

GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEYS, 1972-2000:

CUMULATIVE CODEBOOK

May, 2001

Conducted for
The National Data Program for the Social Sciences

at

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

Data Distributed by

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research
University of Connecticut

INTRODUCTION

The National Data Program for the Social Sciences is designed as a data diffusion project and a program of social indicator research. The data come from the General Social Surveys, interviews administered to NORC national samples using a standard questionnaire. Toward the major goal of functioning as a social indicator program, items which have appeared on previous national surveys between 1937 and 1978 have been replicated here. The search for trend items led us to published reports from Gallup, Harris, the Detroit Area Study, SRC (Michigan) studies, NORC files, and Federal Commissions such as those on Violence and Pornography.

By retaining the exact wording, we hope to facilitate time trend studies as well as replications of earlier findings. For the base line items in the initial 1972 survey, some 105 sociologists and social scientists reviewed drafts of the questionnaire, suggested revisions and additions, and expressed their question preference by vote. Their serious assistance was extremely helpful in putting together a final version of the questionnaire which would represent the varied interests of social scientists. Topic and question selection is monitored by a Board of Overseers: Richard Alba, Lawrence Bobo, Barbara Entwisle, Michael Hout (Chair), Mary Jackman, Christopher Jencks, Bernice Pescosolido, Barbara Reskin, Ruben Rumbaut, Lynn Smith-Lovin, Robert Wuthnow, and Yu Xie.

The items appearing on the surveys are one of three types: Permanent questions that occur on each survey, rotating questions that appear on two out of every three surveys (1973, 1974, and 1976, or 1973, 1975, and 1976), and a few occasional questions such as split ballot experiments that occur in a single survey. Starting in 1988 items were no longer rotated across years but appeared on two-thirds of the cases every year. This design is discussed in Appendix Q. A detailed layout of the appearance of questions can be found right before the index to this codebook.

A second objective is the prompt distribution of fresh, interesting, and high-quality data to a variety of users who are not affiliated with large research centers. Pursuant to this end, the Roper Public Opinion Research Center has agreed to reproduce and distribute the data and codebook. The initial survey, 1972, was supported by grants from the Russell Sage Foundation and the National Science Foundation. NSF has provided support for the 1973 through 1978, 1980, and 1982 through 1987 surveys. NSF will continue to support the project through 1997. Supplemental funding for 1984-1994 came from Andrew M. Greeley. We welcome your participation in this program. While it is not necessary to request permission from NORC before publishing analyses of these data, we do ask that NORC be cited as the source of your data. We also request that copies of reports which utilize the data be sent to the General Social Survey, NORC, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

DATA

The General Social Surveys have been conducted during February, March, and April of 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000. There are a total of 40,933 completed interviews (1,613 in 1972, 1,504 in 1973, 1,484 in 1974, 1,490 in 1975, 1,499 in 1976, 1,530 in 1977, 1,532 in 1978, 1,468 in 1980, 1,506 in 1982, 354 in 1982 black oversample, 1,599 in 1983, 1,473 in 1984, 1,534 in 1985, 1,470 in 1986, 1,466 in 1987, 353 in 1987 black oversample, 1,481 in 1988, 1,537 in 1989, 1,372 in 1990, 1,517 in 1991, 1,606 in 1993, 2,904 in 1996, 2,832 in 1998, and 2,817 in 2000). The median length of the interview has been about one and a half hours. Each survey is an independently drawn sample of English-speaking persons 18 years of age or over, living in non-institutional arrangements within the United States. Block quota sampling was used in 1972, 1973, and 1974 surveys and for half of the 1975 and 1976 surveys. Full probability sampling was employed in half of the 1975 and 1976 surveys and the 1977, 1978, 1980, 1982-1991, 1993-1998, 2000 surveys (see Appendix A for a detailed description of the sample design).

The data from the interviews were processed according to standard NORC procedures. Cleaning procedures--utilizing a combination of the coding specifications and the interviewer instructions--were used to check for inconsistent or illegitimate codes (see Appendix B for interviewer instructions and Appendix C for general coding instructions). Some variables--age, occupation, and occupational prestige--are coded so that the first digit of the two- or three-digit codes may be used separately.

This cumulative data set merges all 23 surveys into a single file with each year or survey acting as a subfile. This greatly simplifies the use of the General Social Surveys for both trend analysis and pooling. In addition, this cumulative data set contains newly created variables (e.g. a poverty line code). Finally, the cumulative file contains certain items never before available.

