

R9000

MINNESOTA CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

September 1990

ANNUAL REPORT

1989 - 90

MINNESOTA CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
2122 RIVERSIDE AVENUE
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55454-1320

612/627-4282

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Introduction. | 1 |
| Mission | 1 |
| History | 2 |
| Surveys Conducted in 1989-90. | 3 |
| Contributions to University Teaching, Research, and Communication. | 6 |
| Internal Operating Improvements | 7 |
| Current Staffing. | 9 |
| Professional Activities | 9 |
| Public Relations. | 10 |
| Governance. | 11 |
| Appendices: | |
| A Other Services Provided by MCSR | A-1 |
| B Unreimbursed Consulting | B-1 |
| C 1989-90 MCSR Advisory Committee Members | C-1 |
| D Minimum Criteria for MCSR Involvement in a Mail Survey | D-1 |
| E MCSR Methodological Research 1987-1990. | E-1 |
| F Publication Resource Collection | F-1 |
| G Index to Significant Items in Previous Annual Reports | G-1 |
| H Abstracts of 1989-90 Surveys | H-1 |
| I Index to Past Surveys and Data Files, 1982-1990 | I-1 |

Introduction

The Minnesota Center for Survey Research (MCSR) is the survey research center of the University of Minnesota, providing services to the University itself and to the Minnesota community. This report provides a brief description of the Center and a summary of activities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1990. This is the third annual report and this year's report closely follows those of the past. New appendices document research projects, MCSR's publication collection, and a specific policy-setting criteria for the use of U of M/MCSR stationery in mail surveys.

This past year again has been one of intense activity and rapid growth. The number of full-service or complete surveys conducted for clients remained constant, but the number of people surveyed grew from 20,368 to 33,551. MCSR also provided other services to 13 clients (see Appendix A).

In addition to these services provided for a fee, MCSR has provided 86 hours of unreimbursed consultation to 60 people. Roughly half of this free service was provided to Minnesota government and non-profit agencies; the rest to University faculty and students. A full list of these consultations is provided in Appendix B.

The major purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the activities at MCSR from July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990. Sections of this report designed to meet this end include: a list of the surveys conducted (mail and telephone); contributions to University teaching, research, and communication; improvements made in the areas of management, technology, and accommodations; recent professional activities of the staff; public relations activities; a list of partial service projects; and lists of those who received unreimbursed consulting services. A secondary purpose of this report is to document the mission, history, staffing, and governance of MCSR.

Nine appendices round out this report, adding documentation to its body. Two of the appendices have been written to encourage outside use of existing MCSR resources: 1) our collection of survey research publications (Appendix F) and 2) our index to past surveys and data files (Appendix I).

Mission

MCSR exists to promote and facilitate the use of high quality survey research techniques. On the one hand, it works to support public policy analysis and development within Minnesota. On the other, it works to serve the survey research needs of the University of Minnesota at whatever scale is required.

At this point in time, MCSR is primarily a facility for supporting mail and telephone surveys. The standards employed and results obtained are of the highest quality. It is a primary goal to maintain and, if possible, improve this capability.

For public policy makers, MCSR provides three types of services. The first is high quality surveys. This service goes beyond fielding a good survey, and often engages faculty experts in designing the research and analyzing the results. Second, MCSR has an educational function that involves promoting the proper use of survey research as a means of developing policy. Third, MCSR critiques the work of others pointing out where results can be properly used or should be disregarded.

For the University of Minnesota, MCSR serves many functions. In support of good research, MCSR assists with quality data collection and in writing proposals to obtain funding for this research. Access is provided to the data bases from past surveys, both to previous MCSR surveys and to national surveys. MCSR can also provide a laboratory for research on survey research. A small reference collection is being developed to serve the survey research needs of students and faculty (see Appendix F):

In support of the educational mission of the University, MCSR annually publishes a catalog of university courses offered in survey research. MCSR is also involved in formal classroom teaching and in informal teaching through the use of student employees.

MCSR does not seek business in the private sector and attempts to avoid conflicts with private sector market research firms. All survey data collected by MCSR become public information after 18 months.

History

MCSR began in 1968 as a part of the Sociology Department. The emphasis in the early days, under the direction of Michael Q. Patton, was on evaluation research. In 1981, Professor Ronald Anderson assumed the directorship and the emphasis changed to survey research. In 1982, he initiated the first Twin Cities Area Survey, an omnibus survey serving the needs of many public agencies and university researchers. He followed this in 1984 with another omnibus survey, the Minnesota State Survey. These omnibus surveys, together with the many individual surveys, remain the center of MCSR's activities.

By 1986, MCSR's level of activity had become large enough that it was no longer reasonable to be a small part of one department. Operating deficits were a major concern. MCSR was transferred to the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) and became a resource accessible to the entire University. CURA's Assistant Director for Research, Dr. William Craig, became Director of the Center. Because of CURA's extensive ties to public agencies, MCSR became more accessible to public policy makers outside the University.

Since the first year under CURA, 1986-87, MCSR has experienced significant growth and change. The number of full-time equivalent professional employees has grown from one to four. The number of projects undertaken has grown and the number of people surveyed has increased significantly each year. Numerous procedural, managerial, and technical changes have accompanied this growth, as documented in this and previous annual reports (see Appendix G).

Surveys Conducted in 1989-90

The following two pages summarize the surveys conducted in the past year. Where the effort or contract straddled two fiscal years, surveys are reported here only when the majority of the work was completed in the July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990 period.

More detailed descriptions of each of these surveys are presented in Appendix H. In most cases, a full report documents the methodology and findings; these reports may be viewed in the MCSR offices or a copy can be made for a nominal fee.

Original data files are also available from MCSR for a majority of projects where data coding and processing were part of the contract with MCSR. These data files are available for use by other researchers 18 months after they have been delivered to the client or when released by the client, whichever comes first.

Compared to previous years, the number of surveys conducted has increased substantially. Going back to the first year under CURA, the number of surveys conducted has grown from 13,689 (1986-87) to 14,562 (1987-88) to 20,368 (1988-89) to 33,551 (1989-90). Moreover, there has been a continuing shift towards mail surveys which now comprise 80 percent of completed surveys, compared to none in 1985-86. Using well-known techniques, MCSR has been able to achieve response rates of 70-80 percent on mail surveys with costs much less than those for a comparable telephone survey.

The surveys conducted during the past year have been more complex and challenging than those of earlier years, indicating increasing sophistication of clients and ever-increasing skill levels at MCSR. Sampling has been more difficult with surveys of rare populations. Clients have probed more complex issues requiring more work in designing and coding the survey instrument. The staff at MCSR has welcomed these challenges and has successfully responded to them.

FULL SERVICE RESEARCH PROJECTS: FISCAL YEAR 1989-90

| | | <u>Number of Completed Surveys</u> | | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | <u>Telephone</u> | <u>Mail*</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| 1) | OMNIBUS SURVEYS | | | |
| | ----- | | | |
| | Twin Cities Area Survey 1989 (3 clients) | 800 | | |
| | Minnesota State Survey 1989 (8 clients) | 804 | | |
| | | ----- | | |
| | SUBTOTAL: | 1,604 | | 1,604 |
| 2) | UNIVERSITY PROJECTS | | | |
| | ----- | | | |
| | Olmsted Housing Survey ** | 1,008 | | |
| | - Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs | | | |
| | Olmsted County Agricultural Trauma Study *** | 416 | | |
| | - School of Public Health | | | |
| | and Minnesota Department of Health | | | |
| | Survey of the Socioeconomic Aspects of Sportfishing | 1,257 | 1,843 | |
| | - Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics | | | |
| | and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources | | | |
| | Marriage in Minnesota Survey | | 657 | |
| | - School of Nursing and Department of Psychology | | | |
| | University of Minnesota Undergraduate Survey | | 2,634 | |
| | - Office of the Provost | | | |
| | B. O. S. S. Evaluation Project | | 78 | |
| | - Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs | | | |
| | and St. Paul Housing Information Office | | | |
| | The Koochiching County and Red Lake County Surveys | | 771 | |
| | - Department of Political Science | | | |
| | University of Minnesota Public Opinion Poll 1990 | 1,628 | | |
| | - Office of the VP for External Relations | | | |
| | Philadelphia Public Library Patron Survey ** | | 7,595 | |
| | - Department of Information and Decision Sciences | | | |
| | | ----- | ----- | |
| | SUBTOTAL: | 4,309 | 13,578 | 18,887 |

* Includes all surveys where respondents completed a survey on their own, without an interviewer asking questions. See Appendix H for details.

