

Codebook

[DataSet16] S:\Studies\POS\Datasets\CCS Elite\2014leaders-web.sav

PastWeight

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	1
	Label	Past Weight
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F11.4
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1302
	Missing	0
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	.590630
	Standard Deviation	.9225709
	Percentile 25	.000000
	Percentile 50	.432377
	Percentile 75	.511303

EqualWeight

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	2
	Label	EqualWeight
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F17.4
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1302
	Missing	0
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	.384025
	Standard Deviation	.5041183
	Percentile 25	.093809
	Percentile 50	.167785
	Percentile 75	.480769

Group

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	5		
	Label	Group		
	Type	String		
	Format	A15		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	Academic		298	22.9%
	Business		27	2.1%
	Congress		53	4.1%
	Government		104	8.0%
	Interest Groups		54	4.1%
	Journalists		81	6.2%
	Labor		15	1.2%
	Military		533	40.9%
	Religious		32	2.5%
	Think Tank		105	8.1%

Q3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	9		
	Label	Q3. Do you think it will be best for the future of the country if we take an active part in world affairs or if we stay out of world affairs?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Active part	1245	95.6%
	2	Stay out	38	2.9%
Missing Values	System		19	1.5%

Q3b

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	10		
	Label	Q3b. What percentage of the public do you think favors taking an active part in world affairs?		
	Type	String		
	Format	A6		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			2	.2%
	.3		1	.1%
	.33		1	.1%
	.4		2	.2%
	.45		1	.1%
	.6		1	.1%
	0		37	2.8%
	1		1	.1%
	10		19	1.5%
	100		1	.1%
	15		31	2.4%
	2		1	.1%
	20		73	5.6%
	22		1	.1%
	25		50	3.8%
	27		3	.2%
	28		3	.2%
	30		152	11.7%
	300		2	.2%
	32		2	.2%
	33		15	1.2%
	35		70	5.4%
	35-45		1	.1%
	39		1	.1%
	40		216	16.6%
	40-50		1	.1%

Q3b

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	43		3	.2%
	45		68	5.2%
	48		3	.2%
	49		4	.3%
	5		5	.4%
	50		145	11.1%
	50-65		1	.1%
	51		11	.8%
	52		1	.1%
	54		1	.1%
	55		44	3.4%
	58		3	.2%
	59		1	.1%
	60		170	13.1%
	65		32	2.5%
	67		2	.2%
	69		1	.1%
	70		52	4.0%
	700		1	.1%
	71		1	.1%
	72		1	.1%
	73		2	.2%
	75		32	2.5%
	80		21	1.6%
	85		2	.2%
	90		7	.5%

Q5a_24

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	11		
	Label	Q5. Threats: U.S. debt to China		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	147	11.3%
	2	Important but not critical threat	333	25.6%
	3	Not an important threat	175	13.4%
Missing Values	System		647	49.7%

Q5a_25

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	12		
	Label	Q5. Threats: The development of China as a world power		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	214	16.4%
	2	Important but not critical threat	355	27.3%
	3	Not an important threat	83	6.4%
Missing Values	System		650	49.9%

Q5a_26

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	13		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Islamic fundamentalism		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	298	22.9%
	2	Important but not critical threat	298	22.9%
	3	Not an important threat	61	4.7%
Missing Values	System		645	49.5%

Q5a_27

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	14		
	Label	Q5. Threats: The possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	352	27.0%
	2	Important but not critical threat	247	19.0%
	3	Not an important threat	38	2.9%
Missing Values	System		665	51.1%

Q5a_28

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	15		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Large numbers of immigrants and refugees coming into the U.S.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	105	8.1%
	2	Important but not critical threat	197	15.1%
	3	Not an important threat	333	25.6%
Missing Values	System		667	51.2%

Q5a_29

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	16		
	Label	Q5 Threats:. Large numbers of immigrants coming into the U.S.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	90	6.9%
	2	Important but not critical threat	201	15.4%
	3	Not an important threat	332	25.5%
Missing Values	System		679	52.2%

Q5a_30

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	17		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Climate change		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	338	26.0%
	2	Important but not critical threat	178	13.7%
	3	Not an important threat	127	9.8%
Missing Values	System		659	50.6%

Q5a_31

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	18		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Global warming		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	284	21.8%
	2	Important but not critical threat	185	14.2%
	3	Not an important threat	158	12.1%
Missing Values	System		675	51.8%

Q5a_32

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	19		
	Label	Q5. Threats: International terrorism		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	358	27.5%
	2	Important but not critical threat	251	19.3%
	3	Not an important threat	32	2.5%
Missing Values	System		661	50.8%

Q5a_33

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	20		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Violent Islamist groups in Pakistan and Afghanistan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	287	22.0%
	2	Important but not critical threat	325	25.0%
	3	Not an important threat	48	3.7%
Missing Values	System		642	49.3%

Q5a_34

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	21		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Iran's nuclear program		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	279	21.4%
	2	Important but not critical threat	293	22.5%
	3	Not an important threat	61	4.7%
Missing Values	System		669	51.4%

Q5a_35

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	22		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Drug related violence and instability in Mexico		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	131	10.1%
	2	Important but not critical threat	428	32.9%
	3	Not an important threat	78	6.0%
Missing Values	System		665	51.1%

Q5a_36

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	23		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Economic competition from low wage countries		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	68	5.2%
	2	Important but not critical threat	299	23.0%
	3	Not an important threat	283	21.7%
Missing Values	System		652	50.1%

Q5a_37

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	24		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Cyber-attacks on U.S. computer networks		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	441	33.9%
	2	Important but not critical threat	191	14.7%
	3	Not an important threat	17	1.3%
Missing Values	System		653	50.2%

Q5a_38

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	25		
	Label	Q5. Threats: The continuing conflict in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	110	8.4%
	2	Important but not critical threat	409	31.4%
	3	Not an important threat	129	9.9%
Missing Values	System		654	50.2%

Q5a_39

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	26		
	Label	Q5. Threats: The possibility of the Taliban returning to power in Afghanistan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	151	11.6%
	2	Important but not critical threat	394	30.3%
	3	Not an important threat	107	8.2%
Missing Values	System		650	49.9%

Q5a_40

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	27		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Political instability in the Middle East		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	255	19.6%
	2	Important but not critical threat	366	28.1%
	3	Not an important threat	27	2.1%
Missing Values	System		654	50.2%

Q5a_41

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	28		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Lack of a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	107	8.2%
	2	Important but not critical threat	426	32.7%
	3	Not an important threat	134	10.3%
Missing Values	System		635	48.8%

Q5a_42

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	29		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Russia's territorial ambitions		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	190	14.6%
	2	Important but not critical threat	368	28.3%
	3	Not an important threat	86	6.6%
Missing Values	System		658	50.5%

Q5a_43

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	30		
	Label	Q5. Threats: Border disputes between China and its neighbors		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Critical threat	119	9.1%
	2	Important but not critical threat	404	31.0%
	3	Not an important threat	123	9.4%
Missing Values	System		656	50.4%

Q7a_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	31		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Strengthening the United Nations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	121	9.3%
	2	Somewhat important	304	23.3%
	3	Not important at all	218	16.7%
Missing Values	System		659	50.6%

Q7a_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	32		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Combating international terrorism		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	427	32.8%
	2	Somewhat important	198	15.2%
	3	Not important at all	14	1.1%
Missing Values	System		663	50.9%

Q7a_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	33		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Maintaining superior military power worldwide		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	354	27.2%
	2	Somewhat important	239	18.4%
	3	Not important at all	50	3.8%
Missing Values	System		659	50.6%

Q7a_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	34		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Protecting the jobs of American workers		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	231	17.7%
	2	Somewhat important	332	25.5%
	3	Not important at all	87	6.7%
Missing Values	System		652	50.1%

Q7a_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	35		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Helping to bring a democratic form of government to other nations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	77	5.9%
	2	Somewhat important	423	32.5%
	3	Not important at all	154	11.8%
Missing Values	System		648	49.8%

Q7a_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	36		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Controlling and reducing illegal immigration		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	134	10.3%
	2	Somewhat important	335	25.7%
	3	Not important at all	173	13.3%
Missing Values	System		660	50.7%

Q7a_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	37		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Limiting climate change		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	345	26.5%
	2	Somewhat important	181	13.9%
	3	Not important at all	110	8.4%
Missing Values	System		666	51.2%

Q7a_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	38		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Limiting global warming		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	305	23.4%
	2	Somewhat important	187	14.4%
	3	Not important at all	134	10.3%
Missing Values	System		676	51.9%

Q7a_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	39		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	472	36.3%
	2	Somewhat important	153	11.8%
	3	Not important at all	11	.8%
Missing Values	System		666	51.2%

Q7a_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	40		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Promoting and defending human rights in other countries		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	165	12.7%
	2	Somewhat important	414	31.8%
	3	Not important at all	72	5.5%
Missing Values	System		651	50.0%

Q7a_11

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	41		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Combating world hunger		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	197	15.1%
	2	Somewhat important	395	30.3%
	3	Not important at all	69	5.3%
Missing Values	System		641	49.2%

Q7a_12

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	42		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	298	22.9%
	2	Somewhat important	291	22.4%
	3	Not important at all	67	5.1%
Missing Values	System		646	49.6%

Q7a_13

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	43		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Securing adequate supplies of energy		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	371	28.5%
	2	Somewhat important	237	18.2%
	3	Not important at all	38	2.9%
Missing Values	System		656	50.4%

Q7a_14

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	44		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Protecting weaker nations against foreign aggression		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	132	10.1%
	2	Somewhat important	464	35.6%
	3	Not important at all	55	4.2%
Missing Values	System		651	50.0%

Q7a_15

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	45		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Defending our allies' security		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	409	31.4%
	2	Somewhat important	224	17.2%
	3	Not important at all	17	1.3%
Missing Values	System		652	50.1%

Q7a_16

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	46		
	Label	Q7. Goals: Protecting the interests of American business abroad		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very important	210	16.1%
	2	Somewhat important	372	28.6%
	3	Not important at all	62	4.8%
Missing Values	System		658	50.5%

Q10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	47		
	Label	Q10 Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for the United States?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Mostly good	1178	90.5%
	2	Mostly bad	103	7.9%
Missing Values	System		21	1.6%

Q20a

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	48		
	Label	Q20. From your point of view, how desirable is it that the U.S. exert strong leadership in world affairs?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Very desirable	952	73.1%
	2	Somewhat desirable	287	22.0%
	3	Somewhat undesirable	39	3.0%
	4	Very undesirable	13	1.0%
Missing Values	System		11	.8%

