TECHNICAL REPORT 87-2

CODEBOOK AND METHODS OF THE 1986 TWIN CITIES AREA SURVEY

January 30, 1987

prepared by: Rossana Rae Armson

Minnesota Center for Social Research
University of Minnesota
2122 Riverside Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55454

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the 31 interviewers and 13 data coders/checkers who spent numerous hours producing the data for this study. In addition, thanks are extended to the staff of the 1986 Twin Cities Area Survey, whose responsibilities were:

Overall Coordination	Rossana Rae Armson
Data Collection Manager	Nancy Davenport-Sis
Data Coding Manager	Pamela Reeves
Data Processing	Terry Schmit Brian Martinson
Questionnaire Production	Tammy Tollefson

This study was made possible by financial support from eight organizations. These organizations included questions in the following content areas:

Quality of Life	Metropolitan Council
Housing	Metropolitan Council Minneapolis City Planning Department
Telephone Services	Minnesota Public Interest Research Group
Human Services	Metropolitan Council
Solid Waste	Metropolitan Council Ramsey County Environmental Health Dept. Washington County Health Department Waste-to-Energy Project
Refuge Lands	Army Corps of Engineers
Police	American Bar Foundation

We anticipate that the usefulness of this data will justify the effort expended in collecting the information.

William J. Craig, Director
Minnesota Center for Survey Research
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE 1986 TWIN CITIES AREA SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

This was the fifth year of the Twin Cities Area Survey (TCAS), an omnibus survey of adults, age 18 and over, who reside in the seven county Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. TCAS'86 was conducted during November and December of 1986 by the Minnesota Center for Survey Research (MCSR), a research unit within the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota.

The survey consisted exclusively of telephone interviews. The topics included in this year's survey ranged from housing and human services to refuge lands.

Objectives

The Twin Cities Area Survey has four basic objectives. The first of these is to get useful and technically sound information on the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors of Twin Cities residents for local decision-makers. Such information is potentially relevant to a multitude of needs, including market analysis, needs assessment, project evaluation, and organizational planning. The second objective is to develop an ongoing social monitoring capability for the metropolitan area. Because the survey is an annual event, it provides the means to maintain an updated metropolitan area database and to monitor change in this database over the course of time. The third objective is to provide sociology students and others with an opportunity to participate in a professional survey operation. This training experience greatly enhances the methodological skills of such students, which also enlarges and enriches the pool of social researchers ultimately available to other projects in the community. The fourth objective is to develop and refine methods for conducting social surveys. The most advanced methods and techniques are utilized in MCSR surveys, but attention is given to explorations that improve upon existing research methods.

Participating Organizations

Organizations providing financial support for TCAS'86 included: the American Bar Foundation, Army Corps of Engineers, Metropolitan Council, Minneapolis City Planning Department, Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, Ramsey County Environmental Health Department, Washington County Health Department, and the Waste-to-Energy Project.

SAMPLING DESIGN

The Twin Cities area sample consisted of households selected randomly from the seven county metropolitan area. The household sample was generated by a computer program which randomized the last two digits of a sample originally acquired from Survey Sampling, Inc. of Westport, Connecticut. Evidence of the integrity of the sampling frame and the survey procedures is given in a later section of this chapter (Evaluation of the Sample).

Selection of respondents occurred in two stages: first a household was randomly selected, and then a person was randomly selected for interviewing from within the household. The selection of a person within the household was done using the Last Birthday Selection Method, a sample of which appears in the introduction (See Appendix C: Administrative Forms). These selection procedures guaranteed that every household in the metropolitan area had an equal chance to be included in the survey, and that once the household was sampled every adult had an equal chance to be included.

INTERVIEWING

Interviewer Recruitment

Ten of the 31 interviewers who participated in TCAS'86 were recruited from a pool of interviewers with prior MCSR experience. All of the interviewers were undergraduate students at the University of Minnesota.

Training of Interviewers

New applicants for interviewing positions were hired only after completing a personal interview with the interviewing manager. All new interviewers were required to attend an initial training session during which they were given basic instructions in survey interviewing.

Both new and experienced interviewers attended a second training session covering survey procedures and policies, and review of the actual interview schedule. In addition, they were provided with standard protocols for dealing with anticipated questions about the survey and reasons for refusing to participate. Before beginning actual interviewing, all interviewers were required to conduct: (1) a practice interview with a supervisor or other MCSR staff member, and (2) a pilot interview with a randomly selected survey respondent, which was critiqued immediately.

Finally, all interviewers were required to sign a statement of professional ethics, which contained explicit guidelines about appropriate interviewing behavior and the confidentiality of all respondent information. A copy of this statement is included in Appendix C.

Supervision

The interviews were conducted by telephone from a central phone bank at the Minnesota Center for Survey Research. This interviewing was organized into two four-hour shifts on four days each week, and one four-hour shift on the remaining three days. Every shift was managed by a supervisor whose responsibilities included distributing new phone numbers and scheduled appointments, monitoring interviewers at work, and reviewing completed interview schedules for errors and omissions.

Operations

Numbers to be called were recorded on callback records (see Appendix C for samples), and these were distributed to interviewers at the beginning of each shift. The disposition of each attempt to complete an interview was recorded on these callback records. Each telephone number in the sample continued to be called unless there were 10 "no answer" dispositions on 10 different shifts.

On the back of every callback record were two forms for recording relevant information about refusals and appointments. The refusal form included entries for the respondents' reasons for declining to participate in the study, the arguments used by the interviewer to encourage participation, and the point at which the termination occurred. The appointment form required specifying the date and time of the scheduled appointment, the name of the targeted respondent if selected, and whether the appointment was firm, probable, or "a shot-in-the-dark."

All completed schedules were turned in to the supervisor for review immediately after the conclusion of the interview. They were then assigned a unique ID number, the phone number was recorded on the master list, and the interview schedule was filed for coding and data entry. All other callback records were returned to the supervisor at the end of the shift. For each call made, interviewers recorded the date, time, and disposition of the call as well as the interviewer number. Copies of the contact records and explanations for all possible disposition codes are included in Appendix C.

MANAGEMENT OF DATA

Coding and Quality Control

Completed instruments were reviewed immediately by shift supervisors for missed questions, errors in branching, and insufficient detail in open-ended responses. Errors detected in this fashion were returned to the interviewer for correction. Following shift supervisor review, instruments were sent to coders for a more detailed and rigorous examination. Coders prepared completed instruments for data entry by (1) coding administrative variables on the contact record; (2) making certain that every question on the schedule was answered properly; (3) assuring that branching had been followed; and (4) coding open-ended responses.

As many questions as possible were pre-coded. The actual coding work was done by 13 of the same people who had conducted the interviews. All TCAS interviewers were given one hour of instruction in coding procedures, followed by one hour of close supervision in coding actual interviews.

Data Entry

Shortly after interviewing began, completed questionnaires were key entered onto a data tape. Data entry and cleaning were continuous during the data collection phase and, as a result of this, a computer file of 1,006 completed interviews was available for preliminary analysis within a few weeks after the last interviews had been collected and coded.

Data Cleaning

Once a complete file of 1,006 interviews was constructed, it was examined systematically to remove data entry errors. Data cleaning involved use of a computer program to evaluate each case for (1) variables with values out of range and (2) inappropriate branching on screening and filter questions. In addition, the file was examined manually to identify cases with paradoxical or inappropriate responses.

EVALUATION OF THE SAMPLE

Completion Status

There were a total of 1,006 completed interviews for TCAS'86 (Table 1). An additional 331 individuals refused to participate, 24 were eliminated because of physical or language problems, and 83 were still active when interviewing was terminated. The remainder of the sample was categorized as follows: 248 of the telephone numbers in the sample were business numbers, 306 were not working numbers, 53 were no answers on each of 10 attempted contacts, and no eligible respondent was available in 12 cases. The overall response rate for TCAS'86 was 70%. This compares favorably with other omnibus social surveys which generally have response rates of 70% to 75%.

TABLE 1

FINAL STATUS OF INTERVIEWING FOR TCAS'86

Status	Number	(Percent)
Completion	1,006	(49%)
Refusal	331	(16%)
Physical or Language Problem	24	(1%)
Active	83	(4%)
Not Home Phone	248	(12%)
Not Working Number	306	(15%)
No Answer (on 10 attempts)	53	(3%)
Eliminated	12	(1%)
TOTALS	2,063	(100%)
RESPONSE RATE*	70%	

---

*Response rates were calculated by the following formula:

$$\text{response rate} = \frac{\text{completions}}{\text{potential interviews}}$$

Potential interviews were defined as all instances where contact was made with the selected household, and were represented by the sum of the first four categories in Table 1.

Representativeness

The accuracy of TCAS'86 can be evaluated by comparing selected characteristics of the survey respondents with 1980 data from the U.S. Census. The geographic representation of the sample is compared to actual census counts of population in the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area (Table 2). It should be remembered that the Census data is now six years old, and deviations from Census counts may represent true changes in population characteristics. However, since no population counts are available which are more recent, the 1980 Census will continue to be used as the general standard of comparison.

In addition to these county comparisons, reasonably accurate comparisons are possible with gender, age, and race (Tables 3, 4, and 5). The Census comparisons for gender and race have been corrected for age, so that both TCAS'86 and the Census percentages are based on the population 18 and over. Finally, household income distributions are presented in Table 6 for comparative purposes.

The percentage of households in each metropolitan area county was very close to the household distribution reported by the Census and the Metropolitan Council 1984 estimates (Table 2).

TABLE 2

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE COMPARISON OF TCAS'86 AND CENSUS DATA
(Household Units)

	TCAS'86	1980 Census	1984 Estimates*
Anoka	9%	8%	9%
Carver	1%	2%	2%
Dakota	11%	9%	9%
Hennepin	48%	51%	50%
Ramsey	21%	24%	23%
Scott	2%	2%	2%
Washington	7%	5%	5%
TOTAL	100% (1,006)	100% (721,444)	100% (767,500)

*Source: Metropolitan Council

TABLE 3

GENDER COMPARISON OF TCAS'86 AND CENSUS DATA

	TCAS'86	1980 Census
Male	45%	48%
Female	55%	52%
TOTAL	100% (1,006)	100% (1,429,711)

The distribution of respondents by gender (Table 3) paralleled that reported by the Census. However, the proportion of TCAS'86 respondents in various age categories does differ slightly from the Census percentages and 1985 estimates. As shown in Table 4, individuals over 65 years old and under 25 years old were slightly under-represented. The 25 - 34 year old cohort was correspondingly over-represented. However, these deviations nearly disappear when comparing TCAS'86 to the 1985 estimates.

TABLE 4

AGE COMPARISON OF TCAS'86 AND CENSUS DATA

	TCAS'86	1980 Census	1985 Estimates*
18-24	15%	20%	17%
25-34	31%	26%	27%
35-44	20%	17%	19%
45-54	12%	13%	12%
55-64	12%	11%	11%
65 +	9%	13%	13%
TOTALS	100% (994)	100% (1,429,711)	100% (1,546,031)

*Source: Research Office, Minnesota Department of Economic Security

TABLE 5

RACE COMPARISON OF TCAS'86 AND CENSUS DATA

	TCAS'86	1980 Census
White	93%	96%
Black	2%	2%
Indian	0%	1%
Other	4%	2%
TOTALS	100% (999)	100% (1,429,711)

The distribution of respondents by race (Table 5) closely approximates the Census distribution, while Table 6 indicates a substantial under-estimate of households with annual incomes below $20,000 and a corresponding over-estimate of households with higher annual incomes. However, such a comparison should be made cautiously. The 1980 Census income distribution has not been corrected for six years of growth in household income. Therefore, the lack of correspondence in the figures is not as significant as it appears to be at first glance.

TABLE 6

INCOME COMPARISON OF TCAS'86 AND CENSUS DATA
(Household Units)

	TCAS'86	1980 Census
Under $10,000	7%	20%
$10,000 to 20,000	17%	26%
$20,000 to 30,000	23%	25%
$30,000 to 40,000	26%	15%
$40,000 to 50,000	9%	6%
Over $50,000	17%	7%
TOTALS	100% (869)	100% (722,219)

Using the above tables to evaluate the degree to which the TCAS'86 sample matches the census profile of individuals living in Minnesota shows that, although individuals with lower incomes are under-represented, it is a generally adequate representation of residents of the seven county metropolitan area.