To facilitate the use of the codebook, several terms must be explained. The abbreviation "R," which appears throughout the text and appendices, stands for "respondent." The format which we have used in the text of the codebook is as follows:

95. Do you think the use of marijuana should be made legal or not? *

[VAR: GRASS]

RESPONSE	PUNCH	YEAR										COL. 377
		1972-82	1982B	1983-87	1987B	1988-91	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000	ALL
Should	1	1,803	0	1,156	63	668	234	457	492	525	597	5,995
Should not	2	5,413	0	4,654	277	3,124	770	1,450	1,332	1,263	1,183	19,466
Don't know	8	242	0	181	12	136	52	93	99	117	111	1,043
No answer	9	35	0	17	1	20	1	11	2	6	5	98
Not applicable	BK	6,133	354	1,534	0	1,959	549	981	979	921	921	14,331

REMARKS: Q. 95 was asked on both Form 1 and Form 2 at different points in the interview in 1978. See App. B for locations in the questionnaire.

The format includes the question exactly as it appeared in the questionnaire. For those few questions that were recoded, the symbol [RECODE] appears immediately after the question. For the original question wording, the user must turn to Appendix D: Recodes. Question numbering as it appeared on the actual questionnaire is given in Appendix B.

"[VAR: GRASS]" refers to the variable name. A mnemonic was assigned to each question to promote standardization in the use of General Social Survey variable names and also to meet the eight character limitation imposed by some computer software systems (e.g., SPSS).

Under the heading "RESPONSE," all possible answers to the questions are listed. The questionnaire contains three alternate forms of response as follows: (1) the answers were read to the respondent (if they were included in the question); (2) answers were presented to the respondent on a card (indicated by interviewer instructions); or (3) answers were marked by the interviewer to best correspond to the answer of the respondent (also indicated by interviewer instructions).

The term "PUNCH" represents the code or numerical value which was assigned to each response. These are the numbers that the user will find punched in the columns. The frequency of occurrence of each of the punch values appears in the next four columns. The combined marginals across the surveys are in the last column headed "ALL."

In most cases, the marginal distributions for all punches are given in the text. For a small number of variables -- the two-or-more-column variables -- frequencies or marginal distributions appear in the appendices. Responses are mutually exclusive (i.e., only one code can appear for each respondent for each question).

The first column under "YEAR," 1972-1982, gives the combined totals for the 1972-1982 cross-sections. In the second column, 1982B, the counts for the 1982 black oversample appear. Blacks who were part of the regular 1982 sample are not part of these figures. The third column, 1983-1987, gives the combined totals for 1983-1987. The fourth column, 1987B, contains the counts for the 1987 black oversample. The fifth column, 1988-1991, gives the combined totals for 1988-1991. The sixth column, 1993, contains the counts for the 1993 survey. The seventh column, 1994, contains the counts for the 1994 survey. The eighth column, 1996, contains the counts for the 1996 survey. The ninth column, 1998, contains the counts for the 1998 survey. The tenth column, 2000, contains the counts for the 2000 survey. The eleventh column, ALL, contains the total for the preceding nine columns. For a discussion of the use of the black oversample see Appendix A. For the individual yearly totals for 1972-1982 consult the *General Social Surveys, 1972-1982: Cumulative Codebook*; for 1983-1987 consult the *General Social Surveys, 1972-1987: Cumulative Codebook*; and for 1988-1991, consult *General Social Surveys, 1972-1991: Cumulative Codebook*. To determine what years or surveys a variable appeared in see Appendix U.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

With NSF's renewal of the GSS for 1993-1997, major changes in design occurred. The 1993 GSS was the last survey conducted under the old design. In 1994 two major innovations were introduced to the GSS.

First, the traditional core is substantially reduced to allow for the creation of mini-modules (i.e. blocks of about 15 minutes devoted to some combination of small- to medium-sized supplements). The mini-modules space gives us greater flexibility to incorporate innovations and to include important items proposed by the social science community.

Second, a new biennial, split-sample design is used. The sample consists of two parallel sub-samples of approximately 1,500 cases each. The two sub-samples both contain the identical core. The A sample also contains a standard, topical module, the mini-modules, and an ISSP module (on women, work, and the family). The B sample has a second topical module, mini-modules,

and an ISSP module (on the environment). In effect, one can think of the A sample as representing a traditional GSS for 1994 and the B sample as representing a traditional GSS for 1995. Rather than being fielded separately in two different years they are fielded together.