** Actual data collection was performed by volunteers or client. MCSR's involvement in other aspects of this project was sufficiently large to justify writing a technical report and listing the project here rather than in Appendix A as a partial project.

*** Second phase of a two year project. Only phase two interviews are reported here.

FULL SERVICE RESEARCH PROJECTS: FISCAL YEAR 1989-90 (continued)

| 3) NON-UNIVERSITY PROJECTS ----- | <u>Number of Completed Surveys</u> | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Telephone</u> | <u>Mail*</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| PCA Onsite Collection: Inventory of Waste Pesticides and Disposal of Waste Pesticides ** - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency | | 244 | |
| Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Critical Needs Survey - Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | | 868 | |
| COMPAS Native American Cultural Arts Fund Program ** - COMPAS | | 159 | |
| Border Waters Business Survey - Minnesota Department of Natural Resources | 142 | | |
| Solvent Waste Survey - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency | | 401 | |
| Business Ownership Survey - Minnesota Department of Administration | | 8,611 | |
| Female and Minority Business Owner Survey - Minnesota Department of Administration | | 687 | |
| AIDS Survey of Gay and Bisexual Men - Minnesota Department of Health and Communication Technologies | 455 | | |
| Common Batteries: Commercial Use and Disposal Practices - Hennepin County Recycling Office | 83 | | |
| Minnesota Farmers Survey - Land Stewardship Project and Center for Urban and Regional Affairs | | 1,016 | |
| Pine City School District Resident Survey - Pine City School District | | 394 | |
| | ----- | ----- | |
| SUBTOTAL: | 680 | 12,380 | 13,060 |
| | ===== | ===== | ===== |
| GRAND TOTALS | 6,593 | 25,957 | 33,551 |
| | (20%) | (80%) | |

* Includes all surveys where respondents completed a survey on their own,
without an interviewer asking questions. See Appendix H for details.

** Actual data collection was performed by volunteers or client. MCSR's
involvement in other aspects of this project was sufficiently large to
justify writing a technical report and listing the project here rather
than in Appendix A as a partial project.

Contributions to University Teaching, Research, and Communication

Until recently, communication among people interested in survey research at the University of Minnesota has been limited. MCSR has taken numerous steps during this past fiscal year to build a community of those interested in this field.

- * Created an abstract and index of MCSR reports and data files. This document was created in order to encourage secondary use of survey data.
- * Compiled and published the third annual directory of Courses in Survey Research. It lists courses from 24 units where at least 25 percent of the course was devoted to survey research material.
- * Continued to actively search out faculty to work with MCSR in submitting proposals for funded research. MCSR scans the State Register and other sources looking for potential projects where a joint MCSR Faculty project could produce a useful product for a state agency.
- * Conducted several methodological studies. See Appendix E for a complete listing of studies to date.
- * Helped to provide access to ICPSR (the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research) in conjunction with Professor William Flanigan, Political Science.
- * Provided access to national poll data by subscribing to POLL at the Roper Center. MCSR splits the subscription cost with Professor David Fan, Genetics and Cell Biology.
- * Continued a seminar series started last year. Professor David Fan, Genetics and Cell Biology, gave a lecture and demonstration on "Online Access to National POLL Data." Dr. Trisha Beuhring described methods and results of the "University Staff Opinion Survey," which she directed.
- * Continued MCSR as a listing in the Instructional Resources Handbook published by the Office of Educational Development Programs.
- * Produced second Annual Report. This was distributed to over 150 faculty and administrators across campus.
- * Extended the practice of providing free questions on the Fall omnibus surveys. Questions must be oriented towards public policy and the faculty member must agree to draft a press release. Competition is decided by the MCSR Advisory Committee. This year's winners were: Sandra Edwardson and Patricia Tomlinson, School of Nursing; George Gordon, Center for Long Term Care Administration; and Steve Simon, Minnesota Criminal Justice System, DWI Task Force.
- * Trained and employed 51 undergraduate students. Every attempt is made to recruit students from a wide variety of disciplines; these 51 students represented 25 different disciplines.

- * Continued to add to our collection of survey research publications. See Appendix F for a complete listing.
- * Provided many other services, including guest lectures. See also list of survey projects, partial service projects (Appendix A), and unreimbursed consulting (Appendix B).

Internal Operating Improvements

At MCSR, quality products and client satisfaction goals and the initiatives documented below were undertaken during the past year to improve performance in these areas.

- * Continued to use CATI, computer assisted telephone interviewing, on a trial basis.
- * Conducted first door-to-door field study. This effort was a success, despite concerns about the survey taking place in an economically disadvantaged area.
- * Reduced number of interviews in the omnibus surveys to 800 each. A survey of past clients of both the Twin Cities and Minnesota surveys showed that this sample size was sufficient for their needs. This reduction allowed us to lower our rates and to provide results more quickly.
- * Received training in administering Focus Groups. This is a new service which MCSR will be able to offer.
- * Increased the number of graduate student project directors from 3 to 4.
- * Created a set of minimum criteria which must be met before any researcher can make use of MCSR/University of Minnesota stationery in a mail survey. See Appendix D.
- * Organized data files by project report number. Established a procedure where each project is on one floppy disk containing the following data files:
 - README, containing documentation
 - SPSS system file containing clean data, and without any data transformations
 - ASCII control command files for creating system files from raw data, creating new variables, setting missing values, and setting weights.

- * Created models to better estimate survey costs. In particular, telephone survey costs are determined by the number of hours interviewers must spend collecting interviews. Those hours are good predictors of all other processing costs. Mail survey costs are estimated based on the number of cases in the original sample. In both cases, individual surveys may require much more or less than the average amount of management time.
- * Established blanket coverage approval from the University's Committee on the Use of Human Subjects. This approval is granted on a yearly basis. It covers the two omnibus surveys and surveys done for outside clients, provided these are surveys of competent adults on non-sensitive topics. University researchers must continue to make their own application to the Human Subjects Committee for all survey work.
- * Received approval from the University's Purchasing Department to select a data entry provider on a two-year basis. This eliminates delays caused by bidding and creates a productive relationship with suppliers. Last year's lower bidder proved to be unable to provide quality work; the second bidder has done very well.
- * Developed written instructions on current office procedures.
- * Gained some limited expertise with computer scored answer sheets.
- * Used a private vendor for printing addresses on envelopes, not using labels. Such a service adds a sense of personalization, but appears cost-justified only for larger surveys. This first experience was unsuccessful because of problems with adding ID numbers.
- * Increased reliance on our interviewer telephone monitoring system and added a second unit. A separate monitor is assigned, in addition to the supervisor, on any shift where five or more interviewers are working. This tool assures a high quality product, as well as improving the management and training of student interviewers.
- * Maintained two mailing lists: one of potential clients and one of university faculty interested in survey research.

Current Staffing

MCSR has a professional staff of four full-time equivalents and a large cadre of trained graduate and undergraduate student employees.

| <u>NAME</u> | <u>POSITION</u> | <u>PERCENT TIME</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| William J. Craig | Director | 50% |
| Rossana Rae Armson | Assistant Director | 100 |
| Nancy J. Davenport | Survey Manager | 100 |
| Antoinette McGinley | Senior Account Specialist | 50 |
| Elizabeth Auten-Smith | Senior Secretary | 100 |

MCSR is able to produce its wide range of services from this small core staff through extensive use of students, both graduate and undergraduate. The training of students is part of MCSR's mission. During the past year, 4 graduate Research Assistants and 51 undergraduate students worked at MCSR. Students are recruited from a wide variety of disciplines and last year's students represented 25 different departments.

Using intelligent, motivated young people yields benefits in high productivity and high quality surveys. These benefits more than compensate for the high training costs associated with the relatively high turnover of students who, by design, leave the University after four years.

Professional Activities

MCSR and its staff are committed to the highest levels of professionalism. This commitment demands participation in the survey research community, both as a contributor and as a learner.

The Center is active in a number of national activities. It has been a member of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) and has been receiving that association's professional journal, Public Opinion Quarterly, since 1986. MCSR is a sponsor and an active member of the National Network of State Polls. It has also been a regular contributor to the Survey Research newsletter published by the Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois.

