Codebook for The European Voter

Prepared after the meeting of principal investigators and team members: Cologne, 21-25 January 2002

This codebook identifies those measures that are requested for each participating country in The European Voter project.

Participants are asked to supply one or more variables as appropriate for each measure that is identified here.

In selecting and constructing variables, participants are asked to bear in mind that the most important requirement for this project is that measures should be as consistent as possible over time within each country. This principle should guide both the selection and the construction of variables. Thus:

1. Where more than one operationalisation may be available, variables that have been asked in the same way over a long period of time are always to be preferred over those that have changed.
2. Where the number of response categories to a variable has been changed, please recode so comparability over time is maximised. In the case of variables with a small number of categories (normally less than five), we would anticipate that this will normally be best achieved by recoding to collapse the number of categories. In the case of those variables with a larger number of categories we would normally anticipate that this would best be achieved by standardising the data. In the case of the latter, the range of the scale should be that which was actually used in most years.

It is appreciated that in some cases a consistent operationalisation across time cannot be provided. There may be one or two major breaks that cannot be bridged by any of the above procedures. In that event please provide the best possible time series, on either side of the break. But please signify the existence of a break by assigning different variable names to the different operationalisations.

Otherwise, please normally adopt the variable name conventions indicated in this document as far as possible. Please also ensure that the variables are as far as possible in the order indicated in this document.

It is appreciated that on occasions a measure will either be unavailable at all, or only available for one election or two or three proximate elections. In that event, please omit. The study has no interest in variables from which no possible long-term time series can be constructed.

In the case of those variables where the response codes are the names of parties, please use the same coding scheme throughout.

Participants may either provide one combined file for their whole country or separate files for each election, as appears most efficient in their case.

Documentation

Please provide a file in a spreadsheet format that indicates which variables are available for which year. Please provide on the left hand side of this spreadsheet sufficient description of the variable that the nature of its contents are likely to be apparent to the user.

Please arrange this documentation in the same order as the file. Where more than one indicator is provided of a measure (perhaps because of a break in a time series) please put each indicator on a separate (but adjacent) row.

Minor discrepancies in question wording or coding between years for a variable (i.e. discrepancies that are not serious enough to require separate variable names) should also be documented here.

Please ensure that the file has adequate variable and value label descriptions.

Please adopt the following missing data codes.

7, 97, 997 = inappropriate
8, 98, 998 = DK
9, 99, 999 = NA

1. Variables to identify the study and respondents

COUNTRY   Britain, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden

YEAR   Election year : year in four digits

WEIGHT1
WEIGHT2

Please provide any weights required to ensure that results are representative of those eligible to vote at the election in question. In the case of multi-wave panels where different weights are required for different waves please provide all appropriate weights and document for which variables each applies.

STUDY Study number

RESP   Respondent identification number

2. General background variables

SEX Respondents sex

     Value   Label

       1   Male
       2   Female

BORN Year of birth (4 digits)

AGE Age in the year election takes place (2 digits)

Please provide at least one or the other, preferably both.

MARRIED Civil status

The crucial distinctions here are married/living as married, previously married, and never married.

URBAN Urbanisation

Please provide a categorisation based on either subjective or objective criteria. We would normally anticipate no more than 5 categories.

REGION   Region where respondent is living

Please supply what you consider to be the most politically relevant categorisation. If region is not thought to be relevant please supply a categorisation that will fairly demonstrate that is the case!

EDU Highest completed education level

Please provide if possible a variable that distinguishes between higher, secondary and primary levels of education.

RELIGION Religion

Respondents' self-assigned religious denomination

CHURCH ATTENDANCE

Frequency of attendance at religious service.

3. Occupation and class

WHOHEAD WHO IS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, OR MAIN INCOME EARNER

Whether respondent is head of household, or not.

(1) Respondent is head of household

(2) Spouse is head of household

(3) Parent of respondent is head of household

(4) Other person is head of household

(5) Respondent is not head of household and no information available about who

else is head of household

EGPCLASS

Please provide if possible a classification of respondents based on the Erikson-Goldthorpe-Portocarero class schema, using as elaborate a version of that schema as you are able to operationalise. The classification may be based on either respondent's or head of household class – or some variant thereof.

If you are unable to operationalise this schema for all or some years please provide the most elaborate class schema that you can construct consistently across all or most elections.

