The 1997 Canadian Election Survey

Technical Documentation

The 1997 Canadian Election Survey

Technical Documentation

David A. Northrup

Institute for Social Research
York University
May 1998

Conditions of Release

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

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

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

ISR Project Team

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

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1.   Study Description

1.1   Introduction

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

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

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

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

In the campaign-period survey respondents were asked about their:
- vote intention and party identification;
- interest in the election, attention paid to polls and the television debates, and what

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Sample Design

2.1   Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

Because the sample distribution is not proportional to the population of the provinces and territories, the data must be weighted before national estimates are derived. The calculation of

---

[2] Residents of old age homes, group homes, educational and penal institutions were excluded from the sample.

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

the weights to facilitate national estimates is provided in Table 2.1. The weights are calculated by dividing the province or territories' proportion of the households in Canada by the province or territories' proportion of the households in the sample. Ontario has the largest weight (1.5) as the province has 36 percent of Canada's households, but only 24 percent of the sample. In preparing national estimates each Ontario case will count for 1.5 observations in the weighted data set; that is, Ontario is "weighted up" so that the impact of the Ontario sample on national estimates is an accurate reflection of Ontario's proportion of the number of households in Canada. Conversely, for provinces or territories where the weights are very small, for example PEI (.1736) and the Northwest Territories (.0653), the proportion of the sample allocated to the province or territory was greater than that province or territories' proportion of the population. As a result, each case is "weighted down."

Table 2.1. Provincial Sample Distribution and Provincial Weights

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

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

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

2.3   Daily Sample Distribution for the Campaign-Period Survey

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

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

It is critical to any analysis which includes date of interview as a continuous or contingent variable, that the sociodemographic characteristics of the survey respondents do not systematically vary over time. Because easy-to-reach respondents (people who are more often home and willing to do the interview when first contacted) have different characteristics than hard-to-reach respondents (Groves, 1989; Hawkins, 1975; and Dunkleberg and Day, 1973), it is important that each day of interviewing include a mix of easy and hard-to-reach people. Assume, for example, that educational achievement is found to covary with attitudes about a specific election issue such as the importance of creating jobs. If more of the interviews at the beginning of data collection were completed with respondents with lower levels of education (and if they were more supportive of job creation efforts as compared to paying down the debt), and if more of the interviews at the end of data collection were completed with respondents with high levels of education (and they were less supportive of job creation efforts), it would be possible to mistake a change in respondent characteristics for a change in attitudes.

Table 2.2   Completions Per Day: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey

Day		Completions	Three Day Average	Five Day Average
April	27	21	--	--
	28	85	67	--
	29	95	91	80
	30	93	97	93
May	1	104	95	93
	2	87	92	92
	3	86	88	97
	4	92	98	106
	5	116	118	111
	6	147	125	116
	7	113	124	118
	8	112	109	116
	9	103	107	109
	10	107	106	117
	11	108	124	123
	12	157	136	128
	13	142	142	132
	14	127	132	132
	15	126	121	121
	16	109	113	115
	17	103	108	110
	18	112	104	106
	19	98	107	111
	20	110	113	111
	21	132	115	112
	22	102	118	112
	23	120	106	113
	24	96	110	110
	25	113	110	114
	26	120	118	111
	27	122	115	115
	28	103	113	115
	29	115	111	116
	30	114	118	118
	31	124	124	--
June	1	135	--	--

The daily variation in the number of completed interviews is expected given the small sample

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

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

2.4   Selection of Households

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

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

8

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

2.5   Selection of Respondents

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

2.6   Household Weights

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

---

[4] See O'Rourke and Blair, 1983; for a review of the birthday selection method.

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

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

Table 2.3 Campaign-Period Survey: Calculation of Household Weights

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

[*] There were no eight adult households in the sample.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

2.8   Post-Election and Mailback Samples

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

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

3. Data Collection

3.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

twenty-two percent of the initial refusals in the PES survey.

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

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

3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey

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

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

Table 3.2   Final Sample Disposition: 1997 Campaign-Period Survey

16

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

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

The response rate for the CPS survey is four to eight percent lower than ISR typically obtains for general population surveys that employ RDD and random selection of the respondent from among all adult household members. The short field period likely accounts for much of the difference as it makes it more difficult to find "hard-to-reach" people at home. The higher than typical percentage of callbacks and eligibility determined telephone numbers in the sample are

17

evidence of the shorter data collection period. In addition, as mentioned above, the shorter data collection period also reduces the effectiveness of "refusal conversion" attempts. In a typical survey, calls are made to households over a two to three week period, while in the CPS the telephone numbers were active for a maximin of ten days.

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

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

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

There was variation in the response rate by province and territory. The lowest rates were

obtained in Saskatchewan (53 percent) and Quebec (54 percent) and the Territories, Alberta and New Brunswick had the highest rates (between 67 and 72 percent, Table 3.4).

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

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

3.4   Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey

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

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

3.5 Data Collection Procedures: Mailback Survey

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

4.   Questionnaire Issues and Data Processing

4.1   Introduction

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

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

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

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

4.3   Province Specific Questions

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

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

4.4 Date Specific Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One. In certain circumstances respondents were not being asked to rate a party's chances of forming the opposition, even though that party had not been rated the most likely to form the government. A change to the code which corrected the rank ordering problem was made on the 17th of May. This error affected 26 cases completed on the 16th and 17th of May.

Two. When a respondent gave two parties equal chances of forming the government, i.e., a tie, the respondent should have been asked both parties' chances of forming the opposition. This functioned correctly, except that when the tie was created as a result of the respondent asking the interviewer to go back and change a previously given rating, the party with the changed rating was excluded from the opposition items. This problem was not corrected until the 26th of May. The "changed answer tie" affected 44 cases from May 16-25.

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

4.6   Randomization of Question Order

The logical operators resident in CATI were used to randomize the order in which respondents received items in several sections of the questionnaire. Given that order effects have been identified in surveys, but are not always easy to predict (Schuman and Presser, 1981), the order randomization was designed primarily as a precautionary measure to determine what impact, if

any, question order had on response.

4.61   Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire

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

A: Rotating the Rating of Election Issues

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

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

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

---

[6]   Respondents outside of Quebec were not asked how important "defending the interests of Quebec" was to them personally in the election.