Generalizability of Results

Since the individuals who participated in TCAS'86 were randomly selected from the population of the metropolitan area, the survey results can be generalized to the entire seven county Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. These generalizations can be made either to households or to individuals, depending upon whether the weighted or unweighted data file is the source of the percentages.

This codebook is based on the weighted computer data file and generalizes to individuals. Each percentage point in TCAS'86 represents approximately 15,460 individuals, since there are an estimated 1,546,000 adults in the Twin Cities seven-county metropolitan area.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE

The purpose of this section is to briefly describe the TCAS'86 sample according to its demographic characteristics. A more detailed demographic description of the sample may be obtained from Chapter 3 of this technical report.

Gender: Fifty-five percent of the sample were females and 45% were males.

Marital Status: Sixty percent of the sample were married, 30% were single, 5% were divorced or separated, and 4% were widowed.

Employment: At the time of the survey, 58% of the sample worked full-time, 19% worked part-time, and 23% did not have a paying job.

Education: Seven percent of the sample had not graduated from high school, 28% were high school graduates, 11% had some technical school training, 22% had some college, and 31% were college graduates.

SAMPLING ERROR

The margin of error for a simple random sample of the size of the Twin Cities Area Survey may be as high as plus or minus three percent, depending upon the distribution of sample responses. This sampling error presumes the conventional 95% degree of desired confidence, which is equivalent to a "significance level" of .05.

The distribution of sample responses is represented by the proportion of people responding to any question with a particular answer. For example, if you have a sample size of 1000 and a question with only two answer alternatives, suppose that 60% of the respondents answer "Yes" and 40% say "No." The sampling error in this case would be 3.0. (Using Table 7 below, the sampling error is equal to 3.0 when the size of the sample equals 1000 and the distribution of sample responses equals 60.) That is, each percentage has a range of plus or minus 3.0%. However, using the same example, but with 10% of the respondents saying "Yes" and 90% saying "No," the sampling error is only 1.9%.

The importance of sample size in estimating sampling error also needs to be mentioned since many of the organizations using the TCAS'86 data will be interested in subgroups, rather than the total sample of over 1,000 completed interviews. Essentially, as the size of the sample decreases, there is a corresponding increase in the estimated sampling error. For example, for a subset of 200 persons the estimated error may be as high as plus or minus seven percent.

TABLE 7

SAMPLING ERROR (IN PERCENTS) BY
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE RESPONSES AND SAMPLE SIZE

Distribution of Sample Responses (percent)	Size of Sample (N) 1000	800	600	400	200
50.0	3.1	3.5	4.0	4.9	6.9
60.0	3.0	3.4	3.9	4.8	6.8
70.0	2.8	3.2	3.7	4.5	6.4
80.0	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.9	5.5
90.0	1.9	2.1	2.4	2.9	4.2

CHAPTER 2

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE CODEBOOK

CODEBOOK OBJECTIVES

The codebook for a survey data file serves three basic functions: (1) a record of the exact wording and order of the survey questions; (2) a report of the responses to those questions; and (3) documentation of the variable names, which are necessary to access the computer data file. The main body of the codebook is a copy of the interview schedule with the frequency distributions and percentages added to those questions which were pre-coded or closed-ended. Appendix A shows the responses to administrative, open-ended, and continuous variables, e.g. date of completion and year of birth. Appendix B shows constructed variables which make many of these responses more useful, e.g. age group.

READING THE CODEBOOK

The main body of this report contains a replica of the 1986 Twin Cities Area Survey questionnaire. To this replica, two pieces of information have been added: question labels, and the response frequencies to each question. The questionnaire and response frequencies will be of major interest to most readers. The question labels, or variable labels, are useful documentation for those who wish to use a computer and the SPSS software package for more detailed analysis.

The questionnaire is an exact replica. This is important in order to know how questions were phrased, in what order they were asked, and when it was proper to skip certain questions. Interviewers were instructed to read these questions verbatim and to avoid giving their interpretations or opinions in any way. Two types of markings which appear on the survey form were not indicated to respondents: instructions to the interviewers which are shown in parentheses, and section and survey labels which are shown in bold type.

To the right of each question is printed a list of permissible answers and a code number for each answer. The interviewer was instructed to circle the code number of the answer given by the respondent. A new questionnaire was used for each interview and was marked to show the answers of each respondent. The first question in the survey provides a good example of this coding scheme. If a respondent felt that the Twin Cities was a "slightly better" place to live than other metropolitan areas in the nation, the "2" would be circled on that questionnaire.

Continuous and open-ended questions were coded in different ways and the responses to those questions are shown in Appendices A and B. Questions with continuous distributions, where many discrete answers are possible, are shown with open spaces in the answer column of the question. Interviewers simply wrote in numbers like zip code and year of birth. The responses to open-ended questions were written verbatim on the questionnaire and later classified into categories by a specially trained coder who wrote numbers into the answer spaces for those questions. Verbatim responses were also recorded for closed questions where the respondent's answer did not match the prepared list of permissible answers. The first housing question (see page 13) provides a code "3" for those who neither own nor rent; MCSR maintains a list of these other responses, to be used by persons interested in those specific responses.

Missing Value Nomenclature

For all types of questions, two to three types of "missing" response categories exist: don't know, refused to answer, and not applicable. The first two categories are self-explanatory and are always options for respondents. Not applicable is an option where answering a given question is conditional, or in other words, where a given question was asked only of certain respondents. Standard codes are associated throughout with each missing value category: 8, 9, and 0. Where the answer is multiple digit, so is the standard code.

	Number of Digits in Code			
	1	2	3	4
DK (Don't Know)	8	88	888	8888
RA (Refused)	9	99	999	9999
NA (Not Applicable)	0	00	000	0000

Response Frequencies

The responses summed for all 1,006 respondents are shown in the last two columns to the right of each question. The first of these columns shows the number (frequency) of people in each response category: these should sum to 1,006, with some rounding error. The second number is the percentage response rate, adjusted to exclude the missing response categories.

For most analytical purposes, people will want these adjusted percentages. They were computed and presented here to meet that need. These adjusted percentages are less appropriate when used as a public opinion poll, for showing public support for policies. For example, if 15 percent of the respondents did not answer a question, but 55 percent of those who did answer supported a particular position, it is inappropriate to argue that the issue has majority support. In this example, only 47 percent of all people would actually be supportive. For policy choices, it may be more appropriate to show the percentage distribution of all 1,006 respondents.

One final comment: the frequencies shown here are "weighted" by the number of adults in the household as explained below. This technique introduces some rounding errors, so that the sum of the frequencies for a given question may not equal 1,006 exactly.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONTINUOUS VARIABLES

The results from survey administration items, such as date of completion, and from questions which have continuous or open-ended responses are presented in Appendix A.

CONSTRUCTED VARIABLES

Appendix B contains the operational definitions for the convenience of the data file user. The distribution of these variables is also presented in Appendix B. These constructed variables are contained in the SPSS data file along with all of the original variables.

WEIGHTING OF DATA

The responses presented in the codebook and appendices have been weighted based upon the total number of adults living in the household. Because telephone surveys tend to oversample people who live in single-individual households, these individuals were downweighted by about 50% and all others upweighted accordingly to more accurately represent the distribution of adult members in households in the population of the metropolitan area. Weighted response distributions will differ slightly from unweighted distributions. The construction and activation of the weighting factor is described in Appendix B, under the variable "WGTS."

M-41/T86.RPT

CHAPTER 3

CODEBOOK OF THE TWIN CITIES AREA SURVEY 1986

A. QUALITY OF LIFE

First, I'm going to ask some questions about living in the Twin Cities area, which includes the entire seven-county metropolitan area.

			Freq	Adj%
A1.	How would you rate the Twin Cities area as a place to live as compared to other metropolitan areas in the nation -- do you feel the Twin Cities area is a much better place, a slightly better place, a slightly worse place, or a much worse place in which to live?	Much better. . . . 1	546	55
		Slightly better. . 2	407	41
		Slightly worse . . 3	29	3
		Much worse 4	6	1
		DK . . . 8	18	
		RA . . . 9	0	
A2.	In your opinion, what do you think is the single most important issue facing people in the Twin Cities metropolitan area today?	**See Appendix A, page A-6.**		
A3.	What other important issues are facing Twin Cities residents today?	**See Appendix A, page A-7.**		
A4.	Generally speaking, would you say that your standard of living, that is, the things that you can buy and do, is getting worse, staying about the same, or getting better compared to one year ago?	Getting worse. . . 1	179	18
		Staying the same . 2	502	50
		Getting better . . 3	322	32
		DK . . . 8	2	
		RA . . . 9	0	
A5.	Looking one year into the future, do you feel that your financial prospects will get better, remain unchanged, or get worse?	Get better 1	513	52
		Remain unchanged . 2	334	34
		Get worse. 3	145	15
		DK . . . 8	14	
		RA . . . 9	1	

B. HOUSING

The next questions are about housing.

			Freq	Adj%
B1.	Do you own or rent your residence?	Own. 1	683	68
		Rent 2	317	32
		Other 3	5	0
		DK . . . 8	0	
		RA . . . 9	1	
B2.	What kind of housing unit do you live in? (DO NOT READ LIST)	Single family detached . . . 1	692	69
		Townhouse 2	42	4
		Duplex or 2-unit building. . 3	72	7
		Apartment building with less than 5 units. 4	34	3
		Apartment building with five or more units 5	142	14
		Mobile home. 6	18	2
		Something else 7	6	1
		DK . . . 8	0	
		RA . . . 9	1	

		Freq	Adj%
B3. Would you prefer a different type of housing?	Yes. 1	221	22
	No 2	782	78
	(IF NO, GO TO B4)		
	DK . . . 8	4	
	RA . . . 9	0	
B3a. (IF YES) What type of housing would you prefer? (DO NOT READ LIST)	Single family detached . . . 1	168	76
	Townhouse 2	22	10
	Duplex or 2-unit building. . 3	10	4
	Apartment building with less than 5 units. 4	12	5
	Apartment building with five or more units 5	5	2
	Mobile home. 6	0	0
	Something else 7	4	2
	DK . . . 8	0	
	RA . . . 9	0	
	NA . . . 0	785	

B3b. (IF YES) What prevents you from moving now?

See Appendix A, page A-9.

B4. How many years have you lived in the home you live in now?

(CODE LESS THAN ONE YEAR AS 01)

See Appendix A, page A-9.

(IF LIVED THERE ALL THEIR LIFE, GO TO NEXT SECTION)

		Freq	Adj%
B5. Did you move to your present home from somewhere else in the Twin Cities metropolitan area?	Yes. 1	792	79
	No 2	213	21
	(IF NO, GO TO NEXT SECTION)		
	DK . . . 8	0	
	RA . . . 9	0	
	NA . . . 0	1	
B5a. (IF YES) Where did you live before you moved into the home you have now ... Minneapolis, St. Paul, in the suburbs, or somewhere else?	Minneapolis. . . . 1	243	31
	St. Paul 2	133	17
	Suburbs. 3	378	48
	Somewhere else . . 4	39	5
	DK . . . 8	0	
	RA . . . 9	0	
	NA . . . 0	214	

B5b. (IF YES) How important was (READ LIST) as a reason for that move ... very important, somewhat important, or not very important?

		Very Imp 1	Somewhat Imp 2	Not Very Imp 3	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
B5b-1.	Having a different size home . .	.423 (54%)	140 (18%)	225 (29%)	4	0	214
B5b-2.	The quality of the school system	.234 (30%)	122 (16%)	422 (54%)	14	0	214
B5b-3.	A job change	. 96 (12%)	64 (8%)	621 (80%)	10	1	214
B5b-4.	The crime rate	.146 (19%)	142 (18%)	497 (63%)	6	1	214
B5b-5.	Neighborhood quality	.327 (42%)	227 (29%)	234 (30%)	4	1	214

C. TELEPHONE SERVICES

Now, I have a few questions about your home telephone use.

			Freq	Adj%
C1.	Has anyone in your household used your phone for an emergency of any kind in the past year? (PROBE: An emergency would be calling 911, the doctor, or whatever you consider an emergency.)	Yes 1	213	21
		No 2	793	79
		DK . . . 8	1	
		RA . . . 9	0	
C2.	Do you consider your local phone service essential as far as your job is concerned? (PROBE: Do you need to call or be called by your employer in order to do your job properly?)	Yes 1	572	57
		No 2	350	35
		Retired 3	71	7
		Unemployed 4	11	1
		DK . . . 8	3	
		RA . . . 9	0	

D. HUMAN SERVICES

Sometimes elderly or handicapped people need help from family or friends.

