur.+pack.	33.82	8331 Forging	37.68
8217 Fish canning,curing and packing	20.38	8333 Sheet metal workers	40.36
8221 Fruit+veg. canning,preserv.+pack.	23.18	8334 Metalworking-machine operators:n.e.c.	34.06
8223 Milk processing and rel. occup.	37.03	8335 Welding and flame cutting	41.42
8225 Sugar processing and rel.	36.76	8336 I.t.g.+s.:metal shap.,form.,exc. machining	43.19
8226 I.t.g.+s.:food,beverage+rel. process.	34.09	8337 Boilermakers,platers+struct metal work	43.58
8227 Beverage processing and related	40.13	8339 Metal shap.+form.,except mach.:n.e.c.	34.61
8228 Lab.+oth. elem.:food,bev.+rel. proc.	24.92	8350 Foremen/women:wood machining	41.47
8229 Food,beverage and rel. proc.:n.e.c.	32.32	8351 Wood patternmaking	42.52
8230 Forem./w:wood proc.,exc. pulp+paper	44.20	8353 Wood sawing and related:n.e.c.	30.68
8231 Sawmill sawyers and related	33.71	8355 Planing,turning,shaping+rel wood mach	31.62
8233 Plywood making and related	34.66	8356 I.t.g.+s.:wood machining	34.03
8235 Wood treating	35.92	8357 Wood sanding	27.51
8236 I.t.g.+s.:wood proc.,exc. pulp+paper	38.91	8359 Wood machining:n.e.c.	31.82
8238 Labour.+oth. elem.:wood proc.,except pulp+paper	29.71	8370 Forem./w.:clay, glass, sto.+rel.mat. mach.	43.15
8239 Wood process.,exc. pulp+paper:n.e.c.	34.87	8371 Cutting+shap.:clay,glass,stone+rel. mat	33.26
8250 Foremen/women:pulp+paper+rel.	52.46	8373 Abra.+pol.:clay, glass, sto.+rel. mat.:n.e.c.	32.88
8251 Cellulose pulp preparing	44.18	8376 I.t.g.+s.:clay,glass,stone+rel. mat.mach.	36.21
8253 Papermaking and finishing	43.92	8379 Clay,glass,stone+rel.mat. mach.:n.e.c.	35.01
8256 I.t.g.+s.:pulp and papermaking	46.10	8390 Foremen/women:other mach+rel.:n.e.c.	46.88
8258 Labour.+oth. elem. work:pulp+paper	39.32	8391 Engravers,etchers and rel.:n.e.c.	32.27
8259 Pulp+papermaking and related:n.e.c.	39.74	8393 Filing,grind.,buff.,clean.+polish.:n.e.c.	35.40
8260 Foremen/women:textile processing	40.71	8395 Patternmakers and mouldmakers:n.e.c.	42.82
8261 Textile fibre preparing	29.13	8396 I.t.g.+s.:other machining and related	33.55
8263 Textile spinning and twisting	28.74	8399 Other machining and related:n.e.c.	32.48
8265 Textile winding and reeling	27.90	8510 Forem./w:fabr.+ assem.:metal prod.n.e.c.	49.97
8267 Textile weaving	30.36	8511 Engine+rel.equip. fabr.+assem.:n.e.c.	36.00
8271 Knitting	27.82	8513 Motor vehicle fabricating+assem.:n.e.c.	36.86
8273 Textile bleaching and dyeing	32.29	8515 Aircraft fabricating+assembling:n.e.c.	43.57
8275 Textile finishing and calendering	29.16	8523 Ind.,farm,const.+oth.mech.equi.+mach.:fabr.+assem.:n.e.c.	36.35
		8525 Bus.+ comm. mach. :fabric.+ assem. n.e.c.	35.56
		8526 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.+assem.metal prod.n.e.c.	43.88
		8527 Prec. instr.+rel.equip:fabr.+assem.n.e.c.	36.24
		8528 Lab.+oth.el.fabri+assem.met. prodn.e.c.	31.03
		8529 Other fabric.+assem.:metal prod.:n.e.c.	33.83

8530 Fore./w.:fab.,ass.,inst.+rel.ele.+rel.eg.	50.36	8589 Other mechanics and repairers:n.e.c.	38.25
8531 Elect.+rel. equip.:fabric.+assembl.	33.31	8590 Forem./w:oth prod:fab.,ass.+rep.:n.e.c.	42.99
8533 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	48.14	8591 Jewelry,silverw.:fabric.,assem.+repair.	33.35