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

C: Randomization of the Party Leader Ratings

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

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

D: Randomization of Party Ratings

As was the case for the ratings of party leaders, the 0-100 ratings for parties were randomized (CPSD1G - CPSD1K). Again there were 24 orders and respondents in Quebec were not asked to rate the Reform Party and respondents in the rest of Canada were not asked to rate the Bloc Québécois. The ratings of the parties were controlled by CPSRN6 and the order in which the

---

[7] The 24 orders represent all possible order combinations for four items as determined by 4 factorial (4 x 3 x 2 x 1 = 24).

party ratings were delivered to respondents was independent of the order in which they were asked to rate party leaders.

E: Rotation of Items Rating the Liberals' Performance

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

F: Randomization of the Leader Traits Battery of Questions

Each respondent was asked how well a set of terms (strong leader, trustworthy, arrogant, compassionate, and in touch with the times) described each party leader (CPH1A - CPSH5E). The order of presentation of the party leaders in this section was randomized using CPSRN7. Again there were 24 orders and the order of presentation of the leaders was independent of the previous ratings questions. Respondents who, in the leader knowledge questions (CPSDR1 - CPSDR5), said they "knew nothing at all about a leader" or who in the leader ratings questions (CPSD1A - CPSD1E) said they "did not know/could not rate/refused to rate a leader" were not asked the traits questions about that leader.

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

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

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

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

A: Party Leaders, Parties, and Candidates

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

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

---

[8]   Respondents in provinces other than Quebec were not asked to rate Gilles Duceppe.

the other provinces and territories.

B: Spending Cuts

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

C: Variation in Response Order for the Abortion Item

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

D: Views on Universality of Government Services

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

4.7   Randomization of Question Wording

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

A:		Identification of Voters

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

B:		The Temporal Dimension of the Vote Intentions

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

C:		Federal/Provincial Government Comparison

There were two versions of the question asking if the respondent's provincial or territorial government, or the federal government, "best looked after the needs of people like you" (PESF14A and PESF14B). The second version of the question (PESF14B) included the response option "or does it not make much difference." The version of the question assigned to respondents was determined by PESRN4.

D:		Federal and Provincial Party Identification

The same wording experiment was used for the set of items used to measure federal (PESH1 - PESH9) and provincial (PESH10 - PESH19) party identification. In the federal version of these

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

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

E: Ranking Goals

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

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

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

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

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

categories developed for the 1993 Canadian Election Study. However, free trade issues, often mentioned in 1993 were infrequent in 1997 whereas there were more mentions of social programs in 1997 than in 1993.

A: Coding Categories for "Most Important Issue" Questions

JOBS AND EMPLOYMENT

10 need/create jobs; reduce unemployment
11 jobs for youth
12 want/need job security (includes things like keeping fisheries open)
13 lack of jobs in resource industry (fishing, farming logging, mining)
14 need more job training, re-training
15 general mention of jobs/unemployment
16 free trade has cost us jobs

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

20 general mention (debt, deficit, etc.)
21 debt - reduce/control/balance
22 debt - eliminate
23 deficit - reduce/control/balance
24 deficit - eliminate
25 transfer payments
26 balance the budget

ECONOMIC CONCERNS

30 general (economy, economic reform)
31 cost of living/inflation, low dollar
32 do something with the interest rate: raise/lower interest rates
33 eco recovery-getting over the recession
34 economic stimulation, initiatives
35 farming/fishing issues (farming, over fishing, costs of transportation)
36 promoting small bus, reduce gov't interference, what will be done for
37 more gov't intervention/fund small bus
38 need to stabilize the economy

HIGH COST OF GOV'T SPENDING

40 general mention high cost of government (too many civil servants)
41 control government spending
42 reduce perks, high salaries, early retire

43 gov't should be accountable for their spending, fiscal responsibility
44 immigration costs/cut back on
45 cut back welfare/clean up abuse
46 helicopter issues
47 early election call/no point to this election/one sided election
48 mention of Manitoba flood

TAXES

50 general mention
51 abolish GST taxes
52 lower GST taxes
53 taxes too high, no new increases
54 give tax break for small business
55 fairer taxation

SOCIAL PROGRAMMES

57 general mention of health care
58 general mention of cutbacks /too many cuts
59 stop health care cuts/more health care $
60 general mention, keep/protect social progs
61 old age pensions/security conc' about cuts
62 child care, increase availability, stop cuts, more subsidies, keep family benefits

63 social programmes/services, stop cutbacks, more than 1 mention
64 stop social assistance cuts (no UIC/welfare cuts, reduce waiting time for UIC etc.)
65 education, general mention of concern
66 education, high cost of tuition /stop cuts
67 education - restructure/improve the system
68 elderly, care of
69 health care concern about availability, afford ability, accessibility

MORAL ISSUES

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

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

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

UNITY/QUEBEC ISSUES

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

REPRESENTATION ISSUES

90 get rid of Chrétien/Liberals
91 need more integrity, honesty, accountability from gov't at all levels

92 need stable government one with foresight strength need good gov't leaders
93 revamp election process/senate
94 want Chrétien and the liberals to win
95 want a change of gov't
96 representation/recognition for west
97 only concerned with who wins

OTHER

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

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

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

JOBS AND EMPLOYMENT

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

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

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

ECONOMIC CONCERNS

30   general mention (economy, economic
     reform)
31   fight inflation
32   keep interest rates down

33   improve economy/bring prosperity
34   strengthen/stimulate the economy
35   economy/budget and jobs both mentions
36   need to stabilize the economy

GENERAL COMMENTS

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

TAXES

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

SOCIAL PROGS/ SOCIAL SECURITY

57   general mention of health care
58   continue the cutbacks
59   maintain health care /more health care $
60   protect social programmes/social services
61   protect old age pensions/security
62   protect child care/family benefits
63   jobs and social programmes (both)
64   jobs and health care (both)
65   health care and budget (both)
66   deficit and health care
68   elderly, care of
69   health care concern about availability, afford ability, accessibility

MORAL ISSUES

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

UNITY/QUEBEC ISSUES

80   general mention of Quebec, bilingualism, sovereignty, independence/future of Quebec/Canada
81   general mention Canadian/National Unity
82   maintain National/Canadian Unity
83   to stop Quebec Independence
84   unity and economy
85   unity and jobs
86   unity and deficit
87   unity and health care
88   unity and social programmes

REPRESENTATION ISSUES

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

OTHER

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

C: Reasons for Not Voting

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

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

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

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

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

F: Other Specifies

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

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

4.9   Response Time Measurement

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

4.10   Linking Respondents from Three Surveys

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

   i.   When the name (or identifier), age, and sex were the same in all five surveys the case was classified as a "goodlink."

   ii.   When the name was different, or there was a change in sex, the case was coded as a "probable badlink."

   iii. When the age was different the case was coded as a "probable badlink", with the exception noted in point iv.

   iv.   When age was different but there was the possibility of an interviewer entry error (for example, year of birth was recorded as 1945 in the first survey and 1954 in the second survey) and there was strong supporting evidence that the same person was interviewed (for example, there was only one male adult in the household who had the correct name), the case was classified as a "probable goodlink".

v.   When the linking problems were specific to the mailback survey, the case was classified as a "Mailback badlink."