Q20A_A

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	49		
	Label	Which of the following comes closest to your response in the previous question: Strong U.S. leadership is desirable because:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The U.S. should be a model for other countries to follow	96	7.4%
	2	Only if the U. S. exerts strong leadership will other countries step up and do their part	183	14.1%
	3	The U.S. has a moral obligation to lead because of our wealth and	124	9.5%
	4	It's in our national interests	756	58.1%
	5	Other	80	6.1%
Missing Values	System		63	4.8%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	50		
	Label	Why_lead_text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A244		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1222	93.9%
	"strong leadership" is ill-defined		1	.1%
	All of the above		4	.3%
	All of the above!		1	.1%
	All of the above.		1	.1%
	all of these questions depend on the manner in which the US is involved. If we are involved diplomatically and with fair trade agreements, pro-worker and human rights without military might, that is the right way to proceed. US militarism and p		1	.1%
	America has a superior combination of national capabilities and global values		1	.1%
	American exceptionalism is based on the primacy of the individual over the collective, a fact that the US shares with no other country, but should champion as a model for everyone else.		1	.1%
	B, C, and D combined		1	.1%
	be a model, but only in the passive sense--let others seek to want our system--avoid the appearance of pressing otyehrs, exporting our values/views as the only correct way to live		1	.1%
	Because no other country is willing or capable of doing it. And with Obama as our President, we won't be able to very long either.		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	Better than the alternatives.		1	.1%
	Better to be a policy maker than a policy taker.		1	.1%
	Combination between moral obligation and in our national interests		1	.1%
	Combination of a, b, and d.		1	.1%
	Depends on the goals of leadership - U.S. not automatically a good thing for the world		1	.1%
	Few others have our notional values or size to make them count		1	.1%
	Having other countries (allies) step up and do their part because we are leading is unequivocally in our national interest.		1	.1%
	Hegemony helps overcome collective action problems.		1	.1%
	I prefer the idea of U.S. leadership to the alternative models		1	.1%
	If not us, the alternatives are worse.		1	.1%
	If the U.S. can adhere to its values and international standards, it can be a force for positive change in the world; however, while still the country others would like to emulate, growing numbers of foreigners are disillusioned with USG polici		1	.1%
	if the US doesn't lead, the vacuum will be filled by worse alternatives		1	.1%
	In our interests and the world's interests.		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	It creates a constituency for outward engagement		1	.1%
	It depends on the issue. Only if vital national interest. Otherwise the perception of America meddling in the affairs of others has a negative effect.		1	.1%
	It is a combination - not any one		1	.1%
	It is in both our national and international interests.		1	.1%
	It is incumbent on all states to lead, in the sense of acting boldly, but together.		1	.1%
	It is the only country able to lead in areas where cooperation is critical		1	.1%
	it's desirable if done in extensive partnership with others		1	.1%
	It's important both to our national interest and to peace and prosperity internationally that the United States follow an informed, realistic, and pragmatic foreign policy.		1	.1%
	It's in our national interest because our moral and ideological leadership as a model helps create support for a global system that reinforces U. S. privat and public prosperity and strength.		1	.1%
	International order will disintegrate with the US lead		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	Leadership does not mean exerting military means to solve all issues, rather by using global economic means to influence events toward our national interests		1	.1%
	Leading is about being the front guy. It is about helping people get together to solve problems. By the US taking on this responsibility we help build relationships and solve problems even if we are not the lead.		1	.1%
	National interest and moral obligation		1	.1%
	National interest and responsibility to rest of world given our power		1	.1%
	No other significant power has the capacity to lead the world toward dealing with climate change and threats to world order.		1	.1%
	Not exerting some leadership on certain issues creates a collective action problem. It isn't that the US needs to exert strong leadership for others to step in but rather that if the US sits out, others are encouraged to sit out.		1	.1%
	Of course some leadership necessary but we need to drop the trope of THE LEADER		1	.1%
	others should want to follow us		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	Our wealth places a moral obligation on us to help those in need. We should lead where necessary because we have the power to do so. But we should always understand that the quality of our leadership as a model can only be as good as the lead		1	.1%
	responsibility to cooperate multilaterally on global problems		1	.1%
	Strong leadership entails all forms of engagement including strong ties between citizens from the local level to national leadership levels.		1	.1%
	Strong leadership is good only when we act properly. We don't always.		1	.1%
	Strong leadership means working with other like-minded nations and maintaining consistency between ideals and action		1	.1%
	The other candidates for hegemonic power are worse		1	.1%
	The U.S. should offer its calming influence but act only when it critical interests are threatened, and then act firmly		1	.1%
	The U.S. should set an example by contributing to the global good, not interfering in the internal affairs of foreign nations, and eschewing unilateral military action around the globe.		1	.1%
	The US has a moral obligation to rectify the damage it has done to the rest of the world		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	The US is one of a minority of countries with the capabilities to lead		1	.1%
	The US is powerful & wealthy; it has a moral responsibility to engage but to do so on a model of collective security, not dominance		1	.1%
	The US must provide global leadership based on the principles that allow for pluralism and inclusive economic development. This leadership will serve as a model, cause other countries to step up and supports our national interests.		1	.1%
	The US should be a model in its innovation and creativity, not by force.		1	.1%
	The US should be moralistic in the conduct of its foreign policies		1	.1%
	The US should continue to advocate and advance the values embodied in the international system it has created over time.		1	.1%
	THE US SHOULD PARTICIPATE WITH OTHER LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES IN HELPING ENSURE SECURITY AND PROSPERITY		1	.1%
	The wealth and power of the US makes it feasible for the US to exert strong leadership; that leadership is desirable to me only if it is in the appropriate areas (slowing climate chane, improving the health of people around the world, etc.)		1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	There are bound to be some countries that play more of a leadership role than others -- better that one of them be the U.S., given the other players involved. The U.S. is far from perfect in its conduct at home and abroad, but it's quite a bit	1	.1%
	there is a myraid of reasons for strong US diplomacy	1	.1%
	there is no choice given current power dynamics	1	.1%
	There is no global governance mechanism that is effective. In an age of co-dependency it is vital that leadership that is sound, stable, and just -- comes from the US, given its historic role in shaping world affairs thus far	1	.1%
	There is no other power to maintain global stability and order	1	.1%
	There is no substitute for the US that is benign	1	.1%
	To protest prace in the world	1	.1%
	True leadership, leadership not corrupted by hypocrisy and not motivated almost exclusively by self-interest, has the potential to promote a safer and more just world.	1	.1%
	U.S. failure to lead creates a worldwide power vacuum, which opens the door to greater instability -- as we see right now.	1	.1%
	U.S. power is the underpinning for global security	1	.1%

Q20A_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	US has a moral responsibility to lead because of wealth and power but leadership must be responsible and in accordance with progressive popular wishes		1	.1%
	US is part of the community of nations & all members of the community should be involved. Also, the US controls a large majority of the world's resources, which really belong to the global community.		1	.1%
	US should minimize its level of influence and let the sovereign nations to decide themselves; at least in the initial stage of their domestic and regional issues.		1	.1%
	We are the ones who can.		1	.1%
	We are the only nation with the power and legitimacy to do so.		1	.1%
	We have in force a Mutual Defense Treaty with Seoul		1	.1%
	We should lead by example, but that's not a moral obligation, but a strategic one.		1	.1%
	Where we have interests (and that is not everywhere) we should lead other like-minded states to do what is necessary		1	.1%
	WWII gave us the mantle of leadership and responsibility and we have ideals that are universal. Also all of the above.		1	.1%

Q25_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	51		
	Label	Q25. Education		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	853	65.5%
	2	Cut back	142	10.9%
	3	Keep same	276	21.2%
	4	Not sure	14	1.1%
Missing Values	System		17	1.3%

Q25_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	52		
	Label	Q25. Defense spending		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	233	17.9%
	2	Cut back	591	45.4%
	3	Keep same	448	34.4%
	4	Not sure	14	1.1%
Missing Values	System		16	1.2%

Q25_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	53		
	Label	Q25. Social security		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	214	16.4%
	2	Cut back	256	19.7%
	3	Keep same	779	59.8%
	4	Not sure	33	2.5%
Missing Values	System		20	1.5%

Q25_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	54		
	Label	Q25. Military aid to other nations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	77	5.9%
	2	Cut back	603	46.3%
	3	Keep same	545	41.9%
	4	Not sure	60	4.6%
Missing Values	System		17	1.3%

Q25_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	55		
	Label	Q25. Economic aid to other nations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	318	24.4%
	2	Cut back	332	25.5%
	3	Keep same	592	45.5%
	4	Not sure	34	2.6%
Missing Values	System		26	2.0%

Q25_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	56		
	Label	Q25. Healthcare		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	550	42.2%
	2	Cut back	299	23.0%
	3	Keep same	388	29.8%
	4	Not sure	47	3.6%
Missing Values	System		18	1.4%

Q25_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	57		
	Label	Q25. Improving public infrastructure such as highways, bridges and airports		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	1075	82.6%
	2	Cut back	18	1.4%
	3	Keep same	181	13.9%
	4	Not sure	8	.6%
Missing Values	System		20	1.5%

Q25_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	58		
	Label	Q25. General information gathering activities of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Agency (NSA)		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	164	12.6%
	2	Cut back	442	33.9%
	3	Keep same	625	48.0%
	4	Not sure	54	4.1%
Missing Values	System		17	1.3%

Q25_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	59		
	Label	Q25. Environmental protection		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	644	49.5%
	2	Cut back	228	17.5%
	3	Keep same	390	30.0%
	4	Not sure	21	1.6%
Missing Values	System		19	1.5%

Q25_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	60		
	Label	Q25. Welfare and unemployment programs at home		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Expand	377	29.0%
	2	Cut back	380	29.2%
	3	Keep same	492	37.8%
	4	Not sure	34	2.6%
Missing Values	System		19	1.5%

Q30Aa_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	61		
	Label	Q30A (US). If North Korea invaded South Korea		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	351	27.0%
	2	oppose	72	5.5%
Missing Values	System		879	67.5%

Q30Aa_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	62		
	Label	Q30A (US). If China invaded Taiwan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	186	14.3%
	2	oppose	227	17.4%
Missing Values	System		889	68.3%

Q30Aa_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	63		
	Label	Q30A (US). To be part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	284	21.8%
	2	oppose	139	10.7%
Missing Values	System		879	67.5%

Q30Aa_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	64		
	Label	Q30A (US). To stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	264	20.3%
	2	oppose	146	11.2%
Missing Values	System		892	68.5%

Q30Aa_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	65		
	Label	Q30A (US). To ensure the oil supply		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	160	12.3%
	2	oppose	253	19.4%
Missing Values	System		889	68.3%

Q30Aa_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	66		
	Label	Q30A (US). To deal with humanitarian crises		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	286	22.0%
	2	oppose	131	10.1%
Missing Values	System		885	68.0%

Q30Aa_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	67		
	Label	Q30A (US). If Israel were attacked by its neighbors		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	238	18.3%
	2	oppose	178	13.7%
Missing Values	System		886	68.0%

Q30Aa_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	68		
	Label	Q30A (US). To stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	159	12.2%
	2	oppose	263	20.2%
Missing Values	System		880	67.6%

Q30Aa_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	69		
	Label	Q30A (US). If Israel bombs Iran's nuclear facilities, and Iran were to retaliate against Israel		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	156	12.0%
	2	oppose	261	20.0%
Missing Values	System		885	68.0%

Q30Aa_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	70		
	Label	Q30A (US). To be part of a peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	187	14.4%
	2	oppose	234	18.0%
Missing Values	System		881	67.7%

Q30Aa_11

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	71		
	Label	Q30A (US). If Russia invades the rest of Ukraine		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	100	7.7%
	2	oppose	316	24.3%
Missing Values	System		886	68.0%

Q30Aa_12

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	72		
	Label	Q30A (US). If Russia invades a NATO ally like Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	330	25.3%
	2	oppose	93	7.1%
Missing Values	System		879	67.5%

Q30Ba_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	73		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If North Korea invaded South Korea		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	351	27.0%
	2	oppose	60	4.6%
Missing Values	System		891	68.4%

Q30Ba_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	74		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If China invaded Taiwan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	199	15.3%
	2	oppose	208	16.0%
Missing Values	System		895	68.7%

Q30Ba_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	75		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To be part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	270	20.7%
	2	oppose	145	11.1%
Missing Values	System		887	68.1%

Q30Ba_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	76		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	279	21.4%
	2	oppose	128	9.8%
Missing Values	System		895	68.7%

Q30Ba_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	77		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To ensure the oil supply		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	169	13.0%
	2	oppose	239	18.4%
Missing Values	System		894	68.7%

Q30Ba_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	78		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To deal with humanitarian crises		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	294	22.6%
	2	oppose	115	8.8%
Missing Values	System		893	68.6%

Q30Ba_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	79		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If Israel were attacked by its neighbors		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	252	19.4%
	2	oppose	156	12.0%
Missing Values	System		894	68.7%

Q30Ba_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	80		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	181	13.9%
	2	oppose	230	17.7%
Missing Values	System		891	68.4%

Q30Ba_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	81		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If Israel bombs Iran's nuclear facilities, and Iran were to retaliate against Israel		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	160	12.3%
	2	oppose	246	18.9%
Missing Values	System		896	68.8%