D1. Do you regularly provide unpaid help, such as personal care, errands or housework, for an elderly or handicapped person?

		Freq	Adj%
Yes	1	310	31
No	2	695	69
(IF NO, GO TO NEXT SECTION)			
DK	8	0	
RA	9	1	

D1a. (IF YES) Is this person your parent, spouse, child, or friend?

Parent	1	101	33
Spouse	2	2	1
Child	3	7	2
Friend	4	83	27
Other relative	5	61	20
In-law	6	15	5
Other	7	40	13
DK	8	1	
RA	9	1	
NA	0	696	

D1b. (IF YES) How many hours per week do you spend helping this person (these people)? (LESS THAN ONE HOUR = 001)

See Appendix A, page A-11.

E. SOLID WASTE

Now I have some questions about environmental issues.

E1. Have your children learned anything about trash disposal problems in school?

		Freq	Adj%
Yes	1	179	19
No	2	197	21
No school-age kids	3	267	28
No children	4	309	32
DK	8	54	
RA	9	0	

E1a. (IF YES) Was this learned in elementary school, junior high, or

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
E1a-1. Elementary school	121 (69%)	55 (31%)	3	0	827
E1a-2. Junior high	52 (30%)	122 (70%)	5	0	827
E1a-3. High school	46 (26%)	130 (74%)	4	0	827
E1a-4. Other	8 (4%)	169 (96%)	3	0	827

E2. Would you be willing to pay an additional dollar each month to have part of your garbage recycled or composted?

		Freq	Adj%
Yes	1	738	76
No	2	240	24
DK	8	25	
RA	9	3	

			Freq	Adj%
E3. Have you read or heard about the county composting sites, where you can drop off leaves and grass and pick up compost at no charge?	Yes	1	576	58
	No	2	426	42
	DK	8	4	
	RA	9	1	
E4. Do you have a yard?	Yes	1	804	80
	No	2	202	20
	(IF NO, GO TO E5)			
	DK	8	0	
	RA	9	0	

E4a. (IF YES) Are your leaves usually composted or put out with the garbage?

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
E4a-1 Left on ground . .	120 (15%)	672 (85%)	11	0	202
E4a-2 Composted.	249 (32%)	542 (68%)	13	0	202
E4a-3 Garbage.	417 (53%)	376 (47%)	11	0	202
E4a-4 Other.	56 (7%)	736 (93%)	11	0	202

			Freq	Adj%
E4a-1a (IF COMPOSTED) Is this on your property?	Yes	1	204	82
	No	2	44	18
	DK	8	2	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	757	

E4b. (IF YES) Are your grass clippings usually left on the ground, composted, or put out with the garbage?

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
E4b-1 Left on ground . .	398 (50%)	399 (50%)	7	0	202
E4b-2 Composted.	150 (19%)	646 (81%)	8	0	202
E4b-3 Garbage.	292 (37%)	505 (63%)	7	0	202
E4b-4 Other.	16 (2%)	781 (98%)	7	0	202

			Freq	Adj%
E4b-1a (IF COMPOSTED) Is this on your property?	Yes	1	136	91
	No	2	13	9
	DK	8	0	
	RA	9	1	
	NA	0	856	

			Freq	Adj%
E4c. (IF YES) Do you think that leaving grass clippings on your lawn would harm it, help it, or have no effect?	Harm it.	1	256	34
	Help it.	2	251	33
	No effect.	3	250	33
	DK . . .	8	45	
	RA . . .	9	1	
	NA . . .	0	202	

E4d. (IF YES) If your garbage hauler was no longer allowed to pick up your bagged leaves and grass clippings what would you do with them? (DO NOT READ LIST)

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
E4d-1. Mulch or leave on ground.	149 (20%)	581 (80%)	73	1	202
E4d-2. Put them in a backyard compost pile.	199 (27%)	530 (73%)	74	1	202
E4d-3. Take to compost center	182 (25%)	548 (75%)	73	1	202
E4d-4. Bag them and have someone else pick them up	53 (7%)	675 (93%)	75	1	202
E4d-5. Other.	225 (31%)	505 (69%)	73	1	202

			Freq	Adj%
E5. If your garbage hauler charged you for each bag or can, are there additional things you would do to reduce the amount of waste you put out for collection?	Yes.	1	556	57
	No	2	421	43
	(IF NO, GO TO E6)			
	DK . . .	8	27	0
	RA . . .	9	1	0

E5a. (IF YES) What additional things would you do? (DO NOT READ LIST)

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
E5a-1. Recycle	266 (51%)	252 (49%)	38	0	450
E5a-2. Take it to a landfill or transfer station	28 (5%)	489 (95%)	39	0	450
E5a-3. Dump it in a public waste container or take it to work to dump . .	26 (5%)	491 (95%)	39	0	450
E5a-4. Buy returnables	38 (7%)	479 (93%)	39	0	450
E5a-5. Get a trash compacter	165 (32%)	352 (68%)	39	0	450
E5a-6. Other	123 (24%)	394 (76%)	39	0	450

			Freq	Adj%
E6. What county do you live in?	Anoka	1	97	10
	Carver	2	13	1
	Dakota	3	113	11
	Hennepin	4	481	48
	Ramsey	5	203	20
	Scott	6	23	2
	Washington	7	76	8
	DK	8	0	
	RA	9	0	

(IF NOT RAMSEY OR WASHINGTON, GO TO NEXT SECTION)

			Freq	Adj%
E6a. (IF RAMSEY OR WASHINGTON) Have you read or heard about your county's plans to build a trash-processing plant in Newport?	Yes	1	117	42
	No	2	159	58
	DK	8	4	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	727	
E6a-1. (IF YES) There has been some confusion about what this plant will actually do. Is it your understanding that this plant will burn trash on-site or shred trash into fuel to be burned elsewhere?	Burn on-site	1	35	46
	Shred into fuel	2	42	54
	DK	8	40	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	889	
E6a-2. (IF YES) Do you feel there will still be a need to recycle at home once this trash-processing plant is operating?	Yes	1	76	81
	No	2	17	19
	DK	8	24	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	889	

F. REFUGE LANDS

The next questions are about some land which is a National Wildlife Refuge along the Mississippi River. The refuge has public docks and the government has also issued permits to nearby landowners for private boat docks. The government wants to allow recreation on this land while still protecting fish and wildlife habitat.

			Freq	Adj%
F1.	Should there be any more public or private boat docks in this refuge?	Yes 1	204	24
		No 2	651	76
		(IF NO, GO TO F2)		
		DK . . . 8	142	
		RA . . . 9	9	
F1a.	(IF YES) Should the government issue more private boat dock permits, or build more public docks?	Private permits. . 1	43	21
		Public docks . . . 2	144	71
		Both 3	14	7
		Either 4	2	1
		Neither. 5	0	0
		DK . . . 8	2	
		RA . . . 9	0	
		NA . . . 0	802	
F1a-1.	(IF PRIVATE, BOTH, OR EITHER) Should each private dock be used by a single family, or should it be shared by several families?	Single family dock 1	14	27
		Several families . 2	38	73
		DK . . . 8	8	
		RA . . . 9	0	
		NA . . . 0	947	
F1b.	(IF YES) Should dock permits be issued for wherever they are requested, or only in designated areas?	Wherever requested 1	39	21
		Designated areas . 2	150	79
		DK . . . 8	15	
		RA . . . 9	0	
		NA . . . 0	802	
F2.	Should this federally-owned land now being used for private docks be transferred to private owners, or not?	Yes 1	154	17
		No 2	758	83
		DK . . . 8	85	
		RA . . . 9	9	
F3.	Have you personally visited the Mississippi River for any sort of recreation in the last 12 months?	Yes 1	486	49
		No 2	515	51
		DK . . . 8	3	
		RA . . . 9	3	

G. POLICE

The next questions deal with police departments.

			Freq	Adj%
G1.	Do you agree or disagree that your police department INVESTIGATES citizen complaints about its police officers thoroughly and impartially? Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?	Strongly agree . . 1	96	11
		Agree. 2	567	65
		Disagree 3	154	18
		Strongly disagree. 4	52	6
		DK . . . 8	130	
		RA . . . 9	9	
G2.	If a police officer in your city were found guilty of misconduct, would the police department discipline the police officer very leniently, leniently, severely, or very severely?	Very leniently . . 1	42	5
		Leniently. 2	342	42
		Severely 3	373	46
		Very severely. . . 4	58	7
		DK . . . 8	183	
		RA . . . 9	8	
G3.	Does your city have a Police Review Panel? For example, a panel that includes civilians and which oversees your police department's investigation of complaints about its officers? (IF ASKED, SAY "THE POLICE REVIEW PANEL IS MADE UP OF POLICE AND CIVILIANS")	Yes. 1	202	57
		No 2	152	43
		(IF NO, GO TO NEXT SECTION)		
		DK . . . 8	649	
		RA . . . 9	3	
G3a.	(IF YES) Does the police review panel give you a lot more, a little more, or less CONFIDENCE that your police department will thoroughly and impartially investigate citizen complaints about its officers?	A lot more 1	76	39
		A little more. . . 2	105	55
		Less 3	12	6
		DK . . . 8	10	
		RA . . . 9	0	
		NA . . . 0	804	

H. DEMOGRAPHICS

Before ending this survey there are a few remaining background questions.

H1.	What is the name of the city or township you live in?	**See Appendix A, page A-11.**		
H2.	What is your zip code?	**See Appendix A, page A-14.**		
H3.	What is your current marital status? (DO NOT READ LIST)	Married. 1	604	60
		Single 2	298	30
		Divorced 3	45	4
		Separated. 4	9	1
		Widowed. 5	44	4
		DK . . . 8	3	
		RA . . . 9	3	
H4.	What year were you born?	**See Appendix A, page A-17.**		

			Freq	Adj%
H5. What is the highest level of school you have completed? (DO NOT READ LIST)	Less than high school	.01	15	2
	Some high school. . .	.02	53	5
	High school graduate.	.03	285	28
	Some technical school	.04	40	4
	Technical school grad	.05	69	7
	Some college.	.06	226	22
	College graduate. . .	.07	232	23
	Post graduate or professional degree.	.08	84	8
	Other	.09	0	0
	DK . .	.88	0	
	RA . .	.99	3	
H6. What race do you consider yourself? (DO NOT READ LIST, BUT CODE THE FOLLOWING)				
	White/Caucasian.	.01	939	94
	Mexican/Hispanic	.02	5	0
	Black/Negro.	.03	21	2
	American Indian/Native American.	.04	2	0
	Oriental	.05	6	1
	Mixed, no dominant racial identification	.06	4	0
	Other.	.07	22	2
	DK . .	.88	1	
	RA . .	.99	6	
H7. Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?	Republican	1	242	25
	Democrat	2	362	37
	Independent. . . .	3	351	36
	Other.	4	15	2
	DK . . .	8	9	
	RA . . .	9	27	
H8. Do you have a home computer?	Yes.	1	197	20
	No	2	805	80
	DK . . .	8	0	
	RA . . .	9	4	
H9. Did you have a paying job last week?	Yes.	1	776	77
	No	2	228	23
	(IF NO, GO TO H9c)			
	DK . . .	8	0	
	RA . . .	9	2	
H9a. (IF YES) Were you working full-time or part-time?	Full-time.	1	587	76
	Part-time.	2	188	24
	DK . . .	8	0	
	RA . . .	9	1	
	NA . . .	0	230	

H9b. (IF YES) What is your main occupation? What kind of work do you do?

		Freq	Adj%
Managerial/Professional	1	154	20
Technical, Sales, Admin.	2	360	47
Service	3	78	10
Farming, Forestry, Fishing	4	4	0
Precision Production/Craft & Repair	5	81	11
Operators, Fabricators, Laborers	6	93	12
DK	8	0	
RA	9	7	
NA	0	230	

(IF WORKING LAST WEEK, GO TO H10)

H9c. (IF NO) Do you consider yourself: (READ LIST)?

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
H9c-1 Unemployed	46 (20%)	181 (80%)	0	1	778
H9c-2 A student	34 (15%)	193 (85%)	0	1	778
H9c-3 A homemaker	90 (40%)	137 (60%)	0	1	778
H9c-4 Retired	115 (51%)	112 (49%)	0	1	778

H10. How many people are living in your household now including yourself?