PUBLIC R.

This variable should identify whether the HoH or respondent is employed in the public or private sectors.

SUBCLASS subjective social class

Respondent's self class assignment/identification.

INCOME   Gross income

This may be based on either the respondent or the household. A division into quartiles or quintiles will be acceptable.

UNION Respondent member of trade union

Value   Label

1   Yes
2   No

OWNHOUSE DOES RESPONDENT, OR HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OWN A HOUSE

(1) No, not a house owner

(2) Yes, a house owner

4. Measures of political interest and involvement

The aim of this section is to create a number of indicators of the respondent's involvement in politics. It is not designed, for example, to permit the analysis of media impact.

POLINTR   Indicator of subjective political interest.

CAREWON. How much respondent cared about the outcome of the election

MEDIAUSE

One or more variables that measure frequency of use of or reported attention to news in the media (e.g. TV news, newspapers) either in general or during the campaign.

DISCUSSION Discussed politics

One or more variables, as available, reporting involvement in political discussions, either in general or during the campaign.

WHEN   Reported timing of when decision was made how to vote

EFFICACY1 to EFFICACYn

Please provide any time series that may be available for your country of any measures (such as those first administered in the ANES/The Civic Culture) of political efficacy. These measures may be of either system/external or personal/internal – and where both are available please provide both.

5. Measures of party attachment

MEMBER member of a party

Value   Label

1   Yes
2   No

PID   Party identification, direction

Please use code 97 to indicate no identification

STRENGTH Party identification, strength

6. Party and party leader sympathy

Please provide a measure of the respondent's overall sympathy/likeing for each party. We would anticipate that this would normally be the product of a 'theremometer' score, but in the absence of such a score please supply the most similar alternative.

Use same order of parties as in the coding scheme for parties.

SYMP1 sympathy score party 1

SYMP2

SYMP3

SYMP4

SYMP5

SYMP6

SYMP7

SYMP8
SYMP9
SYMP10
SYMP11
SYMP12

Please provide a similar measure for the leader of each of the above parties.

SYMPL1 sympathy score for leader party 1

SYMPL2

SYMPL3

SYMPL4

SYMPL5

SYMPL6

SYMPL7

SYMP8L
SYMP9L
SYMP10L
SYMP11L
SYMP12L

7. Left – right positions

LRSP

Respondent's left-right self placement.

LRP1
LRP2
LRP3
LRP4
LRP5
LRP6
LRP7
LRP8
LRP9
LRP10
LRP11
LRP12

Respondent's left-right placement for each party (in the same order as above)

In the event that the classic left-right scale was not administered please provide a functional equivalent where possible.

8. Economic and Non-economic evaluations.

Please provide one or more indicators of the following, where available:-

ECONOMY1 Retrospective socio-tropic economic evaluations
ECONOMY2 Retrospective egocentric economic evaluations
ECONOMY3 Prospective socio-tropic economic evaluations
ECONOMY4 Prospective egocentric economic evaluations

Questions that ask about the situation 'now' may be substituted for retrospective evaluations.

BLAME1 to BLAME2

Who does the respondent blame/credit for the retrospective/current situation.

NONECON1

Please supply any non-economic retrospective evaluations for which a time series is available.

9. Value Dimensions

 Please provide at least two indicators for each year of the following value dimensions. The indicators should be capable of being combined into an additive scale. Examples are given of the kinds of items that it is anticipated might be reliable and valid indicators but these should be regarded as illustrative rather than definitive.

Each of the following strategies is acceptable:-

For each value dimension, the inclusion of two indicators for both of which there is a good individual time series.

The inclusion of a larger number of items, on each of which the time series may be broken, but where in most pairs of years two or more items that comprise the scale are available in common.

Participants are welcome to construct a value scale for each dimension, but this is not essential. They should however ensure that which indicator belongs to which dimension is adequately documented.

MORAL1   MORAL CONSERVATISM / RELIGIOUS VALUES

- Role of Christian values in society

- Attitudes towards the position of the family

- Attitudes towards abortion

- Attitudes towards Pornography

- Attitudes towards homosexuality

- The role of religious teaching in schools

- Traditional values vs. modern values in society

MORAL2, etc.