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

4.11   Occupational Classification

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

The codebook for the 1980 occupation classifications is contained in this section. Appended to each occupation is a socio-economic index score. These indices are commonly referred to as "Blishen 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 Blishen, 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 "BLISH81R" and are identical to those shown in the detailed codebook.   The Pineo/Porter/McRoberts scores are contained in the variable "PINPORR". The full set of SPSS recode statements used to create these two indices is available from the Institute on request.

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

CCDO Number	Description	Blishen Score	CCDO Number	Description	Blishen Score
1111	Members of legislative bodies	55.08	2131	Agriculturists and related scientists	62.19
1113	Government administrators	66.84	2133	Biologists and related scientists	65.63
1115	Post office management	38.19	2135	Life sciences:technologists+technicians	52.86
1116	Inspectors+regulatory officers, gov't	56.42	2139	Life sciences:n.e.c.	51.01
1119	Officials,admin. unique to gov't:n.e.c.	59.94	2141	Architects	68.12
1130	General managers,other senior officials	71.62	2142	Chemical engineers	72.47
1131	Mgmt:natural sciences and engineering	79.23	2143	Civil engineers	71.70
1132	Mgmt:social sciences+related fields	62.53	2144	Electrical engineers	70.48
1133	Adminis. in teaching, related fields	78.34	2145	Industrial engineers	64.07
1134	Adminis. in medicine and health	68.89	2146	Agricultural engineers	64.22
1135	Financial management	60.65	2147	Mechanical engineers	68.37
1136	Personnel, industrial relations mgmt	62.87	2151	Metallurgical engineers	71.05
1137	Sales and advertising management	50.07	2153	Mining engineers	72.80
1141	Purchasing management	50.83	2154	Petroleum engineers	74.67
1142	Services management	40.99	2155	Aerospace engineers	65.79
1143	Production management	57.57	2156	Nuclear engineers	75.44
1145	Management:construction operations	55.91	2157	Community planners	65.11
1146	Farm management	32.06	2159	Professional engineers:n.e.c.	70.27
1147	Management:transport and communications operations	61.01	2160	Supervis.:oth. occup.in architec.+ engin	62.97
1151	Other management:mines+oil wells	66.39	2161	Surveyors	46.22
1152	Other mgmt:durable goods manuf.	56.56	2163	Draughting	53.83
1153	Other mgmt:non-durable goods manuf.	54.91	2164	Architectural technolog.+technic.	55.82
1154	Other management:construction	49.40	2165	Engineering technologists+technicians	56.57
1155	Oth. mgmt:transp.+commun.	56.38	2169	Oth. occup. in architec.+engineer.:n.e.c.	35.47
1156	Other management:trade	47.79	2181	Math.,statisticians+actuaries	61.91
1157	Other management:service	52.49	2183	Systems analysts,computer prog.., rel.	60.73
1158	Other mgmt:other industries	56.83	2189	Math.,stat.,systems analysis, rel.:n.e.c.	48.24
1171	Accountants, auditors and other financial officers	59.44	2311	Economists	69.18
1173	Organization and methods analysts	65.98	2313	Socio.,anthropologists+rel. social sci.	63.09
1174	Personnel and related officers	57.19	2315	Psychologists	65.36
1175	Purchasing officers+buyers,except wholesale+retail trade	52.23	2319	Social sciences:n.e.c.	49.87
1176	Inspectors+regulatory officers:n.e.c.	52.51	2331	Social workers	60.11
1179	Related to mgmt and admin:n.e.c.	57.55	2333	Welfare and community services	36.89
2111	Chemists	63.47	2339	Social work and related fields:n.e.c.	44.39
2112	Geologists	71.01	2341	Judges and magistrates	93.27
2113	Physicists	73.00	2343	Lawyers and notaries	75.60
2114	Meteorologists	70.66	2349	In law and jurisprudence:n.e.c.	48.72
2117	Physical sci.:technologists+technicians	54.05	2350	Superv.:library,museum+archival sci.	57.97
2119	Physical sciences:n.e.c.	41.81	2351	Librarians,archivists+conservators	55.40
			2353	Techn. in library,museum+archival sci.	51.11
			2359	Library,museum+archival sci.:n.e.c.	37.70
			2391	Educational+vocational counsellors	67.61