Director William Craig has been a member of AAPOR since 1986 and has attended conferences. The National Network of State Polls has held its annual meeting in conjunction with AAPOR and Dr. Craig has attended and participated in those meetings. They have been invaluable for getting advice from other professionals and for making the acquaintances that form a professional network.

In November 1989, Dr. Craig visited the Survey Research Center at the University of Utah. He was invited to perform an outside review of the Center and its constituency. His conclusion was that the Center's work was excellent and its services were necessary on campus. Because the University of Utah has a limited service mission, the Center cannot be justified as a contribution to the state. Additional funds to support that Center should be collected from overhead recovery on research grants.

Each year MCSR's Director undertakes one or more significant policy oriented research projects using special questions included in the Twin Cities or Minnesota State omnibus survey. Two years ago, the result was the six-part Profiles of the Twin Cities Poor. Last year the focus was on "Downtown Shopping." This year's topic was Snowbirds, the elderly who leave Minnesota during winter months. The story was the lead article in the CURA Reporter and gained much coverage by the Twin Cities print and electronic media. Craig estimated 73,000 people leave each winter, spending \$110 million in other states, particularly Arizona.

Assistant Director Rossana Armson has attended the annual National Field Director's Conference since 1986. In 1989 she served as program chair. In 1990, she was a discussion leader for a session on questionnaire effects.

Survey Manager Nancy Davenport has attended the National Field Director's Conference since 1987 and has presented research papers at those conferences. She was unable to attend the 1990 Conference. She has contributed to a number of methodological studies at MCSR. Under her direction, student employees have seen improved employee training, job satisfaction, and longer tenure. Outside the University, she is the field director of the Minnesota Poll conducted by the Star Tribune newspaper and KSTP-TV.

Project Manager Timothy Beebe attended the 1989 National Field Director's Conference and presented results of his paper "Efforts to Increase Response Rates in a Mail Survey: The Effects of Survey Color, Cover Letter, and Reminder Type." See Appendix E for a summary of findings. In 1990, he was a discussion leader for a session on problems of nonresponse.

Public Relations

Public relations are important to MCSR for two reasons. As an advocate of survey research, we encourage the wide distribution of high quality stories based on our work. As an organization dependent on contracts for its survival, we need to make more potential clients aware of our services. A number of initiatives were undertaken in the past year:

* Continued to issue press releases resulting in 46 articles in the print media across the state. This is twice the number of the previous year. Three topics generated the most interest: snowbirds (mentioned above), the most important problem facing people in the Twin Cities (crime and drugs are now top issues), and the most important problem facing people in Minnesota (environmental and social concerns are growing). These releases also resulted in television and radio spots as reporters from the electronic media pursued stories about research results.

- * Encouraged clients to issue press releases. MCSR has offered to help write these releases. University Relations has agreed to provide its services to any organization, even those outside the University, if MCSR was involved and is mentioned.
- * Continued to purchase space in the League of Minnesota Cities' City Products and Services Guide.
- * Continued working with the State Planning Agency and its deputy commissioner, Tom Harron, to hold an informational meeting for state agencies. This meeting resulted in several clients, including those who could not attend, but were inspired by the notice to follow-up.
- * Continued metropolitan informational meetings, one each in Minneapolis and St. Paul, inviting all prospective omnibus survey clients.
- * Continued an institutional listing in AAPOR's (American Association for Public Opinion Research) publication Agencies and Organizations Represented in AAPOR Membership.
- * Added a separate MCSR listing in the white pages under University of Minnesota.

Governance

MCSR is a part of the University of Minnesota. As a division of the University's Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA), which reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, it serves as an all-University resource.

While CURA has direct responsibility for MCSR, an Advisory Committee has been established, comprised of experts and users from the field of survey research (see Appendix C). University faculty dominate this committee, with representatives from every college and from every department with a significant interest in this area. Faculty fill 10 of the 13 positions, the remainder are users from the public sector: one each from local, regional, and state government. Individual members provided invaluable assistance in many areas to MCSR staff.

Internal staff meetings are held weekly and involve all senior staff. The major purpose of these meetings is to solve problems and to coordinate work. They are also used to share information about survey results and methodological findings from MCSR projects or those of other researchers.

APPENDIX A

Other Services Provided by MCSR

Projects and Clients Contracting for Less than a Full Survey Project

Fiscal Year 1988-89

| | Survey Design | Consul- tation | Data Collected | Coding/ Editing | Data file Created | Data Analysis | Report Writing |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Car Buyer Survey - Leonard, Street, & Deinard Attorneys at Law | | X | | | | | |
| Cereal Print Ad Study - Office of the Attorney General | X | X | | | | | |
| Household Hazardous Waste Surveys - Hennepin County | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Mothers to Mothers Project - Community Clinic Consortium | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Pay Equity Survey - Child Care Worker's Alliance | X | X | | | | | |
| Personal Health Survey - Prof. Robert Fulton, Dept. of Sociology, Univ of MN | X | X | | | | | |
| St. Paul Intervention Project - Ctr for Urban & Regional Affairs | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Search Warrant Project - Myron Orfield | | X | | X | X | X | |
| Sexual Harassment Report - U of M Office of Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action | | X | | | | X | X |
| Survey of Costs of Filing Individual Tax Returns - Marsha Blumenthal, College of St. Thomas | | X | X | | | | |
| Survey of Residents of a Minneapolis Apartment Complex - Superior Associates | X | X | X | | | | |
| Surveys for Landfill Site Environmental Impact Statement - City of Lake Elmo | | X | | | | | |
| University Grove Residents - U of M Housing Services | X | X | X | X | X | | |

APPENDIX B

Unreimbursed Consulting

Provided to State and Local Government Units

| <u>TIME FRAME</u> | <u>NAME</u> | <u>DEPARTMENT OR UNIT</u> | <u>TYPE OF SERVICE</u> | <u>HOURS</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| August 89 | Ellen Benavides | Hennepin County Bureau of Health | Research & design | 1.50 |
| August 89 | Fred Strains | Metropolitan Mosquito Control | Questionnaire design | 1.50 |
| Aug/Sept 89 | Terry Lappin | City of Minneapolis proposal | Project critique | 1.25 |
| September 89 | Shelly Baxter | Minneapolis Community Development Agency | Questionnaire design | 1.50 |
| September 89 thru May 90 | Pat Kelly | Department of Agriculture | Questionnaire review, sampling | 4.75 |
| September 89 | Carol Milligan | Department of Agriculture | Questionnaire review | .50 |
| October 89 | Steve Scholl | Department of Jobs and Training | Questionnaire review | 1.25 |
| October 89 | Luis Siojo | Minneapolis Public Library | Survey design | 1.25 |
| December 89 | Mike Marxen | Fish and Wildlife Service | Survey topics | .25 |
| January 90 | Cindy Orbovich | Health Care Access Commission | Writing RFP | 3.00 |
| March 90 | Mike Riggs | Department of Natural Resources | Sampling | .50 |
| April 90 | Doug Miller | Census Bureau | Questionnaire design | 3.00 |
| May 90 thru June 90 | Nancy Bunnett | Higher Education Coordinating Board | Survey logistics/ data collection | 1.75 |
| Spring 90 | Jack Brondum | MN Health Department | Mail survey design | 1.00 |
| June 90 | Kim Rosenwinkel | MN Health Department | Sample sources | .25 |
| June 90 | Paul Wheeler | Olmsted County | Survey design | 2.00 |
| June 90 | Roger Winberg | City of Shoreview | Survey critique | .75 |
| | | | TOTAL HOURS: | ----- 26.00 |