From the same list

STATE1   STATE INTERVENTION / ECONOMIC LEFT-RIGHT / STATE vs. MARKET

- regulation of the market economy

- size of the welfare state / public sector

- privatisation ("privatise health care" etc)

- socialisation of private enterprise

- regulation of private property

- level of public social security and benefits (replacement rates)

- income equality versus the need for incentives

- tax level / tax progression

- economic democracy (influence of employees/workers in firms)

STATE2 etc.

From the same list

AUTHOR1   AUTHORITARIAN/LIBERTARIAN

- emphasis on law and order

- strong measures against crime and criminals

- size of the defence forces

- attitudes towards increasing political and social participation and involvement in
decision making versus the need for efficient decisions without much involvement.

- attitudes towards respect for authorities

AUTHOR2, etc.

From the same list

GROWTH1, GROWTH-ECOLOGY

- attitudes towards environmental protection in general

- environmental protection versus economic growth

- attitudes towards economic growth/high productivity

- attitudes towards nuclear power

- attitudes towards private motoring

- speed in development of energy sources (waterfalls, oil, etc.)

GROWTH2, etc.

INGLHART MATERIALISM-POSTMATERIALISM

Classification of respondents as follows based on the four item Inglehart battery

Materialist

Mixed

Postmaterialist

NATISSUE1

NATISSUE2

Please include any other politically relevant indicators of respondents' issue or value orientations for which you have a good time series.

10. Issue Voting

We are interested here in indicators of two concepts.

1. The importance that respondents attach to issues. This may come in the form of rankings of issues (such as a response to a question, 'what is the most important problem …') or of ratings of individcual issues (such as a response to a question how important is issue x).
2. Which party respopndents think is best able to deal with/is more likely to give priority to such an issue.

IMP1   Most important issue/rating of issue 1

COMP1   Most competent party on this issue. (Codes should be for a single party where possible, though combination/coalition of parties acceptable as a second best)

IMP2   Second most important issue/rating of issue 2

COMP2   Most competent party on this issue. Same list of parties as before

Etc.

TOPICAL.

If there were any issues that were particularly important at an individual election for which an issue position variable has not been provided in section 9, please include here. This is the one exceptional occasion when the data set may contain variables that do not comprise part of a time series.

11. Voting behaviour

TURNOUT Turnout,

Value   Label

    1 Voted
    2 Did not vote

PARTY CHOICE Party choice,
    Same list as above

RECALL TURNOUT   Voted previous national election

Value   Label

    1 Voted
    2 Did not vote

RECALL CHOICE Party choice in previous national elections

Same list as above

The European Voter Data Set
The Netherlands

Dutch Election Studies from 1971 to 1998

Contents

ZA-Nr. 3911: The European Voter Database. Continuity File of National Election studies in the Netherlands

Dates of Data Collection:
1971 (ICPSR 7261), 1971 (P 0131), 1972 (ICPSR 7261), 1972 (P0353), 1977 (P0354), 1981 (0350), 1982 (0633), 1986 (0866), 1989 (P1000), 1994 (P1208), 1998 (P1415).

Documentation:
At the end of this document a variable correspondence list gives information about the original variable names and reports which variable was asked in which years.

Publications:
Thomassen, Jacques (ed.): The European Voter, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Principal Investigators:
See original study descriptions

Data Collectors:
See original study descriptions

Abstract:
This database includes subsets containing a selection of variables from the national election studies listed above. Subsets of every election are included as well as an integrated file covering all subsets from 1971 until 1998. The subsets and the integrated file cover variables from the following areas: General background variables, Occupation and class, others related to the cleavage model, political interest and involvement, variables regarding parties, party and party leaders sympathy, political participation, left right positions, economy, values and ideology, national issues and voting.

Sample:
National Election Studies with representative samples.

Data Set:

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1971	3756	19.5	19.5	19.5
1972	2498	13.0	13.0	32.5
1977	1856	9.6	9.6	42.1
1981	2305	12.0	12.0	54.1
1982	1541	8.0	8.0	62.1
1986	1630	8.5	8.5	70.6
1989	1754	9.1	9.1	79.7
1994	1812	9.4	9.4	89.1
1998	2101	10.9	10.9	100.0
Total	19253	100.0	100.0	

Format: SPSS Files

Additional Notes:

For the 1971 and 1972 elections there are data from two election studies; the NKO study and the Tilburg three wave panel study (conducted in 1970, 1971, 1972). The reason for including the Tilburg study is that it contains more variables on citizens' policy preferences than the NKO studies (e.g. left-right positions). A potential disadvantage of the Tilburg study is that it contains fewer respondents. It's up to the authors to decide which of the two studies to use.