Q30Ba_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	82		
	Label	Q30B (UN). To be part of a peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	208	16.0%
	2	oppose	202	15.5%
Missing Values	System		892	68.5%

Q30Ba_11

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	83		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If Russia invades the rest of Ukraine		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	123	9.4%
	2	oppose	288	22.1%
Missing Values	System		891	68.4%

Q30Ba_12

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	84		
	Label	Q30B (UN). If Russia invades a NATO ally like Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	324	24.9%
	2	oppose	84	6.5%
Missing Values	System		894	68.7%

Q30Ca_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	85		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If North Korea invaded South Korea		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	398	30.6%
	2	oppose	48	3.7%
Missing Values	System		856	65.7%

Q30Ca_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	86		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If China invaded Taiwan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	216	16.6%
	2	oppose	221	17.0%
Missing Values	System		865	66.4%

Q30Ca_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	87		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To be part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	266	20.4%
	2	oppose	177	13.6%
Missing Values	System		859	66.0%

Q30Ca_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	88		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	288	22.1%
	2	oppose	148	11.4%
Missing Values	System		866	66.5%

Q30Ca_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	89		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To ensure the oil supply		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	193	14.8%
	2	oppose	240	18.4%
Missing Values	System		869	66.7%

Q30Ca_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	90		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To deal with humanitarian crises		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	300	23.0%
	2	oppose	137	10.5%
Missing Values	System		865	66.4%

Q30Ca_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	91		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If Israel were attacked by its neighbors		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	260	20.0%
	2	oppose	174	13.4%
Missing Values	System		868	66.7%

Q30Ca_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	92		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	181	13.9%
	2	oppose	255	19.6%
Missing Values	System		866	66.5%

Q30Ca_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	93		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If Israel bombs Iran's nuclear facilities, and Iran were to retaliate against Israel		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	189	14.5%
	2	oppose	247	19.0%
Missing Values	System		866	66.5%

Q30Ca_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	94		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). To be part of a peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	183	14.1%
	2	oppose	259	19.9%
Missing Values	System		860	66.1%

Q30Ca_11

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	95		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If Russia invades the rest of Ukraine		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	114	8.8%
	2	oppose	323	24.8%
Missing Values	System		865	66.4%

Q30Ca_12

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	96		
	Label	Q30C (Coalition). If Russia invades a NATO ally like Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	355	27.3%
	2	oppose	84	6.5%
Missing Values	System		863	66.3%

Q30AF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	97		
	Label	Q30AF In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs will be acceptable	0	.0%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed	7	.5%
	3	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action	23	1.8%
	4	The risk to American lives will be low	1	.1%
	5		45	3.5%
	6	It is in our national interest to act	207	15.9%
	7	Other	65	5.0%
Missing Values	System		954	73.3%

Q30AF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	98		
	Label	Reasons Yes1text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A183		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1237	95.0%
	A moral obligation and in the national interest (deterrence) and promoting the liberation of a horribly oppressed people.		1	.1%
	alliance commitment		1	.1%
	Alliance commitment		2	.2%
	alliance obligation		1	.1%
	Alliance system especially treaty alliances have to mean something.		1	.1%
	credibility of us defense treaty commitments		1	.1%
	In our national interest and also complies with current defense agreements		1	.1%
	inaction becomes an international symbol of lack of U.S. will to support allies		1	.1%
	International agreements From '50-53 war and current treaties		1	.1%
	It is a convenient opportunity to eviscerate the North Korean regime		1	.1%
	It is a treaty obligation and in our national interest		1	.1%
	It will force China to stop supporting North Korea covertly		1	.1%
	Korea is a military ally.		1	.1%
	Korea is our ally and I don't want ROK or Japan going for nuclear weapons.		1	.1%
	Longstanding commitment to South Korea		1	.1%

Q30AF_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	North Korean attack will have already killed many US troops	1	.1%
	Our commitment to the ROK and the message it sends to anyone else with whom we have such commitments or treaty relationships.	1	.1%
	Our troops are already there. Inevitably we would be engaged with the South Koreans in some capacity.	1	.1%
	Presence of US service members and families	1	.1%
	Protect US troops in the DMZ	1	.1%
	Rebuild reputation as reliable ally to deter aggressive states. It is a moral obligation and in our national interests.	1	.1%
	Retain military influence on China's border.	1	.1%
	ROK ally we've pledged to protect, 48,000 US casualties before	1	.1%
	South Korea is a Major non-NATO Ally. The U.S. should defend its allies who are attacked.	1	.1%
	South Korea is an ally	1	.1%
	South Korea is an ally and a democracy	1	.1%
	The U.S. has a treaty commitment to South Korea, if it reneges on that commitment, all others are also in doubt	1	.1%
	The US has signed a security agreement to do so.	1	.1%
	to defend our own troops and a key ally.	1	.1%
	To honor the Mutual Defense Treaty	1	.1%
	To protect South Korean population	1	.1%

Q30AF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	To restrain Japan or China from getting involved.		1	.1%
	Treaty ally		1	.1%
	Treaty and bi lateral obligations. We must stick by our agreements.		1	.1%
	Treaty commitment		1	.1%
	Treaty obligation		2	.2%
	treaty obligations, coupled with national interest		1	.1%
	Treaty requirements		1	.1%
	troops are already there, perhaps more to dissuade NK from attacking, but presumably prepared to respond kinetically		1	.1%
	Trusted by our allies, respected by nuetrals, feared by our enemies; This would be an ally commitment		1	.1%
	U.S. troops are already committed.		1	.1%
	uphold treaty/International agreements. National interest and a moral obligation.		1	.1%
	We already have troops in South Korea. If the North were to attack, it would be a direct attack on American troops, an act of war against the U.S.		1	.1%
	We already have US troops there and must not risk their lives while standing by.		1	.1%
	We continue to have service members and civilians assigned to the ROK to monitor and help continue the peace. Their status is a tripwire. Also it is in our national interest to act.		1	.1%

Q30AF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We have a long standing treaty obligation to defend ROK and we also have a commitment as a UN member to defend the ROK		1	.1%
	We have a Mutual Defense Treaty with South Korea		1	.1%
	We have a treaty and moral obligation to act.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to defend KS.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to defend South Korea		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty to do so as part of our ASEAN obligations.		1	.1%
	We have an agreement with ROK to defend it; we must keep our word		1	.1%
	We have an alliance obligation to act		1	.1%
	We have an alliance to defend South Korea.		1	.1%
	We have an obligation to keep with an ally, and the world will be watching whether we keep our commitment		1	.1%
	We have committed to do so		1	.1%
	We have moral and security obligations to act.		1	.1%
	We have to honor our commitment to S Korea		1	.1%
	We have treaty obligations to defend South Korea		1	.1%
	We have treaty obligations to South Korea or other obligations arising from the Korean conflict		1	.1%

Q30AF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	we're technically still at war there / armistice		1	.1%
	we've kept troops in South Korea for more than 50 years to keep this from happening		1	.1%

Q30BF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	99		
	Label	Q30BF In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	The financial costs will be acceptable	1	.1%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed	4	.3%
	3	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action	22	1.7%
	4	The risk to American lives will be low	0	.0%
	5		53	4.1%
	6	It is in our national interest to act	221	17.0%
	7	Other	48	3.7%
Missing Values	System		953	73.2%

Q30BF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	100		
	Label	Reasons Yes2text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A175		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1254	96.3%
	an agreement is an agreement		1	.1%
	As part of a UN effort, the moral obligation to act coincides with global legitimacy.		1	.1%
	Because we have backed ourselves into the corner where we must defend South Korea.		1	.1%
	Complex situation with potential of WMD coming into play		1	.1%
	Credibility of US alliances		1	.1%
	defending a country's sovereignty helps promote international peace		1	.1%
	He have a historical obligation to act		1	.1%
	I suspect it would be in relation to our treaty with them.		1	.1%
	It is in our national interest, free people will view it as a legitimate action and South Korea is a champion of democracy!		1	.1%
	It matters credibility towards US allies.		1	.1%
	It will finally allow us to resolve/destroy North Korea		1	.1%
	it's part of our treaty obligation to S. Korea, as well as that the war is not officially over.		1	.1%
	Long-time ally and major trading partner deserves our support		1	.1%

Q30BF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	Moral and legal obligation and need to take part in management		1	.1%
	moral obligation to act, of 60+ years standing		1	.1%
	North Korea could not attack South Korea without killing US troops		1	.1%
	Reliability of US commitment in mutual defense treaties		1	.1%
	TDreaty obligation		1	.1%
	The United Nations authorized military intervention in Korea decades ago and there is only a cease-fire agreement in place with the U.N. collective security military alliance.		1	.1%
	To prevent N. K. from gaining nuclear weapons/ it multilateral		1	.1%
	To support our few existing allies.		1	.1%
	Treaty obligation		1	.1%
	treaty obligations		1	.1%
	US alliances must be reliable		1	.1%
	US defense agreement with ROK would require us to act		1	.1%
	US leadership would be lost if our commitment to our ally, ROK, is not upheld		1	.1%
	US would have not vetoed the UNSC to do so		1	.1%
	we are bound by Treaty commitments		1	.1%
	We are obligated under the armistice and integrated in the defense of South Korea.		1	.1%
	We have a comitment to the country of ROK		1	.1%

Q30BF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We have a defense treaty with Korea.		1	.1%
	We have a moral obligation AND it is necessary to retain bargaining power elsewhere in the world		1	.1%
	We have a Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of South Korea since 1953		1	.1%
	We have a nuclear mutual defense pact with Seoul		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation		3	.2%
	We have a treaty obligation to defend SoKor. Fail here and our other allies will no longer trust or support us.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to do so		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to protect South Korea		1	.1%
	We have a treaty with Republic of Korea and troops there.		1	.1%
	we have an alliance to honor		1	.1%
	We have an obligation to act on our commitments. I would like to end the commitment, but insofar as it exists, believe in living up to it.		1	.1%
	We have been there since the '50s and pledged our support. Cutting and running when they need us doesn't make sense on many levels.		1	.1%
	We made this commitment in the past and we MUST follow through		1	.1%
	We technically are at war now. There is a Cease Fire.		1	.1%

Q30BF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We're already there!		1	.1%
	We're on the dmz. It would be self defense.		1	.1%

Q30CF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	101		
	Label	Q30CF In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops as part of a coalition of like-minded allies:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs will be acceptable	0	.0%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed	5	.4%
	3	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action	27	2.1%
	4	The risk to American lives will be low	0	.0%
	5		66	5.1%
	6	It is in our national interest to act	245	18.8%
	7	Other	54	4.1%
Missing Values	System		905	69.5%

Q30CF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	102		
	Label	Reasons Yes3text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A244		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1248	95.9%
	A combination of the above plus we've led them to believe we will help		1	.1%
	All of the above		1	.1%
	Alliance obligations to South Korea		1	.1%
	Credibility, we have promises to keep; I guess you could say it's in our national interest, but not as directly as economic interest.		1	.1%
	Defense agreement		1	.1%
	failure to act will seriously hurt US credibility given alliance with S Korea		1	.1%
	historical commitment to South Korea's security and historical commitment to China's support of North Korea		1	.1%
	It would be preferable to using nuclear weapons against North Korea which would indiscriminately impact on civilians		1	.1%
	it's in our national interest AND we have moral obligation.		1	.1%
	Keep our long standing promise.		1	.1%
	LONG STANDING DEFENSE COMMITMENT		1	.1%
	North Korea is a potentially big threat		1	.1%
	Obligation to defend allies		1	.1%
	South Korea is a formal Ally. We are obliged to defend it.		1	.1%