See Appendix A, page A-19.

(IF LIVE ALONE, GO TO H12)

H10a. (IF MORE THAN ONE) How many of these are under 18?

See Appendix A, page A-19.

H10b. (IF MORE THAN ONE) Is everyone in your household related to you in some way?

		Freq	Adj%
Yes	1	786	86
(IF YES, GO TO H11)			
No	2	126	14
DK	8	0	
RA	9	0	
NA	0	94	0

H10b-1 (IF NO) How many persons are not related to you in any way?

See Appendix A, page A-19.

Now I'd like to know the employment status of the person in your household who contributed most to the household income in 1985.

H11. Is this person you or someone else in your household?

		Freq	Adj%
Respondent	1	456	51
(IF RESPONDENT, GO TO H12)			
Someone else	2	437	49
Someone no longer in household	3	7	1
(IF NOT IN HH, GO TO H12)			
DK	8	5	
RA	9	10	
NA	0	91	

			Freq	Adj%
H11a. (IF SOMEONE ELSE) Did this person have a paying job last week?	Yes	1	383	88
	No	2	53	12
	(IF NO, GO TO H11a-3)			
	DK	8	2	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	569	
H11a-1 (IF YES) Were they working full-time or part-time?	Full-time	1	368	96
	Part-time	2	15	4
	DK	8	0	
	RA	9	0	
	NA	0	623	
H11a-2 (IF YES) What is their main occupation? What kind of work do they do?				
	Managerial/Professional	1	105	28
	Technical, Sales, Admin.	2	135	36
	Service	3	17	5
	Farming, Forestry, Fishing	4	3	1
	Precision Production/Craft & Repair	5	60	16
	Operators, Fabricators, Laborers	6	55	15
	DK	8	4	
	RA	9	4	
	NA	0	623	

H11a-3 (IF NO) Are they: (READ LIST)?

	Yes 1	No 2	DK 8	RA 9	NA 0
H9c-1 Unemployed	7 (14%)	46 (86%)	0	0	953
H9c-2 A student	1 (2%)	52 (98%)	0	0	953
H9c-3 A homemaker	5 (10%)	48 (90%)	0	0	953
H9c-4 Retired	42 (80%)	11 (20%)	0	0	953

		Freq	Adj%
H12. Was your total household income in 1985 above or below $20,000?	Above. 1	736	79
	Below. 2	196	21
	(IF BELOW, GO TO H12b)		
	DK . . . 8	27	
	RA . . . 9	47	
	(IF DK OR RA, GO TO H13)		
H12a. (IF ABOVE $20,000) I am going to mention a number of income categories. When I come to the category which describes your total household income before taxes in 1985, please stop me.	20 to 25,000 . . .25	86	12
	25 to 30,000 . . .30	102	15
	30 to 35,000 . . .35	133	19
	35 to 40,000 . . .40	111	16
	40 to 50,000 . . .50	84	12
	50 to 60,000 . . .60	64	9
	60,000 or more . .61	106	16
	DK . . .88	10	
	RA . . .99	41	
	NA . . .00	270	
H12b. (IF BELOW $20,000) I am going to to mention a number of income categories. When I come to the category which describes your total household income before taxes in 1985, please stop me.	Under 5,000. . . .05	13	7
	5 to 10,000. . . .10	34	19
	10 to 15,000 . . .15	68	38
	15 to 20,000 . . .20	64	36
	DK . . .88	11	
	RA . . .99	8	
	NA . . .00	810	

This income figure you just gave me includes the income of everyone who was living in your household in 1985. Is that correct? (IF NO, REPEAT QUESTION 12)

H13. How many persons in the household received earnings or income that was part of the total household income you gave me for 1985?

See Appendix A, page A-20.

(ASK ONLY IF UNSURE) **H14.** Respondent is	Male 1	453	45
	Female 2	553	55

Thank you for answering all these questions. I really appreciate your time.

(IF A RESPONDENT ASKS FOR TCAS RESULTS, HAVE THEM CONTACT ROSSANA ARMSON AT 627-4282.)

COMMENTS:

M-70/TCAS86.CDB

APPENDIX A: Frequency Counts of Administrative, Continuous, and Open-Ended Variables

Directory of Appendix A

DOC Date of completion

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1105	24	2.4	2.4	2.4
	1106	22	2.2	2.2	4.6
	1107	38	3.8	3.8	8.4
	1108	29	2.9	2.9	11.3
	1109	45	4.5	4.5	15.8
	1110	65	6.5	6.5	22.3
	1111	51	5.1	5.1	27.4
	1112	37	3.7	3.7	31.1
	1113	28	2.8	2.8	33.9
	1114	32	3.1	3.1	37.0
	1115	47	4.6	4.6	41.7
	1116	27	2.7	2.7	44.4
	1117	75	7.4	7.4	51.8
	1118	61	6.1	6.1	57.9
	1119	60	6.0	6.0	63.9
	1120	26	2.6	2.6	66.6
	1121	15	1.5	1.5	68.1
	1122	44	4.4	4.4	72.5
	1123	35	3.5	3.5	76.0
	1124	57	5.7	5.7	81.7
	1125	54	5.4	5.4	87.1
	1126	19	1.9	1.9	89.0
	1127	2	.2	.2	89.1
	1128	9	.9	.9	90.0
	1129	5	.5	.5	90.5
	1130	9	.9	.9	91.3
	1201	16	1.6	1.6	92.9
	1204	8	.8	.8	93.6
	1205	1	.1	.1	93.7
	1215	2	.2	.2	93.9
	1216	4	.4	.4	94.3
	1217	6	.6	.6	94.8
	1218	6	.6	.6	95.4
	1219	6	.6	.6	96.0
	1220	1	.1	.1	96.1
	1222	3	.3	.3	96.4
	1223	2	.2	.2	96.5
	1226	2	.2	.2	96.7
	1227	1	.1	.1	96.8
	1228	14	1.4	1.4	98.2
	1229	12	1.2	1.2	99.4
	1230	6	.6	.6	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

NMIN **Number of minutes the interview took**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	5	1	.1	.1	.1
	7	2	.2	.2	.3
	8	15	1.5	1.5	1.8
	9	39	3.8	3.8	5.6
	10	166	16.5	16.5	22.1
	11	103	10.3	10.3	32.4
	12	141	14.0	14.0	46.4
	13	135	13.4	13.4	59.7
	14	72	7.1	7.1	66.9
	15	136	13.5	13.5	80.4
	16	58	5.8	5.8	86.2
	17	37	3.7	3.7	89.8
	18	24	2.4	2.4	92.2
	19	15	1.5	1.5	93.7
	20	21	2.1	2.1	95.9
	21	5	.5	.5	96.4
	22	5	.5	.5	96.9
	23	7	.7	.7	97.5
	24	5	.5	.5	98.0
	25	4	.4	.4	98.4
	26	5	.5	.5	98.8
	27	4	.4	.4	99.2
	28	3	.3	.3	99.4
	30	2	.2	.2	99.6
	33	1	.1	.1	99.7
	35	2	.2	.2	99.8
	38	2	.2	.2	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean 13.448 Median 13.000 Mode 10.000

IID Interviewer ID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	30	3.0	3.0	3.0
	2	58	5.8	5.8	8.8
	4	8	.8	.8	9.5
	5	21	2.1	2.1	11.6
	7	19	1.9	1.9	13.5
	8	25	2.5	2.5	16.0
	9	8	.8	.8	16.8
	10	29	2.9	2.9	19.7
	11	24	2.4	2.4	22.1
	12	24	2.4	2.4	24.5
	13	10	1.0	1.0	25.5
	14	23	2.3	2.3	27.8
	15	49	4.8	4.8	32.6
	16	32	3.1	3.1	35.8
	18	114	11.3	11.3	47.1
	19	13	1.3	1.3	48.4
	20	54	5.4	5.4	53.7
	21	55	5.5	5.5	59.2
	22	19	1.9	1.9	61.1
	23	40	3.9	3.9	65.1
	24	3	.3	.3	65.3
	25	21	2.1	2.1	67.4
	26	59	5.9	5.9	73.3
	27	44	4.4	4.4	77.7
	28	36	3.6	3.6	81.3
	29	44	4.3	4.3	85.6
	30	39	3.9	3.9	89.5
	31	14	1.4	1.4	90.9
	32	39	3.8	3.8	94.7
	35	32	3.1	3.1	97.8
	36	22	2.2	2.2	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

NCON Number of contacts

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	361	35.9	35.9	35.9
	2	200	19.9	19.9	55.8
	3	157	15.6	15.6	71.4
	4	101	10.1	10.1	81.4
	5	42	4.1	4.1	85.6
	6	43	4.3	4.3	89.8
	7	30	3.0	3.0	92.9
	8	23	2.3	2.3	95.2
	9	7	.7	.7	95.9
	10	5	.5	.5	96.4
	11	11	1.1	1.1	97.4
	12	8	.8	.8	98.2
	13	4	.4	.4	98.6
	14	4	.4	.4	99.0
	15	4	.4	.4	99.3
	16	5	.5	.5	99.8
	18	1	.1	.1	99.9
	19	1	.1	.1	99.9
	24	1	.1	.1	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.082 Median 2.000 Mode 1.000

CID Coder ID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	5	.5	.5	.5
	11	68	6.8	6.8	7.2
	12	22	2.2	2.2	9.4
	15	7	.7	.7	10.1
	20	88	8.7	8.7	18.8
	21	20	2.0	2.0	20.9
	22	4	.4	.4	21.3
	23	2	.2	.2	21.4
	26	120	12.0	12.0	33.4
	31	9	.9	.9	34.3
	33	650	64.6	64.6	98.9
	45	8	.8	.8	99.6
	65	4	.4	.4	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

PHCHANGE Has phone number changed?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	65	6.4	6.4	6.4
No	2	941	93.6	93.6	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

A2 Most important issue in Twin Cities area

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Unemployment	1	126	12.5	13.8	13.8
State taxes	2	126	12.5	13.8	27.7
Federal Taxes	3	10	1.0	1.1	28.7
Taxes-unspecified	4	29	2.9	3.2	32.0
Nuclear war	5	13	1.3	1.5	33.4
Environment	6	78	7.7	8.5	41.9
Education	7	20	2.0	2.2	44.2
Crime	8	160	15.9	17.5	61.7
Traffic	9	9	.9	.9	62.6
Hunger	10	5	.5	.5	63.1
Family behavior	11	10	1.0	1.1	64.2
Alcohol & drugs	12	20	2.0	2.2	66.4
Welfare	13	12	1.2	1.3	67.8
Housing	14	18	1.8	2.0	69.8
Economy	15	61	6.1	6.7	76.5
Homeless	16	27	2.7	3.0	79.5
Transportation	18	36	3.6	4.0	83.5
Airport noise	19	1	.1	.1	83.6
Aids	20	11	1.1	1.2	84.8
The elderly	22	2	.2	.2	85.1
Pornography	23	2	.2	.2	85.3
Government	24	21	2.1	2.3	87.6
Poverty	26	9	.9	.9	88.6
Growth	27	15	1.5	1.6	90.2
Abortion	29	7	.7	.7	90.9
Weather	30	20	2.0	2.2	93.1
Maintain qual life	31	8	.8	.9	94.0
Farmers situation	32	5	.5	.5	94.5
Other (not listed above)	77	50	4.9	5.5	100.0
RA	99	95	9.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

A3A Other issues facing Twin Cities area today

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Unemployment	1	68	6.8	8.9	8.9
State taxes	2	74	7.3	9.6	18.5
Federal Taxes	3	5	.5	.6	19.1
Taxes-unspecified	4	40	3.9	5.2	24.2
Nuclear war	5	6	.6	.8	25.0
Environment	6	101	10.0	13.1	38.1
Education	7	33	3.2	4.2	42.4
Crime	8	116	11.5	15.1	57.4
Traffic	9	7	.7	.9	58.3
Hunger	10	2	.2	.3	58.6
Family behavior	11	16	1.6	2.1	60.6
Alcohol & drugs	12	18	1.8	2.3	62.9
Welfare	13	13	1.3	1.7	64.6
Housing	14	29	2.9	3.8	68.4
Economy	15	49	4.8	6.4	74.8
Homeless	16	12	1.2	1.6	76.4
Transportation	18	46	4.6	6.0	82.4
Airport noise	19	5	.5	.7	83.1
Aids	20	7	.7	.9	83.9
Health Care	21	3	.3	.3	84.2
The elderly	22	8	.8	1.1	85.3
Pornography	23	3	.3	.4	85.7
Government	24	20	2.0	2.6	88.3
Poverty	26	8	.8	1.0	89.3
Growth	27	13	1.3	1.7	90.9
Abortion	29	8	.8	1.0	91.9
Weather	30	14	1.4	1.9	93.8
Maintain qual life	31	7	.7	.9	94.6
Farmers situation	32	5	.5	.6	95.2
Other (not listed above)	77	37	3.6	4.8	100.0
RA	99	238	23.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