APPENDIX B

Unreimbursed Consulting
Provided to the University of Minnesota

| <u>STATUS</u> | <u>TIME FRAME</u> | <u>NAME</u> | <u>DEPARTMENT OR UNIT</u> | <u>TYPE OF SERVICE</u> | <u>HOURS</u> |
|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Faculty | July 89 | John Sullivan | Political Science | CATI | .25 |
| Faculty | September 89 | Nora Hall | Humphrey Institute | Research topics | 1.25 |
| Staff | September 89 | Tom Anding | Cntr. for Urban & Regional Affairs | Women's caucus data | 1.25 |
| Grad student | September 89 | John Taylor | Physical Education | Survey design | 2.00 |
| Student | October 89 | Jay Maasch | Social Science | Job skills needed for research | .75 |
| Staff | October 89 | Jack Whitehurst/ Fred Smith | Cntr. for Urban & Regional Affairs | Coding procedures | .75 |
| Grad student | November 89 | Paul Reynolds | Sociology | Guest lecture | 2.00 |
| Grad student | November 89 | Barry Johansen | Vocational Ed | Reliability and validity | .25 |
| Grad student | November 89 | Katie Denehay | Sociology | Sampling | .50 |
| Faculty | November 89 | Oliver Williams | Social Work | Survey design | 1.00 |
| Grad student | November 89 | Kate Windsor | Fish and Wildlife | Response rates and results presentation | .25 |
| Faculty | December 89 | Eugene Borgida | Psychology | Sampling error | .25 |
| Faculty | January 90 | Robert Fulton | Sociology | How to estimate survey costs | .75 |
| Faculty | January 90 | Jeff Edelson | Social Work | Survey methodology | 1.00 |
| Staff | January 90, April 90 | Mary Vogel/ Charles Huizenga | Cold Climate Bldg. Research Center | Survey design | 4.00 |
| Grad student | February 90 | Margie Weiss | Nursing | Sampling | 1.25 |
| Grad student | February 90 | Bill Norman | Rec, Parks and Leisure Studies | Sampling | .25 |
| Staff | February 90 | Tracy Toomey | CLA | Data collection on telephone survey | .50 |
| Staff | March 90, April 90 | Kathy Robbins | Biomedical Library | Questionnaire review | 1.50 |

Unreimbursed Consulting
 Provided to the University of Minnesota
 (Continued)

| <u>STATUS</u> | <u>TIME FRAME</u> | <u>NAME</u> | <u>DEPARTMENT OR UNIT</u> | <u>TYPE OF SERVICE</u> | <u>HOURS</u> |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------|
| Faculty | March 90 | Earl Scott | Geography | Data analysis | 3.00 |
| Grad student | March 90 | Jessica Clark | Humphrey Institute | Census | 1.00 |
| Student | April 90 | Connie Tzenis | Educational Psychology | Data collection | .25 |
| Grad student | April 90 | Joe Gathman | Forest Resources | Mail surveys | 1.00 |
| Grad student | April 90 | Imho Bae | Social Work | Sampling | .50 |
| Student | April 90, May 90 | Derk Scholtz | Geography | Questionnaire design/data collection | 1.75 |
| Instructor | May 90 | Lance Egley | Sociology | Guest lecture | 3.00 |
| Faculty | May 90 | Myles Graff | Architecture | Survey design | 1.25 |
| Faculty | May 90 | David Smith | Fish & Wildlife | Sample error | .75 |
| Faculty | June 90 | Eugene Borgida | Psychology | How to estimate survey costs | .50 |
| Grad student | June 90 | Byron Miller | Geography | Survey critique | 1.50 |
| TOTAL HOURS: | | | | | 34.75 |

APPENDIX B

Unreimbursed Consulting
 Provided to Non-Profit Groups

| <u>TIME FRAME</u> | <u>NAME</u> | <u>DEPARTMENT OR UNIT</u> | <u>TYPE OF SERVICE</u> | <u>HOURS</u> |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| July 89 | Steve Musch | Mpls YMCA | Information about downtown survey | .25 |
| August 89 | Mitzi Health | St. Mary's - Winona | Survey design | 1.75 |
| August 89 | Cindy Kallstrom | Park-Nicollet Medical Foundation | Phone vs. mail surveys | .25 |
| August 89 | Ron Krupicka | Center for Rural Affairs | Survey coordination | 4.50 |
| October 89 | Beatrice Spector | St. Mary's | Secondary analysis | .50 |
| November | Susan Showalter | NW Area Foundation | Health care survey | .25 |
| Fall 89 | Anne Hamre | MN Food Education and Resource Center | Survey critique and recommendation | 10.00 |
| January 90 | Fred Doll | U of Wyoming | MCSR planning/policies | .50 |
| February 90 | Sharon Osborn | Children's Defense Fund | Survey design | 1.50 |
| February 90 | Michael O'Neal | Augsberg College | Guest lecture | 2.25 |
| March 90 | Wes Stevens | U of Illinois | Questionnaire review | 1.75 |
| April 90 | Joann Hall-Swenson | St. Thomas | Survey design | 1.50 |
| May 90 | Ned Crosby | Jefferson Center | Data collection | .75 |
| | | | TOTAL HOURS: | ----- 25.75 |

APPENDIX C

1989-90 MCSR Advisory Committee Members

University of Minnesota Representatives

John Campbell, Psychology

Terry Childers, Marketing & Business Law

William Flanigan, Political Science

Theodore Graham-Tomasi, Agriculture & Applied Economics

Robert Leik, Sociology

Karen Seashore Louis, Educational Policy and Administration

Frank Martin, Applied Statistics

Yorgos Stephanedes, Civil & Mineral Engineering

Albert Tims, Journalism & Mass Communications

James Vaupel, Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs

Wayne Welch, Educational Psychology

Government Representatives

Phillip Eckhert, Hennepin County Planning & Development

Paul Gunderson, Minnesota Dept. of Health, Center for Health Statistics

Michael Munson, Metropolitan Council

APPENDIX D

Minimum Criteria for MCSR Involvement in a Mail Survey

Background: MCSR is often approached by researchers who would like to use our supplies and letterhead in a mail survey, but not contract with MCSR for full survey services. This has several advantages for these people, including reducing their costs, reducing their logistical problems in printing envelopes, etc., and in increasing their response rate through the use of the name of the University of Minnesota.

Research has indeed shown that people respond favorably to university-sponsored research. Whether this is because of a trust in academic research or a pride in the local institution, university survey research centers have a responsibility to ensure that such research is of the highest quality. To protect the name of MCSR and the University of Minnesota, the following criteria have been established. They must be agreed to before MCSR stationery is allowed on any mail survey which is not conducted by MCSR itself.

1. We review questionnaire, improving clarity and removing bias. Ideally, in controversial surveys, we ask for comment from the opposing side and seek to work questions in ways that are acceptable to both sides.
2. All mechanical procedures are handled according to Dillman's Mail and Telephone Surveys. Cover letters are on letterhead, bond paper, individually signed using blue ink, etc.
3. Dillman's cover letter and postcard text approach is used, including both length (short) and content. MCSR reviews before mailing.
4. MCSR staff supervises mailing operations.
5. MCSR approves mailing schedule, taking into account the proper mailing interval, day of week, and time of year.
6. MCSR either handles the summarization of results or reviews the procedures used in enough detail to allow comment.
7. MCSR writes or has final approval on the methodology report.
8. Minimum reporting requirements are based on the AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research) Code of Ethics and Practices. See section III of that Code on the back of this sheet.
9. Every attempt is made to reach response rates of at least 60 percent, including follow-up mailings. This is the minimum rate to assure lack of response bias. If lower rates are achieved, the reasons are investigated (for example, through phone calls to non-respondents) and reported with the survey results.
10. No other part of the AAPOR Code of Ethics is violated, including breach of confidentiality, etc. See reverse side of this sheet.
11. If the above criteria are met and MCSR has available resources, MCSR will agree to sign a contract committing resources and the use of its name in a mail survey, whether or not MCSR is responsible for all aspects of the survey.

We, the members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, subscribe to the principles expressed in the following code. Our goals are to support sound and ethical practice in the conduct of public opinion research and in the use of such research for policy and decision-making in the public and private sectors, as well as to improve public understanding of opinion research methods and the proper use of opinion research results.

We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in conducting, analyzing, and reporting our work and in our relations with survey respondents, with our clients, with those who eventually use the research for decision-making purposes, and with the general public. We further pledge ourselves to reject all tasks or assignments that would require activities inconsistent with the principles of this code.

THE CODE

I. Principles of Professional Practice in the Conduct of Our Work

- A. We shall exercise due care in developing research designs and survey instruments, and in collecting, processing, and analyzing data, taking all reasonable steps to assure the reliability and validity of results.
1. We shall recommend and employ only those tools and methods of analysis which, in our professional judgment, are well suited to the research problem at hand.
 2. We shall not select research tools and methods of analysis because of their capacity to yield misleading conclusions.
 3. We shall not knowingly make interpretations of research results, nor shall we tacitly permit interpretations that are inconsistent with the data available.
 4. We shall not knowingly imply that interpretations should be accorded greater confidence than the data actually warrant.
- B. We shall describe our methods and findings accurately and in appropriate detail in all research reports, adhering to the standards for minimal disclosure specified in Section III, below.
- C. If any of our work becomes the subject of a formal investigation of an alleged violation of this Code, undertaken with the approval of the AAPOR Executive Council, we shall provide additional information on the survey in such detail that a fellow survey practitioner would be able to conduct a professional evaluation of the survey.