2399 Other social sci.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	51.54	3335 Actors/actresses	42.94
2511 Ministers of religion	52.84	3337 Radio and television announcers	46.43
2513 Nuns and brothers	42.17	3339 Performing and audio-visual arts:n.e.c.	37.54
2519 Religion:n.e.c.	43.27	3351 Writers and editors	54.58
2711 University teachers	75.87	3355 Translators and interpreters	57.30
2719 University teaching+related:n.e.c.	46.83	3359 Writing:n.e.c.	50.15
2731 Elementary+kindergarten teachers	63.64	3360 Supervisors:sports and recreation	38.48
2733 Secondary school teachers	70.19	3370 Coach.,train.,instr.+manag.:sport+rec.	36.71
2739 Elemen./secon. teach.+rel.:n.e.c.	43.38	3371 Referees and related officials	23.77
2791 Comm. college+vocat. school teach.	66.03	3373 Athletes	40.36
2792 Fine arts school teachers:n.e.c.	40.93	3375 Attendants:sport and recreation	24.93
2793 Post-secondary school teachers:n.e.c.	67.05	3379 Sport and recreation:n.e.c.	25.74
2795 Teachers of exceptional students:n.e.c.	58.09	4110 Supervisors:stenographic and typing	46.00
2797 Instructors and training officers:n.e.c.	49.94	4111 Secretaries and stenographers	41.82
2799 Other teaching and related:n.e.c.	53.23	4113 Typists and clerk-typists	38.47
3111 Physicians and surgeon	101.32	4130 Supervis.:bookkeep.,account-rec.+rel.	45.39
3113 Dentists	101.74	4131 Bookkeepers and accounting clerks	40.28
3115 Veterinarians	72.24	4133 Cashiers and tellers	28.31
3117 Osteopaths and chiropractors	70.24	4135 Insurance,bank and other finance clerks	40.51
3119 Health diagnosing and treating:n.e.c.	57.21	4137 Statistical clerks	41.79
3130 Supervisors:nursing,therapy+rel.assis.	63.51	4139 Bookkeep.,account-record.+rel.:n.e.c.	40.23
3131 Nurses,regist.,grad.+nurses-in-train.	55.26	4140 Supervis.:office mach.+e.d.p.equ.oper.	51.16
3132 Orderlies	38.68	4141 Office machine operators	37.39
3134 Registered nursing assistants	46.51	4143 Electronic data-processing equip. oper.	41.93
3135 Nursing attendants	33.60	4150 Supervisors:mat. record.,sched.+dist.	44.50
3136 Audio and speech therapists	62.36	4151 Production clerks	43.11
3137 Physiotherapists	56.56	4153 Shipping and receiving clerks	34.11
3138 Occupational therapists	55.23	4155 Stock clerks and related	35.46
3139 Nursing,therapy+rel. assisting:n.e.c.	40.44	4157 Weighers	32.07
3151 Pharmacists	64.39	4159 Mater. recording,sched.,distrib.:n.e.c.	31.89
3152 Dietitians and nutritionists	59.31	4160 Superv.:library,file+corres. clerks+rel.	50.57
3153 Optometrists	79.63	4161 Library and file clerks	34.85
3154 Dispensing opticians	48.55	4169 Library,file and corres.clerks+rel.:n.e.c.	43.50
3155 Radiolog. technologists+technicians	56.78	4170 Superv.:recep.,info.,mail+message dist.	46.46
3156 Med lab. technologists+technicians	55.79	4171 Receptionists and information clerks	35.04
3157 Denturists	59.02	4172 Mail carriers	42.29
3158 Dental hygienists+dental assistants	45.02	4173 Mail and postal clerks	38.15
3161 Dental laboratory technicians	45.15	4175 Telephone operators	33.25
3162 Respiratory technicians	59.05	4177 Messengers	28.82
3169 Other in medicine and health:n.e.c.	39.86	4179 Recep.,info.,mail+mes. distrib.:n.e.c.	34.90
3311 Painters,sculptors and related artists	36.88	4190 Supervis.:other clerical+related:n.e.c.	47.88
3313 Product and interior designers	43.47	4191 Collectors	43.10
3314 Advertising and illustrating artists	47.23	4192 Claim adjusters	41.70
3315 Photographers and cameramen	44.66	4193 Travel clerks,ticket,station, freight agen.	44.92
3319 Fine+com. art,phot.+rel. fields:n.e.c.	40.57	4194 Hotel clerks	31.63
3330 Prod.+direct.,perf.+audio-vis. arts	57.04	4195 Personnel clerks	45.22
3331 Conductors,composers+arrangers	42.01	4197 General office clerks	37.93
3332 Musicians and singers	36.58	4199 Other clerical and related:n.e.c.	39.01
3333 Music+musical entertain. rel.:n.e.c.	32.35	5130 Supervisors:sales:commodities	41.01
3334 Dancers and choreographers	32.94	5131 Technical sales and related advisers	57.89

5133 Commercial travellers	50.52	7115 Crop farmers	31.32
5135 Sales clerks, salesp.:commod.:n.e.c.	30.93	7119 Farmers:n.e.c.	27.92
5141 Street vendors+door-to-door sales	29.95	7180 Fore./w:oth. farm.,hort.+ anim. husb.	38.95
5143 Newspaper carriers and vendors	17.81	7183 Livestock farm workers	25.36
5145 Service station attendants	21.47	7185 Crop farm workers	22.04
5149 Sales:commodities:n.e.c.	29.16	7195 Nursery and related workers	26.99
5170 Supervisors:sales:services	56.44	7196 I.t.g.+s.:other farm.,horticul.+anim. husb	25.71
5171 Insurance sales	50.18	7197 Farm machinery operators	23.76
5172 Real estate sales	49.99	7199 Other farming,horti.+animal husb.n.e.c.	23.34
5173 Sales agents+ traders:securities	58.62	7311 Captains+other officers:fishing vessels	36.35
5174 Advertising sales	47.26	7313 Net,trap and line fishing	24.59
5177 Business services sales	52.09	7315 Trapping and related	19.02
5179 Sales:services:n.e.c.	44.56	7319 Fishing,trapping and related:n.e.c.	22.73
5190 Supervisors:other sales	44.32	7510 Foremen/women:forestry and logging	45.16
5191 Buyers,wholesale and retail trade	46.08	7511 Forestry conservationist	34.14
5193 Route drivers	35.73	7513 Timber cutting and related	25.23
5199 Other sales:n.e.c.	32.84	7516 Log inspecting,grading,scaling+rel.	44.19
6111 Fire-fighting	51.17	7517 Log hoisting,sorting,moving+ rel.	34.57
6112 Police officers+detectives,gov't	58.78	7518 Labour.+oth. elemental:forestry, log.	25.34
6113 Police agents+investigators,private	46.60	7519 Forestry and logging:n.e.c.	32.30
6115 Guards and related security	31.95	7710 Forem/w:min.+quar. incl.oil+gas field	54.07
6116 Commissioned officers,armed forces	62.19	7711 Rotary well-drilling and related	42.43
6117 Other ranks,armed forces	41.69	7713 Rock and soil-drilling	40.23
6119 Protection service:n.e.c.	33.20	7715 Blasting	40.43
6120 Supervis.:food+bev. prep.+rel. serv.	34.64	7717 Min.+quarry.:cut.,handl.+loading	39.56
6121 Chefs and cooks	25.56	7718 Lab.+oth. elem. min + quarry incl. oil+gas	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,hairdressers 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
6199 Other service:n.e.c.	27.60	8156 I.t.g.+s.:clay,glass+stone process.+form	37.98
7113 Livestock farmers	29.59	8158 Labour.+oth. elem.:clay,glass+stone	