A3B Other issues facing Twin Cities area today

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Unemployment	1	23	2.3	2.3	2.3
State taxes	2	18	1.8	1.8	4.1
Federal Taxes	3	8	.8	.8	4.8
Taxes-unspecified	4	10	1.0	1.0	5.9
Nuclear war	5	6	.6	.6	6.4
Environment	6	32	3.1	3.1	9.5
Education	7	14	1.4	1.4	11.0
Crime	8	25	2.5	2.5	13.5
Traffic	9	5	.5	.5	13.9
Hunger	10	1	.1	.1	14.0
Family behavior	11	6	.6	.6	14.6
Alcohol & drugs	12	5	.5	.5	15.1
Welfare	13	9	.9	.9	15.9
Housing	14	5	.5	.5	16.4
Economy	15	14	1.4	1.4	17.8
Homeless	16	14	1.4	1.4	19.1
Transportation	18	6	.6	.6	19.7
Airport noise	19	5	.5	.5	20.2
Aids	20	5	.5	.5	20.7
Health Care	21	2	.2	.2	20.9
The elderly	22	4	.4	.4	21.2
Pornography	23	2	.2	.2	21.4
Government	24	7	.7	.7	22.1
Poverty	26	2	.2	.2	22.3
Growth	27	9	.9	.9	23.2
Abortion	29	1	.1	.1	23.3
Weather	30	3	.3	.3	23.5
Maintain qual life	31	4	.4	.4	23.9
Other (not listed above)	77	11	1.1	1.1	24.9
RA	99	755	75.1	75.1	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

B3B What prevents you from moving now?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Financial reasons	1	164	16.3	74.4	74.4
Family behavior	2	14	1.4	6.5	80.8
House being built	3	3	.3	1.2	82.0
On a waiting list	4	1	.1	.2	82.2
Responsibility	5	1	.1	.5	82.7
Afraid of change	6	1	.1	.2	82.9
Can't find house	7	4	.4	1.8	84.8
Other (not listed above)	8	3	.3	1.4	86.1
Nothing	66	30	3.0	13.9	100.0
RA	99	786	78.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

B4 Number of years in current home

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	279	27.7	27.9	27.9
	2	81	8.1	8.1	36.0
	3	74	7.3	7.4	43.4
	4	36	3.6	3.6	47.0
	5	35	3.4	3.5	50.5
	6	29	2.9	2.9	53.4
	7	38	3.7	3.8	57.1
	8	30	3.0	3.0	60.2
	9	24	2.4	2.4	62.6
	10	43	4.2	4.3	66.9
	11	10	1.0	1.0	67.8
	12	24	2.4	2.4	70.3
	13	19	1.9	1.9	72.2
	14	10	1.0	1.0	73.1
	15	25	2.5	2.5	75.7
	16	11	1.1	1.1	76.8
	17	18	1.8	1.8	78.6
	18	15	1.5	1.5	80.1
	19	8	.8	.8	80.8
	20	32	3.2	3.2	84.0
	21	10	1.0	1.0	85.0
	22	14	1.4	1.4	86.4
	23	5	.5	.5	86.8
	24	16	1.6	1.6	88.5
	25	26	2.6	2.6	91.1

B4 Number of years in current home (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	26	11	1.1	1.1	92.2
	27	9	.9	.9	93.1
	28	9	.9	.9	94.0
	29	4	.4	.4	94.3
	30	13	1.3	1.3	95.6
	31	6	.6	.6	96.2
	32	2	.2	.2	96.4
	33	3	.3	.3	96.7
	34	3	.3	.3	97.0
	35	7	.7	.7	97.6
	36	7	.7	.7	98.3
	37	3	.3	.3	98.6
	38	2	.2	.2	98.8
	39	2	.2	.2	99.0
	40	6	.6	.6	99.5
	45	1	.1	.1	99.6
	46	1	.1	.1	99.6
	50	1	.1	.1	99.7
	56	1	.1	.1	99.8
	60	1	.1	.1	99.9
	82	1	.1	.1	100.0
RA	99	6	.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	9.589	Median	5.000	Mode	1.000
Std Dev	10.333	Variance	106.781		

D1B How many hours per week spent helping

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	64	6.3	21.3	21.3
	2	60	6.0	20.2	41.5
	3	31	3.1	10.4	51.9
	4	20	2.0	6.6	58.5
	5	24	2.4	8.0	66.5
	6	12	1.2	3.9	70.4
	7	8	.8	2.6	73.0
	8	9	.9	2.9	75.9
	9	1	.1	.3	76.2
	10	22	2.2	7.3	83.5
	11	1	.1	.3	83.8
	12	7	.7	2.4	86.2
	14	3	.3	1.0	87.2
	15	9	.9	2.9	90.1
	16	3	.3	.9	91.0
	20	11	1.1	3.6	94.6
	24	1	.1	.3	94.9
	25	2	.2	.5	95.4
	30	3	.3	.9	96.3
	40	2	.2	.5	96.8
	42	2	.2	.7	97.4
	48	2	.2	.7	98.1
	60	1	.1	.3	98.5
	168	5	.5	1.5	100.0
	999	707	70.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	8.806	Median	3.000	Mode	1.000
Std Dev	21.513	Variance	462.804		

H1 City or township of residence

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	13	1.3	1.3	1.3
	33	1	.1	.1	1.4
	83	9	.9	.9	2.3
	104	16	1.6	1.6	3.8
	124	11	1.1	1.1	4.9
	233	2	.2	.2	5.1
	243	2	.2	.2	5.3
	314	12	1.2	1.2	6.4
Bloomington	334	39	3.8	3.8	10.3
	394	18	1.8	1.8	12.1

H1 City or township of residence (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Brooklyn Park	404	18	1.8	1.8	13.9
	434	23	2.3	2.3	16.2
	503	7	.7	.7	16.9
	513	2	.2	.2	17.1
	523	5	.5	.5	17.5
	563	5	.5	.5	18.0
	634	9	.9	.9	18.9
	644	18	1.8	1.8	20.6
	653	1	.1	.1	20.7
	664	14	1.4	1.4	22.1
	704	8	.8	.8	22.9
	733	3	.3	.3	23.2
	743	3	.3	.3	23.5
	804	19	1.9	1.9	25.4
	823	2	.2	.2	25.6
	844	11	1.1	1.1	26.6
Edina	864	25	2.5	2.5	29.2
	923	2	.2	.2	29.4
	983	3	.3	.3	29.6
	1013	7	.7	.7	30.3
	1044	12	1.2	1.2	31.5
	1104	12	1.2	1.2	32.8
	1173	4	.4	.4	33.2
	1194	5	.5	.5	33.7
	1254	8	.8	.8	34.5
	1293	2	.2	.2	34.7
	1313	3	.3	.3	35.0
	1334	10	1.0	1.0	35.9
	1363	2	.2	.2	36.1
	1433	4	.4	.4	36.5
	1452	5	.5	.5	37.0
	1474	8	.8	.8	37.8
	1492	1	.1	.1	37.9
	1563	2	.2	.2	38.1
	1583	5	.5	.5	38.5
	1602	3	.3	.3	38.8
	1673	1	.1	.1	38.9
	1694	17	1.7	1.7	40.6
	1734	16	1.6	1.6	42.2
	1744	1	.1	.1	42.3

H1 City or township of residence (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1753	1	.1	.1	42.4
	1773	3	.3	.3	42.7
Minneapolis	1794	186	18.5	18.6	61.2
	1814	18	1.8	1.8	63.0
	1823	1	.1	.1	63.1
	1903	6	.6	.6	63.7
	1914	2	.2	.2	63.9
	1954	7	.7	.7	64.6
	1964	9	.9	.9	65.4
	1973	3	.3	.3	65.7
	2053	1	.1	.1	65.8
	2064	7	.7	.7	66.5
	2084	4	.4	.4	66.9
	2113	2	.2	.2	67.0
	2143	1	.1	.1	67.1
	2264	14	1.4	1.4	68.5
	2293	7	.7	.7	69.2
	2314	5	.5	.5	69.7
Richfield	2364	23	2.3	2.3	71.9
	2374	9	.9	.9	72.8
	2413	7	.7	.7	73.5
	2424	20	2.0	2.0	75.5
	2453	6	.6	.6	76.1
Richfield	2514	27	2.7	2.7	78.8
St Louis Park	2534	118	11.8	11.8	90.5
	2543	4	.4	.4	91.0
	2623	12	1.2	1.2	92.1
	2644	9	.9	.9	93.0
	2653	5	.5	.5	93.4
	2704	10	1.0	1.0	94.4
	2733	4	.4	.4	94.8
	2794	14	1.4	1.4	96.2
	2863	3	.3	.3	96.5
	2872	1	.1	.1	96.6
	2903	1	.1	.1	96.7
	2962	1	.1	.1	96.7
	2983	2	.2	.2	96.9
	3004	13	1.3	1.3	98.2
	3024	11	1.1	1.1	99.3
	3094	7	.7	.7	100.0
	9999	1	.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

H2 Respondent's zip code

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	55001	1	.1	.1	.1
	55003	2	.2	.2	.3
	55005	1	.1	.1	.4
	55011	4	.4	.4	.8
	55014	9	.9	.9	1.7
	55016	14	1.4	1.4	3.1
	55017	2	.2	.2	3.3
	55020	1	.1	.1	3.4
	55024	3	.3	.3	3.6
	55025	7	.7	.7	4.4
	55033	7	.7	.7	5.1
	55038	2	.2	.2	5.3
	55042	4	.4	.4	5.6
	55043	2	.2	.2	5.8
	55044	6	.6	.6	6.4
	55047	3	.3	.3	6.7
	55055	3	.3	.3	6.9
	55068	9	.9	.9	7.8
	55071	5	.5	.5	8.3
	55075	20	2.0	2.0	10.3
	55082	16	1.6	1.6	11.9
	55092	2	.2	.2	12.1
	55101	6	.6	.6	12.7
	55102	5	.5	.5	13.2
	55103	8	.8	.8	14.0
	55104	17	1.7	1.7	15.7
	55105	10	1.0	1.0	16.7
	55106	28	2.8	2.8	19.5
	55107	5	.5	.5	20.0
	55108	9	.9	.9	20.9
	55109	16	1.6	1.6	22.5
	55110	18	1.8	1.8	24.4
	55112	8	.8	.8	25.2
	55113	20	2.0	2.0	27.2
	55115	1	.1	.1	27.3
	55116	12	1.2	1.2	28.5
	55117	14	1.4	1.4	29.9
	55118	16	1.6	1.6	31.5
	55119	14	1.4	1.4	32.9
	55120	1	.1	.1	33.0

H2 **Respondent's zip code** (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	55121	5	.5	.5	33.5
	55122	9	.9	.9	34.4
	55123	5	.5	.5	34.9
	55124	10	1.0	1.0	35.9
	55125	7	.7	.7	36.6
	55126	10	1.0	1.0	37.6
	55204	2	.2	.2	37.8
	55301	1	.1	.1	37.9
	55303	19	1.9	1.9	39.8
	55304	8	.8	.8	40.6
	55311	1	.1	.1	40.7
	55313	1	.1	.1	40.8
	55316	7	.7	.7	41.5
	55317	1	.1	.1	41.6
	55318	7	.7	.7	42.3
	55322	1	.1	.1	42.3
	55323	1	.1	.1	42.4
	55327	1	.1	.1	42.5
	55331	7	.7	.7	43.2
	55337	22	2.2	2.2	45.4
	55338	2	.2	.2	45.6
	55340	2	.2	.2	45.8
	55343	13	1.3	1.3	47.0
	55344	11	1.1	1.1	48.1
	55345	13	1.3	1.3	49.4
	55352	1	.1	.1	49.5
	55356	3	.3	.3	49.8
	55359	3	.3	.3	50.1
	55364	8	.8	.8	50.9
	55369	20	2.0	2.0	52.9
	55372	8	.8	.8	53.6
	55375	2	.2	.2	53.8
	55379	12	1.2	1.2	55.0
	55386	1	.1	.1	55.1
	55387	1	.1	.1	55.2
	55388	1	.1	.1	55.2
	55391	4	.4	.4	55.6
	55402	1	.1	.1	55.7
	55403	5	.5	.5	56.2
	55404	7	.7	.7	56.9