II. Principles of Professional Responsibility in Our Dealings With People

- A. The Public:
1. If we become aware of the appearance in public of serious distortions of our research, we shall publicly disclose what is required to correct these distortions, including, as appropriate, a statement to the public media, legislative body, regulatory agency, or other appropriate group, in or before which the distorted findings were presented.
- B. Clients or Sponsors:
1. When undertaking work for a private client, we shall hold confidential all proprietary information obtained about the client and about the conduct and findings of the research undertaken for the client, except when the dissemination of the information is expressly authorized by the client, or when disclosure becomes necessary under terms of Section I-C or II-A of this Code.
 2. We shall be mindful of the limitations of our techniques and capabilities and shall accept only those research assignments which we can reasonably expect to accomplish within these limitations.
- C. The Profession:
1. We recognize our responsibility to contribute to the science of public opinion research and to disseminate as freely as possible the ideas and findings which emerge from our research.
 2. We shall not cite our membership in the Association as evidence of professional competence, since the association does not so certify any persons or organizations.
- D. The Respondent:
1. We shall strive to avoid the use of practices or methods that may harm, humiliate, or seriously mislead survey respondents.
 2. Unless the respondent waives confidentiality for specified uses, we shall hold as privileged and confidential all information that might identify a respondent with his or her responses. We shall also not disclose or use the names of respondents for nonresearch purposes unless the respondents grant us permission to do so.

III. Standards for Minimal Disclosure

Good professional practice imposes the obligation upon all public opinion researchers to include, in any report of research results, or to make available when that report is released, certain essential information about how the research was conducted. At a minimum, the following items should be disclosed:

1. Who sponsored the survey, and who conducted it.
2. The exact wording of questions asked, including the text of any preceding instruction or explanation to the interviewer or respondent that might reasonably be expected to affect the response.
3. A definition of the population under study, and a description of the sampling frame used to identify this population.
4. A description of the sample selection procedure, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected by the researcher, or whether the respondents were entirely self-selected.
5. Size of sample and, if applicable, completion rates and information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures.
6. A discussion of the precision of the findings, including, if appropriate, estimates of sampling error, and a description of any weighting or estimating procedures used.
7. Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total sample.
8. Method, location, and dates of data collection.

APPENDIX E

MCSR METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH 1987-1990

Telephone Follow-up to Nonrespondents (1988). A methodological study was conducted within Minnesota Family Economic Well-Being Study (#89-5), a mail survey. One of the two counties being studied was showing very low response rates. Shortly after the third mailing, one-half of the non-respondents in this county were telephoned and encouraged to participate. The ultimate survey response rate for those not telephoned was 13%; the response rate for those telephoned in the methodological study was 23%.

Telephone Follow-up of Initial Refusers (1988). This methodological study was conducted on a telephone survey done for the Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, the Political Participation Survey (#88-13). The purpose of this methodological study was three-fold: (1) to get feedback on the introduction of the survey instrument, (2) to increase response rate, and (3) to see if there were any systematic response differences between initial refusers and completions. Of the over 200 initial refusers contacted by the telephone follow-up, 33 ended up completing the interview. Analysis of response differences is still in progress.

How Many Attempts Are Enough? (1989) In telephone surveys, MCSR routinely attempted at least 10 contacts before eliminating the individual from the original sample. Records of the number of contacts required for completion were studied to determine how the number of contacts affects the representativeness of the sample and responses to attitudinal questions. Current and two past years' omnibus surveys were studied. Preliminary results indicate that six contacts are enough to get a representative sample and that number of contacts does not significantly affect responses to selected attitudinal questions.

A Confirmation of Sample Validity (1989). A mail survey of Female and Minority Owned Businesses (#90-2) was conducted using client-supplied lists, but response rates were well under 60%. In an effort to increase the response rate and to determine the eligibility of nonrespondents, approximately half of the nonresponding business owners were contacted by telephone. This telephone effort resulted in the elimination of 39% of the original nonrespondent sample due to ineligibility.

Double-Sided Postcard Survey (1989). The short length of the Business Ownership Survey (#90-1) provided an unprecedented opportunity to enlist a new method of obtaining data. The mailings consisted of a perforated double postcard with the questionnaire and return address on one half of the perforation, and the cover letter and business address on the other. This format was selected because of the small number of questions in the questionnaire, the large number of surveys sent out (15,365), and the need to minimize postage costs. All the respondent would have to do was fill out the questionnaire, remove the cover letter via the perforation, and drop the postage paid post card into the mail. The response rate for the survey was 58% after two mailings.

Efforts to Increase Response Rate in a Mail Survey: The Effects of Survey Color, Cover Letter, and Reminder Type (1990). Within the University of Minnesota Staff Opinion Survey (#89-14), there were three methodological studies that were designed to enhance the response rate. The first dealt with the effect of survey color on response rate. Analysis of the data provided no significant differences among the blue, tan, and green conditions. In the second study, which involved type of cover letter, individuals received one of three different cover letters in the initial mailing: (1) a standard Dillman-type cover letter, (2) a cover letter with a sentence mentioning the potential of a mail follow-up for nonresponse, and (3) a cover letter with a sentence mentioning the potential of a mail and/or telephone follow-up for nonresponse. In the third study on type of follow-up reminder, nonrespondents to the initial mailing received a follow-up reminder either by mail or by telephone. Analysis of the data provided no significant main effects and no interactions between the cover letter and follow-up reminder manipulations.

Postcard Screener (1990). One week before the initial mailing of the Marriage in Minnesota Survey (#90-10), a screener was mailed to each household in the sample in the form of a double postcard. Since the survey was targeted only for married couples, the double postcard was comprised of a question asking if the potential respondent(s) was/were divorced, separated, widowed, single, or married. The purpose of this postcard was to reduce the costs of mailing a survey to non-married households. As a result of the postcard screener, a total of 209 (17%) of the 1200 households in the sample were eliminated from the study because they were not married, the postcard was not deliverable, or the person specified on the mailing label was deceased or had refused to participate.

Telephone Follow-up to Nonrespondents (1990). After returns from the third mailing of the Marriage in Minnesota survey (#90-10) slowed down, it became apparent that the overall response rate was substantially lower than the specified goal of 60%. In an effort to increase the response rate, all of the nonresponding households were contacted by telephone. This telephone effort was intended to do three things: (1) to determine the size of the ineligible unmarried population; (2) to encourage the husband or wife who had not completed a survey to participate in the study, and (3) to identify the reason(s) people were refusing to participate. A total of 32% of the nonrespondent sample could be eliminated from the eligible category. The top four reasons for not responding were: (1) the survey was too long; (2) the questions in the survey were too personal; (3) the potential respondent was too busy to fill out the survey; and (4) the potential respondent was just not interested in doing the survey.

APPENDIX F

PUBLICATION RESOURCE COLLECTION

I. SURVEY RESEARCH AND RELATED PUBLICATIONS

A. JOURNALS & PROCEEDINGS

Public Opinion Quarterly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Incomplete set 1962-1982. Complete 1986-present.

Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods. Prepared by the American Statistical Association from papers presented at the ASA Annual Meetings, Alexandria, Virginia: ASA Press. 1985-present.

B. BOOKS & MONOGRAPHS

AAPOR, *Directory of Members*, American Association for Public Opinion Research, current year.

_____ and WAPOR. *Agencies and Organizations*, AAPOR and the World Association for Public Opinion Research, current year.

Anon. *American Public Opinion Index*. Boston, Massachusetts: Public Opinion Research Service, 1987 and 1988.

Chatfield, C. and Collins, A.J. *Introduction to Multivariate Analysis*. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1980.

Converse, Jean M. *Survey Research in the United States: Roots & Emergence 1890-1960*. Berkely, California: University of California Press, 1987.

_____ and Presser, Stanley. *Survey Question: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-063. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1986.