8534 Electronic+rel. equip.:fabric.+assem.	32.33	8592 Marine craft:fabricating,assem.+repair.	37.66
8535 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	52.85	8593 Paper product:fabricating + assembling	32.93
8536 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assem.,inst.+rep:el., electron.+rel.eg.	42.52	8595 Painting and decorating:n.e.c.	33.30
8537 Radio and television repairers	43.76	8596 I.t.g.+s.:other prod. fabric.,assem. +repair.	33.38
8538 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,ass.,i.,+r.:el. electron.+rel.eg.	29.59	8598 Labour.+oth.elem.:oth. prod.:fabr., assem.+repair.	30.01
8539 Fabr.,assemb.i.+r.:electric.,electron.+ rel. equip.:n.e.c.	34.62	8599 Oth. prod.:fabricat.,assem.+repair.n.e.c.	30.36
8540 Forem./w:fabri.,assem.+rep.:wood prod	39.87	8710 Foremen/w:excavat.,grading,paving+rel.	42.54
8541 Cabinet and wood furniture makers	32.57	8711 Excavating,grading and related	35.29
8546 I.t.g.+s.:fabr.,ass.+repair.wood prod.	31.98	8713 Paving,surfacing and related	30.71
8548 Labour.+oth.elem.:fabr.,assem., +repair: wood products	27.61	8715 Railway section and track workers	32.64
8549 Fabr.,assem.+repair.:wood prod.:n.e.c.	29.04	8718 Lab.+oth.elem.:excav.,grad.,pav.+rel.	28.33
8550 Forem./w.:fabr.,assem.+repair.:textile, fur+leather prod.	34.53	8719 Excav.,grading,paving and rel.:n.e.c.	37.36
8551 Patternmaking,marking+cutting:textile fur+leather prod.	30.32	8730 Forem./w:el.pow.,light.+wire com. eg. erecting,i.+rep.	57.39
8553 Tailors and dressmakers	28.52	8731 Electrical power line workers and rel.	51.09
8555 Furriers	28.91	8733 Construction electrician and repair.	47.94
8557 Milliners,hat and cap makers	22.71	8735 Wire comm.+rel. equip.:install.+rep.	50.71
8561 Shoemaking and repairing	25.37	8736 I.t.g.+s.:el.power,light.+wire comm eg.erecting,i.+rep.	53.53
8562 Upholsterers	31.22	8738 Labour.+oth.el.:el.power,light.+wire comm.eg.:er.i.+rep.	36.61
8563 Sewing mach. oper.:textile+similar mat.	25.00	8739 El.power,light.+wire comm.eg.: erecting, ins.+rep: n.e.c.	47.31
8566 Itg.+s.:fabric.,assem.,+repair:textile, fur+leather	26.78	8780 Foremen/women:other constr. trades	44.75
8568 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,assem,+repair: text.,fur+leather	24.81	8781 Carpenters and related	34.86
8569 Fabric.assem.+repair.:text.,fur+leath. n.e.c.	26.36	8782 Brick and stone masons+tile setters	36.21
8570 Foremen/w:fabr.,assem.+repair.:rubber, plastics+rel.	42.59	8783 Concrete finishing and related	33.46
8571 Bond.,cement.:rubber,plastics+rel. prod	33.27	8784 Plasterers and related	34.15
8573 Moulding:rubber,plastics+ rel. prod.	30.45	8785 Painters,paperhangers and related	31.94
8575 Cut., finish.rubber,plastics+rel. prod.	31.37	8786 Insulating:construction	34.34
8576 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assem.+repair.:rubber, plastics+rel.	36.98	8787 Roofing,waterproofing and related	29.83
8578 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.assem.+rep.: rubber, plastics+rel.	30.37	8791 Pipefitting,plumbing and related	45.04
8579 Fabr.,assem.+rep.:rubber,plas.+rel. n.e.c.	31.23	8793 Structural metal erectors	40.78