H2 Respondent's zip code (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	55405	6	.6	.6	57.5
	55406	21	2.1	2.1	59.5
	55407	17	1.7	1.7	61.2
	55408	13	1.3	1.3	62.5
	55409	20	2.0	2.0	64.5
	55410	10	1.0	1.0	65.5
	55411	19	1.9	1.9	67.4
	55412	7	.7	.7	68.1
	55413	9	.9	.9	69.0
	55414	12	1.2	1.2	70.2
	55416	21	2.1	2.1	72.3
	55417	8	.8	.8	73.1
	55418	19	1.9	1.9	75.0
	55419	12	1.2	1.2	76.2
	55420	18	1.8	1.8	78.0
	55421	10	1.0	1.0	79.0
	55422	13	1.3	1.3	80.3
	55423	23	2.3	2.3	82.6
	55424	6	.6	.6	83.2
	55426	12	1.2	1.2	84.4
	55427	9	.9	.9	85.3
	55428	15	1.5	1.5	86.8
	55429	11	1.1	1.1	87.9
	55430	14	1.4	1.4	89.3
	55431	9	.9	.9	90.1
	55432	18	1.8	1.8	91.9
	55433	18	1.8	1.8	93.7
	55434	10	1.0	1.0	94.6
	55435	8	.8	.8	95.4
	55436	8	.8	.8	96.2
	55437	9	.9	.9	97.0
	55438	4	.4	.4	97.4
	55439	1	.1	.1	97.5
	55441	4	.4	.4	97.9
	55442	1	.1	.1	98.0
	55443	7	.7	.7	98.6
	55444	3	.3	.3	98.9
	55445	3	.3	.3	99.2
	55447	7	.7	.7	99.9
	55504	1	.1	.1	100.0
RA	999	3	.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

H4 Year of birth

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	894	1	.1	.1	.1
	895	1	.1	.1	.2
	897	1	.1	.1	.3
	899	1	.1	.1	.4
	900	1	.1	.1	.5
	902	3	.3	.3	.7
	903	1	.1	.1	.8
	904	3	.3	.3	1.0
	905	5	.5	.5	1.5
	906	1	.1	.1	1.6
	907	1	.1	.1	1.7
	908	4	.4	.4	2.1
	909	6	.6	.6	2.7
	910	3	.3	.3	3.0
	911	4	.4	.4	3.4
	912	3	.3	.3	3.7
	913	6	.6	.6	4.3
	914	4	.4	.4	4.7
	915	2	.2	.2	4.9
	916	7	.7	.7	5.6
	917	8	.8	.8	6.4
	918	7	.7	.7	7.1
	919	8	.8	.8	7.9
	920	8	.8	.8	8.7
	921	8	.8	.8	9.5
	922	5	.5	.5	10.0
	923	14	1.4	1.4	11.5
	924	14	1.4	1.4	12.9
	925	13	1.3	1.3	14.2
	926	9	.9	.9	15.1
	927	15	1.5	1.5	16.6
	928	11	1.1	1.1	17.6
	929	12	1.2	1.2	18.8
	930	14	1.4	1.4	20.2
	931	10	1.0	1.0	21.2
	932	12	1.2	1.2	22.4
	933	15	1.5	1.5	23.9
	934	7	.7	.7	24.6
	935	12	1.2	1.2	25.8
	936	7	.7	.7	26.5

H4 Year of birth (continued)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	937	7	.7	.7	27.2
	938	9	.9	.9	28.1
	939	20	2.0	2.0	30.1
	940	14	1.4	1.4	31.5
	941	15	1.5	1.5	33.0
	942	23	2.3	2.4	35.4
	943	12	1.2	1.2	36.6
	944	10	1.0	1.0	37.6
	945	20	2.0	2.0	39.6
	946	25	2.5	2.6	42.2
	947	26	2.6	2.6	44.8
	948	14	1.4	1.4	46.2
	949	18	1.8	1.8	48.1
	950	26	2.6	2.6	50.7
	951	25	2.5	2.5	53.2
	952	27	2.7	2.8	55.9
	953	34	3.3	3.4	59.3
	954	19	1.9	1.9	61.2
	955	28	2.8	2.9	64.1
	956	25	2.5	2.6	66.7
	957	29	2.9	2.9	69.6
	958	32	3.2	3.2	72.8
	959	41	4.0	4.1	76.9
	960	44	4.4	4.4	81.3
	961	33	3.3	3.3	84.7
	962	27	2.7	2.7	87.4
	963	15	1.5	1.5	88.9
	964	24	2.4	2.5	91.4
	965	26	2.6	2.6	94.0
	966	20	2.0	2.0	96.0
	967	19	1.9	1.9	97.9
	968	20	2.0	2.0	99.9
	969	1	.1	.1	100.0
RA	999	12	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

H10 Number living in respondent's household

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Live alone	1	91	9.0	9.1	9.1
	2	334	33.2	33.3	42.4
	3	260	25.8	25.9	68.3
	4	212	21.1	21.2	89.5
	5	69	6.8	6.8	96.3
	6	27	2.7	2.7	99.0
	8	1	.1	.1	99.1
	9	5	.5	.5	99.6
	10	2	.2	.2	99.8
	16	2	.2	.2	100.0
RA	99	3	.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.990 Median 3.000 Mode 2.000

H10A Number in household under 18

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	184	18.3	20.2	20.2
	2	153	15.2	16.8	36.9
	3	45	4.4	4.9	41.8
	4	11	1.1	1.2	43.1
	5	3	.3	.3	43.3
	6	4	.4	.4	43.8
None	77	513	51.0	56.2	100.0
RA	99	94	9.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

H10B1 Number in HH not related to respondent

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	78	7.8	62.6	62.6
	2	31	3.1	24.8	87.4
	3	11	1.1	8.5	95.9
	4	3	.3	2.4	98.4
	15	2	.2	1.6	100.0
RA	99	881	87.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

H13 Number contributing to 1985 HH income

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	323	32.1	33.2	33.2
	2	544	54.1	56.1	89.3
	3	82	8.2	8.5	97.8
	4	19	1.9	2.0	99.8
	5	2	.2	.2	100.0
RA	99	36	3.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.798 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

M-70/APPA.T86

APPENDIX B: Definitions and Distributions of Constructed Variables in Data File

Certain variables have been constructed for the convenience of the user, and to aid interpretations of the variables used in this codebook to summarize multi-variable composites, such as the respondent's employment status or household size. In this Appendix, the variables are operationally defined, and the SPSS statements are presented which were used to construct each variable.

The distributions of each of these variables are presented beginning on page B-8.

Directory of Appendix B

AGE

Age of respondent in years (uncollapsed). This variable was constructed by subtracting the respondent,s year of birth from 1986. Those who refused to give their year of birth were assigned a value of 99 and defined as missing.

```
COMPUTE          AGE=1986- H4
ASSIGN MISSING   AGE (99)
```

AGED

Respondent,s age in years, collapsed to reflect decades (20's, 30's) grouped together. For this version, group 2 includes those 29 and younger; group 3 includes those 30 through 39; group 4 includes those 40 through 49; group 5 includes those 50 through 59; and group 6 includes those 60 through 69; and group 7 includes those 70 and older. Those refusing to give their ages were assigned missing values of 99.

```
COMPUTE          AGED=TRUNC(AGE/10)
RECODE           AGED(1=2)(8,9=7)
ASSIGN MISSING   AGED(99)
VALUE LABELS     AGED (2)20'S (3)30'S (4)40'S (5)50'S (6)60'S (7)70+'S
```

AGEMD

Age of respondent in years, collapsed into 6 midpoint categories. This variable recodes AGE so that 18 through 24 year olds are in group 1, 25 through 34 year olds are in group 2, 35 through 44 year olds are in group 3, 45 through 54 year olds are in group 4, 55 through 64 year olds are in group 5, and those 65 and older are in group 6. Those refusing to give their ages were assigned to category 99.

```
COMPUTE          AGEMD=AGE
RECODE           AGEMD(LO THRU 24=1)(25 THRU 34=2)(35 THRU 44=3)(45 THRU
                 54=4)(55 THRU 64=5)(65 THRU 92=6)(99=99)
ASSIGN MISSING   AGEMD(99)
VALUE LABELS     AGEMD (1)18 - 24 (2)25 - 34 (3)35 - 44 (4)45 - 54
                 (5)55 - 64 (6)65 AND OLDER
```

BOOMERS

Boomers is a recode of the date of birth variable. Individuals born before 1946 are labeled as pre-baby boom. Respondents born between 1946 and 1959 are categorized as baby boomers. Those born after 1959 are labeled as post baby boom.

```
COMPUTE          BOOMERS=H4
RECODE           BOOMERS(LO THRU 945=1)(1946 THRU 1959=2)
                 (1960 THRU HI=3)
IF               (H4 EQ 888 OR H4 EQ 999)BOOMERS = 9
MISSING VALUES   BOOMERS (9)
VARIABLE LABELS  BOOMERS (1)PRE-BABY BOOME (2)BABY BOOMERS
                 (3)POST BABY BOOM
```

CITY

City in which the respondent reports living. City has been recoded so that those living in Minneapolis are given a value of 1, St. Paul residents are coded as 2, while those living elsewhere are grouped together as "Other."

```
COMPUTE          CITY=H1
RECODE           CITY (1794=1)(2534=2)(ELSE=3)
ASSIGN MISSING   CITY (9)
VALUE LABELS     CITY (1) MINNEAPOLIS (2) ST PAUL (3) OTHER
```

CITYSIZE

Size of city of residence, population. This variable takes the last digit of the city code as the indicator of size, as follows: (0) lives in open country; (1) city under 1,000 (2) 1,000 to 2,500 people (3) 2,500 to 10,000 people (4) 10,000 and over.

```
COMPUTE          CITYSIZE=(H1 - (TRUNC(H1/10) * 10))
VAR LABELS       CITYSIZE POPULATION OF CITY OF RESIDENCE/
VALUE LABELS     CITYSIZE (0)NOT IN TOWN (1)CITY UNDER 1,000 (2)1,000-
                 2,500 (3)2,500-10,000 (4)10,000+/
IF               ((H1 EQ 0) OR (H1 EQ 8888) OR (H1 EQ 9999))CITYSIZE=9
MISSING VALUES   CITYSIZE (9)
```

COUNTY

County in which the respondent reports living. COUNTY is an unrecoded duplicate of question E6, and is not shown in this appendix.

```
COMPUTE          COUNTY=E6
MISSING VALUES   COUNTY(88,99)
```

HHCOMP

Household composition, marital status of respondent. This variable is constructed from the marital status of the respondent, and the number of children reported living in the household. Respondents who were married, and had children living in the home were assigned a value of 1. Those who were married, and had no children living in the home were assigned a value of 2. Individuals who were divorced, separated, widowed, or single, and who had children in the home were assigned a value of 3. Singles without kids were assigned a 4.

```
IF               ((H3 EQ 1) AND (H10A EQ 77 OR H10A EQ 0))HHCOMP=2
IF               ((H3 EQ 1) AND ((H10A GE 1) AND (H10A LE 60)))HHCOMP=1
IF               ((H3 EQ 2) AND (H10A EQ 77 OR H10A EQ 0))HHCOMP=4
IF               ((H3 EQ 2) AND ((H10A GE 1) AND (H10A LE 60)))HHCOMP=3
IF               (H3 GE 8)HHCOMP=9
IF               (H10A GE 88)HHCOMP=9
MISSING VALUES   HHCOMP (9)
VALUE LABELS     HHCOMP (1)MARRIED, KIDS (2)MARRIED, NO KIDS
                        (3)SINGLE PARENT  (4)SINGLE, NO KIDS
```

HHSIZE

The total number of people reported to be living in the household. This variable is derived from H10A, and recoded so that the value 3 represents households with 3 or 4 persons living in the household, and value 4 represents those households in which more than 4 persons live.

```
COMPUTE          HHSIZE = H10
RECODE           HHSIZE (3,4=3)(5 THRU HI=4)
IF               (H10 GE 88)HHSIZE=9
MISSING VALUES   HHSIZE (9)
VALUE LABELS     HHSIZE (1)ONE PERSON (2)2 PEOPLE (3)3 OR 4 PEOPLE
                        (4)5 OR MORE PEOPLE/
```