Missing values have been coded as follows:
dk: 998
na: 999
pa: 997
Values of variables are assigned the score 9999 if these variables are not present in a specific election year.

Most social background variables are consistent across time. Differences between election years exist on the number of categories of these variables. For the sake of comparison, for some years, categories have been collapsed into one category. In the data-set, data on occupation have not yet been recoded into EGP class codings. Measures of political interest, involvement and party attachment are completely comparable across time.

Sympathy rating-scores for parties are available in 1971 (Tilburg), 1972 (Tilburg), 1986, 1994 and 1998.

Sympathy rating-scores for party-leaders are available from 1986 onwards.

Left-right positions of parties are not included in the NKO studies of 1971, 1972 and 1977. For LR party positions, the Tilburg studies of 1971 and 1972 can be used. For 1977, data from the *1976 Continu Onderzoek* can be used (Pieter van Wijnen can provide these data).

Left-right self-placements are not available in the 1971 and 1972 NKO studies. Instead, the 1971 and 1972 Tilburg studies can be used.

Comparable data on economic evaluations are present from 1986 onwards. A measure of general satisfaction with government policy is available in every election year (save 1982).

Comparable measures of the moral value dimension are the abortion issue (1971-1989), the euthanasia issue (1986-1998) and attitudes towards religion and politics (1971-1998).

A comparable measure of the socio-economic dimension is the issue of income differences (1971-1998).

A comparable measure of the M/PM dimension is the issue of nuclear energy reactors (1977-1998). Ingleharts 4 item battery is available from 1989 onwards.

For the authoritarian-libertarian dimension, the dataset does not have comparable measures. For analysing this dimension, each election year a different item has to be used.

Answer-categories for open-ended questions on the most important problems have been made comparable across election years.

Longitudinal data on issue competence and issue emphasis of parties are not available.

Relevant Parties:

small left	(CPN, PSP, PPR, SP, Groen Links)
social democrats	(PvdA)
progressive liberals	(D66)
protestants	(ARP 1971, 1972)
Christian democrats	(CDA 1977 onwards)
Catholic	(KVP 1971, 1972)
Dutch reformed	(CHU 1971, 1972)
conservative liberals	(VVD)
small religious right	(SGP, GPV, RPF)

Weights:
(Information on weighting of variables *from the original codebooks*)

1986

Owing to sampling and non-response (refer to the GENERAL INFORMATION part of this codebook, pp. 7-21) the composition of the group of respondents may deviate in various respects from that of the electorate. To improve the quality of estimates from the survey (particularly univariate estimates) weighting may be employed.

Which method of weighting would be best and which information about population distributions is to be used in weighting, depends on various considerations such as the variables of which population estimates have to be made, the correlates of these variables, the nature of the process which is assumed to be responsible for biases in the composition of the sample, and the availability of information of population distributions of the variables which are to be used in a weighting scheme.

Consequently, no single weighting scheme with its resulting weighting coefficients can be proclaimed to be useful for all purposes. The weights which have been included in the datafile in VAR384 and VAR385 are based on a multivariate population distribution of sex, degree of urbanization of residence, and age. This population information has been obtained from publications of the Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics. To avoid too large a number of (multivariate) strata the latter two variables have been collapsed into 3, respectively 5 categories, resulting in 2*3*5=30 strata. In terms of the categories of urbanization listed in Appendix 13, the following combinations have been made: codes 2,3 and 4 were combined, codes 5, 6 and 7 constituted the second category, and 8 through 13 the third. As far as age is concerned, the categorization has been made in such a manner as to coincide with a partially collapsed distinction between electoral cohorts (refer to VAR105) where codes 0, 1 and 2 constitute the first category, code 3 the second, codes 4 and 5 the third, codes 6, 7 and 8 the fourth and codes 9 through 13 the fifth category. The weights are based on a procedure using generalized estimators from a linear model which relates target variables to discrete auxiliary variables. This method has been implemented by the Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) in a PC-computer program called LINWEIGHT. The method and the program are described in detail in the following publications:

J.G.Bethlehem and W.J.Keller, A general method for weighting sample surveys, Voorburg, CBS, 1985 (nr. 1401-84-M1);

J.G.Bethlehem, Linweight user manual, Voorburg, CBS, 1985 (nr. 3912-85-M1).

