

R9300

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**MINNESOTA
CENTER FOR
SURVEY
RESEARCH**



May 1993

ANNUAL REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 1991 - 1992

prepared by: Rossana Armson, Acting Director

Minnesota Center for Survey Research
University of Minnesota
2122 Riverside Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55454-1320
(612) 627-4282

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction.	1
Mission	1
History	2
Surveys Conducted in 1991-92.	3
Contributions to University Teaching, Research, and Communication.	6
Internal Operating Improvements	7
1991-92 Staffing.	8
Professional Activities	9
Public Relations.	10
Governance.	10
Appendices:	
A Other Services Provided by MCSR	A-1
B Unreimbursed Consulting	B-1
C 1991-92 MCSR Advisory Committee Members	C-1
D MCSR Research Documentation	D-1
E Index to Significant Items in Previous Annual Reports	E-1
F Abstracts of 1991-92 Surveys	F-1
G Index to Past Surveys and Data Files, 1982-1992	G-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 academic year ending June 30, 1992. This is the fifth annual report and this year's report closely follows those of the past.

This year has been one of relative stability in the number and size of projects, accompanied by intense activity and new challenges. The number of full-service or complete surveys conducted for clients declined slightly to 25, while surveys were completed by 33,952 people and institutions. MCSR also provided other services to 16 clients (see Appendix A).

In addition to these services provided for a fee, MCSR provided 122.25 hours of unreimbursed consultation to 63 people. About two thirds of this free service was provided to University faculty and students; the rest to Minnesota government and non-profit agencies. 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, 1991 to June 30, 1992. Sections of this report designed to meet this end include: a list of the surveys conducted; contributions to University teaching, research, and communication; improvements made in the areas of management, technology, and accommodations; 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.

Seven 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) abstracts of this year's surveys (Appendix F); and 2) our index to past surveys and data files (Appendix G).

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, though increasingly we are collecting data in the field. 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 conducting 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. In addition, MCSR can provide a laboratory for research on survey research. A small reference collection is also being developed to serve the survey research needs of students and faculty.

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 is currently in the fourth stage of its history. In its two earliest stages it was part of the Department of Sociology, but it became a University-wide facility in 1986 under the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA). At the beginning of the 1991-92 academic year, MCSR's latest stage began under the leadership of acting director Rossana Armson.

MCSR began in 1968 as the Minnesota Center for Sociological Research. At this point, its director was Michael Quinn Patton and its focus was on evaluation research. In 1981, Ronald E. Anderson assumed the directorship of MCSR; the name was changed to the Minnesota Center for Social Research, and the focus was shifted to survey research. In 1982, MCSR conducted its first Twin Cities Area Survey and the Minnesota State Survey followed in 1984.

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 CURA and became a resource accessible to the entire university. Its name was changed again, to the Minnesota Center for Survey Research, and CURA's Assistant Director for Research, Dr. William Craig, became director of MCSR. Because of CURA's extensive ties to public agencies and the non-profit community, MCSR became more accessible to the outside community concerned with public policy in Minnesota.

At the end of the 1990-91 academic year, Dr. Craig returned full-time to CURA. During his tenure at MCSR, the Center saw significant growth in the number of surveys conducted and the attainment of financial stability. Numerous policies and procedures were implemented, as documented in this and previous annual reports, that brought coherence to MCSR's operations and enhanced its reputation for conducting high quality research.

On July 1, 1991, assistant director Rossana Armson became acting director of MCSR. She had continued many of the procedures initiated by Dr. Craig, including the preparation of this annual report.

Surveys Conducted in 1991-92

The following two pages summarize the surveys conducted in the past year. Where the effort or contract occurred during two academic years, surveys are reported here only when the majority of the work was completed in the July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992 period.

More detailed descriptions of each of these surveys are presented in Appendix F. 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.

Twenty-five survey projects collected data from 33,952 people or institutions. This represents a slight decline in the number of projects from the previous year, although the number of completed surveys increased (See Table 1). Compared to the first year of operation under CURA, 1986-87, the number of surveys completed has more than doubled and there has been a major shift toward mail surveys.

TABLE 1

ANNUAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND COMPLETED SURVEYS

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Number of Completed Surveys</u>	<u>% Completions that were Mail Surveys</u>
1986-87	10	13,689	14%
1987-88	20	14,562	43%
1988-89	22	19,568	52%
1989-90	22	33,551	80%
1990-91	29	27,928	79%
1991-92	25	33,952	82%