Q30CF_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	South Korea is a treaty ally and we have a legal obligation to act, plus it would give us a chance to deal with their nuclear capability	1	.1%
	South Korea is an ally	1	.1%
	The fact that we have had a military presence in Korea for over 60 years, and the rationale for this presence, which has not changed, is sufficient reason for the US to use our military, as part of a coalition, to join South Korea in dealing wi	1	.1%
	The lives of thousands American servicemembers already posted in South korea will be at stake	1	.1%
	The U.S. has led a UN military force in Korea since 1950. We are already there and fully committed.	1	.1%
	To help avoid N. Korea using nuclear weapons	1	.1%
	to help S.Korea	1	.1%
	To honor our prior commitments	1	.1%
	Treaty ally	1	.1%
	treaty commitment	1	.1%
	Treaty obligation	1	.1%
	Treaty obligation plus national interest	1	.1%
	Treaty obligation.	1	.1%
	Treaty obligations	1	.1%
	US troops are there	1	.1%
	We are committed with troops there and a Defense Treaty in place. Must go to fulfill the treaty.	1	.1%

Q30CF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We are there, and legally committed to act.		1	.1%
	We have a bilateral commitment to defend South Korea		1	.1%
	We have a defense treaty which requires us to act.		1	.1%
	We have a mutual defense treaty. Not that North Korea would invade -- it'd be a rocket attack on Seoul.		1	.1%
	We have a regional strategic responsibility to do so.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation in the event North Korea initiates hostilities against the ROK.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation that if ignored sends a bad reputational signal for future crises.		1	.1%
	we have a treaty obligation to act		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to act		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to act.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to intervene.		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation to support Korea if attacked		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation with South Korea		1	.1%
	We have a treaty obligation. If we don't act, we lose global credibility.		1	.1%
	We have agreed to protect South Korea		1	.1%
	We have an agreement with South Korea		1	.1%

Q30CF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We have an alliance commitment that we must fulfill.		1	.1%
	We have an alliance commitment to South Korea		1	.1%
	We have an alliance obligation to act.		1	.1%
	We must fulfill our treaty obligations. If we don't intend to we should pull out now.		1	.1%
	We must honor our alliance commitment to South Korea		1	.1%
	We must show Asia allies that we will meet our obligations to protect them, especially with them increasingly feeling threatened by China.		1	.1%
	We pledged our support to South Korea if north korea invades		1	.1%
	We're manning the border - we're already there.		1	.1%

Q30AO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	103		
	Label	Q30AO In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable	4	.3%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed	7	.5%
	3	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action	5	.4%
	4	The risk to American lives would be too high	6	.5%
	5		2	.2%
	6	It is not in our national interest to act	19	1.5%
	7	Other	27	2.1%
Missing Values	System		1232	94.6%

Q30AO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	104		
	Label	Reasons No1text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A244		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1276	98.0%
	a combination of financial cost, and desirability of working with international institutions to defuse crises by non-military means		1	.1%
	A completely implausible scenario - but South Korea has the resources to defend itself		1	.1%
	all the above		1	.1%
	Americans are tired of wars, and there are many actions the US could take to support South Korea other than "boots on the ground."		1	.1%
	Asian nations would have to be involved as well, perhaps playing a leading role in their area of interest and in preventing or ending a conflict		1	.1%
	China should make sure it never happens		1	.1%
	Diplomacy with China instead of force would be more effective		1	.1%
	It is a civil war that needn't require US troops. SK is perfectly capable of deploying its own troops.		1	.1%
	Let the historical and cultural identity prevail.		1	.1%
	not ENOUGH of our interests are involved		1	.1%
	only with UN approval		1	.1%

Q30AO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	our intervention should not be military. We need stronger international enforcement through mechanisms such as the ICC, the U.S. participation in UN treaties. A more robust non-military approach to conflict resolution through increased diplomati	1	.1%
	S. Korea is capable of defending itself	1	.1%
	South Korea can defend itself.	1	.1%
	South Korea has the economic might to defend itself and should be weaned off US support.	1	.1%
	South Korea has the military strength to defeat North Korea--it also has the democratic structure and respect for international treaties to engage in a moral war. Of course, if the situation became dire, U.S. action could very well become warr	1	.1%
	South Korea is strong enough to defend itself	1	.1%
	South Korea is strong enough without us troops	1	.1%
	South Korea's capabilities are already strong enough to repel a North Korean attack.	1	.1%
	The risk of broadening a regional conflict - involving China	1	.1%
	The threat is if N.Korea starts to actively use nuclear weapons. Nations fight all the time for a variety of issues. But that isn't enough of a reason for us to be involved. There would need to be a real threat to the world and/or our nationa	1	.1%

Q30AO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	The US shudn't enter proxy wars that might engage Russia or China and trigger a wider conflict..		1	.1%
	This unwarranted military action will further weaken the US		1	.1%
	Unilateral action on the part of the US makes us incredibly unpopular around the world		1	.1%
	US troops would exacerbate, not solve the problem		1	.1%
	Will depend on what China does		1	.1%

Q30BO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	105		
	Label	Q30BO In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable	3	.2%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed	9	.7%
	3	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action	4	.3%
	4	The risk to American lives would be too high	7	.5%
	5		4	.3%
	6	It is not in our national interest to act	11	.8%
Missing Values	7	Other	20	1.5%
	System		1244	95.5%

Q30BO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	106		
	Label	Reasons No2text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A239		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1282	98.5%
	A combination of the above. We have been building up regional groups; outside intervention exacerbates problems. We do not have a good history of improving situations with military intervention.		1	.1%
	Asian troops should carry out this mission.		1	.1%
	Believe diplomatic means would suffice to sway NK		1	.1%
	Believe South Korea could defend itself.		1	.1%
	Geopolitical considerations. Would become proxy war between US and China, fought in Korea--this scenario would drag the US indefinitely into another protracted war.		1	.1%
	It would be up to China and Japan to act. The US should avoid getting too much involved in the area and let the local powers step up to the plate		1	.1%
	not a vital threat to US. US should not be global policeman and shoulder military spending burden, nor be "for hire"		1	.1%
	Not sure Congress would support today		1	.1%
	Not worth the cost in lives.		1	.1%
	Our Asian allies should be able to provide troops		1	.1%
	Should be handled regionally		1	.1%
	South Korea doesn't need much help.		1	.1%

Q30BO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	South Korea is strong enough to repel a conventional attack, and the U.S. can provide air and naval support as needed.	1	.1%
	South Korea should be prepared to handle this situation itself.	1	.1%
	The potential for nuclear engagement is too high	1	.1%
	The South Koreans should be able to defend themselves	1	.1%
	The US can offer other support than troops on the ground. This is a role that could be played by other regional actors.	1	.1%
	There are more humanizing and more effective ways to engage.	1	.1%
	U.S. troops should not be subordinated to a UN mandate.	1	.1%
	We already have close to 30,000 troops in South Korea. Seems like a good start if combined with ROK forces which have US equipment and training. I support helping the ROK but not taking responsibility for the full fight against the DPRK.	1	.1%

Q30CO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	107		
	Label	Q30CO In relation to your answer on the North Korea scenario, which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops as part of a coalition of like-minded allies:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable	4	.3%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed	9	.7%
	3	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action	1	.1%
	4	The risk to American lives would be too high	1	.1%
	5		1	.1%
	6	It is not in our national interest to act	17	1.3%
	7	Other	14	1.1%
Missing Values	System		1255	96.4%

Q30CO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	108		
	Label	Reasons No3text		
	Type	String		
	Format	A201		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1288	98.9%
	because the question said send US troops, it didn't mention a coalition		1	.1%
	China should be brought in to rein in North Korea; the PRK would in the long haul be completely transformed by the ROK.		1	.1%
	Cut the top leadership from the totalitarian pyramid with decisive force, using smart weapons; then the effort against South Korea collapses under its own weight.		1	.1%
	danger of nuclear war		1	.1%
	I think it unlikely that ROK cannot handle invasion, plus US troops are already deployed, right?		1	.1%
	not necessary for S Korea to defend itself		1	.1%
	risky to escalate due to nuclear dimension		1	.1%
	South Korea can defend its territory. The UN would also be involved. We don't need to take bilateral action so long as multilaterally, we are able to protect South Korea from North Korea's aggression.		1	.1%
	South Korea has excellent military capabilities and can protect itself.		1	.1%
	South Korea is a rich country, should take care of itself		1	.1%
	South Korea is capable of handling their own affairs		1	.1%

Q30CO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	South Koreans can do it on own		1	.1%
	there is no reason to do it		1	.1%
	This scenario is too unlikely and deterrence should be used		1	.1%

Q35

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	109		
	Label	Q35. Thinking about long-term military bases the U. S. has overseas, do you think the U.S. should have more bases overseas, fewer bases overseas, or about as many as we have now?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	More bases	143	11.0%
	2	Fewer bases	497	38.2%
	3	About as many as now	637	48.9%
Missing Values	System		25	1.9%

Q40a_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	110		
	Label	Q40. Japan - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	997	76.6%
	2	should not	247	19.0%
Missing Values	System		58	4.5%

Q40a_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	111		
	Label	Q40. Iraq - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	214	16.4%
	2	should not	1013	77.8%
Missing Values	System		75	5.8%

Q40a_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	112		
	Label	Q40. South Korea - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	1118	85.9%
	2	should not	132	10.1%
Missing Values	System		52	4.0%

Q40a_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	113		
	Label	Q40. Afghanistan - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	324	24.9%
	2	should not	908	69.7%
Missing Values	System		70	5.4%

Q40a_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	114		
	Label	Q40. Pakistan - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	149	11.4%
	2	should not	1080	82.9%
Missing Values	System		73	5.6%

Q40a_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	115		
	Label	Q40. Germany - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	863	66.3%
	2	should not	376	28.9%
Missing Values	System		63	4.8%

Q40a_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	116		
	Label	Q40. Turkey - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	776	59.6%
	2	should not	458	35.2%
Missing Values	System		68	5.2%

Q40a_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	117		
	Label	Q40. Australia - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	759	58.3%
	2	should not	474	36.4%
Missing Values	System		69	5.3%

Q40a_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	118		
	Label	Q40. Guantanamo Bay in Cuba - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	495	38.0%
	2	should not	752	57.8%
Missing Values	System		55	4.2%

Q40a_10

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	119		
	Label	Q40. Poland - Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	683	52.5%
	2	should not	557	42.8%
Missing Values	System		62	4.8%

Q40a_11

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	120		
	Label	Q40. Kuwait - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	625	48.0%
	2	should not	601	46.2%
Missing Values	System		76	5.8%

Q40a_12

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	121		
	Label	Q40. The Philippines - Do you think the United States should or should not have long- term military bases in the following places?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	should	887	68.1%
	2	should not	353	27.1%
Missing Values	System		62	4.8%

N25

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	122		
	Label	N25. Currently the U.S. is scheduled to withdraw combat forces from Afghanistan by the end of 2014. Do you think that the U.S. should:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Withdraw all troops from Afghanistan before the end of 2014	108	8.3%
	2	Bring all troops home as scheduled by the end of 2014	295	22.7%
	3	Leave some troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014 for training, anti-insurgency and counterterrorism activities	878	67.4%
Missing Values	System		21	1.6%

Q45_1

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	123
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: Pakistan
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1299
	Missing	3
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	31.18
	Standard Deviation	23.309
	Percentile 25	15.00
	Percentile 50	30.00
	Percentile 75	50.00

Q45_4

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	124
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: Israel
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1301
	Missing	1
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	63.35
	Standard Deviation	27.528
	Percentile 25	50.00
	Percentile 50	70.00
	Percentile 75	85.00

Q45_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	125		
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: Britain		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F3		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	0		59	4.5%
	9		1	.1%
	10		2	.2%
	15		1	.1%
	30		2	.2%
	40		4	.3%
	45		1	.1%
	50		25	1.9%
	52		1	.1%
	60		22	1.7%
	65		3	.2%
	70		53	4.1%
	75		19	1.5%
	78		1	.1%
	80		91	7.0%
	85		166	12.7%
	90		199	15.3%
	95		53	4.1%
	97		1	.1%
	98		3	.2%
	99		8	.6%
	100		585	44.9%
Missing Values	System		2	.2%

Q45_6

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	126
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: China
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1299
	Missing	3
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	42.59
	Standard Deviation	21.289
	Percentile 25	30.00
	Percentile 50	40.00
	Percentile 75	60.00