While we will generally field separate topical, mini-, and ISSP modules on the A and B samples, we have the option of including some items on both samples if a larger sample size is needed. This would most likely be utilized in the case of the ISSP modules.

In 1996 and in subsequent even numbered years the same design described for 1994 has been repeated. In addition to the 1994 only there is a transitional design to calibrate any impact of deletions from the core. On Sample A, the old core was administered to respondents receiving Version 1 (X) and the new reduced core was given on Version 2 (Y). See Appendix A for further information about specific items.

Abbreviations:

The following abbreviations are used throughout the text and appendices:

AIPO	American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup Poll)
BK	Blank
Col(s).	Column(s)
IISR	International Institute for Social Research
ISSP	International Social Survey Program
GO	Gallup Organization
N	Number
NAP	Not applicable
NORC/SRS	National Opinion Research Center/Survey Research Service
n.e.c.	Not elsewhere classified
ORCO	Opinion Research Corporation
POS	Public Opinion Survey (Gallup)
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit
Q(s).	Question(s)
R	Respondent, except in Appendix C: General Coding Instructions, where R stands for blank.
Roper	Roper Public Opinion Research Center, University of Connecticut
ICPSR	Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, University of Michigan
SRC	Survey Research Center, University of Michigan
Var.	Variable
Vol.	Volunteered
ZUMA	Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden, und Analysen, Germany

Data Identification Numbers:

Identification numbers and locations are as follows:

- N = 40,933
- 5,380 cols. per respondent
- Year appears in col. 1-4
- Respondent identification number in cols. 5-8

APPENDIX A:

SAMPLING DESIGN & WEIGHTING

In the original National Science Foundation grant, support was given for a modified probability sample. Samples for the 1972 through 1974 surveys followed this design. This modified probability design, described below, introduces the quota element at the block level. The NSF renewal grant, awarded for the 1975-1977 surveys, provided funds for a full probability sample design, a design which is acknowledged to be superior.

Thus, having the wherewithal to shift to a full probability sample with predesignated respondents, the 1975 and 1976 studies were conducted with a transitional sample design, viz., one-half full probability and one-half block quota. The sample was divided into two parts for several reasons: 1) to provide data for possibly interesting methodological comparisons; and 2) on the chance that there are some differences over time, that it would be possible to assign these differences to either shifts in sample designs, or changes in response patterns. For example, if the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were "very happy" increased by 10 percent between 1974 and 1976, it would be possible to determine whether it was due to changes in sample design, or an actual increase in happiness.

There is considerable controversy and ambiguity about the merits of these two samples. Text book tests of significance assume full rather than modified probability samples, and simple random rather than clustered random samples. In general, the question of what to do with a mixture of samples is no easier solved than the question of what to do with the "pure" types. Investigators who have applied statistical tests to previous General Social Survey data should continue to apply those tests. Investigators who have refrained from applying such tests may now want to perform analyses on the probability subsample. This would, of course, reduce the number of cases by one-half. Whatever choice investigators make, it should be remembered that the two subsamples represent the same universe.¹

Having allowed for the appearance of all items in the transitional sample design, the General Social Survey then switched to a full probability sample for the 1977, 1978, 1980, and 1982-2000 surveys. The variable SAMPLE (Col. 5375) can be used to separate the block quota and full probability samples on the 1975 and 1976 surveys.

A similar split sample transition design was used in the 1983 survey to measure the effect of switching from the 1970 sample frame to the 1980 sample frame. Half of the sample was drawn from the 1970 frame and half was drawn from the 1980 frame. The variable SAMPLE (Col. 5375) separates cases from these two sample frames. Again in 1993, a split sample transition design was employed on the 1993 survey to measure the effect of switching from the 1980 sample frame to the 1990 sample frame. Half of the sample was drawn from each frame. More details on the 1970, 1980 and 1990 sample frames as well as the block quota samples appear below.

The adult, household population of the United States covered about 97.3% of the resident population of the United States in 1985. Coverage varies greatly by age group. For those 18-24, 9.4% of the population in 1980 lived outside of households (mostly in college dorms and military quarters). Among age groups from 25 to 64 the only 0.8-1.4% of the population lived outside of households. For those 75 and older 11.4% were in group quarters, mostly in nursing homes and long-term care facilities. For more details on the non-household population see Living Arrangements of Children and Adults, Census of Population, PC80-2-413, May, 1985.