3) NON-UNIVERSITY PROJECTS -----	<u>Number of Completed Surveys</u>		
	<u>Telephone</u> **	<u>Mail</u> *	<u>Total</u>
Glendale Community Survey - Glendale Residents Action Council		109	
Minneapolis Community Survey: Downtown Minneapolis, Loring Park, and Stevens Square - Central Community Council		243	
Minnesota Transfer Student Survey - Minnesota Pollution Control Survey	788		
The Community Affairs Department Surveys - Marsha Mueller, Mueller & Associates		120	
Bryant Neighborhood Resident Survey - Neighborhood Revitalization Program		227	
Mississippi River Boating Survey ** - Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	741		
Judicial Evaluation and Retention Survey - Hennepin County Bar Association		3,821	
College and University Financial System Project: A Survey of the Financial Management System - KPMG Peat Marwick Company	24		
Cultural Diversity - GrayHall, Inc.		47	
Whittier Neighborhood School Survey - Neighborhood Revitalization Program	205		
A Survey about Using Geographic Information Systems - Government Information Systems Management Org.		416	
Hennepin County Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Recycling Survey ** - Hennepin County Dept of Environmental Mgmt	234		
Lowry Hill Neighborhood Resident Survey - Neighborhood Revitalization Program		594	
Bancroft Neighborhood Resident Survey - Neighborhood Revitalization Program		910	
Phillips Neighborhood Resident Survey *** - Neighborhood Revitalization Program	2,236	132	
	-----	-----	
	SUBTOTAL:	4,228	6,619
		-----	-----
	GRAND TOTALS:	6,030	27,922
		(18%)	(82%)
		-----	-----
			10,847

* Includes all surveys where respondents completed a self-administered survey, without an interviewer asking questions.

** Includes surveys that were conducted by personal interview.

*** Actual data collection was performed by volunteers or client.

Each year, the surveys conducted at MCSR present new data collection challenges. Sampling has been more difficult with surveys of rare populations. Large-scale face-to-face interviewing projects have presented new training, quality control, and logistical challenges. Working with neighborhood residents on the Neighborhood Revitalization Program surveys required us to develop new ways to talk about our survey work. Resident participation was continually changing, with frequent reviews of previous decisions necessary. Finally, several clients had unusually stringent requirements related to confidentiality, for both mail and telephone survey data collection. The staff at MCSR has welcomed these challenges and has successfully responded to them.

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 academic year to build a community of those interested in this field.

- * Continued to abstract and index MCSR reports and data files. This material is developed in order to encourage secondary use of survey data.
- * Compiled and published the fifth annual directory of Courses in Survey Research. It lists courses from 23 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 looks for potential projects where a joint MCSR/faculty project could produce a useful product for a state agency. This year a collaborative project was conducted with faculty in Landscape Architecture and Kinesiology and Leisure Studies: the Mississippi River Boating Survey. This study was conducted for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and the study area included 135 miles and 250 different locations on the Mississippi River. Interviews were conducted at ramps/marinas with 741 boaters who were leaving the river. (See Appendix F for more information about this study.)
- * 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 MCSR as a listing in the Instructional Resources Handbook published by the Office of Educational Development Programs.
- * Produced fourth Annual Report. This was distributed to over 150 faculty and administrators across campus.

- * Continued the practice of providing free questions on the Fall omnibus surveys. Questions must be oriented toward 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: George Gordon, School of Public Health; and Mark Umbreit, School of Social Work.
- * Trained and employed 40 undergraduate students. Every attempt is made to recruit students from a wide variety of disciplines; these 40 students represented 34 different disciplines.
- * Continued to add to our collection of survey research publications.
- * Provided many other services; see list of survey projects, partial service projects (Appendix A), and unreimbursed consulting (Appendix B).
- * Had our project reports utilized by dozens of students who were looking for survey data for course papers. Provided computer data files to a few of them.

Internal Operating Improvements

The initiatives documented below were undertaken during the past year to improve the quality of our products and the satisfaction of our clients.

- * Fully implemented the use of CATI, computer assisted telephone interviewing. This changeover began in January 1991. In academic year 1991-92, MCSR conducted three CATI projects and over 2,500 interviews. CATI increases start-up time for telephone surveys, but reduces data processing time and costs, with results available for analysis within days after interviewing is completed.
- * Conducted our second major field study, the Mississippi River Boating Survey. This effort was a success, despite concerns about the survey taking place in remote areas, complicated sampling issues, and the difficult task of obtaining and coding trip-specific information about boating routes.
- * Continued to leave messages on answering machines. We found that many people returned our call and that others were receptive on subsequent calls.
- * Continued to look for ways to conduct small methodological research projects as part of some surveys.
- * Continued positive relationships with the University of Minnesota's School of Public Health survey research unit in Epidemiology. Senior staff in the two units continue to meet informally on a regular basis.
- * Received approval from the University Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration for revised hourly billing rates for calendar year 1992. This system includes a surcharge on hourly wages which covers the fixed costs of running MCSR. This approach greatly simplifies accounting work for MCSR and for the University.