Q45_10

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	127
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: India
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1300
	Missing	2
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	56.47
	Standard Deviation	21.797
	Percentile 25	50.00
	Percentile 50	60.00
	Percentile 75	70.00

Q45_11

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	128
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: Japan
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1300
	Missing	2
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	73.44
	Standard Deviation	22.148
	Percentile 25	70.00
	Percentile 50	80.00
	Percentile 75	85.00

Q45_12

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	129
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: Russia
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1300
	Missing	2
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	32.53
	Standard Deviation	21.321
	Percentile 25	15.00
	Percentile 50	30.00
	Percentile 75	50.00

Q45_20

		Value
Standard Attributes	Position	130
	Label	Q45. Thermometer Rating: South Korea
	Type	Numeric
	Format	F3
	Measurement	Scale
	Role	Input
N	Valid	1300
	Missing	2
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	69.51
	Standard Deviation	22.152
	Percentile 25	60.00
	Percentile 50	70.00
	Percentile 75	85.00

Q50a_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	131		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: The US		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	3		1	.1%
	4		1	.1%
	5		9	.7%
	6		16	1.2%
	7		32	2.5%
	8		98	7.5%
	9		241	18.5%
	10		333	25.6%
	11		546	41.9%
Missing Values	System		25	1.9%

Q50a_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	132		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: Russia		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		1	.1%
	2		12	.9%
	3		17	1.3%
	4		80	6.1%
	5		102	7.8%
	6		160	12.3%
	7		240	18.4%
	8		264	20.3%
	9		229	17.6%
	10		110	8.4%
	11		62	4.8%
Missing Values	System		25	1.9%

Q50a_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	133		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: Japan		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		3	.2%
	2		7	.5%
	3		24	1.8%
	4		87	6.7%
	5		146	11.2%
	6		234	18.0%
	7		277	21.3%
	8		289	22.2%
	9		166	12.7%
	10		31	2.4%
	11		9	.7%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

Q50a_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	134		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: China		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	2		2	.2%
	3		2	.2%
	4		11	.8%
	5		27	2.1%
	6		44	3.4%
	7		127	9.8%
	8		264	20.3%
	9		356	27.3%
	10		255	19.6%
	11		188	14.4%
Missing Values	System		26	2.0%

Q50a_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	135		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: India		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		9	.7%
	2		17	1.3%
	3		59	4.5%
	4		136	10.4%
	5		192	14.7%
	6		281	21.6%
	7		283	21.7%
	8		209	16.1%
	9		70	5.4%
	10		12	.9%
	11		5	.4%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

Q50a_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	136		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: EU		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		1	.1%
	2		7	.5%
	3		13	1.0%
	4		32	2.5%
	5		56	4.3%
	6		110	8.4%
	7		176	13.5%
	8		305	23.4%
	9		327	25.1%
	10		174	13.4%
	11		75	5.8%
Missing Values	System		26	2.0%

Q50a_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	137		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: South Korea		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		20	1.5%
	2		42	3.2%
	3		112	8.6%
	4		210	16.1%
	5		224	17.2%
	6		274	21.0%
	7		220	16.9%
	8		120	9.2%
	9		44	3.4%
	10		3	.2%
	11		3	.2%
Missing Values	System		30	2.3%

Q50a_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	138		
	Label	Q50. Please select how much influence you think each of the following countries has in the world: Iran		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		14	1.1%
	2		64	4.9%
	3		190	14.6%
	4		250	19.2%
	5		194	14.9%
	6		212	16.3%
	7		178	13.7%
	8		114	8.8%
	9		48	3.7%
	10		11	.8%
	11		3	.2%
Missing Values	System		24	1.8%

Q120a_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	139		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: The American people		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		21	1.6%
	2		42	3.2%
	3		90	6.9%
	4		127	9.8%
	5		144	11.1%
	6		236	18.1%
	7		202	15.5%
	8		189	14.5%
	9		120	9.2%
	10		65	5.0%
	11		29	2.2%
Missing Values	System		37	2.8%

Q120a_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	140		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: Congress		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		6	.5%
	2		16	1.2%
	3		22	1.7%
	4		43	3.3%
	5		74	5.7%
	6		103	7.9%
	7		160	12.3%
	8		265	20.4%
	9		292	22.4%
	10		199	15.3%
	11		91	7.0%
Missing Values	System		31	2.4%

Q120a_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	141		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: The President		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		7	.5%
	2		3	.2%
	3		6	.5%
	4		9	.7%
	5		17	1.3%
	6		25	1.9%
	7		46	3.5%
	8		103	7.9%
	9		206	15.8%
	10		319	24.5%
Missing Values	11		533	40.9%
	System		28	2.2%

Q120a_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	142		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: US interest groups		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		1	.1%
	2		7	.5%
	3		17	1.3%
	4		41	3.1%
	5		65	5.0%
	6		144	11.1%
	7		198	15.2%
	8		287	22.0%
	9		274	21.0%
	10		136	10.4%
	11		103	7.9%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

Q120a_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	143		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: Large corporations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		1	.1%
	2		8	.6%
	3		37	2.8%
	4		46	3.5%
	5		93	7.1%
	6		128	9.8%
	7		213	16.4%
	8		261	20.0%
	9		241	18.5%
	10		127	9.8%
	11		113	8.7%
Missing Values	System		34	2.6%

Q120a_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	144		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: The media		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		5	.4%
	2		8	.6%
	3		30	2.3%
	4		53	4.1%
	5		75	5.8%
	6		143	11.0%
	7		215	16.5%
	8		263	20.2%
	9		255	19.6%
	10		148	11.4%
	11		77	5.9%
Missing Values	System		30	2.3%

Q120a_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	145		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: Religious leaders		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		40	3.1%
	2		86	6.6%
	3		169	13.0%
	4		217	16.7%
	5		204	15.7%
	6		212	16.3%
	7		169	13.0%
	8		110	8.4%
	9		49	3.8%
	10		12	.9%
	11		4	.3%
Missing Values	System		30	2.3%

Q120a_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	146		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: Universities and think tanks		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		14	1.1%
	2		33	2.5%
	3		68	5.2%
	4		130	10.0%
	5		169	13.0%
	6		262	20.1%
	7		240	18.4%
	8		214	16.4%
	9		113	8.7%
	10		27	2.1%
	11		3	.2%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

Q120a_9

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	147		
	Label	Q120. Please consider how much influence you think some people and groups have on U.S. foreign policy: Military leaders		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		2	.2%
	2		14	1.1%
	3		17	1.3%
	4		35	2.7%
	5		55	4.2%
	6		150	11.5%
	7		195	15.0%
	8		288	22.1%
	9		297	22.8%
	10		155	11.9%
	11		61	4.7%
Missing Values	System		33	2.5%

Q140a_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	148		
	Label	Q140. Small Arms - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: An international treaty to regulate the trade in small arms (such as handguns, rifles, and automatic weapons) and I		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	912	70.0%
	2	Should not participate	362	27.8%
Missing Values	System		28	2.2%

Q140a_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	149		
	Label	Q140. Diabilities - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: The international treaty that would establish rights for people with disabilities.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	792	60.8%
	2	Should not participate	468	35.9%
Missing Values	System		42	3.2%

Q140a_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	150		
	Label	Q140. Law of the Sea - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: The Law of the Sea Treaty that defines the rights and responsibilities of international use of the world's ocean		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	1172	90.0%
	2	Should not participate	106	8.1%
Missing Values	System		24	1.8%

Q140a_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	151		
	Label	Q140. Climate - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: A new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	949	72.9%
	2	Should not participate	326	25.0%
Missing Values	System		27	2.1%

Q140a_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	152		
	Label	Q140. ICC - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against hum		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	851	65.4%
	2	Should not participate	423	32.5%
Missing Values	System		28	2.2%

Q140a_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	153		
	Label	Q140. Test Ban - Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should participate	1060	81.4%
	2	Should not participate	214	16.4%
Missing Values	System		28	2.2%

T1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	154		
	Label	T1. Do you think that the United States is respected more in the world today than it was ten years ago, is respected less, or is respected about as much now as it was ten years ago?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Respected more	229	17.6%
	2	Respected less	806	61.9%
	3	Respected about as much	233	17.9%
	4	Not sure	21	1.6%
Missing Values	System		13	1.0%

Q145

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	155		
	Label	Q145. When dealing with international problems, the U.S. should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that the United States will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Agree	703	54.0%
	2	Disagree	571	43.9%
Missing Values	System		28	2.2%

N14Ba_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	156		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Protecting and supporting refugees around the world		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	128	9.8%
	2	somewhat good	741	56.9%
	3	somewhat bad	290	22.3%
	4	very bad	108	8.3%
Missing Values	System		35	2.7%

N14Ba_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	157		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Sending peacekeeping troops to conflict zones		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	75	5.8%
	2	somewhat good	701	53.8%
	3	somewhat bad	396	30.4%
	4	very bad	95	7.3%
Missing Values	System		35	2.7%

N14Ba_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	158		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Leading international efforts to combat hunger		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	52	4.0%
	2	somewhat good	361	27.7%
	3	somewhat bad	166	12.7%
	4	very bad	47	3.6%
Missing Values	System		676	51.9%

N14Ba_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	159		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Protecting the cultural heritage of the world		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	55	4.2%
	2	somewhat good	362	27.8%
	3	somewhat bad	154	11.8%
	4	very bad	53	4.1%
Missing Values	System		678	52.1%

N14Ba_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	160		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Resolving international conflicts through negotiations		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	14	1.1%
	2	somewhat good	312	24.0%
	3	somewhat bad	618	47.5%
	4	very bad	322	24.7%
Missing Values	System		36	2.8%

N14Ba_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	161		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Authorizing the use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	21	1.6%
	2	somewhat good	282	21.7%
	3	somewhat bad	631	48.5%
	4	very bad	328	25.2%
Missing Values	System		40	3.1%

N14Ba_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	162		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Imposing sanctions to punish countries that violate international law		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	31	2.4%
	2	somewhat good	383	29.4%
	3	somewhat bad	548	42.1%
	4	very bad	299	23.0%
Missing Values	System		41	3.1%

N14Ba_8

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	163		
	Label	N14. Performance of the UN: Preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	very good	51	3.9%
	2	somewhat good	407	31.3%
	3	somewhat bad	484	37.2%
	4	very bad	318	24.4%
Missing Values	System		42	3.2%

T13A

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	164		
	Label	T13B. In your judgment, should the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) be placed under greater restraint, should it have fewer restrictions than it does now, or should the restrictions remain the same?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Greater restrictions	224	17.2%
	2	Fewer restrictions	77	5.9%
	3	Remain the same	279	21.4%
	4	Not sure	29	2.2%
Missing Values	System		693	53.2%

T13B

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	165		
	Label	T13B. In your judgment, should the National Security Agency (NSA) be placed under greater restraint, should it have fewer restrictions than it does now, or should the restrictions remain the same?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Greater restrictions	356	27.3%
	2	Fewer restrictions	52	4.0%
	3	Remain the same	236	18.1%
	4	Not sure	31	2.4%
Missing Values	System		627	48.2%

Q17B

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	166		
	Label	Q17B. What do you think is more important right now:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	For the federal government to investigate possible terrorist threats, even if that intrudes on personal privacy	783	60.1%
	2	For the federal government not to intrude on personal privacy, even if that limits its ability to investigate possible	471	36.2%
Missing Values	System		48	3.7%

Q70

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	167		
	Label	Q70. Which of the following three positions comes closest to your point of view about lowering trade barriers such as tariffs?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	I favor agreements to lower trade barriers provided the government has programs to help workers who lose their jobs.	915	70.3%
	2	I favor agreements to lower trade barriers, but oppose government programs to help workers who lose their jobs.	248	19.0%
	3	I oppose agreements to lower trade barriers.	89	6.8%
Missing Values	System		50	3.8%