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

41

8528 Lab.+oth.el.fabri+assam.met. prodn.e.c.	31.03		8584 Indus.,farm+constr. mach.:mechan.+rep.	46.70
8529 Other fabric.+assam.:metal prod.:n.e.c.	33.83		8585 Bus.,comm. mach.:mechan.+rep.	48.13
8530 Fore./w.:fab.,ass.,inst.+rel.ele.+rel.eg.	50.36		8586 I.t.g.+s.:equipment repair:n.e.c.	43.87
8531 Elect.+rel. equip.:fabric.+assembl.	33.31		8587 Watch and clock:repairers	39.87
8533 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	48.14		8588 Precision instrument:make.+repairers	53.83
8534 Electronic+rel. equip.:fabric.+assam.	32.33		8589 Other mechanics and repairers:n.e.c.	38.25
8535 Elect.+rel. equip.:insta.+repair.:n.e.c.	52.85		8590 Forem./w:oth prod:fab.,ass.+rep.:n.e.c.	42.99
8536 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assam.,inst.+rep:el.,			8591 Jewelry,silverw.:fabric.,assam.+repair.	33.35
electron.+rel.eg.	42.52		8592 Marine craft:fabricating,assam.+repair.	37.66
8537 Radio and television repairers	43.76		8593 Paper product:fabricating + assembling	32.93
8538 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,ass.,i.,+r.:el.			8595 Painting and decorating:n.e.c.	33.30
electron.+rel.eg.	29.59		8596 I.t.g.+s.:other prod. fabric.,assam.	
8539 Fab.,assemb.i.+r.:electric.,electron.+ rel.			+repair.	33.38
equip.:n.e.c.	34.62		8598 Labour.+oth.elem.:oth. prod.:fab.,	
8540 Forem./w:fabri.,assam.+rep.:wood prod	39.87		assam.+repair.	30.01
8541 Cabinet and wood furniture makers	32.57		8599 Oth. prod.:fabricat.,assam.+repair.n.e.c.	30.36
8546 I.t.g.+s.:fab.,ass.+repair.wood prod.	31.98		8710 Foremen/w:excavat.,grading,paving+rel.	42.54
8548 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,assam.,			8711 Excavating,grading and related	35.29
+repair: wood products	27.61		8713 Paving,surfacing and related	30.71
8549 Fab.,assam.+repair.:wood prod.:n.e.c.	29.04		8715 Railway section and track workers	32.64
8550 Forem./w.:fab.,assam.+repair.:textile,			8718 Lab.+oth.elem.:excav.,grad.,pav.+rel.	28.33
fur+leather prod.	34.53		8719 Excav.,grading,paving and rel.:n.e.c.	37.36
			8730 Forem./w:el.pow.,light.+wire com. eg.	
8551 Patternmaking,marking+cutting:textile			erecting,i.+rep.	57.39
fur+leather prod.	30.32		8731 Electrical power line workers and rel.	51.09
8553 Tailors and dressmakers	28.52		8733 Construction electrician and repair.	47.94
8555 Furriers	28.91		8735 Wire comm.+rel. equip.:install.+rep.	50.71
8557 Milliners,hat and cap makers	22.71		8736 I.t.g.+s.:el.power,light.+wire comm	
8561 Shoemaking and repairing	25.37		eg.erecting,i.+rep.	53.53
8562 Upholsterers	31.22		8738 Labour.+oth.el.:el.power,light.+wire	
8563 Sewing mach. oper.:textile+similar mat.	25.00		comm.eg.:er.i.+rep.	36.61
8566 Itg.+s.:fabric.,assam.,+repair:textile,			8739 El.power,light.+wire comm.eg.: erecting,	
fur+leather	26.78		ins.+rep: n.e.c.	47.31
8568 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.,assam,+repair:			8780 Foremen/women:other constr. trades	44.75
text.,fur+leather	24.81		8781 Carpenters and related	34.86
8569 Fabric.assam.+repair.:text.,fur+leath.	26.36		8782 Brick and stone masons+tile setters	36.21
8570 Foremen/w:fab.,assam.+repair.:rubber,			8783 Concrete finishing and related	33.46
plastics+rel.	42.59		8784 Plasterers and related	34.15
8571 Bond.,cement.:rubber,plastics+rel. prod	33.27		8785 Painters,paperhangers and related	31.94
8573 Moulding:rubber,plastics+ rel. prod.	30.45		8786 Insulating:construction	34.34
8575 Cut., finish.rubber,plastics+rel. prod.	31.37		8787 Roofing,waterproofing and related	29.83
8576 I.t.g.+s.:fabric.,assam.+repair.:rubber,			8791 Pipefitting,plumbing and related	45.04
plastics+rel.	36.98		8793 Structural metal erectors	40.78
8578 Labour.+oth.elem.:fab.assam.+rep.: rubber,			8795 Glaziers	35.07
plastics+rel.	30.37		8796 I.t.g.+s.:other construction trades	48.79
8579 Fab.,assam.+rep.:rubber,plas.+rel.n.e.c.	31.23		8798 Lab.+oth. elemen.:oth.const. trades	28.13
8580 Foremen/w:mechan.+repairers:n.e.c.	48.51		8799 Other construction trades:n.e.c.	33.43
8581 Motor vehicle:mechanics and repairers	39.19		9110 Foremen/w:air transport operating	58.01
8582 Aircraft:mechanics and repairers	49.42		9111 Air pilots,navigat.+flight engineers	64.07
8583 Rail transport equip.:mechan.+repair.	42.57		9113 Air transport operating support	53.64

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

4.13   Map of Variables

CAMPAIGN-PERIOD: FRONT END VARIABLES

Name	Label
IDNUM	Respondent Identification Number
PROVINCE	Province Of Interview
AREACODE	Telephone Area Code
CPSSAMP	Day Of Sample Release
CPSREP	Sample Subsets <Replicate>
CPSTIME	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
CPSRES	Outcome Of Interview
NADULTS	Number Of Adults <Cdn Citizens> In Hhld
CPSATTEM	Total Number Of Call Attempts
CPSCONT	Total Times Respondent Contacted
CPSANS	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
CPSREFUS	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
CPSDATE	Date Of Interview <MDDYY>
CPSINUM	Interviewer's Number (# Of Interviews)
CPSIGEN	Interviewer's Gender (# Of Interviews)
CPSLANG	Language Of Interview
CPSRN1	Question Order/Random Delivery <A1A-A2H>
CPSRN2	Question Order/Random Delivery <C3-C5>
CPSRN3	Question Order/Random Delivery<F10A-F10G>
CPSRN4	Route Country/Riding Split <I1A--I2D>
CPSRN5	Randomize Party Leaders <D1A-D1C>
CPSRN6	Randomize Federal Parties <D1G-D1I>
CPSRN7	Randomize Party Leaders <H1A--H4E>
CPSRN8	Randomize Parties In Riding <I1A-I1C>
CPSRN9	Randomize Parties In Country <I2A-I2D>