Dillman, Don A. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Fowler, Floyd J. and Mangione, Thomas W. *Standardized Survey Interviewing: Minimizing Interviewer-Related Error*. Sage Pubns. series on Applied Social Research Methods, vol 18. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990.

Groves, R., et. al. *Telephone Survey Methodology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1988.

Guenzel, Pamela J., Berkman, Tracy R., and Cannell, Charles F. *General Interviewer Techniques: A Self-Instructional Workbook for Telephone and Personal Interviewer Training*. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, 1983.

B. BOOKS & MONOGRAPHS (continued)

ICPSR. "Guide to Resources and Services." Prepared by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. Ann Arbor, Michigan: 1985-86, 1987-88, 1989-90.

Kalton, Graham. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-035. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1983.

Kiecolt, K. Jill and Nathan, Laura E. *Secondary Analysis of Survey Data*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-053. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1985.

Kish, Leslie. *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Krueger, Richard A. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1988.

_____. *Focus Group Interviewing*. Workshop notebook. University of Minnesota. St. Paul, Minnesota, 1989.

Labaw, Patricia. *Advanced Questionnaire Design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Books, 1980.

Lindman, Harold R. *Analysis of Variance in Complex Experimental Designs*. San Francisco, California: W.H. Freeman & Co., 1974.

Long, J. Scott. *Covariance Structure Models*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-034. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1983.

Markus, Gregory. *Analyzing Panel Data*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-018. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1979.

McKeown, Bruce and Thomas, Dan. *Q Methodology*. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, #07-066. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1988.

McKillip, Jack. *Need Analysis: Tools for the Human Services and Education*. Sage Pubns. series on Applied Social Research Methods, vol. 10. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987.

Mitchell, Robert C. and Carson, Richard T. *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods*. Washington D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1989.

Rosenberg, Morris. *The Logic of Survey Analysis*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

B. BOOKS & MONOGRAPHS (continued)

Rosenthal, Robert. *Meta-Analytic Procedures for Social Research*. Sage Pubns. series on Applied Social Research Methods, vol. 6. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1984.

Spiegel, Murray. *Statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Sudman, Seymour and Bradburn, Norman M. *Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design*. San Fransisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

C. NEWSLETTERS

AAPOR News. American Association for Public Opinion Research. Spring 1986-present.

CATI News. Sawtooth Software: Ketchum, ID. December 1985-present.

The Sampler. Response Analysis: Princeton, New Jersey. Sept 1987-present.

Survey Research. Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois. Winter 1987-present.

II. CENSUS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Borchert, John R. and Gustafson, Neil C. *Atlas of Minnesota Resources and Settlement*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: jointly published by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota and the Minnesota State Planning Agency, 1980.

Census Bureau. "Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations." U.S. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

_____. "Block Statistics & Maps: Minneapolis-St. Paul," 1980 Census. Department of Commerce. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

_____. "County and City Data Book." A Statistical Abstract Supplement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

_____. "Number of Inhabitants: Minnesota." 1980 Census, Chapter A. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

_____. "General Population Characteristics: Minnesota." 1980 Census, Chapter B. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

II. CENSUS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (continued)

_____. "General Social and Economic Characteristics: Minnesota." 1980 Census, Chapter C. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

_____. "Statistical Abstract of the United States." Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.

City of Minneapolis. "State of the City 1987." Planning Department. Minneapolis, Minnesota: 1988.

D'Aleo, Richard J. *FEDfind: Your Key to Finding Federal Government Information*. Springfield, Virginia: ICUC Press, 1986.

Energy and Economic Development Department. "1986 Economic Profile of Minnesota." Prepared by the Policy Analysis Division. St. Paul, Minnesota: 1986.

Lesko, Matthew. *Information USA*. New York: Viking Press, 1983.

MAPS. "Minnesota Population and Housing Characteristics." From 1980 Census. Prepared the the Minnesota Analysis and Planning System, University of Minnesota. St. Paul, Minnesota: 1982.

_____. "Minnesota Socio-Economic Characteristics." From 1980 Census. Prepared by the Minnesota Analysis and Planning System, University of Minnesota. St. Paul, Minnesota: (subset of full publication) 1983.

State Demography Unit. *Minnesota Population Projections 1980-2010*. St. Paul, 1983.

APPENDIX G

INDEX TO SIGNIFICANT ITEMS IN PREVIOUS ANNUAL REPORTS

Results of 1988 Faculty Survey (1987-88 Annual Report, Appendix E)

This survey was sent to all Twin City Campus faculty with an interest in survey research. The survey was a needs assessment for MCSR, as we looked for popular topics to present in the Brown Bag Seminar Series; we also used the information to set priorities in developing new services. Full results are presented in this publication.

Client Feedback Questionnaire (1988-89 Annual Report, Appendix D)

This questionnaire was developed to evaluate and improve service to our clients. It is sent to our primary contact at the end of each project.

MCSR Project Responsibility Worksheet (1988-89 Annual Report, Appendix E)

This worksheet is completed with the client before the initiation of any project. It serves as a checklist on all aspects of any survey. It also ensures that each party is clear about who has responsibility for each task.

Annotated List and Index of Past Surveys and Data Files (1988-89 Annual Report, Appendix F)

This item was developed to encourage and support secondary use of existing survey data. The list and index are now updated annually and available as a separate report.

APPENDIX H

ABSTRACTS OF 1989-90 SURVEYS

INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains abstracts of surveys completed during the past fiscal year. Abstracts of surveys from earlier years are available from MCSR. This listing is intended to facilitate access to this rich data source by interested faculty, students, and other researchers.

Except where confidentiality or privacy laws override, all survey data collected by MCSR is available for public use after the client has had primary access. Data is available 18 months after completion of the survey project or when released by the client, whichever comes first.

MCSR began detailed documentation and archiving of survey data files in 1982. Results are preserved in written technical reports and on magnetic media. Within each calendar year the abstracts are ordered by technical report number, which simply reflects the order in which survey projects were completed in a given year. The technical report number is given in parenthesis following the title of each survey, e.g., (#89-9) was the ninth technical report completed in 1989.

Unless otherwise noted, surveys were based on random samples of adults, age 18 and over, living in Minnesota. Each survey contains demographic data on the respondents in addition to the substantive questions. Response rates range from 70% to 90%. The number of surveys completed for each project is included in the abstract.

More detailed information about each survey is contained in its technical report. These are available for perusal in the MCSR office. Photocopies can be made on a cost reimbursable basis.

The availability of a data file varies by survey. A few data files are not available for distribution at this time. In most cases, however, MCSR has an SPSS system file on disk available for copying. In some cases there was no computer file, or it has been transferred to the client for maintenance, access, and sharing. The following codes, following the technical report number, denote the format and accessibility of each data file, e.g., (#90-4,1) means that the 1989 Minnesota State Omnibus Survey is available on floppy disk from MCSR.

- 1 - Floppy disk available at MCSR
- 2 - Tape file available from MCSR (Note that these older files may require special handling. MCSR cannot guarantee readability or provide extensive technical assistance.)
- 3 - Data available from client
- 4 - No computerized data file exists
- 5 - Data not publicly available at this time

PCA ON-SITE COLLECTION: INVENTORY OF WASTE PESTICIDES AND DISPOSAL OF WASTE PESTICIDES (#89-16,1)

Data collection for the PCA On-Site Collection was conducted by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (PCA) in the Springs of 1988 and 1989. The Minnesota Center for Survey Research (MCSR) assisted the project with survey design, editing and coding the survey and the inventory sheets, and preparing a computer file ready for analysis. A total of 244 farmers and commercial users completed surveys.

This study consisted of setting up collection sites in six southern Minnesota counties. Farmers and some commercial users from these counties used the collection sites to dispose of their waste pesticides. PCA agents took inventory of the waste pesticides brought into the collection sites. While the farmers were at the collection sites, they completed a survey about their attitudes on the collection effort.

MINNEAPOLIS PARK AND RECREATION BOARD CRITICAL NEEDS SURVEY (#89-17,1)

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Critical Needs Survey was conducted as a mail survey in the Spring of 1989. Roughly half of 868 completed surveys came from a city-wide sample, the other half equally divided among four park service areas.

Questions concerned the best and worst things about Minneapolis parks, the use and perceptions of park facilities and programs, the importance of Minneapolis parks, and sources of information about Minneapolis parks and park programs.