N9A

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	168		
	Label	N9A. As you may know, the United States is now negotiating a free trade agreement with twelve Pacific nations called the Trans-Pacific Partnership (or TPP). Based on what you know, do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly op		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Strongly support	258	19.8%
	2	Somewhat support	317	24.3%
	3	Somewhat oppose	45	3.5%
	4	Strongly oppose	38	2.9%
Missing Values	System		644	49.5%

N9B

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	169		
	Label	N9B. As you may know, the United States is now negotiating a free trade agreement with the European Union called the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (or TTIP). Based on what you know, do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppo		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Strongly support	223	17.1%
	2	Somewhat support	273	21.0%
	3	Somewhat oppose	50	3.8%
	4	Strongly oppose	20	1.5%
Missing Values	System		736	56.5%

Q155

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	170		
	Label	Q155. The World Trade Organization was established to rule on disputes over trade treaties. If another country files a complaint with the World Trade Organization and it rules against the U. S., as a general rule, should the U. S. comply with that decision		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Should	1127	86.6%
	2	Should not	123	9.4%
Missing Values	System		52	4.0%

Q200

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	171		
	Label	Q200. Do you think we should increase our commitment to NATO, keep our commitment what it is now, decrease our commitment but still remain in NATO, or withdraw from NATO entirely?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increase commitment	247	19.0%
	2	Keep commitment same	862	66.2%
	3	Decrease commitment	150	11.5%
	4	Withdraw entirely	23	1.8%
Missing Values	System		20	1.5%

Q210_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	172		
	Label	Q210. Egypt - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	88	6.8%
	2	Decreased	590	45.3%
	3	Kept about the same	452	34.7%
	4	Stopped altogether	133	10.2%
Missing Values	System		39	3.0%

Q210_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	173		
	Label	Q210. Israel - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	71	5.5%
	2	Decreased	548	42.1%
	3	Kept about the same	480	36.9%
	4	Stopped altogether	166	12.7%
Missing Values	System		37	2.8%

Q210_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	174		
	Label	Q210. African countries - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	548	42.1%
	2	Decreased	141	10.8%
	3	Kept about the same	528	40.6%
	4	Stopped altogether	36	2.8%
Missing Values	System		49	3.8%

Q210_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	175		
	Label	Q210. Afghanistan - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Increased	159	12.2%
	2	Decreased	476	36.6%
	3	Kept about the same	513	39.4%
	4	Stopped altogether	109	8.4%
Missing Values	System		45	3.5%

Q210_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	176		
	Label	Q210. Pakistan - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	Increased	70	5.4%
	2	Decreased	591	45.4%
	3	Kept about the same	398	30.6%
	4	Stopped altogether	193	14.8%
Missing Values	System		50	3.8%

Q210_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	177		
	Label	Q210. Iraq - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	104	8.0%
	2	Decreased	484	37.2%
	3	Kept about the same	518	39.8%
	4	Stopped altogether	152	11.7%
Missing Values	System		44	3.4%

Q210_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	178		
	Label	Q210. Ukraine - Do you think economic aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	699	53.7%
	2	Decreased	98	7.5%
	3	Kept about the same	399	30.6%
	4	Stopped altogether	54	4.1%
Missing Values	System		52	4.0%

Q211_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	179		
	Label	Q211. Egypt - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	51	3.9%
	2	Decreased	575	44.2%
	3	Kept about the same	390	30.0%
	4	Stopped altogether	236	18.1%
Missing Values	System		50	3.8%

Q211_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	180		
	Label	Q211. Israel - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	105	8.1%
	2	Decreased	418	32.1%
	3	Kept about the same	571	43.9%
	4	Stopped altogether	159	12.2%
Missing Values	System		49	3.8%

Q211_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	181		
	Label	Q211. Taiwan - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	139	10.7%
	2	Decreased	222	17.1%
	3	Kept about the same	791	60.8%
	4	Stopped altogether	93	7.1%
Missing Values	System		57	4.4%

Q211_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	182		
	Label	Q211. Pakistan - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	29	2.2%
	2	Decreased	617	47.4%
	3	Kept about the same	338	26.0%
	4	Stopped altogether	261	20.0%
Missing Values	System		57	4.4%

Q211_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	183		
	Label	Q211. Afghanistan Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	128	9.8%
	2	Decreased	466	35.8%
	3	Kept about the same	513	39.4%
	4	Stopped altogether	141	10.8%
Missing Values	System		54	4.1%

Q211_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	184		
	Label	Q211. Iraq - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	94	7.2%
	2	Decreased	458	35.2%
	3	Kept about the same	494	37.9%
	4	Stopped altogether	198	15.2%
Missing Values	System		58	4.5%

Q211_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	185		
	Label	Q211. Mexico - Do you think military aid to the following people or nations should be increased, decreased, kept about the same, or stopped altogether?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increased	237	18.2%
	2	Decreased	223	17.1%
	3	Kept about the same	660	50.7%
	4	Stopped altogether	123	9.4%
Missing Values	System		59	4.5%

Text

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	186		
	Label	Text		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		1302	100.0%

Q227

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	187		
	Label	Q227. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Iraq was worth fighting, or not?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Was worth it	238	18.3%
	2	Was not worth it	1039	79.8%
Missing Values	System		25	1.9%

Q271

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	188		
	Label	Q271. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting, or not?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Was worth it	536	41.2%
	2	Was not worth it	723	55.5%
Missing Values	System		43	3.3%

N23

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	189		
	Label	N23. As you may know, the U.S. and other countries have reached an interim deal with Iran that eases some of the international economic sanctions against Iran. In exchange, the deal requires that Iran accept some restrictions on its nuclear program - but		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	favor	993	76.3%
	2	oppose	289	22.2%
Missing Values	System		20	1.5%

N24A_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	190		
	Label	N24A. If Iran commits a major violation of this agreement, would you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the UN Security Council taking each of the following actions: Not pressure Iran to stop enriching uranium		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	strongly support	49	3.8%
	2	somewhat support	47	3.6%
	3	somewhat oppose	200	15.4%
Missing Values	4	strongly oppose	940	72.2%
	System		66	5.1%

N24A_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	191		
	Label	N24A. If Iran commits a major violation of this agreement, would you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the UN Security Council taking each of the following actions: Continue diplomatic efforts to get Iran to stop enric		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	strongly support	881	67.7%
	2	somewhat support	276	21.2%
	3	somewhat oppose	51	3.9%
	4	strongly oppose	47	3.6%
Missing Values	System		47	3.6%

N24A_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	192		
	Label	N24A. If Iran commits a major violation of this agreement, would you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the UN Security Council taking each of the following actions: Impose tighter economic sanctions on Iran		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	strongly support	909	69.8%
	2	somewhat support	237	18.2%
	3	somewhat oppose	67	5.1%
	4	strongly oppose	48	3.7%
Missing Values	System		41	3.1%

N24A_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	193		
	Label	N24A. If Iran commits a major violation of this agreement, would you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the UN Security Council taking each of the following actions: Authorize a military strike against Iran's nuclear en		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	strongly support	191	14.7%
	2	somewhat support	321	24.7%
	3	somewhat oppose	313	24.0%
Missing Values	4	strongly oppose	424	32.6%
	System		53	4.1%

Q355B

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	194		
	Label	Q355B. Do you think that the U.S. military presence in the Middle East increases or decreases stability in the region?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	increases	844	64.8%
	2	decreases	401	30.8%
Missing Values	System		57	4.4%

Q267A_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	195		
	Label	Q267A. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria? Accepting Syrian refugees in the U.S.		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	257	19.7%
	2	oppose	146	11.2%
Missing Values	System		899	69.0%

Q267A_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	196		
	Label	Q267A. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria? Increasing economic and diplomatic sanctions on Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	376	28.9%
	2	oppose	29	2.2%
Missing Values	System		897	68.9%

Q267A_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	197		
	Label	Q267A. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria? Sending arms and supplies to anti-government groups in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	233	17.9%
	2	oppose	165	12.7%
Missing Values	System		904	69.4%

Q267A_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	198		
	Label	Q267A. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria? Enforcing a no-fly zone over Syria, including bombing Syrian air defenses		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	227	17.4%
	2	oppose	174	13.4%
Missing Values	System		901	69.2%

Q267A_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	199		
	Label	Q267A. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria? Sending troops into Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	18	1.4%
	2	oppose	382	29.3%
Missing Values	System		902	69.3%

Q267B_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	200		
	Label	Q267B. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission? Increasing economic and diplomatic sanctions on Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	378	29.0%
	2	oppose	39	3.0%
Missing Values	System		885	68.0%

Q267B_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	201		
	Label	Q267B. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission? Sending arms and supplies to anti-government groups in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	231	17.7%
	2	oppose	181	13.9%
Missing Values	System		890	68.4%

Q267B_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	202		
	Label	Q267B. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission? Enforcing a no-fly zone over Syria, including bombing Syrian air defen		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	234	18.0%
	2	oppose	181	13.9%
Missing Values	System		887	68.1%

Q267B_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	203		
	Label	Q267B. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission? Sending troops into Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	35	2.7%
	2	oppose	379	29.1%
Missing Values	System		888	68.2%

Q267C_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	204		
	Label	Q267C. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies? Increasing economic and diplomatic sanctions on Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	382	29.3%
	2	oppose	61	4.7%
Missing Values	System		859	66.0%

Q267C_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	205		
	Label	Q267C. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies? Sending arms and supplies to anti-government groups in Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	236	18.1%
	2	oppose	203	15.6%
Missing Values	System		863	66.3%

Q267C_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	206		
	Label	Q267C. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies? Enforcing a no-fly zone over Syria, including bombing Syrian air defenses		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	225	17.3%
	2	oppose	213	16.4%
Missing Values	System		864	66.4%

Q267C_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	207		
	Label	Q267C. Would you support or oppose the United States doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies? Sending troops into Syria		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	support	14	1.1%
	2	oppose	427	32.8%
Missing Values	System		861	66.1%

Q267AF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	208		
	Label	Q267AF Which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops into Syria:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs will be acceptable.	0	.0%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed.	0	.0%
	3	It would make a difference in stopping the war.	5	.4%
	4	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action.	0	.0%
	5	The risk to American lives will be low.	0	.0%
	6	We have a moral obligation to act.	3	.2%
	7	It is in our national interest to act.	8	.6%
	8	Other	2	.2%
Missing Values	System		1284	98.6%

Q267AF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	209		
	Label	SyrRea1Y_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A98		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1300	99.8%
	it's in our national interest, it may helped the war stopped sooner and it's our moral obligation		1	.1%
	only if it were to implement a peace agreement/ceasefire		1	.1%

Q267BF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	210		
	Label	Q267BF. Which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops into Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs will be acceptable.	0	.0%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed.	0	.0%
	3	It would make a difference in stopping the war.	17	1.3%
	4	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action.	3	.2%
	5	The risk to American lives will be low.	0	.0%
	6	We have a moral obligation to act.	8	.6%
	7	It is in our national interest to act.	5	.4%
	8	Other	2	.2%
Missing Values	System		1267	97.3%

Q267BF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	211		
	Label	SyrRea2Y_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A74		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1300	99.8%
	First, the UN won't do it, but if it should happen, we should participate.		1	.1%
	If the UNSC calls on its members to do something, we should		1	.1%

Q267CF

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	212		
	Label	Q267CF. Which of the following is your primary reason for supporting sending troops into Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs will be acceptable.	0	.0%
	2	The mission is likely to succeed.	0	.0%
	3	It would make a difference in stopping the war.	6	.5%
	4	People around the world will view this is a legitimate action.	0	.0%
	5	The risk to American lives will be low.	0	.0%
	6	We have a moral obligation to act.	3	.2%
	7	It is in our national interest to act.	4	.3%
	8	Other	1	.1%
Missing Values	System		1288	98.9%

Q267CF_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	213		
	Label	SyrRea3Y_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A53		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1301	99.9%
	I would send troops as peacekeepers and trainers only		1	.1%