To the extent that a weighting scheme based on sex, urbanization and age does not fit a particular purpose, we recommend using the same program for designing a different weighting scheme. The program and documentation can be obtained from CBS in Voorburg.

It has been shown that using the weights contained in VAR384 and VAR385 reduces the discrepancy between known population distributions of political variables (turnout, and participation in a massive petition drive) and the concommitant

distributions in the unweighted sample. For more information and possible interpretations of the remaining differences between the population distributions and the weighted sample distributions refer to:

C. van der Eijk and G.A. Irwin, Survey: het Nationaal Kiezersonderzoek, in: W. Derksen, A.F.A. Kortsen and A.F.M. Bertrand (eds.), De praktijk van onderzoek, Groningen, 1988: 205-236.

The difference between VAR384 and VAR385 is the number of cases for which non-zero weights have been computed. VAR384 gives non-zero weights to 1630 cases, VAR385 does so for 1356 cases. If weighting by means of these variables is desired and all substantive variables to be used come from the questionnaire used in the first wave of interviews, VAR384 should be used. If one or more of the variables in the analysis comes from the second wave (in which fewer respondents were interviewed, refer to VAR003) VAR385 should be used for weighting. In both instances one will find that the weights have been calculated in such a way that the weighted number of cases equals the unweighted number.

1989

The data file contains three variables (VAR290, VAR291, and VAR292), each of which contains a different set of weighting coefficients by means of which the data can be weighted as to accord to known population distributions (such as sex or age). This appendix provides a brief description of these three variables and the way in which they were derived.

All weight coefficients were calculated by means of the multiplicative weighting procedure as implemented in the computer program BASCULA (Gottgens et al. 1991; refer to Bethlehem and Kersten (1986) for a detailed description of the weighting methods). All weight coefficients were calculated on the basis of the population information provided by the Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS).

Weight variable VAR292 was supplied by CBS and is based upon population distributions of sex, degree of urbanization, age, marital status, size of household, region and voting behavior in the parliamentary elections of September 1989. The use of VAR292 will yield the exact outcome of the parliamentary elections of 1989. However, users should be aware that VAR292 contains a number of weights that are either very large or very small. Further information about the derivation of this weight variable and its performance can be found in Schmeets and Molin (1990).

The other two weight variables, VAR290 and VAR291, are comparable to the weighting variables as included in previous Dutch Parliamentary Election Studies. They are based upon population distributions of sex, degree of urbanization, and age. To avoid either very large or very small weighting coefficients, the number of strata has been kept small by collapsing some of the categories of urbanization and age. The use of the weights stored in VAR290 and VAR291 reduces the discrepancy between the outcome of the 1989 election and the concomitant distribution in the unweighted sample.

VAR290 and VAR291 differ from each other in the number of weights that are equal to zero. VAR290 contains no such weights, while VAR291 contains zero weights for all respondents who participated only in the first wave, and not in the second. Users are recommended to use VAR290 to weigh the data if all relevant information has been collected during the first wave of interviews. If, however, part of the required information was collected during the second wave of interviews (that is, if there is panel attrition), VAR291 should be used.

The population and sample distributions of the variables that were used for the creation of VAR290 and VAR291 are as follows (ICPSR 9950, Page 263):

Sex:

Code Label	population	wave 1	wave 2
1. male	48.6%	50.9%	52.5%
2. female	51.4%	49.1%	47.5%

Urbanization (refer to Appendix 9 for a description of the codes):

Code Label	population	wave 1	wave 2
1. A3-A4	11.1%	12.7%	13.1%
2. B1-B3	37.5%	35.3%	35.0%
3. C1-C6	51.4%	52.0%	51.9%

Age (collapsed from ten to seven categories):

Code Label	population	wave 1	wave 2
1. 18-25	17.3%	10.8%	10.2%
2. 26-35	20.7%	26.2%	26.6%
3. 36-45	20.7%	23.4%	24.6%
4. 46-55	12.8%	12.0%	12.2%
5. 56-65	12.5%	11.6%	11.6%
6. 66-75	9.6%	10.0%	9.8%
7. 76 and over	6.4%	6.0%	5.0%

1994

VAR523 Weighting factor
QUEST none
MD = 9
This weighting factor has been provided by CBS and ranges from 0.045319396 to 6.415469339.