INCOME

Reported household income level for 1985. This variable represents a composite of questions H12 through H12B. The categories of INCOME are those under H12, H12A, and H12B.

```
COMPUTE          INCOME = 99
IF               (H12 = 1) INCOME = H12A
IF               (H12 = 2) INCOME = H12B
IF               (H12 = 8 OR H12 = 9) INCOME = 99
RECODE           INCOME (88=99)
MISSING VALUES   INCOME (99)
VALUE LABELS     INCOME 5)UNDER 5,000 (10)5 TO 10,000 (15)10 TO 15,000
                 (20)15 TO 20,000 (25)20 TO 25,000 (30)25 TO 30,000
                 (35)30 TO 35,000 (40)35 TO 40,000 (50)40 TO 50,000
                 (60)50 TO 60,000 (61)MORE THAN 60,000
```

INCOME10

Household income level, recoded so that thousand dollar ranges are rounded off. For instance, those with incomes of $10,000 or under are assigned a value of 10, and those whose income falls between $10,000 and $20,000 are assigned a value of 20, etc.

```
COMPUTE          INCOME10 = INCOME
RECODE           INCOME10 (5=10)(15=20)(25=30)(35=40)(61=60)
MISSING VALUES   INCOME10 (99)
VALUE LABELS     INCOME10 (10)10K OR LESS (20)10 TO 20K (30)20 TO 30K
                 (40)30 TO 40K (50)40 TO 50K (60)60K +
```

MSPAREA

Area of the county in which the respondent lives. This variable is a combination of county and city combined so that the St. Paul area of Ramsey county is separated from the non-St. Paul area of Ramsey county. Hennepin county is separated similarly. All other cities and counties are recorded into the "other" category. Those not giving their city or county are defined as missing.

```
COMPUTE         MSPAREA=0
IF              ((E6 EQ 4) AND (H1 EQ 1794)) MSPAREA = 1
IF              ((E6 EQ 4) AND (H1 NE 1794)) MSPAREA = 2
IF              ((E6 EQ 5) AND (H1 EQ 2534)) MSPAREA = 3
IF              ((E6 EQ 5) AND (H1 NE 2534)) MSPAREA = 4
IF              (E6 EQ 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 6 OR 7)MSPAREA = 5
VALUE LABELS    MSPAREA (1)Henn & Mpls (2)Henn not Mpls
                (3)Ramsey & St Paul (4)Ramsey not St Paul
                (5)Other
VAR LABELS      County and city of residence
MISSING VALUES  MSPAREA (0)
```

NADULTS

The number of adult members living in the respondent's household, including him/her self.
Variable was constructed by taking the total number of individuals living in the household (H10), and subtracting the total number of children (18 or younger) reported to be living in the household (H10A). Since this variable was used in the construction of the weighting variable, the few missing cases were assigned to the 1 category, and households with 5 or more adults were combined with those with four or fewer adults.

```
COMPUTE         NADULTS=H10-H10A
IF              ((H10 EQ 88 OR 99) OR (H10A EQ 88 OR99)) NADULTS = 1
RECODE          NADULTS (5 THRU 11=4)
IF              (NADULTS EQ 0 OR 99)NADULTS=1
VALUE LABELS    NADULTS (4) 4+ ADULTS
```

NKIDS

The number of household members who are under 18 years of age.

```
COMPUTE         NKIDS=H10A
RECODE          NKIDS(77=0)
IF              (H10 EQ 99) NKIDS = 9
MISSING VALUES  NKIDS(9)
```

RACE Respondent's self-reported racial or ethnic background. The original variable H6 was recoded into standard census categories, where white, black, and american indians are broken out, and the other individuals are combined into an 'other' category.

```
COMPUTE          RACE=H6
RECODE           RACE (1=1)(3=2)(4=3)(5 THRU 87=4)
VALUE LABELS     RACE (1)WHITE (2)BLACK (3)INDIAN (4)OTHER/
MISSING VALUES   RACE(88,99)
```

SEX Gender of respondent. This variable is merely the H14 (gender) variable set to a new name for the conveniance of the datafile users.

```
COMPUTE          SEX = H14
VALUE LABELS     SEX (1) MALE (2) FEMALE
```

WGHT Case-weighting factor to adjust for household size bias. This variable weights each respondent's representation in the sample according to the number of adult members living in the household, with the purpose being to down-weight respondents living one-adult households, and up-weight those living in two or more person households. The weighting factor was derived by looking at a frequency of NADULTS in UNWEIGHTED form, and making the following computation;

VALUE		FREQUENCY (n)		PRODUCT
1	x	n	=	x
2	x	n	=	nn
3	x	n	=	nnn
4	x	n	=	nnnn
		SUM		nnnnn

Weighting factor = sample size (1006)/sum of nadults.

For the TCAS sample the weighting factor is 0.508080808. Each respondent is assigned a case weight by multiplying his/her value of nadults by this weighting factor. This is accomplished in SPSS by the following statements:

```
COMPUTE          WGHT=(NADULTS * .50808080808)
WEIGHT           WGHT
```

WKSTATUS

Respondent's employment status.
This variable was constructed from the working variables H9, H9A, H9B, H9C, AND H9D and is prioritized so that those respondents who have more than one status, for example, women who have a part time job and who are housewives, are assigned to the working category status as opposed to the housewife (or retiree, student...) category. Fulltime workers are in WKSTATUS value 1; parttime workers are in WKSTATUS value 2; those who are unemployed are in group 3; Individuals who are students and retirees and do not have paying jobs are in groups 4 and 5, respectively. Individuals who are homemakers and who do have have paying jobs outside the home are in group 6;

```
COMPUTE          WKSTATUS = 9
IF               (H9 EQ 1) WKSTATUS = H9A
IF               (H9 NE 1 AND H9C3 = 1) WKSTATUS = 6
IF               (H9 NE 1 AND H9C4 = 1) WKSTATUS = 5
IF               (H9 NE 1 AND H9C2 = 1) WKSTATUS = 4
IF               (H9 NE 1 AND H9C1 = 1) WKSTATUS = 3
MISSING VALUES   WKSTATUS (9)
VALUE LABELS     WKSTATUS (1) WORKED FULL TIME (2) WORKED PART TIME
                 (3) UNEMPLOYED (4) STUDENT (6) HOMEMAKER (5) RETIRED
```

WKSTAT2

Head of household's employment status.
This variable was constructed from the working variables H11A through H11A3D, and is prioritized so that those head of household's who have more than one status, for example, women who have a part time job and who are housewives, are assigned to the working category status as opposed to the housewife (or retired, etc) category. Fulltime workers are in WKSTATUS value 1; parttime workers are in WKSTATUS value 2; those who are unemployed are in group 3; Individuals who are students and retirees and do not have paying jobs are in groups 4 and 5, respectively. Individuals who are homemakers and who do have have paying jobs outside the home are in group 6;

```
COMPUTE          WKSTAT2 = 9
IF               (H11A = 1) WKSTAT2 = H11A1
IF               (H11A NE 1 AND H11A3C = 1) WKSTAT2 = 6
IF               (H11A NE 1 AND H11A3D = 1) WKSTAT2 = 5
IF               (H11A NE 1 AND H11A3B = 1) WKSTAT2 = 4
IF               (H11A NE 1 AND H11A3A = 1) WKSTAT2 = 3
MISSING VALUES   WKSTAT2 (9)
VALUE LABELS     WKSTAT2 (1) WORKED FULL TIME (2) WORKED PART TIME
                 (3) UNEMPLOYED (4) STUDENT (6) HOMEMAKER (5) RETIRED
```

AGE **Age of respondent in years**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	17.00	1	.1	.1	.1
	18.00	20	2.0	2.0	2.1
	19.00	19	1.9	1.9	4.0
	20.00	20	2.0	2.0	6.0
	21.00	26	2.6	2.6	8.6
	22.00	24	2.4	2.5	11.1
	23.00	15	1.5	1.5	12.6
	24.00	27	2.7	2.7	15.3
	25.00	33	3.3	3.3	18.7
	26.00	44	4.4	4.4	23.1
	27.00	41	4.0	4.1	27.2
	28.00	32	3.2	3.2	30.4
	29.00	29	2.9	2.9	33.3
	30.00	25	2.5	2.6	35.9
	31.00	28	2.8	2.9	38.8
	32.00	19	1.9	1.9	40.7
	33.00	34	3.3	3.4	44.1
	34.00	27	2.7	2.8	46.8
	35.00	25	2.5	2.5	49.3
	36.00	26	2.6	2.6	51.9
	37.00	18	1.8	1.8	53.8
	38.00	14	1.4	1.4	55.2
	39.00	26	2.6	2.6	57.8
	40.00	25	2.5	2.6	60.4
	41.00	20	2.0	2.0	62.4
	42.00	10	1.0	1.0	63.4
	43.00	12	1.2	1.2	64.6
	44.00	23	2.3	2.4	67.0
	45.00	15	1.5	1.5	68.5
	46.00	14	1.4	1.4	69.9
	47.00	20	2.0	2.0	71.9
	48.00	9	.9	.9	72.8
	49.00	7	.7	.7	73.5
	50.00	7	.7	.7	74.2
	51.00	12	1.2	1.2	75.4
	52.00	7	.7	.7	76.1
	53.00	15	1.5	1.5	77.6
	54.00	12	1.2	1.2	78.8
	55.00	10	1.0	1.0	79.8
	56.00	14	1.4	1.4	81.2

AGE **Age of respondent in years**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	57.00	12	1.2	1.2	82.4
	58.00	11	1.1	1.1	83.4
	59.00	15	1.5	1.5	84.9
	60.00	9	.9	.9	85.8
	61.00	13	1.3	1.3	87.1
	62.00	14	1.4	1.4	88.5
	63.00	14	1.4	1.4	90.0
	64.00	5	.5	.5	90.5
	65.00	8	.8	.8	91.3
	66.00	8	.8	.8	92.1
	67.00	8	.8	.8	92.9
	68.00	7	.7	.7	93.6
	69.00	8	.8	.8	94.4
	70.00	7	.7	.7	95.1
	71.00	2	.2	.2	95.3
	72.00	4	.4	.4	95.7
	73.00	6	.6	.6	96.3
	74.00	3	.3	.3	96.6
	75.00	4	.4	.4	97.0
	76.00	3	.3	.3	97.3
	77.00	6	.6	.6	97.9
	78.00	4	.4	.4	98.3
	79.00	1	.1	.1	98.4
	80.00	1	.1	.1	98.5
	81.00	5	.5	.5	99.0
	82.00	3	.3	.3	99.2
	83.00	1	.1	.1	99.3
	84.00	3	.3	.3	99.5
	86.00	1	.1	.1	99.6
	87.00	1	.1	.1	99.7
	89.00	1	.1	.1	99.8
	91.00	1	.1	.1	99.9
	92.00	1	.1	.1	100.0
	99.00	12	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

AGED **Age of respondent collapsed by decades**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
20's	2.00	331	32.9	33.3	33.3
30's	3.00	243	24.2	24.5	57.8
40's	4.00	155	15.5	15.6	73.5
50's	5.00	114	11.3	11.5	84.9
60's	6.00	95	9.4	9.5	94.4
70 +	7.00	55	5.5	5.6	100.0
	.	12	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

AGEMD **Age of respondent, collapsed**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
18-24	1.00	152	15.2	15.3	15.3
25-34	2.00	313	31.1	31.5	46.8
35-45	3.00	200	19.9	20.1	67.0
45-54	4.00	117	11.7	11.8	78.8
55-64	5.00	116	11.6	11.7	90.5
65 +	6.00	95	9.4	9.5	100.0
	.	12	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

BOOMERS **Born in baby boom era**

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Pre-boom babies	1.00	394	39.1	39.6	39.6
Baby boomers	2.00	370	36.8	37.3	76.9
Post boom babies	3.00	230	22.8	23.1	100.0
	9.00	12	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

CITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Minneapolis	1.00	186	18.5	18.6	18.6
St Paul	2.00	118	11.8	11.8	30.3
Other	3.00	700	69.6	69.7	100.0
	9.00	1	.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