Q267AO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	214		
	Label	Q267AO. Which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops into Syria:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable.	1	.1%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed.	138	10.6%
	3	It would not make enough of a difference in stopping the war.	29	2.2%
	4	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action.	8	.6%
	5	The risk to American lives would be too high.	30	2.3%
	6	It would be immoral to engage in military action.	3	.2%
	7	It is not in our national interest to act.	129	9.9%
	8	other	43	3.3%
Missing Values	System		921	70.7%

Q267AO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	215		
	Label	SyrRea1N_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A244		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1259	96.7%
	A combinatin, but mostly that it would be immoral to engage and the risk is too high for the situation.		1	.1%
	all of the above		1	.1%
	All of the above		1	.1%
	All of the above.		1	.1%
	Assad Government better than the rebels		1	.1%
	Costs are high, success is unlikely, the culture will not be changed, USA will be used, and it is not our fight!!!		1	.1%
	Expensive & No national interest & both sides are horrible (gas-using dictator vs Al Qaeda allies)		1	.1%
	I don't see a good side to this fight... both sides are bad actors.		1	.1%
	illegal absent SC authorization		1	.1%
	it depends on what 'sending troops' means. there are scenarios i could support		1	.1%
	it is not clear that there are any good guys in Syria		1	.1%
	It needs to be situation dependent with our national interests identified to the American people.		1	.1%
	It would be unsuccessful and commit Americans to an internal conflict		1	.1%

Q267AO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	it would create further distabilization in the region; others should take on the role	1	.1%
	It would likely make the situation worse	1	.1%
	It would likely not succeed as planned and we would be there for too long as in Iraq and Afganistan. Let other countries (EU and Middle East) step in first.	1	.1%
	It would make matters worse	1	.1%
	Let regional neighbors put boots on the ground	1	.1%
	Middle East nations need to do more to deal with Syria.	1	.1%
	most of the above	1	.1%
	need to bring troops home from Afghanistan first before launching new operations	1	.1%
	Need to try other steps first.	1	.1%
	No more "boots on the ground" for the sake of giving the Army something to do!	1	.1%
	Not acceptable, unless our presence is permanent	1	.1%
	Only as peace keepers	1	.1%
	Political divisions within the country raise doubts about whether the country would be able to unify behind a new government, so I don't see an obvious conclusion to military action	1	.1%
	Quagmire. Financial, human, reputational costs	1	.1%
	See if we can get like-minded neighbors to step up.	1	.1%

Q267AO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	Syria has been a largely secular society with space for minority religions and ethnic groups to participate in society and government. U.S. troops would end up supporting the end of that.		1	.1%
	The financial and human costs would be unacceptable, and the mission is not likely to succeed		1	.1%
	THE LONG TERM MISSION IS UNLIKELY TO SUCCEED		1	.1%
	The only way to obtain lasting peace is through a clear-cut military victory by one side or the other		1	.1%
	the opposition includes islamists and is anarchical		1	.1%
	The question implied unilateral deployment; I would support deployment as part of a broad multilateral force akin to Desert Shield/Storm with strong participation by regional states, especially Turkey		1	.1%
	The US should avoid getting militarily involved in disputes in the Middle East - it's not worth the cost in lives, dollars, and international reputation		1	.1%
	The US should not intervene with substantial ground forces (a division or more) in any country whose culture we do not understand and whose politics we cannot significantly influence.		1	.1%

Q267AO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	they are all, almost equally part of my primary points of opposition to sending troops in to Syria. Furthermore, we are incapable of fighting an insurgency with conventional forces, as we know from our involvement in other countries in the reg	1	.1%
	This president would not be sufficiently committed to success.	1	.1%
	Too Late	1	.1%
	U.S. involvement would attract extremist mercenaries againsts the U.S. and further destabilize the region.	1	.1%
	unintended consequences	1	.1%
	US has neither a military nor strategic policy to support militry action in Syria	1	.1%
	We need to stop acting unilaterally	1	.1%

Q267BO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	216		
	Label	Q267BO. Which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops into Syria as part of a United Nations Security Council authorized military mission:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable.	8	.6%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed.	128	9.8%
	3	It would not make enough of a difference in stopping the war.	36	2.8%
	4	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action.	8	.6%
	5	The risk to American lives would be too high.	37	2.8%
	6	It would be immoral to engage in military action.	0	.0%
	7	It is not in our national interest to act.	120	9.2%
	8	other	41	3.1%
Missing Values	System		924	71.0%

Q267BO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	217		
	Label	SyrRea2N_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A197		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1261	96.9%
	all above except immoral		1	.1%
	All of the above except #6		1	.1%
	American soldiers on the ground become a focal point for groups to oppose.		1	.1%
	American troops would play into the negative reactions across the region to the American occupation of Iran. Troops should be from other states.		1	.1%
	combination of above: low success, US lives, financial costs, lack of US vital interest		1	.1%
	Difficulty of exiting once engaged		1	.1%
	Important that regional players assume responsibility		1	.1%
	It is not an immediate threat to our national security. Try other things first.		1	.1%
	It is not clear who the enemy or friendlies are?		1	.1%
	It would be a double standard		1	.1%
	Many of the opposition forces are enemies of the U.S. We would have trouble separating the forces of evil from well intentioned Syrians who are trying to overthrow a dictator.		1	.1%
	May result in furthering tensions between the US and Russia		1	.1%

Q267BO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	National interest is suspect but administration does not have the political will to follow through		1	.1%
	no clear opposition		1	.1%
	no need to be successful		1	.1%
	Other less interested nations should provide troops		1	.1%
	Other Middle East States should do this		1	.1%
	Our political leaders cannot develop an appropriate plan		1	.1%
	Outcomes of Iraq War		1	.1%
	overstretch an exhausted military after 13 years of war.		1	.1%
	Risk of escalation and the inevitable crisis from captured/missing Americans		1	.1%
	several of the above!		1	.1%
	Simply: it would be a costly, time consuming mess.		1	.1%
	Syria does not rise to "vital interest" or a threat to ours; separately, no option is likely to succeed in Syria.		1	.1%
	Syria is a very large country, the number of troops required would be large		1	.1%
	the military goal is unclear.		1	.1%
	The mission is more likely to succeed if the UNSC authorized initiative were comprised primarily of troops from the region, especially from Islamic countries.		1	.1%
	The US is not a neutral country - send proper peacekeepers, eg Ireland, Norway etc.		1	.1%

Q267BO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	There are more humanizing and more effective ways to engage the conflict.		1	.1%
	There are too many factions fighting in Syria, several that are Islamic extremists.We may end up fighting on two fronts.		1	.1%
	U.S. troops would become a target in their own right and not promote stability		1	.1%
	US can provide much support short of sending troops		1	.1%
	US troops in combat in the Middle East could stip up mosre conflict than it would tamp down and, therefore, would not be in our national interest or in the interest of bringing peace to the region.		1	.1%
	US troops in Syria would act as a lightening rod for Islamist terror at home and abroad AND trigger a regional war.		1	.1%
	US troops would escalate, not end the 6 wars now being fought in Syria		1	.1%
	US troops would not be effective. Other nations' forces would be effective.		1	.1%
	We can use covert actoi to get the same reuslt, just as we did in the Afghanistan in the 1980s. No US troops sent there.		1	.1%
	WE lack national will and capacity after two major wars		1	.1%
	We should allow others to bear that burden in this instance.		1	.1%

Q267BO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We would become targets of all sides.		1	.1%
	Who would we like to be in charge? I'm not sure who's on our team. This is an issue that they are going to have to resolve themselves, even though it comes at great expense.		1	.1%

Q267CO

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	218		
	Label	Q267CO. Which of the following is your primary reason for opposing sending troops into Syria as part of a coalition of like-minded allies:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
Valid Values	Role	Input		
	1	The financial costs would be unacceptable.	5	.4%
	2	The mission is not likely to succeed.	151	11.6%
	3	It would not make enough of a difference in stopping the war.	38	2.9%
	4	People around the world would not view it as a legitimate action.	18	1.4%
	5	The risk to American lives would be too high.	15	1.2%
	6	It would be immoral to engage in military action.	4	.3%
	7	It is not in our national interest to act.	158	12.1%
	8	other	37	2.8%
Missing Values	System		876	67.3%

Q267CO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	219		
	Label	SyrRea3N_t		
	Type	String		
	Format	A244		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1265	97.2%
	All the above--makes no sense		1	.1%
	b, c, d, e, and g		1	.1%
	been there before. bad idea. no exit strategy. unlikely to succeed.		1	.1%
	Combination of the above. It is not a problem we can solve, so we do not have legitimacy. Governance decisions have to be made by the domestic population -- we fought a bloody war for our republic; it would be nice if there were a short-cut b		1	.1%
	Creates more problems than it solves.		1	.1%
	for what geo-political purpose, both sides are not in the us interest		1	.1%
	Ground troops would be a magnet for jihadis.		1	.1%
	It could have severe regional repercussions and blowback		1	.1%
	It is not in our national interest to act because the human, economic, and geopolitical risks are greater than the potential benefits from success.		1	.1%
	It will enmesh us in another daunting, protracted messy nation-building enterprise,		1	.1%
	It's a civil war we didn't start.		1	.1%
	it's unclear which rebel group we should support		1	.1%
	Lack of public support in US		1	.1%

Q267CO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	let them settle their own problem; wait and watch.	1	.1%
	Likely to raise tensions / attract external actors	1	.1%
	military solution is not a solution. There are human rights violations on all sides. We need to support peace-keeping, international diplomatic efforts and humanitarian aid. Adding the U.S. military to a burning powder keg will only make the ex	1	.1%
	Most of the opposition is no better than the current regime.	1	.1%
	Nearly all of the above listed reasons	1	.1%
	Not a primary threat to US	1	.1%
	Not clear that the opposition winning would be better or more stable	1	.1%
	sides within the anti-government movement are not clear - some being islamic fundamentalist. It's short sided to support an unknown aside from humanitarian and medical aid.	1	.1%
	SOF only for missions against HVTs of Assad & Islamists	1	.1%
	Supporting the non-radical anti-governmental forces with limited arms and anti-armor and anti-air offers best hope. Safeguards on such weapons would be critical and are within US technical capabilities.	1	.1%
	The Assad regime is not worth a single American life.	1	.1%
	The mission is not likely to succeed without a large US engagement.	1	.1%

Q267CO_TEXT

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	the opposition is not a good alternative to today's regime. It is not united and there would probably be a civil war for many years to come. Look at Lybia	1	.1%
	The US cannot be seen as invading yet another Muslim country	1	.1%
	The US is unlikely to keep troops there for the 25+ years needed to transform the country. See Iraq and Afghanistan where the citizens would have preferred long term US presence to the Obama abandonment. The US still has troops in Germany, Ja	1	.1%
	There are no "good guys" and we don't know what outcome is in our best interest.	1	.1%
	There is no clear mission or solution; no obvious, genuine allies to work with. Rebel groups are indistinguishable from terrorist groups in many cases.	1	.1%
	Too late. Costly. Likely to fail. Could lead to regional war. Antagonizes Russia and China further. We should look at other ways to really up pressure on Assad w/o sending in troops. And why now when war has bene ongoing for three years?!	1	.1%
	Unless we know who will take over the government.	1	.1%
	We are not credible at this stage	1	.1%
	We do not have the will to win--stabilizing should not be the mission.	1	.1%
	We would replace Assad as the enemy in the minds of many	1	.1%

Q267CO_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	We're too late - we're just following from behind.		1	.1%
	Would make matters worse on the ground and increase anti-American sentiments [this would be the third major war against a Muslim country]. Therefore, the conflict in Syria will spillover to neighboring countries and destabilize the whole region		1	.1%

N16

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	220		
	Label	N16. Do you think that, as a country, we are more safe, about as safe, or less safe than we were before the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	More safe	480	36.9%
	2	About as safe	524	40.2%
	3	Less safe	282	21.7%
Missing Values	System		16	1.2%