1998

V0025 – V0027 are three weighting variables. The first weighting variable, V0025, was constructed by Statistics Netherlands, using an elaborate weighting model including electoral behavior. By using electoral behavior, it excludes all respondents not participating in the second wave. The second and third weighing factor, V0026 and V0027, are post-stratification weights for the pre-election sample as a whole and for the pre-election rolling cross-section design, respectively.

1. Statistics Netherlands weight (V0025). The weighting variable was provided by Statistics Netherlands, and constructed by means of the Bascula program. This weight is explored and defended in (Schmeets & Molin 1990) and (CBS 1992a). The weight ('model 4') is based upon actual voting behavior (including non-voting) , agegroup (18-24; 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65-74; 75 and older), sex, marital status (married; divorced; widow(er); not-married), degree of urbanization (see V0013) and region (see V0010). In the original weighing factor M4 household size was taken into account (Schmeets & Molin 1992: 13 and 23), however, because a sample of persons instead of households was used, this correction was not performed in the construction of this weight. Since the CBS weight is partly based on electoral behavior, it can only be computed for those respondents about whom information on their electoral behavior is available, i.e. the respondents in the post-election wave of interviews. The minimum value of weight 1 is of course 0, the maximum value is 3,75. The variance is 0.473. The mean is 0.86, due to the fact that first wave respondents not participating in the second wave are not included (weight = 0).

2. Simple post-stratification weight (V0026). The simple post-stratification weight V0026 only adjusts for flaws in the net pre-election sample when compared to the desired number of sample units according to the stratification table, Table 11. Table 11 contains 18 non-empty cells, so that V0026 has only 18 distinct values. For computing these weights, Statistics Netherlands provided a table with the population figures of persons aged 18 and over for all Dutch municipalities, on January 1, 1998. On the basis of this table, the number of enfranchised persons in each cell of the stratification table could be computed. The realized number of pre-election interviews (refer to Table 11) should ideally have an identical distribution over the cells of the table. However, the actual numbers of successful pre-election interviews in the cells of the table 7. Not all persons aged 18 and over in a municipality are enfranchised: e.g., foreigners and persons in mental institutions are not. The potential bias that might have resulted from an non-uniform distribution of adults without the right to vote over the stratification table, was ignored.

European Voter - Dutch Variable Correspondence List

Survey	Tilb 71	NKO 71	Tilb 72	NKO 72	NKO 77	NKO 81	NKO 82	NKO 86	NKO 89	NKO 94	NKO 98
Country	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl
Year	71	71	72	72	77	81	82	86	89	94	98
Weight 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	384	290	523	25
Weight 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	385	291	-	26
Study	7261	0131	7261	0353	0354	0350	0633	0860	1000	1208	1415
Resp	Respnr	2	respnr	respnr	1	2	1002	2	2	2	2
Sex	621	374	758	393	299	127	1265	96	93	176	288
Born	603	296	736	308	300	135	1273	97	-	172	316
Age	603	296	736	308	300	135	1266	97	-	172	316
Married	604	298	737	310	-	137	1275	106	95	177	351
Urban	377	384	631	399	313	187	1319	173	105	180	13
Region	375	383	629	398	314	189	1321	176	106	-	10
Edu	314	313	314	323	261,263,244	167	1301	132	94	174	352
Religion	615	362	754	384	290	174	1306	138	108	521	377
Chrch a.	617	364	756	387	293	177	1309	141	112	522	382
Whohea	608	336	744	351	242	156	1293	124	100	218	-
Egpclass	740	322	740	332	271	141	1279	110	97	189	361
Publi r p	295	324	295	334	261,249	140	1278	109	96	-	355
Subclass	613	357	752	369	287	173	1305	136	122	178	394
Income	620	372	757	370/373	280,282	179	1311	154	123	179	348
Union	-	350	-	81	549	406	1092	300	244	461	724
Ownhou	-	359	-	377	576	181	1313	158	126	-	-
Polintr	165	88	716	7	9	9	1009	7	7	8	33
Tvuse	41	4	41	2	-	-	-	12	9	14,15	40,41
Paperuse	30	82	30	61	6	6	1006	4	4	5	30