COMPAS NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL ARTS FUND PROGRAM: A NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY (#89-18,5)

This COMPAS Needs Assessment Survey was conducted to identify barriers that Native American artists in Minnesota face in creating and disseminating their art. Data collection for the COMPAS Needs Assessment Survey was conducted by Minnesota's largest community arts organization, COMPAS. Data was collected during the Spring of 1989 by two survey methods, survey administration and mail, and resulted in 159 completed questionnaires. MCSR assisted on all other aspects of the project, including preparation of a brief report of substantive findings.

Respondents answered questions about: their art, the time and money they spend on it, income and experience with funding sources, and what services and resources they would appreciate in a new Native American Cultural Arts Program.

OLMSTED HOUSING SURVEY (#89-19,1)

The Olmsted Housing Survey was a telephone survey of 1008 households conducted during the summer of 1989. The sample was stratified by geographic area, income level, and tenure. The survey was conducted for faculty in the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs who work for Olmsted County. Actual telephone work was conducted by local volunteers trained by MCSR.

Respondents answered questions about their current housing, housing maintenance, housing satisfaction, and cost of housing. Renters were asked about their prospects of becoming homeowners. Low income individuals were asked about the burden of housing costs.

BORDER WATERS BUSINESS SURVEY (#89-20,3)

This Border Waters Business Survey for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources was conducted as a telephone survey of 142 businesses located on the border waters between Northeastern Minnesota and Southwestern Ontario. Data collection was conducted from August 25 through September 7, 1989.

Business managers or owners answered questions about the type and size of their operations, the proportion of their business attributable to hunting/fishing trade and to users of the adjacent US/Canadian wilderness areas, and the geographic distribution of their customers.

SOLVENT WASTE SURVEY (#89-21,5)

This Solvent Waste Survey a mail survey of 401 businesses listed as generators of solvent waste by the state Pollution Control Agency, the project client. Data was collected during August and September, 1989.

Respondents answered questions about their familiarity with waste minimization; how much various practices would help reduce the amount of solvent waste being produced; importance of reasons for reducing solvent wastes; the amounts, uses, and disposal methods of the solvent waste generated by the business; the costs associated with solvent waste generation; and reasons the business would not be interested in reducing solvent wastes.

BUSINESS OWNERSHIP SURVEY (#90-1,3)

This Business Ownership Survey for the Minnesota Department of Administration was a mail survey of 8611 small businesses in Minnesota. The survey was conducted in the Fall of 1989.

Respondents answered questions about the gender and race of the business owner, whether the business owner was handicapped, and the firm's gross revenues for the last full year.

FEMALE AND MINORITY BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY (#90-2,3)

The Female and Minority Business Owner Survey was a mail survey of 687 businesses conducted for the state Department of Administration in the Fall of 1989. The sample was created from lists provided by the Small Business Administration, the Women's Economic Development Association, and the state's own contract bidder list.

The goal of this survey was two-fold: 1) to better understand the problems that business owners face in operating their business, and 2) to identify whether discrimination is occurring toward female and minority business owners.

AIDS SURVEY OF GAY AND BISEXUAL MEN (#90-3,5)

The AIDS Survey of Gay and Bisexual Men was a telephone survey conducted for Communication Technologies of San Francisco, California, and the Minnesota Department of Health. Gay and bisexual men were contacted by random digit dialing in selected census tracts in Minneapolis and St. Paul, then asked screening questions. Fifty-one men were interviewed in a pilot study; 404 were interviewed in the full study, conducted in the Fall of 1989 and early winter 1990.

The goal of the survey was to discover respondent knowledge about AIDS and what, if any, changes had been made in sexual practices and drug usage as a result of the AIDS epidemic.

1989 MINNESOTA STATE SURVEY (#90-4,1)

The 1989 Minnesota State Survey was an omnibus survey of 804 Minnesota residents conducted during Fall 1989. Eleven topics were included in the survey:

- 1) Quality of Life asked respondents to identify the most important problem in Minnesota.
- 2) Attractions asked about museums, especially the Science Museum of Minnesota.
- 3) Public Education inquired about appropriate teacher salaries and about school consolidation.
- 4) Business and Nonprofits asked about plant closing regulations. Respondents were also asked about tax status of and participation in nonprofit groups.
- 5) Transportation questions were about problems with highway construction.
- 6) Drunk Driving questions were about funding sources to reduce this problem.
- 7) Gambling questions were about individual participation and problems.
- 8) Recreation questions concerned bicycling.

1989 MINNESOTA STATE SURVEY (continued)

- 9) Food Products questions were about purchasing Minnesota grown products.
- 10) Food Inspection questions were about confidence in food safety.
- 11) Higher Education questions focused on participation in and prospects for taking extension classes.

1989 TWIN CITIES AREA SURVEY (#90-5, 1)

The 1989 Twin Cities Area Survey was an omnibus survey of 800 Twin Cities area residents conducted during Fall 1989. Four topics were included in the survey:

- 1) Quality of Life questions concerned rating the Twin Cities as a place to live and the most important problems facing the Twin Cities.
- 2) Environment questions were about landfills and recycling.
- 3) Education questions were about higher education courses people planned to take.
- 4) Elderly questions concerned current and prospective care-giving needs.

OLMSTED COUNTY AGRICULTURAL TRAUMA STUDY (#90-6,5)

The Olmsted County Agricultural Trauma Study was a telephone survey of 985 farm households conducted for the Minnesota Department of Health and the School of Public Health at the University of Minnesota. This project consisted of four different phases: (1) the Rice County Agricultural Trauma Pilot Study; (2) the Olmsted County Index Farm Study; (3) the Olmsted County Other Household Study; and (4) the Case Control Feasibility Study. It began in Summer 1988 and continued through Fall 1989.

The primary objective of this study was to determine, for a census of Olmsted County farms, the incidence of farm injuries, including the proportion of farms with injuries, the incidence of injuries by age and gender, injuries associated with specific farming activities, and different kinds of farm enterprises.

COMMON BATTERIES: COMMERCIAL USE AND DISPOSAL PRACTICES (#90-7, 1)

This survey about the commercial use and disposal practices of common batteries for the Recycling Office of Hennepin County was conducted as a telephone survey of 83 businesses engaged in enterprises known as heavy users of batteries. It was conducted in Winter 1990.

This survey had two goals: 1) to get an idea of how many and what kind of batteries are used by businesses in Hennepin County and 2) how these batteries are currently being disposed of. Respondents answered questions about their business or organization's use and disposal of seven kinds of batteries.

APPENDIX H

MINNESOTA FARMERS' SURVEY (#90-8, 5)

The Minnesota Farmers' Survey was conducted as mail survey in the Winter of 1990 and was completed by 1016 farmers. Three sub-samples of farmers were included in the study: a random statewide sample; an oversample of farmers in nine specified counties; and an oversample of "sustainable" farmers. This project was conducted for the Land Stewardship Project and is part of a larger five-state study being funded by the Northwest Area Foundation.

Selected farm owners or operators answered questions about attitudes toward farming techniques and agricultural issues, sources of information on farming issues, farming practices, the impact of farming on the family, labor market and community impact issues, and economic factors related to farming.

SURVEY OF THE SOCIOECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MINNESOTA SPORTFISHING (#90-9, 3)

This survey of angling activity in Minnesota was conducted for a faculty member in the University's Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics as part of a study for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. The data collection included a four-phase iterative telephone survey and three discrete mail surveys to Minnesota resident anglers, non-resident anglers, and ice anglers.

For this study, a total of 3,300 surveys were completed. Of these, 1257 were telephone interviews conducted in the summer of 1989. A total of 1,843 mail surveys were completed from September 1989 through March 1990. The sample was drawn from 1988 licenses.

The goal of this study was to integrate knowledge of sport fishing economics into Minnesota's fish management program. Two objectives of the survey were: 1) to assess the economic impact of recreational fishing in Minnesota, and 2) to place a value on Minnesota's fishery resources, assessed via willingness-to-pay measures. Respondents were asked questions about the frequency and location of fishing activity, the type of fish sought and caught, and the amount of money spent. More detailed questions were asked about trips more than 30 minutes from home.

MARRIAGE IN MINNESOTA SURVEY (#90-10, 5)

The Marriage in Minnesota Survey was a mail survey of Twin Cities married couples. A total of 303 married couples returned completed surveys and 51 married people sent back a single completed survey. The survey was conducted in the Winter and Spring of 1990 for a professor in the School of Nursing and a graduate student in the Department of Psychology. A follow-up survey designed to assess changes in attitude was sent to respondents two months after their initial response; 495 individuals responded.