Name	Label
CPSRN10	Question Order/Random Delivery <J1A-J1G>
CPSRGEN	Respondent's Gender

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION A: VOTE INTENTIONS

Name	Label
CPSJF1	Timer - Response Time Item <CPSA4>
CPSA1	Most Important Issue To You Personally
CPSA2A	Personally> Preserving National Unity
CPSA2B	Personally> Reducing The Deficit
CPSA2C	Personally> Creating Jobs
CPSA2D	Personally> Cutting Taxes
CPSA2E	Personally> Keeping Election Promises
CPSA2F	Personally> Protecting Social Pgms
CPSA2G	Personally> Fighting Crime
CPSA2H	Personally>Defending Interests Of Quebec
CPSA3	On Election Day Certain To Vote
CPSA4	Party Think Will Vote For <CPSJF1>
CPSA5	Don't Know,NoParty> Party Leaning Toward
CPSA7	Which Party Would Be Your Second Choice

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION B: INTEREST AND CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

Name	Label
CPSB1	Attention Paid>News About Election On TV
CPSB2	Attention Paid>ElectionNews In Newspaper
CPSB3	Attention Paid>ElectionNews On The Radio
CPSB4	How Rate Interest In This Election
CPSB5	How Rate Interest In Politics Generally
CPSB6	See TV Commercials For A Political

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION C: PERSONAL FINANCES AND
THE ECONOMY

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION D: LEADER AND PARTY
EVALUATION

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION E: PLACEMENTS

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

Much | | Minorities
CPSE1P Bloc Quebecois Wants To Cut Taxes | | CPSF2 Only Married People Be Having Children
CPSE1Q Bloc Quebecois Cut Taxes> By How Much | | CPSF3 Better Off Women StayedHome WithChildren
CPSE1R BlocQuebecois Increase Taxes>By How Much | | CPSF4 Not Much Any Gov DoTo Solve Unemployment
CPSE3A How Much Should Be Done For Quebec | | CPSF5 Maintain Social Pgms=Eliminate Deficit
CPSE3B More Done For Quebec> How Much More | | CPSF6 Gov Leave To Private Sector Create Jobs

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION F: POLICY I

Name   Label

CPSF1   How Much ShldBeDoneFor Racial
Minorities
CPSF2   Only Married People Be Having Children
CPSF3   Better Off Women StayedHome WithChildren
CPSF4   Not Much Any Gov DoTo Solve Unemployment
CPSF5   Maintain Social Pgms=Eliminate Deficit
CPSF6   Gov Leave To Private Sector Create Jobs
CPSF7   Liberals Elected To Do In 1993
CPSF8   Best Way To Fight Unemployment
CPSF10A   Liberals> Preserving National Unity
CPSF10B Liberals> Reducing The Deficit
CPSF10C Liberals> Creating Jobs
CPSF10D   Liberals> Keeping Election Promises
CPSF10E Liberals> Defending Interests Quebec
CPSF10F Liberals> Fighting Crime
CPSF10G   Liberals> Protecting Social Programs
CPSF11   Job By Reform Party In Parliament
CPSF12   Job By Bloc Quebecois In Parliament
CPSF13   Party PromisingTo Lower Income Taxes 10%
CPSF14   Promising Cut UnemploymentInHalf By 2001
CPSF15   Party Against Quebec As Distinct Society

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION G: NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Name   Label

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

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

Name   Label

CPSH1A   Describe> Charest> Strong Leader
CPSH1B   Describe> Charest> Trustworthy
CPSH1C   Describe> Charest> Arrogant
CPSH1D   Describe> Charest> Compassionate
CPSH1E   Describe> Charest> In Touch With
         Times
CPSH2A   Describe> Chrétien> Strong Leader
CPSH2B   Describe> Chrétien> Trustworthy
CPSH2C   Describe> Chrétien> Arrogant
CPSH2D   Describe> Chrétien> Compassionate
CPSH2E   Describe> Chrétien> In Touch With
         Times
CPSH3A   Describe> McDonough> Strong Leader
CPSH3B   Describe> McDonough> Trustworthy
CPSH3C   Describe> McDonough> Arrogant
CPSH3D   Describe> McDonough>
         Compassionate
CPSH3E   Describe> McDonough> In Touch
         With Times
CPSH4A   Describe> Manning> Strong Leader
CPSH4B   Describe> Manning> Trustworthy
CPSH4C   Describe> Manning> Arrogant
CPSH4D   Describe> Manning> Compassionate
CPSH4E   Describe> Manning> In Touch With
         Times
CPSH5A   Describe> Duceppe> Strong Leader
CPSH5B   Describe> Duceppe> Trustworthy
CPSH5C   Describe> Duceppe> Arrogant
CPSH5D   Describe> Duceppe> Compassionate
CPSH5E   Describe> Duceppe> In Touch With
         Times

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

Name   Label

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

CPSI2C   NDP Chances> Winning In Whole
         Country
CPSI2D   Reform Chances> Winning In Whole
         Country
CPSI2E   Bloc Chances>Majority Of Seats In Quebec
CPSI3A   Lib Chances> Forming Offical Opposition
CPSI3B   PC Chances> Forming Official Opposition
CPSI3C   NDP Chances> Forming Official
         Opposition
CPSI3D   Reform Chances> Form Official
         Opposition
CPSI3E   Bloc Chances>Forming Official Opposition