Survey	Tilb 71	NKO 71	Tilb 72	NKO 72	NKO 77	NKO 81	NKO 82	NKO 86	NKO 89	NKO 94	NKO 98
Discuss	225	89	717	60	7	7	1007	5	5	6	31
When	-	768	708	-	326	516	1049	187	157	288	616
Efficacy1	46	137	46	241	140	118	1029	278	222	409	793
Efficacy2	45	136	45	240	139	117	1028	277	221	408	792
Efficacy3	48	134	48	238	137	115	1026	275	219	406	790
Efficacy4	47	135	47	239	138	116	1027	276	220	407	791
Member	230	277	230	229	164	36	1023	26	29	28	60
Pid-direct	456	226	693	-	160	20	1022	25	28	27	59
Pid-stren	457	230	694	-	161	19	1021	24	27	26	58
Symp1	186,188, 195	-	724,726, 733	-	-	-	-	68,69	-	94	173
Symp2	184	-	722	-	-	-	-	65	-	91	170
Symp3	193	-	731	-	-	-	-	67	-	93	172
Symp4	191	-	729	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symp5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	-	95	174
Symp6	189	-	727	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symp7	187	-	725	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symp8	185	-	723	-	-	-	-	66	-	92	171
Symp9	192,194	-	730,732	-	-	-	-	71,72, 73	-	96,97, 98	175,176, 177
Sympl1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sympl2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77	278	101	181
Sympl3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	280	107	184
Sympl4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sympl5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76	277	100	182
Sympl6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Survey	Tilb 71	NKO 71	Tilb 72	NKO 72	NKO 77	NKO 81	NKO 82	NKO 86	NKO 89	NKO 94	NKO 98
Sympl7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sympl8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78	279	103	183
Sympl9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lrself	454	-	691	-	186	120	1031	262	206	390	770
Lrp1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lrp2	453	-	690	-	-	555	1032	263	207	391	775
Lrp3	451	-	688	-	-	557	1034	265	209	393	777
Lrp4	452	-	689	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lrp5	-	-	-	-	-	560	1037	268	212	395	779
Lrp6	449	-	686	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lrp7	447	-	684	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lrp8	450	-	687	-	-	556	1033	264	208	392	776
Lrp9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retr-Pers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	36	34	72
Retr-Gen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	33	32	70
Retr-Empl	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	34	33	71
Govpolic	477	388	703	267	503	405	-	32	32	35	73
Moral1	398	-	651	-	107	354	1149	38	41	-	-
Moral 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	209	172	61	116
Moral 3	-	519	-	637	197	403	1090	363	265	485	864
Moral 4	-	-	-	-	-	404	1091	364	266	486	865
State 1	422	-	667	-	115	365	1160	49	52	71	123
State2	-	94	-	123	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Survey	Tilb 71	NKO 71	Tilb 72	NKO 72	NKO 77	NKO 81	NKO 82	NKO 86	NKO 89	NKO 94	NKO 98
M/PM1	-	-	-	-	111	359	1154	43	46	76	743
mpmbat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	267,268	487,488	655,656
Author1	446	-	683	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Author2	406	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Autho22	-	-	-	-	447	-	-	-	-	-	-
Author3	430	-	675	-	119	-	-	-	-	-	-
Author4	-	668	-	715	446	-	-	-	-	-	-
Author5	-	-	-	-	-	621	1115	-	-	-	-
Autho6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	308	-	-	-
Autho62	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	267,268	-	-
Author7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66	-
Author8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	-
Author9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	505	881
Natissu1	659	463	659	270	69	348	1099	237	183	318,319, 320	144
Natissu2	131	433	642	271	70	394	1165	226	66	81	673
Imp 1	381	50	635	39	64	11	1011	14	14	16	45
Imp 2	384	51	638	40	65	12	1012	15	15	17	46
Imp 3	389	52	641	41	66	13	1013	16	16	18	47
Turnout	481	762	705	143	315	512	1045	180	146	280	610
Party ch.	482	764	706	150	323	513	1046	181	147	281	611
Rec turn	155	272	481	154	94	16	1171	203	55	55	165
Rec choic	155	273	482	155	95	17	1172	204	56	56	166