Q276_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	221		
	Label	Q276. U.S. air strikes against terrorist training camps and other facilities		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	1056	81.1%
	2	Oppose	198	15.2%
Missing Values	System		48	3.7%

Q276_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	222		
	Label	Q276. Attacks by U.S. ground troops against terrorist training camps and other facilities		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	628	48.2%
	2	Oppose	619	47.5%
Missing Values	System		55	4.2%

Q276_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	223		
	Label	Q276. Assassination of individual terrorist leaders		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	927	71.2%
	2	Oppose	311	23.9%
Missing Values	System		64	4.9%

Q276_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	224		
	Label	Q276. Helping poor countries develop their economies		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	1148	88.2%
	2	Oppose	110	8.4%
Missing Values	System		44	3.4%

Q276_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	225		
	Label	Q276. Working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members enforce them		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	1135	87.2%
	2	Oppose	119	9.1%
Missing Values	System		48	3.7%

Q276_6

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	226		
	Label	Q276. Drone strikes to carry out bombing attacks against suspected terrorists		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	914	70.2%
	2	Oppose	330	25.3%
Missing Values	System		58	4.5%

Q276_7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	227		
	Label	Q276. The National Security Agency collecting telephone and internet data to identify links to potential terrorists		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Favor	941	72.3%
	2	Oppose	302	23.2%
Missing Values	System		59	4.5%

Q355

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	228		
	Label	Q355. In your view, which continent is more important to the U.S. - Asia or Europe?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Asia	599	46.0%
	2	Europe	599	46.0%
Missing Values	System		104	8.0%

T15a

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	229		
	Label	T15a. At the present time, which nation do you feel is stronger in terms of military power, the U.S. or China – or do you think they are about equal militarily?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	US	1165	89.5%
	2	China	31	2.4%
	3	About equal	69	5.3%
Missing Values	System		37	2.8%

N32a

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	230		
	Label	N32a. At the present time, which nation do you feel is stronger in terms of economic power, the U. S. or China – or do you think they are about equal economically?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	US	914	70.2%
	2	China	128	9.8%
	3	About equal	221	17.0%
Missing Values	System		39	3.0%

Q340

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	231		
	Label	Q340. If China's economy were to grow to be as large as the U.S. economy, do you think that would be mostly positive, mostly negative, or equally positive and negative?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Mostly positive	229	17.6%
	2	Mostly negative	311	23.9%
	3	Equally positive and negative	723	55.5%
Missing Values	System		39	3.0%

Q350

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	232		
	Label	Q350. In dealing with the rise of China's power, do you think the U.S. should:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Undertake friendly cooperation and engagement with China	1082	83.1%
	2	Actively work to limit the growth of China's power	174	13.4%
Missing Values	System		46	3.5%

Q356

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	233		
	Label	Q356. How do you feel about the U.S. government's plans to pivot our diplomatic and military resources away from the Middle East and Europe and more toward Asia?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	strongly support	212	16.3%
	2	somewhat support	702	53.9%
	3	somewhat oppose	277	21.3%
	4	strongly oppose	47	3.6%
Missing Values	System		64	4.9%

Q355_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	234		
	Label	Q355_1. Do you think that the U.S. military presence in East Asia increases or decreases stability in the region?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Increases	1100	84.5%
	2	Decreases	142	10.9%
Missing Values	System		60	4.6%

Q1005

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	235		
	Label	Q1005. In general, do you think of yourself as:		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Extremely liberal	51	3.9%
	2	Liberal	292	22.4%
	3	Slightly liberal	182	14.0%
	4	Moderate, middle of the road	312	24.0%
	5	Slightly conservative	184	14.1%
	6	Conservative	238	18.3%
	7	Extremely conservative	16	1.2%
Missing Values	System		27	2.1%

Q1010

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	236		
	Label	Q1010. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Republican	302	23.2%
	2	Democrat	496	38.1%
	3	Independent	427	32.8%
	4	Other	48	3.7%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

Q1015

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	237		
	Label	Q1015. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Strong Republican	160	12.3%
	2	Not strong Republican	137	10.5%
Missing Values	System		1005	77.2%

Q1020

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	238		
	Label	Q1020. Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Strong Democrat	336	25.8%
	2	Not strong Democrat	153	11.8%
Missing Values	System		813	62.4%

Q1025

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	239		
	Label	Q1025. Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Republican	117	9.0%
	2	Democratic	156	12.0%
	3	neither	198	15.2%
Missing Values	System		831	63.8%

NEW

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	240		
	Label	NEW. Do you consider yourself a part of or do you identify with the Tea Party movement?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	yes	80	6.1%
	2	no	1186	91.1%
Missing Values	System		36	2.8%

Q1040

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	241		
	Label	Q1040. What is your religious preference? Is it Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, some other religion, or no religion?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Christian	747	57.4%
	2	Jewish	113	8.7%
	3	Muslim	17	1.3%
	4	Hindu	8	.6%
	5	Other	47	3.6%
	6	No religion	325	25.0%
Missing Values	System		45	3.5%

Q1041

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	242		
	Label	What is your religious preference?		
	Type	String		
	Format	A65		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1267	97.3%
	agnostic		1	.1%
	Baptist raised		1	.1%
	Buddhism		4	.3%
	buddhist		2	.2%
	Buddhist		4	.3%
	buddist		1	.1%
	Combination, drawing from christianity, islam, buddhism and wikka		1	.1%
	Decline to state		1	.1%
	Hindu/Christian		1	.1%
	I am spiritually active.		1	.1%
	LDS		1	.1%
	not sure how that is relevant here		1	.1%
	NOYB		1	.1%
	Pagan		1	.1%
	Quaker		1	.1%
	Sikh		1	.1%
	Society of Friends (Quaker)		1	.1%
	spiritualist		1	.1%
	Spiritual		1	.1%
	Sufism		1	.1%
	Unitarian		3	.2%
	Unitarian atheist		1	.1%
	Unitarian Universalist		3	.2%
	What is in the heart and mind		1	.1%

New_A

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	243		
	Label	Apart from weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	More than once a week	74	5.7%
	2	Once a week	269	20.7%
	3	Once or twice a month	112	8.6%
	4	Several times a year	214	16.4%
	5	Hardly ever	354	27.2%
	6	Never	227	17.4%
Missing Values	System		52	4.0%

GENDER

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	244		
	Label	GENDER		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Male	1041	80.0%
	2	Female	221	17.0%
Missing Values	System		40	3.1%

AGE

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	245		
	Label	AGE		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	18-29	21	1.6%
	2	30-44	212	16.3%
	3	45-59	391	30.0%
	4	60-74	470	36.1%
	5	75+	164	12.6%
Missing Values	System		44	3.4%

RACE

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	246		
	Label	RACE		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	White/Caucasian	1125	86.4%
	2	African American	23	1.8%
	3	Hispanic	31	2.4%
	4	Asian	33	2.5%
	5	Native American	3	.2%
	6	Pacific Islander	2	.2%
	7	Other	24	1.8%
Missing Values	System		61	4.7%

EDU

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	247		
	Label	Highest Education		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Scale		
	Role	Input		
N	Valid	1285		
	Missing	17		
Central Tendency and Dispersion	Mean	12.89		
	Standard Deviation	.374		
	Percentile 25	13.00		
	Percentile 50	13.00		
	Percentile 75	13.00		
Labeled Values	1	High School	0	.0%
	2	Some college	0	.0%
	3	College	0	.0%
	4	Postgrad	0	.0%

EDU2_1

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	248		
	Label	MA		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		905	69.5%
Missing Values	System		397	30.5%

EDU2_2

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	249		
	Label	PHD		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		426	32.7%
Missing Values	System		876	67.3%

EDU2_3

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	250		
	Label	JD		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		81	6.2%
Missing Values	System		1221	93.8%

EDU2_4

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	251		
	Label	MD		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		12	.9%
Missing Values	System		1290	99.1%

EDU2_5

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	252		
	Label	OTHER		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1		83	6.4%
Missing Values	System		1219	93.6%

EDU2_5_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	253		
	Label	OTHERTEXT		
	Type	String		
	Format	A54		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values			1247	95.8%
	2 Master's Degrees		1	.1%
	2 master's degrees plus two military colleges		1	.1%
	2 Masters degrees		1	.1%
	2nd Master's		1	.1%
	3 masters degrees		1	.1%
	ABD		1	.1%
	all but dissertation for PhD		1	.1%
	BAA		1	.1%
	C.Phil		1	.1%
	Certificate		1	.1%
	D.Min.		1	.1%
	DA		1	.1%
	DD		1	.1%
	Did not complete		1	.1%
	DMin		2	.2%
	Doctor of Ministry		1	.1%
	doctorate honoris causa		1	.1%
	Doctorate in Divinity		1	.1%
	Ed.D.		1	.1%
	Ed.D., D.E.A., 3 MAs		1	.1%
	Ed.S.		1	.1%
	EdD		1	.1%
	graduate diploma		1	.1%
	Honorary Doctorate		1	.1%
	Honors		1	.1%
	JD-student		1	.1%
	LLB		1	.1%
	Llm		1	.1%

EDU2_5_TEXT

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	LLM		5	.4%
	MA & MBA		1	.1%
	Masters		1	.1%
	MBA		1	.1%
	Misc grad studies at Ph.D level		1	.1%
	MSS, MIA		1	.1%
	National Defense University		1	.1%
	national war college		2	.2%
	National War College		3	.2%
	no Graduate Degree		1	.1%
	Non-degree post grad		1	.1%
	None		1	.1%
	NWC		1	.1%
	Olmsted Scholar		1	.1%
	Other: National War College Certificate, Class of 1986		1	.1%
	post graduate studfes but did not take a degree		1	.1%
	second and third masters		1	.1%
	Some Masters		1	.1%
	Two Master's degrees		1	.1%

Military

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	254		
	Label	Have you ever served in the U.S. military?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	yes	487	37.4%
	2	no	792	60.8%
Missing Values	System		23	1.8%

Type

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	255		
	Label	Which service?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Army	161	12.4%
	2	Air Force	173	13.3%
	3	Coast Guard	11	.8%
	4	Marines	32	2.5%
	5	National Guard	5	.4%
	6	Navy	101	7.8%
Missing Values	System		819	62.9%

Q82

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	256		
	Label	Have you ever served in the U.S. government?		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F1		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	yes	586	45.0%
	2	no	688	52.8%
Missing Values	System		28	2.2%

LeaderGroup

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	257		
	Label	LeaderGroup		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F2		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	1	Academic	298	22.9%
	2	Business	27	2.1%
	3	Congress	53	4.1%
	4	Government/Executive Branch	104	8.0%
	5	Interest Groups	54	4.1%
	6	Media	81	6.2%
	7	Labor	15	1.2%
	8	Military	533	40.9%
	9	Religion	32	2.5%
	10	Think Tanks	105	8.1%

PID7

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	258		
	Label	Party ID - 7 Category		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F8		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	-1	Refused	0	.0%
	1	Strong Republican	160	12.3%
	2	Not strong Republican	137	10.5%
	3	Lean Republican	117	9.0%
	4	Independent	200	15.4%
	5	Lean Democrat	156	12.0%
	6	Not strong Democrat	153	11.8%
	7	Strong Democrat	336	25.8%
Missing Values	System		43	3.3%

partyid3nl

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	259		
	Label	Party ID 3 - leaners unlumped		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F8		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	-2	Not asked	0	.0%
	-1	Refused	0	.0%
	1	Republican	302	23.2%
	2	Democrat	496	38.1%
	3	Independent/ Other	475	36.5%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%

partyid3ll

		Value	Count	Percent
Standard Attributes	Position	260		
	Label	Party ID 3 - leaners lumped		
	Type	Numeric		
	Format	F8		
	Measurement	Nominal		
	Role	Input		
Valid Values	-2	Not asked	0	.0%
	-1	Refused	0	.0%
	1	Republican/Lean Republican	419	32.2%
	2	Democrat/Lean Democrat	652	50.1%
	3	Independent	202	15.5%
Missing Values	System		29	2.2%