8580 Foremen/w:mechan.+repairers:n.e.c.	48.51	8795 Glaziers	35.07
8581 Motor vehicle:mechanics and repairers	39.19	8796 I.t.g.+s.:other construction trades	48.79
8582 Aircraft:mechanics and repairers	49.42	8798 Lab.+oth. elemen.:oth.const. trades	28.13
8583 Rail transport equip.:mechan.+repair.	42.57	8799 Other construction trades:n.e.c.	33.43
8584 Indus.,farm+constr. mach.:mechan. +rep.	46.70	9110 Foremen/w:air transport operating	58.01
8585 Bus.,comm. mach.:mechan.+rep.	48.13	9111 Air pilots,navigat.+flight engineers	64.07
8586 I.t.g.+s.:equipment repair:n.e.c.	43.87	9113 Air transport operating support	53.64
8587 Watch and clock:repairers	39.87	9119 Air transport operating:n.e.c.	45.16
8588 Precision instrument:mech.+repairers	53.83	9130 Foremen/w:railway transp. operat.	48.23
		9131 Locomotive operating	49.25
		9133 Conductors+brake workers:railway	44.28
		9135 Railway transp. operating support	42.87
		9139 Railway transp. operating:n.e.c.	37.35
		9151 Deck officers:ship	56.36
		9153 Engineering officers:ship	55.32

9155 Deck crew:ship	36.31	9317 Packaging:n.e.c.	25.79
9157 Engine and boiler-room crew:ship	38.48	9318 Labour.+oth. elem.:mat. handl.+rel.	28.56
9159 Water transport operating:n.e.c.	37.15	9319 Other material handling+rel.:n.e.c.	31.99
9170 Foremen/w:motor transport oper.	40.79	9510 Foremen/women:printing+related	46.36
9171 Bus drivers	34.93	9511 Typesetting and composing	42.35
9173 Taxi drivers and chauffeurs	30.92	9512 Printing press	40.66
9175 Truck drivers	34.45	9513 Stereotyping and electrotyping	36.43
9179 Motor transport operating:n.e.c.	36.04	9514 Print.,engrav.,exc. photo-engraving	48.79
9190 Foremen/w:oth. transp. equip. oper.	47.31	9515 Photo-engraving and related	44.92
9191 Subway+street railway operating	45.62	9517 Bookbinding and related	30.30
9193 Rail vehicle oper.,exc. rail transport	40.79	9518 Labouring+other elemental:printing	
9199 Other transport equip. oper.:n.e.c.	31.93	+ rel.	26.37
9310 Foremen/w:mat. handl.+rel.:n.e.c.	42.33	9519 Printing and related:n.e.c.	31.69
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		

## 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. and Joseph F. Fletcher. 1991. "Response-Time Measurement in Surveys." Public Opinion Quarterly, 55 (3) 331-346.
- Blishen, Bernard, Bill Carroll and C. 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.
- Bryant, Alan, Marc Gold, Michael Stevenson and David Northrup. 1990. "Public Attitudes Towards the Exclusion of Evidence: Section 24(2) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." Canadian Bar Review, 69 (1) 1-45.
- Converse, Jean M. and Stanley Presser. 1986. Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. Beverly 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Porter, J., P. Pineo 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. Hamilton: McMaster University.
- Schuman, Howard and Stanley Presser. 1981. Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Steech, Charlotte G. 1981. "Trends in Nonresponse Rates, 1952-1979." Public Opinion Quarterly, 45 (1) 40-57.
- 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.