Respondents answered questions about many aspects of their relationship such as amount of time spent together, spouse's influence on the respondent, the respondent's influence on their spouse, their present marriage compared to their own best realistic alternative, their present marriage compared to their own expectations, their own feelings and behavior (a depression scale), how their marriage is now, and various background questions.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA UNDERGRADUATE SURVEY (#90-11, 5)

The Undergraduate Survey was conducted as a mail survey of 2634 students at the University of Minnesota. This project was sponsored by the Provost's Office at the University of Minnesota.

The goal of this survey research was to better understand the relationship between attending school and working at a paid job. A random sample of undergraduate students answered questions about school and work. Topics included: the number of hours spent in a variety of activities, type of paid work, salary, length of employment, job satisfaction, reasons for working, effect of paid work on school, compatibility of roles as a student and a worker, personal finances, parental attitudes and their ability to help with school expenses, and demographic data.

BOSS PROJECT EVALUATION 1990 (#90-12, 3)

The BOSS Project Evaluation '90 was a mail survey completed by 78 participants in the BOSS (Better Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency) program. It was conducted for a faculty member in the Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs under contract with the City of St. Paul's Housing Information Office. This project was a follow-up to a project conducted by MCSR during Winter 1989 (#89-9).

Questions included in the BOSS Evaluation focused on expectations of and experiences with the program, importance and satisfaction with each of five services provided by the program, suggestions for changes in the program, and overall impact of the program in the respondent's life. The questions asked participants to compare the attitudes they had at the time they completed the program to the attitudes they have now.

PINE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT RESIDENT SURVEY (#90-13, 1)

The Pine City School District Resident Survey was of 394 households in the school district. The survey was conducted in the spring of 1990 for the administration of the Pine City school district. This was a follow-up to an earlier study (#87-4).

The survey asked respondents to comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the school district, subjects and programs to be emphasized at elementary and secondary levels, quality of the schools, parents' involvement, and selected demographic information.

THE KOOCHICHING COUNTY AND RED LAKE COUNTY SURVEYS (#90-14, 5)

The Koochiching County and Red Lake County Surveys consisted of two separate mail surveys, in Koochiching County (n=406) and Red Lake County (n=365), who were/are in the process of deciding whether or not to accept a proposal to build a hazardous waste facility in their respective counties. The surveys were conducted in the Spring and Summer of 1990 for a graduate student in the Department of Political Science and was sponsored by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA).

The major issue was the siting of a statewide hazardous waste facility; Koochiching had considered and rejected the idea, while Red Lake was still deliberating. Respondents in both counties answered comparable questions about the extent of their support or opposition to the hazardous waste facility, their agreement with several factual statements about hazardous waste and the economic repercussions of having a facility in their county, how active they were in the controversy in the form of civic participation, and how much they trusted the people making the decisions.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PUBLIC OPINION POLL, 1990 (#90-15, 5)

The University of Minnesota Public Opinion Poll was a 5-part telephone survey consisting of an external sample of Minnesota residents (n=807) and an internal sample of University of Minnesota full-time students (n=202), faculty (n=200), civil service (n=206), and professional/academic staff (n=213). The survey was conducted in Spring 1990 for the Office of External Relations as a follow-up to a 1988 survey of Minnesota residents.

Respondents answered questions about the University of Minnesota's purpose and mission, performance and accomplishments, accountability and responsiveness, and value and payback.

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC LIBRARY PATRON SURVEY (#90-16, 5)

The Philadelphia Public Library Patron Survey was conducted as an exit survey of 7595 patrons of the Philadelphia Public Library in May 1990. MCSR performed two tasks for this project: 1) editing and coding of the questionnaires, and 2) preparation of a computer file ready for analysis.

The goals of this project were threefold: 1) to determine what the patrons actually used the library for, 2) to have patrons evaluate the library and its services, and 3) to provide an opportunity for patrons to make recommendations for improving the library.

APPENDIX I

INDEX TO PAST SURVEYS AND DATA FILES, 1982-1990

NOTE: Numbers refer to year and report number, e.g. #86-4 is the 4th report written in 1986.

Business 86-4, 88-2, 88-5, 88-7, 88-18, 88-20, 89-3, 89-16, 89-18, 89-20,
89-21, 90-1, 90-2, 90-4, 90-7

Crime, Criminal Justice System 83-2, 84-1, 84-4, 85-1, 86-2, 87-1, 87-7,
88-3, 88-5, 88-13, 89-15

Community Surveys 87-4, 87-7, 87-8, 88-5, 88-15, 89-17, 89-19, 90-13, 90-14

Computer Usage 83-2, 84-1

Economy, Economic Well-Being 83-2, 85-1, 85-8, 86-1, 86-2, 86-4, 88-15,
89-5, 90-9, 90-11

Education 84-4, 85-7, 87-4, 87-6, 87-14, 88-3, 88-15, 88-19, 88-21, 89-1, 90-4,
90-5, 90-11, 90-13, 90-15

Elderly 85-1, 86-2, 87-1, 88-1, 88-23, 89-1, 89-2

Emotions 83-2, 84-1, 88-23, 90-10

Energy 83-2, 84-4

Environment 84-1, 84-4, 85-1, 85-7, 86-1, 86-2, 86-5, 87-1, 87-6,
88-2, 88-3, 88-7, 88-9, 89-1, 89-4, 89-6, 89-10, 89-16, 89-21, 90-5, 90-7,
90-8, 90-14

Food and Food Sufficiency 85-1, 86-2, (86-3) 88-3, (88-8), 90-4

Foreign Opinion 88-12

Gambling 85-1, 85-7, 90-4

Government Program Evaluation 83-2, 84-1, 85-1, 85-8, 86-6, 87-1, 87-4, 87-8,
87-10, 87-11, 87-13, 88-5, 88-19, 89-2, 89-10, 90-13, 90-14, 90-15

Health, Health Care 84-4, 85-7, 86-2, 88-1, 88-3, 88-23, 89-1, 89-3, 90-3,
90-6, 90-14

Housing 84-1, 85-1, 85-8, 87-1, 87-7, 87-8, 87-15, 88-5, 88-15, 89-19, 90-12

Human Services 85-1, 85-8, 86-2, 87-1, 87-6, 87-10, 87-11, 88-5, 88-23,
89-7, 89-8, 89-9, 90-12

Library 86-2, 88-14, 90-16

APPENDIX I

Low-Income Population 85-1, 85-8, 86-2, (86-3), 88-3, (88-8), 89-9, 89-19,
90-12

Migration 86-2, 88-23

Metropolitan Omnibus Surveys 83-2, 84-1, 85-1, 86-2, 87-2, 88-3, 89-2, 90-5

Northeast Minnesota 88-2, (88-4), 88-20

Organization Survey 85-7, 87-9, 88-19, 89-12, 89-18, 90-15, 90-16

Participation, Volunteer 85-7, 88-13, 88-23, 89-6, 90-4, 90-5

Patriotism 88-17, 88-24

Political Candidates 85-7

Recreation 84-5, 85-7, 86-1, 86-2, 86-4, 87-1, 87-5, 87-9, 87-12, 88-15,
89-1, 89-10, 89-17, 89-20, 90-4, 90-9

Retail Shopping and Entertainment 85-1, 86-4, 88-2, 88-15, 89-1, 89-2

Social Indicators and Quality of Life 83-2, 84-1, 84-4, 85-1, 85-7, 86-1,
86-2, 87-2, 87-6, 88-2, 88-3, 89-1, 89-2, 90-4, 90-5

Social Issues 83-2, 84-1, 85-7, 88-17, 90-4

State Omnibus Surveys 84-4, 85-7, 86-1, 87-6, 88-2, 89-1, 90-4

Taxes and Tax Compliance 85-7, 86-1, 88-2, 88-10

Telephone Services 85-6, (85-7), 86-1, 86-2, 87-1, 88-2

Transportation and Driving 83-2, 84-1, 84-4, 86-2, 87-1, 87-13, 88-5,
88-23, 89-1, 89-15, 90-4

University Administration 84-5, 87-14, 87-15, 88-6, 88-19, 88-22, 89-11,
89-13, 89-14, 89-15, 90-11, 90-15