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION J: POLICY II

Name   Label

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION K: PARTY IDENTIFICATION AND
VOTE HISTORY

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION L: DEBATE

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

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

CAMPAIGN PERIOD
SECTION M: BACKGROUND

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

WEIGHT VARIABLES

Name	Label
CPSHHWGT	Household Weight - CES Campaign

48

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

POST ELECTION: FRONT END VARIABLES

Name	Label
PESSAMP	Day Of Sample Release
PESREP	Sample Subsets <Replicate>
PESTIME	Length Of Interview <Minutes>
PESRES	Outcome Of Interview
PESATTEM	Total Number Of Call Attempts
PESCONT	Total Times Respondent Contacted
PESANS	Number Of Times Telephone Answered
PESREFUS	Number Of Refusals Before Completion
PESDATE	Date Of Interview <MMDDYY>
PESINUM	Interviewer's Number (# Of Interviews)
PESIGEN	Interviewer's Gender (# Of Interviews)
PESLANG	Language Of Interview
PESRN12	Question Order/Random Delivery <A2A,A2B>
PESRN2	Question Order/Random Delivery <A4C,A4D>
PESRN10	Question Order/Random Delivery<E5A--E5C>
PESRN11	Question Order/Random Delivery<E7A,E7B>
PESRN4	Question Order/RandomDelivery <F14A,F14B>
PESRN16	QuestionOrder/RandomDelivery <H1-5H10-14>
PESRN14	Question Order/Random Delivery<I5A--I5F>
PESRN5	Randomize Party Leaders <C1A--C1E>
PESRN6	Randomize Federal Parties <C2A--C2E>
PESRN8	Randomize Parties In Riding <C3A--C3E>
PESRN9	Question Order/Random

	Delivery<E6A--E6G>
PESRN3	Question Wording <E11B>
PESRGEN	Respondent's Gender

POST ELECTION
SECTION A: THE VOTE

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

POST ELECTION
SECTION B: INTEREST AND MEDIA

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

POST ELECTION
SECTION C: LEADER, PARTY, CANDIDATE

EVALUATION

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

POST ELECTION
SECTION E: POLICY

Name	Label
PESE6A	Cut Spending> Defence
PESE6B	Cut Spending> Welfare
PESE6C	Cut Spending> Pensions/Old Age Security
PESE6D	Cut Spending> Health Care
PESE6E	Cut Spending> Unemployment Insurance

Name	Label
PESE6F	Cut Spending> Education
PESE6G	Cut Spending> Aid Developing Countries
PESE3	How Much Power Think Unions Should Have
PESE2	How Much Should Be Done For Business
PESE1	How Much Should Be Done For Women
PESE4	Canada's Ties With The United States
PESE5A	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE5B	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE5C	Opinion> 3 Positions: Abortion <PESRN10>
PESE7A	Opinion> Government Services <PESRN11>
PESE7B	Opinion> Government Services <PESRN11>
PESE9A	Last Five Years, Quality Of Education
PESE9B	Quality Of Education How Much Worse
PESE9C	Last Five Years, Quality Of Health Care
PESE9D	Quality Of Health Care How Much Worse
PESE9E	Most Responsible For Cuts To Health Care
PESE10	Favourable To Quebec Sovereignty <Que>
PESE11B	Likely Canada Become Part Of U.S. <ROC>
PESE10A	Standard Of Living If Quebec Separates
PESE10B	Standard Of Living How Much Better
PESE10C	Standard Of Living How Much Worse
PESE10D	French Language Threatened In Quebec
PESE10E	Que Separates, French Language In Quebec
PESE10F	Language Situation How Much Better
PESE10G	Language Situation How Much Worse
PESE11D	Que Separates,Close EconomicUnion Canada
PESE12	Only Police & Military Allowed Have Guns
PESE13	Capital Punishment Is Never Justified
PESE15	Politicians Ready To Lie To Get Elected
PESE16	Gov Accepts High Level Unemploy=Defeated
PESE18	Everyone Should Be Forced Retire At 65
PESE28	Issues That Matter To Women NotDiscussed
PESE25	Good Thing Canada&USA Become One Country
PESE19	Not Get Ahead, Blame Self, Not System

PESE20 Businesses Make Money, Everyone
Benefits
PESE21 Trust Down-To-Earth People Than
Experts
PESE22 Party Promised Lower Personal Tax 10
%
PESE23 Party Promised Cut Unemployment In
Half
PESE29 Party Said All Provinces Treated
Equally
PESE30 What Meant By Provinces Treated
Equally
PESE24 Party Against Quebec As Distinct
Society

POST ELECTION
SECTION F: COLLECTIVITIES

Name   Label

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

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

POST ELECTION
SECTION H: PARTY IDENTIFICATION AND
VOTE HISTORY

Name   Label

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

POST ELECTION
SECTION I: MEDIA HABITS

Name   Label

PESI1   # Hours A Day Usually Watch TV
PESI2   Do You Watch Canadian Stations
PESI3   # Hours A Day Listen To The Radio
PESI4   # Days A Week Read A Newspaper
PESB7   See English TV Debate Among PartyLeaders
PESB7A   See All Of The English TV Debate
PESB7B   Which Leader Did Best In English Debate
PESB7C   Which Leader Did Worst In English
Debate
PESB8   See First French TV Debate (May 13)
PESB8A   See All Of First French TV Debate
PESB8B   Who Did The Best In First French
Debate

PESB8C Who Did The Worst In First French Debate

PESB9 See Second French TV Debate (May 19)