As defined for the GSS in 1983-1987, 98% of the adult, household population is English speaking. The number of non-English speakers excluded is indicated in Table A.3. Spanish speakers typically make up 60-65% of the

¹C. Bruce Stephenson, "Probability Sampling with Quotas: An Experiment," GSS Methodological Report No.7, April, 1979. Published in Public Opinion Quarterly, 43 (Winter, 1979), 477-496.

language exclusions. About a dozen languages make up the remaining exclusions.

BLOCK QUOTA

The sample is a multi-stage area probability sample to the block or segment level. At the block level, however, quota sampling is used with quotas based on sex, age, and employment status. The cost of the quota samples is substantially less than the cost of a full probability sample of the same size, but there is, of course, the chance of sample biases mainly due to not-at-homes which are not controlled by the quotas. However, in order to reduce this bias, the interviewers are given instructions to canvass and interview only after 3:00 p.m. on weekdays or during the weekend or holidays. This type of sample design is most appropriate when the past experience and judgment of a project director suggest that sample biases are likely to be small relative to the precision of the measuring instrument and the decisions that are to be made.

Selection of PSUs

The Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) employed are Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) or non-metropolitan counties selected in NORC's Master Sample. These SMSAs and counties were stratified by region, age, and race before selection.²

Selection of Sample within PSUs

The units of selection of the second stage were block groups (BGs) and enumeration districts (EDs). These EDs and BGs were stratified according to race and income before selection.³ The third stage of selection was that of blocks. The blocks were selected with probabilities proportional to size. In places without block statistics, measures of size for the blocks were obtained by field counting. The average cluster size is five respondents per cluster. This provides a suitable balance of precision and economy.

Interviewer Instructions

At the block or segment level, the interviewer begins a travel pattern at the first DU (dwelling unit) from the northwest corner of the block and proceeds in a specified direction until the quotas have been filled.

The quotas call for approximately equal numbers of men and women with the exact proportion in each segment determined by the 1970 Census tract data. For women, the additional requirement is imposed that there be the proper proportion of employed and unemployed women in the location. Again, these quotas are based on the 1970 Census tract data. For men, the added requirement is that there be the proper proportion of men over and under 35 in the location.

These particular quotas have been established because past experience has shown that employed women and young men under 35 are the most difficult to find at home for interviewing.

Sampling Error

Although the mean squared error cannot be estimated directly from a quota sample, one can make estimates of sampling variability using procedures such as those outlined by Stephan and McCarthy.⁴ Past experience would suggest that, for most purposes, this sample of 1,500 could be considered as having about the same efficiency as a simple random sample of 1,000 cases. In making this judgment concerning the design effect, we are concerned with

²For selection procedures, see Benjamin King and Carol Richards, "The 1972 NORC National Probability Sample." Chicago: NORC, August, 1972.

³Ibid.

⁴Frederick Stephan and Philip McCarthy, Sampling Opinions. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958, Chapter 10.)

the "average" effect upon a large set of different variables of the clustering of households at the last stage of selection.⁵ Any statement of sampling error assumes that the bias in quota sampling due to the lack of control over respondent availability is slight for the study under consideration.

For those persons interested in investigating the within-sample variability of these data, we have included a "sampling error code" (see Q. 982). Information about the use of this code is available from the GSS project staff at NORC.

Probability, 1970 Frame

The NORC national probability sample is a stratified, multistage area probability sample of clusters of households in the continental United States.⁶ The selection of geographic areas at successive stages is in accordance with the method of probabilities proportional to size (p.p.s.). Furthermore, the clusters of households are divided into replicated subsamples in order to facilitate estimation of the variance of sample estimators of population characteristics.

At the first stage of selection, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) and nonmetropolitan counties covering the total continental United States were grouped according to size strata within the nine Census regions. All population figures and other demographic information were obtained from 1970 Census reports. Within each size stratum grouping based upon geographic location, or racial characteristics (or both), was accomplished before selection. The final frame was further separated into zones or "paper strata" of equal population size in order to facilitate the selection of replicated subsamples of primary sampling units (PSUs).⁷ The selection of PSUs was designed to produce four independent subsamples of equal size. The four subsamples were randomly combined to form two larger subsamples of 101 PSUs each.⁸ The large subsamples are thus internally separable into two replicated subsamples for variance estimation purposes.

NORC has selected one of the two large subsamples described above to serve as its principal frame of households for the remainder of the decade. The PSUs fall into 89 distinct SMSAs and nonmetropolitan counties. (New York, a very large SMSA, represents five PSUs, whereas the smaller counties represent only one PSU.)