CITYSIZE Size of city of residence

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
City under 1,000	1.00	13	1.3	1.3	1.3
1,000-2,500	2.00	10	1.0	1.0	2.3
2,500-5,000	3.00	140	13.9	13.9	16.2
10,000 +	4.00	842	83.7	83.8	100.0
	9.00	1	.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

COUNTY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Anoka	1.00	97	9.6	9.6	9.6
Carver	2.00	13	1.3	1.3	10.9
Dakota	3.00	113	11.3	11.3	22.2
Hennepin	4.00	481	47.8	47.8	70.0
Ramsey	5.00	203	20.2	20.2	90.2
Scott	6.00	23	2.3	2.3	92.4
Washington	7.00	76	7.6	7.6	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

HHCOMP Marital and kids in home

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Married w-kids	1.00	299	29.7	30.0	30.0
Married no kids	2.00	304	30.3	30.5	60.5
Single w-kids	3.00	99	9.8	9.9	70.4
Single no kids	4.00	295	29.3	29.6	100.0
	9.00	9	.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

HHSIZE Number of people in household

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One person	1.00	91	9.0	9.1	9.1
Two people	2.00	334	33.2	33.3	42.4
3 or 4	3.00	472	46.9	47.1	89.5
5 or more people	4.00	106	10.5	10.5	100.0
	9.00	3	.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

INCOME Household income

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Under 5,000	5.00	13	1.3	1.5	1.5
5 to 10,000	10.00	34	3.3	3.9	5.4
10 to 15,000	15.00	68	6.7	7.8	13.2
15 to 20,000	20.00	64	6.3	7.4	20.6
20 to 25,000	25.00	86	8.5	9.9	30.5
25 to 30,000	30.00	102	10.1	11.8	42.3
30 to 35,000	35.00	133	13.2	15.4	57.7
35 to 40,000	40.00	111	11.0	12.8	70.6
40 to 50,000	50.00	84	8.3	9.7	80.3
50 to 60,000	60.00	64	6.4	7.4	87.7
More than 60,000	61.00	106	10.6	12.3	100.0
	99.00	143	14.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	36.468	Std Err	.540	Median	35.000
Mode	35.000	Std Dev	15.859	Variance	251.511

INCOME10 HH income collapsed by $10,000

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
10K or less	10.00	47	4.6	5.4	5.4
10 to 20K	20.00	131	13.0	15.2	20.6
20 to 30K	30.00	187	18.6	21.7	42.3
30 to 40K	40.00	244	24.2	28.3	70.6
40 to 50K	50.00	84	8.3	9.7	80.3
60K +	60.00	170	16.9	19.7	100.0
	.	143	14.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	38.081	Std Err	.501	Median	40.000
Mode	40.000	Std Dev	14.709	Variance	216.345

MSPAREA County and city of residence

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Henn & Mpls	1.00	183	18.2	18.2	18.2
Henn not Mpls	2.00	298	29.6	29.6	47.8
Ramsey & St Paul	3.00	118	11.8	11.8	59.6
Ramsey not St Paul	4.00	84	8.4	8.4	68.0
Other	5.00	322	32.0	32.0	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

NADULTS Number of adults in HH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	123	12.2	12.2	12.2
	2.00	610	60.6	60.6	72.8
	3.00	180	17.9	17.9	90.7
4 or more adults	4.00	93	9.3	9.3	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.242	Std Err	.025	Median	2.000
Mode	2.000	Std Dev	.784	Variance	.615

NKIDS Number of kids in HH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0.0	604	60.0	60.2	60.2
	1.00	184	18.3	18.3	78.5
	2.00	153	15.2	15.2	93.8
	3.00	45	4.4	4.5	98.2
	4.00	11	1.1	1.1	99.3
	5.00	3	.3	.3	99.6
	6.00	4	.4	.4	100.0
	9.00	3	.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

Mean	.704	Std Err	.033	Median	0.0
Mode	0.0	Std Dev	1.043	Variance	1.088

RACE Race by standard census categories

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
White	1.00	939	93.3	94.0	94.0
Black	2.00	21	2.1	2.1	96.1
Indian	3.00	2	.2	.2	96.3
Other	4.00	37	3.7	3.7	100.0
	9.00	7	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Male	1.00	453	45.0	45.0	45.0
Female	2.00	553	55.0	55.0	100.0
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

WKSTATUS Work status of respondent

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Worked full time	1.00	587	58.4	58.7	58.7
Worked part time	2.00	188	18.7	18.8	77.5
Unemployed	3.00	46	4.6	4.6	82.1
Student	4.00	26	2.6	2.6	84.7
Retired	5.00	105	10.5	10.5	95.2
Homemaker	6.00	48	4.8	4.8	100.0
	9.00	5	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

WKSTAT2 Work status of HH's main earner

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Worked full time	1.00	368	36.6	84.9	84.9
Worked part time	2.00	15	1.5	3.4	88.3
Unemployed	3.00	7	.7	1.6	89.9
Student	4.00	1	.1	.2	90.2
Retired	5.00	41	4.0	9.4	99.5
Homemaker	6.00	2	.2	.5	100.0
	9.00	573	56.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	1006	100.0	100.0	

M-41/APPB.T86

APPENDIX C: Administrative Forms

Appendix C contains brief explanations for the contact record disposition categories, and copies of the administrative forms used in TCAS'86. There were two primary administrative forms: the contact record with callback/refusal forms on the back, and the introduction. Contact records were used to record the actual date and time of each attempted contact with a household, the interviewer ID, and the final outcome (disposition) of each attempted contact.

Directory of Appendix C

CONTACT RECORD DISPOSITION CATEGORIES

There were 13 possible disposition categories for each call that was made. A brief explanation for each of these disposition categories is presented below.

Disposition	Explanation
Completed	All questions in the interview schedule had been asked.
Partial	The interview schedule had been begun, but not completed. In such a case, interviewers were instructed to schedule an appointment to finish, and fill out the appointment form on the back of the callback record. If a respondent declined to complete the interview, the refusal form on the back of the callback record was filled out.
No answer/Busy	All attempts during a shift had resulted in the phone ringing six times without being answered. If no one in a household could be contacted on a minimim of 10 separate shifts, the telephone number was eliminated. Every attempt to contact the household during the shift had resulted in a busy signal.
Disconnected/Not working	The number was not in operation.
Not home phone	The number was not for a residential phone.
R not available	The targeted respondent had been selected within the household, but would not be available to interview during the period of time in which interviewing was conducted. For example, if the respondent was out of town, or if they were not available between 9:30 a.m. and 9:30 p.m.
Physical/language problem	Respondent had been selected, but could not complete the interview, for example, because they were ill, were hearing impaired, or developmentally disabled.

Disposition	Explanation
Refusal and Second Refusal	Someone in the household declined to participate. The person who refused could have been any member of the household. Interviewers were instructed to complete the refusal form and to attach the selection grid to the callback record.
Callback to select R	Contact had been made with someone in the household, but the targeted respondent had not been determined. Interviewers were instructed to suggest a more convenient time to call back and select the respondent, and to fill out the appropriate information on the back of the callback record.
Callback to contact R	A respondent had been selected, but that an appointment had been suggested by someone other than the respondent. The appointment form was filled out, and the selection grid was attached.
Appointment with R	A respondent had been selected and he or she had scheduled a time to complete the interview.
Other	Reserved for contingencies not covered by the other dispositions, for example, no one under 18 living in the household.

Callback time:

(CODER USE ONLY)

N-ID __ __ __ __

Do C __ __ __ __

Min __ __

I-ID __ __

Con __ __

H Con __ __

Sample __ __

C-ID __ __

Has phone # changed?
yes.....1
no.....2

CONTACT RECORD
TCAS '86

DATE - _____

TIME - _____

CIRCLE CODE

01 Completed	01 Completed
02 Partial	02 Partial
03 No answer/busy	03 No answer/busy
04 # disc/not working	04 # disc/not working
05 Not home phone	05 Not home phone
06 R not available*	06 R not available*
07 Phys/lang problem	07 Phys/lang problem
08 1st refusal **	08 1st refusal **
09 2nd refusal **	09 2nd refusal **
10 Callback to select R ***	10 Callback to select R ***
11 Callback to contact R ***	11 Callback to contact R ***
12 Appointment with R ***	12 Appointment with R ***
13 Other*	13 Other*

CONTACTS/SHIFT _____

INTERVIEWER - _____

DATE - _____

TIME - _____

01 Completed	01 Completed
02 Partial	02 Partial
03 No answer/busy	03 No answer/busy
04 # disc/not working	04 # disc/not working
05 Not home phone	05 Not home phone
06 R not available *	06 R not available *
07 Phys/lang problem *	07 Phys/lang problem *
08 1st refusal **	08 1st refusal **
09 2nd refusal **	09 2nd refusal **
10 Callback to select R ***	10 Callback to select R ***
11 Callback to contact R ***	11 Callback to contact R ***
12 Appointment with R *	12 Appointment with R *
13 Other*	13 Other*

CONTACTS/SHIFT _____

INTERVIEWER - _____

TIME START _____

TIME END _____

INTERVIEW IN MIN _____

EDIT TIME IN MIN _____

INTERVIEWER # _____

* Describe
** Complete refusal form
*** Complete callback form

SUPERVISOR _____

CALLBACK FORM

Was respondent selected? Yes / No

Did you talk to respondent in person? Yes / No

Respondent is: Female / Male

Who arranged callback? Respondent / Someone Else

Callback time: _____ Date: _____

Was this a: Firm Appointment / Probable / Shot-in-the-Dark

Was respondent open and cooperative? Yes / Uncertain / No

Other comments and information: _____

REFUSAL FORM

Was respondent selected? Yes / No Respondent is: Female / Male

Was respondent person who refused? Yes / No

Person answering phone was: Female / Male

At what point was the interview terminated? _____

What reasons were given for refusal? _____

What arguments were employed by interviewer? _____

Other comments or information: _____

Introduction
Twin Cities Area Survey, 1986
Fall 1986

A. Hello, is this _____. (IF NO) I'm sorry, I must have a wrong number.
Phone number

B. My name is _____. I'm calling for the Twin Cities Area Survey at the University of Minnesota. Your telephone number has been chosen randomly by a scientific procedure.

C. We're doing a study to see how people in the Twin Cities metropolitan area compare to people in the rest of the country, and to get opinions on such things as solid waste recovery, leisure activities, and the general quality of life.

D. It is important that we randomly select a person in your household to interview so that results will truly reflect all people in our area. I need to talk to the person in your household who is 18 or older, and had the last birthday.

May I please speak to that person?

(IF RIGHT PERSON IS ON THE LINE, GO TO PARAGRAPH E.)

(IF RIGHT PERSON IS NOT ON THE LINE, ASK TO SPEAK TO THAT PERSON AND WHEN THEY ARE ON THE LINE, REPEAT PARAGRAPHS B AND C AND THEN GO ON TO PARAGRAPH E.)

(IF RIGHT PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE) When would be the best time to speak with that person?

SPECIFIC TIME AND DATE: Time_____ Date_____

What is his/her first name? NAME: _____

E. Your answers will be put with a lot of other people's, so you can't be identified in any way. If there are questions you don't care to answer, we'll skip over them. Okay, we'll begin.

F16/INT.T86

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

All interviewers working for the Minnesota Center for Social Research are expected to understand that their professional activities are directed and regulated by the following statements of policy.

The rights of human subjects are a matter of primary concern. All study procedures are reviewed to ensure that individual respondents are protected at each stage of the research. When study findings are made available, the utmost care is taken to ensure that no data are released that would permit any respondent to be identified. Careful procedures are followed to ensure that identity of individuals will not be compromised.

To protect the anonymity of respondents it is also necessary for the interviewer to treat all information about respondents with equal regard. Interviewers perform a professional function when they obtain information from individuals. Interviewers are expected to maintain professional ethical standards of confidentiality regarding what they hear in telephone interviews and observe in a respondent's home during personal interviews. All information about respondents obtained during the course of research is privileged information, whether it relates to the interview itself or includes extraneous observations concerning the respondent's home, family, and activities. This information is confidential and should not be discussed with anyone who is not affiliated with the research project.

I hereby agree to abide by the policy statements above, and in signing this statement I testify that I in fact agree to abide by and understand the contents of this statement. I also understand that if I fail to abide by the policies presented above, my actions constitute grounds for dismissal.

_____ _____

(Please **print** name here) (Please **sign** name here)

Date: _____