PESB9B Who Did The Best In Second French Debate

PESB9C Who Did The Worst In Second FrenchDebate

PESE21A Chrétien Betrayed Quebec Constitutional

PESE21C Reform Party Only Speaks For The West

PESE21D Charest Has Style, But Not Much To Say

PESE21E Manning Is Threat To Canadian Unity

PESE21F NDP Is Out Of Touch With The Times

PESE21G No Reason Sovereignist Party In Ottawa

PESE21I Best Way Defend West=Elect Reform Mps

PESE21J Jean Charest Was A One Man Show

PESE21K Jean Charest Too Close To Brian Mulroney

PESE27 QueSeparates,Canada Close Economic Union

PESI5A Four Goals> Most Important <PESRN14>

PESI5B Four Goals> Next Most Important To You

PESI5C Four Goals> Least Most Important To You

PESI5D Four Goals> Most Important <PESRN14>

PESI5E Four Goals> Next Most Important To You

PESI5F Four Goals> Least Most Important To You

Religion

PESM12 Respondent's Province/Territory Of Birth

PESM20 # Of Years Lived In <Province/Territory>

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION A

Name   Label

MBSQLANG Language Of Questionnaire

MBSA1 Gone Too Far In Pushing Equal Rights

MBSA2 Be More Tolerant People Choose Standards

MBSA3 Lay Off Women Whose Husbands Have Jobs

MBSA4 Gov Do More Reduce Income Gap Rich&Poor

MBSA5 Difficult Women Get Jobs Equal Abilities

MBSA6 Protect Env. More Imp Than Creating Jobs

MBSA7 NewerLifestyles Contrib BreakdownSociety

MBSA8 Change=Adapt Our View Of Moral Behaviour

MBSA9 Fewer Problems=Traditional Family Values

MBSA10 Not Big Problem Some Have More Chance

MBSA11 Look After Cdns BornHere First,Others2nd

MBSA12 People Really Want Work, Can Find A Job

MBSA13 Tough For Young Because Of Babyboomers

MBSA14 Minority Groups Need Special Rights

MBSA15 DoMore Protect Cdn Business From Foreign

POST ELECTION
SECTION M: BACKGROUND

Name   Label

PESAGE Respondent's Year Of Birth

PESM10B In Your Life, Importance Of

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION B

Name   Label

MBSB1 Government Should <Standard Of

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION C

Name	Label
MBSC1A	Influence Has> Unions
MBSC2A	Influence Has> Farmers
MBSC3A	Influence Has> Big Business
MBSC4A	Influence Has> Media
MBSC5A	Influence Has> Public Sector Workers
MBSC6A	Influence Has> Banks
MBSC7A	Influence Has> Consumers
MBSC8A	Influence Has> Feminists
MBSC9A	Influence Has> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC10A	Influence Has> Racial Minorities
MBSC11A	Influence Has> People On Welfare
MBSC12A	Influence Has> Small Business
MBSC13A	Influence Has> Senior Citizens
MBSC14A	Influence Has> Gays And Lesbians
MBSC15A	Influence Has> Babyboomers
MBSC16A	Influence Has> Environmentalists
MBSC1B	Influence ShldHave> Unions
MBSC2B	Influence ShldHave> Farmers
MBSC3B	Influence ShldHave> Big Business
MBSC4B	Influence ShldHave> Media
MBSC5B	Influence ShldHave>Public Sector Workers
MBSC6B	Influence ShldHave> Banks
MBSC7B	Influence ShldHave> Consumers
MBSC8B	Influence ShldHave> Feminists
MBSC9B	Influence ShldHave> Aboriginal Peoples
MBSC10B	Influence ShldHave> Racial Minorities
MBSC11B	Influence ShldHave> People On Welfare
MBSC12B	Influence ShldHave> Small Business

MBSC13B	Influence ShldHave> Senior Citizens
MBSC14B	Influence ShldHave> Gays And Lesbians
MBSC15B	Influence ShldHave> Babyboomers
MBSC16B	Influence ShldHave> Environmentalists

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION D

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION E

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION F

Name	Label

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION G

Name   Label

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION H

Name   Label

MBSH1   Political Parties/Cands Spend
        MuchAsWant
MBSH2   YourView>Allowed
        AdvertiseDuringCampaign
MBSH3   Limit Individuals/Groups Spending On
        Ads
MBSH4   Individuals/Groups Can Advertise,
Spend:
MBSH5   Referendums On Important Questions
        Held:

MBSH6   Have Referendums Same Time As
        Elections
MBSH7   Win Majority Seats W/O Majority Of
        Votes

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION I

Name   Label

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION J

Name   Label

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

MAILBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION K

Name   Label

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

ANALYSIS ASSISTANCE VARIABLES

Name   Label

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

55

References

Babbie, Earl. 1992. <u>The Practice of Survey Research</u> (6th Edition). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Bartels, Larry M. 1988. <u>Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice</u>. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bassili, John N. 1993. "Response Latency versus Certainty." <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 57 (1) 54-61.

Bassili, John N. 1996. "The How and Why of Response Latency Measurement in Surveys." In: Answering Questions, eds., Norbert Schwarz and Seymour Sudman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bassili, John N. and Joseph F. Fletcher. 1991. "Response-Time Measurement in Surveys." <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 55 (3) 331-346.

Blais, André and Martin Boyer. 1996. "Assessing the Impact of Televised Debates: The Case of the 1988 Canadian Election." <u>British Journal of Political Science</u>, 26: 143-164.
.
Blishen, Bernard, Bill Carroll and Catherine. Moore. 1987. "The 1981 Socioeconomic Index for Occupations in Canada." <u>Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology</u>, 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., <u>The New Hampshire Primary and Nomination Politics</u>. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House.

Converse, Jean M. And Stanley Presser. 1986. <u>Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire</u>. Beverley Hills: Sage

Dillman, Don A. 1978. <u>Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method</u>, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Dunkelberg, William C. and George S. Day. 1973. "Nonresponse Bias and Callbacks in Sample Surveys." <u>Journal of Marketing Research</u>, 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." <u>Sociological Methods and Research</u>, 11 (1), 3-32.

Frey, James H. 1983. <u>Survey Research by Telephone</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Groves, Robert M. and Lars E. Lyberg. 1988. "An Overview of Nonresponse Issues in Telephone Surveys." In <u>Telephone Survey Methodology</u>, 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. <u>Survey Errors and Survey Costs</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hawkins, Darnell F. 1975. "Estimation of Nonresponse Bias." <u>Sociological Methods and Research</u>, 3 (4) 461-488.

Holbrook, Thomas M. 1996. Do Campaigns Matter? Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 1996. <u>The Challenge of Direct Democracy</u>. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.

Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Henry E. Brady, and Jean Crête. 1992. <u>Letting the People Decide: Dynamics of a Canadian Election</u>. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.

Kalton, Graham. 1983. <u>Introduction to Survey Sampling</u>. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Katosh, John P., and Michael Traugott. 1981. The consequences of validated and self-reported voting measures." <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 57(1): 1-28.

Kish, Leslie. 1965. <u>Survey Sampling</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Lessler, Judith T. and William D. Kalsbeek. 1992. <u>Nonsampling Errors in Surveys</u>.

New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McDonald, P. 1979. "Noncontact and Refusal Rates in Consumer Telephone Surveys."
        Journal of Marketing Research, 16, 478-484.

O'Rourke, D. and J. Blair. 1983. "Improving Random Respondent Selection in Telephone
        Surveys." Journal of Marketing Research, 20, 428-432.

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

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

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

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