The second-stage procedure involved the direct selection of Census block groups or enumeration districts (E.D.s) within SMSAs or counties, eliminating the traditional intermediate stage of clustering selections within urban places or county division. The increase in geographic dispersion within the primary areas has a negligible effect on field costs. Before selection, the Census tracts, minor civil divisions, and Census county divisions containing the block groups and E.D.s were carefully stratified by geographic location, income, and race, in order to maximize the precision of sample estimation within a PSU. Block groups and E.D.s were then selected with probabilities proportional to size in numbers sufficient to satisfy survey demands for households expected throughout the decade. Lists of the separate households contained in the second stage blocks or E.D.s were constructed by field personnel or obtained from directories. Thus, the principal NORC national probability sample is, in effect, an inventory of identifiable households, each with a known probability of selection.

⁵For variable specific design effects from the 1993 GSS, see Tom W. Smith, Hee-Choin Shin, and Xiaoxi Tong, "A Report on the Sample Frame Comparisons and Design Effects of the 1993 General Social Survey," GSS Methodological Report No. 87, 1994.

⁶Alaska and Hawaii are not included in this sample.

⁷The selection methods used are similar to those described in standard textbooks, e.g., W. E. Deming, Sample Design in Business Research (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1960), and L. Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1965).

⁸In the actual implementation of the selection method, subsamples 1 and 4 resulted in 51 PSUs, whereas subsamples 2 and 3 produced only 50 PSUs. The result was not unexpected and is due to a technical reason, details of which will be provided on request. The inequality of subsample sizes does not affect the equal probability characteristics of the sample.

In a typical sample survey with equal probability of selection for individual households (i.e., a self-weighting sample), households at which interviews will take place are probabilistically selected from the available lists of addresses for blocks and E.D.s. The method of probabilities proportional to size results in the assignment of approximately equal numbers of interviews in each final stage cluster, which in turn leads to increased precision in the estimation of overall population characteristics.

The NORC national probability frame, with its broad geographic dispersion, its reserves of additional SMSAs and counties, and its built-in replication, provides sufficient flexibility for application to a wide range of survey tasks. Its design is based on the consideration of sampling problems that NORC and other organizations have encountered in past surveys, and we believe that it substantially eliminates many of these difficulties.

Probability, 1980 Frame

1980 National Sampling Frame

The 1980 frame was designed, selected, and listed jointly by NORC and the Survey Research Center. The new frame was selected, in most cases, in two stages; about one-fifth of the second stage units were subsampled, producing a third stage.

Eighty-four PSUs were selected at the first stage. The PSUs consist of counties, SMSAs, independent cities and, in New England, parts of counties. Prior to selection, the United States was divided into PSUs; the PSUs were then grouped into 84 strata. The strata were formed by grouping metropolitan and non-metropolitan PSUs within each of the four Census regions. Within each region, additional variables were used to define strata. The stratifying variables included within-region geography and size; size was measured by the 1980 Census count of occupied housing units. One PSU was selected from each stratum using a controlled selection procedure. This procedure ensured proportionate representation along certain control dimensions (such as percentage Hispanic in the West). The exact control variables (like the stratification variables) differed somewhat from region to region. Sixteen strata contained only one PSU, which was selected with certainty. The remaining 68 PSUs were selected with probability proportional to size (measured in housing units).

The unit for second stage selection was the block or enumeration district (ED). The number of secondary selections within a PSU depended in part on the stratum size. The number of second stage selections listed for NORC's national frame in the 16 PSUs selected with certainty ranged from 24 to six selections for PSU. In the remaining 68 sample PSUs, six second stage selections were listed. (The same number of second stage selections were listed for SRC's national frame; further, both organizations retained a similar number of second stage selections as a reserve for future use.) All total, the new frame includes 562 secondary selections.

Prior to selection, the second stage units within each sample PSU were sorted by county, by minor civil division (in some areas), by Census Tract or ED number, and by block number. Counties were ordered within PSUs according to size and geography (e.g., in SMSAs, the county containing the central city came first, then counties containing nearby suburbs, and so on). In twenty states, information was available on the size and median family income of minor civil divisions (MCDs), which are governmental units below the county level (such as cities or towns). Where this information was available, we sorted the block and EDs by MCD and ordered the MCDs by size and income.

Next, we sorted all blocks and EDs by Census Tract number and then by block or ED number; these sorts establish a geographic ordering. The secondary selections were made using systematic zone selection; the probabilities of selection were proportional to size (measured in housing units). Each secondary selection included at least 50 housing units.

In enumeration districts and blocks with a large number of dwelling units, a third stage of selection was carried out. The block or ED was subdivided into pieces which were "field counted" by field staff from NORC or SRC. In a field count, an area is scouted and a rough count of the number of housing units is made. Based on the field count we selected a piece of the sample block or ED with probability proportional to its size.*

Table A.3

NON-RESPONSE RATES ON THE 1975-2000 GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEYS
(Full Probability Samples Only)

Disposition of Cases	Surveys												
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982	1982B	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	
A. Original Sample	1102	1113	2317	2344	2210	2221	2900	2222	2157	2201	2192	2250	
B. -Out of Sample	11	16	0	20	1	0	2258*	3	0	0	0	0	
C. -Not a Dwelling Unit	116-	43	126	93	130	117	219	84	77	45	73	77	
D. -Vacant		74	217	190	197	245		172	197	227	176	206	
E. -Language Problem	27	33	54	59	46	46	6	31	52	28	49	43	
F. +New Dwelling Unit	24	44	79	102	97	129	77	82	42	47	50	21	
G. Net Sample	972	991	1999	2084	1933	1942	494	2014	1873	1948	1944	1945	
H. Completed Cases	735	744	1530	1532	1468	1506	354	1599	1473	1534	1470	1466	
I. Refusals	162	-206	339	-417	309	297	66	320	320	344	365	358-	
J. Break-offs	2		7										
K. No one Home to Complete Screener	22	-41	54	48	30	41	-56	17	-49	23	22	46	
L. R Unavailable Entire Field Period	13		26	22	38	23		18		8	13	20	
M. Ill	12	43-	-	21	37	-75	18	60	31	39	74	55	
N. Other	26			44	51								
G. Net Sample	972	991	1999	2084	1933	1942	494	2014	1873	1948	1944	1945	
Eligibility Rate (G/A)	.882	.890	.863	.889	.875	.874	.170	.906	.868	.885	.887	.864	
Response Rate (H/G) ^P	.756	.751	.765	.735	.759	.775	.717	.794	.786	.787	.756	.754	
Refusal Rate (I+J/G)	.169	.208	.173	.200	.160	.153	.134	.159	.171	.177	.188	.184	
Unavailable Rate (K+L/G)	.036	—	.040	.034	.035	.033	.113	.017	.026	.016	.018	.034	
Other Rate (M+N/G)	.039	—	.022	.031	.046	.039	.036	.030	.017	.020	.038	.028	

*Includes screened households with no Blacks.

^PThis corresponds to RR5 (response rate 5) in the American Association for Public Opinion Research's Standard Definitions of the Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys (1998).

^RRefusal rate 3 in AAPOR's Standards.

Table A.3 (continued)

NON-RESPONSE RATES ON THE 1975-2000 GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEYS
(Full Probability Samples Only)

Disposition of Cases	Surveys									
	1987B	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000
A. Original Sample	4750	2250	2250	2165	2312	2296	4559	4559	4567	4883
B. -Out of Sample	3916a	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
C. -Not a Dwelling Unit	106	78	57	70	85	65	103	158	158	242
D. -Vacant	328	261	212	232	256	246	524	493	573	531
E. -Language Problem	0	52	72	47	67	66	143	136	146	178
F. +New Dwelling Unit	<u>42</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>94</u>
G. Net Sample	442	1916	1981	1857	1950	1950	3846	3814	3745	4026
H. Completed Cases	353	1481	1537	1372	1517	1606	2992	2904	2832	2817
I. Refusals	57-	359-	346-	355-	323-	285-	708-	757-	755-	1044-
J. Break-offs										
K. No one Home to Complete Screener	5	19	26	61	54-	18-	18-	60-	66-	97-
L. R Unavailable Entire Field Period	3	7	8	15						
M. Ill	24	50	59	54	56	41	128	93	92	68-
N. Other										
G. Net Sample	442	1916	1981	1857	1950	1950	3846	3814	3745	4026
Eligibility Rate (G/A)	.093	.852	.884	.858	.843	.849	.844	.837	.820	.824
Response Rate (H/G)	.799	.773	.776	.739	.778	.824	.778	.761	.756	.700
Refusal Rate (I+J/G)	.129	.187	.175	.191	.166	.146	.184	.198	.202	.259
Unavailable Rate (K+L/G)	.018	.014	.017	.041	.028	.009	.005	.016	.018	.024
Other Rate (M+H/G)	.054	.026	.030	.029	.029	.021	.033	.024	.025	.017

*Includes screened households with no Blacks.