ANNUAL REPORT 1991-92

- * Revised the CATI Instruction Manual. This manual documents procedures and also helps interviewers make the transition to supervisor.
- * Revised the Project Responsibility Worksheet (See Appendix D).
- * Revised the Client Feedback Questionnaire (See Appendix D), and continued to send out a Client Feedback Questionnaire to each client after a project is completed.
- * Developed a "Project Manager's Notebook", which provides one source for written documentation and samples for new project managers. Major sections of this Notebook include: an MCSR organizational chart; general project management information (working with clients, sample project schedules, sampling); questionnaire design; project management; coding and editing paper and pencil questionnaires; calculating response rates; finishing a project; and report standards.
- * Made a transition in word processing software, from Word Star to Word Perfect. This allows us to have much more flexibility in survey design and layout.
- * Developed a standardized format on diskette for MCSR technical reports and appendices.
- * Continued to utilize a new telephone number sampling service which screens out at least half of the disconnected numbers. Our supplier, Survey Sampling, Inc., now screens our random digit samples for: (1) known business listings and (2) disconnected numbers which are identified by a special computer generated tone on the telephone line.

1991-92 Staffing

MCSR has a professional staff of 4.5 full-time equivalents and a large cadre of trained graduate and undergraduate student employees. There were three major staff transitions during this academic year. First, Nancy Davenport left MCSR to become the Associate Head of Field Operations at the University of Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. Second, the office specialist, a full-time Civil Service position, was replaced. Third, the position of Data Manager became a full-time Civil Service position.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>PERCENT TIME</u>
Rossana Rae Armson	Acting Director	100
Nancy J. Davenport	Survey Manager	100
Pamela J. Schomaker	Survey Manager	
Antoinette McGinley	Senior Account Specialist	50
Lisa Peterson	Data Manager	100
Janelle Miersch	Office Specialist	100
Michelle Cook	Office Specialist	

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, four graduate Research Assistants and 40 undergraduate students worked at MCSR.

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 completing their degree.

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. MCSR staff members have been members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) and MCSR 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.

Assistant Director Rossana Armson has attended the annual National Field Director's Conference since 1986. In 1989 she served as program chair. In 1990, 1991, and 1992 she was a discussion leader; this year's session was on accurately budgeting survey costs in a small survey operation. In 1992 she also became a member of AAPOR and attended that organization's annual conference.

Survey Manager Pamela Schomaker is a new staff member. This year, she attended the annual National Field Director's Conference for the first time. She also attended: a workshop on Attaining Goals and Improving Leadership Through Administrator Performance Review that was offered by the University's Administrative Development Program; and a two day Focus Group Interviewing Workshop that was conducted by Richard Krueger, Minnesota Extension Service.

Data Manager Lisa Peterson attended the 1992 National Field Technologies Conference which is held in conjunction with the National Field Director's Conference.

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:

- * Distributed an informational mailing to all faculty at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities campus in September 1991 about MCSR's data conversion services. This memo described our expertise in editing and coding, coordinating data entry services, data cleaning, and analysis.
- * Updated our brochure to better reflect MCSR's current services.
- * 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 working with the Minnesota Department of Administration's Office of Strategic and Long-range Planning and its deputy director, John Husted, to hold an information meeting about MCSR's annual omnibus survey for state agencies and east metropolitan agencies and governments. A Minneapolis meeting is held in conjunction with Hennepin County and Minneapolis, inviting all prospective west metro omnibus survey clients.
- * Continued an institutional listing in AAPOR's (American Association for Public Opinion Research) publication The Blue Book: Agencies and Organizations Represented in AAPOR Membership.
- * Continued to list MCSR separately 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, which includes 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, while 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

	Consul- tation	Inter- viewers	Phone Bank	Coding/ Editing	Data file Created	Data Analysis	Evaluation/ Report Writing
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Analysis of Gambling Survey Data - Star Tribune						X	
Cancer Screening Survey - MN Department of Health	X						
Carlson School of Management Alumni Survey - Carlson School Dean's Office				X	X	X	
Civilian Review Authority Coding Project - Center for Urban & Regional Affairs					X	X	
Coding of Open-Ended Interviews - Patricia Carlson	X			X			
Conservation Project - Center for Urban & Regional Affairs		X					
Evaluation of the CARE Program - Center for Urban & Regional Affairs	X						X
Indian Transportation Surveys - Center for Urban & Regional Affairs	X			X	X	X	
New Home Buyer Survey - Rottlund Homes	X		X				
Problem Solving Strategies & Styles Survey - Elizabeth Carlson					X	X	
Sampling Issues - BRW, Inc.	X						
Survey of Liberal Arts Seniors - CLA Career Development Office					X	X	
Survey of Minnesota Surgeons - Veterans Administration	X						
Survey of Noncompliance Among Transplant Patients - Department of Psychology	X	X	X				
1990-91 CLA Graduates Survey - CLA Career Development Office					X	X	
1992 Food Services Survey - U of M Housing Services					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>
July 91	Barbara Raymond	City of Minneapolis	Study feasibility	.75
July 91	Michele Scheitker	St. Paul Public Housing Agency	Questionnaire review	.25
July 91	Shelley Baxter	Minneapolis Community Development Agency	Sample status	2.75
January 92	Ellen Benevides	Hennepin County	Survey results	.50
February 92	Therese Blaine	Minn. Dept. of Administration	Study design	1.50
March 92	Carol Langer	Minn. Pollution Control Agency	Questionnaire review	.75
June 92	Olivia Cua	Minn. Dept. of Public Service	Study design	.25
June 92	Tim Kelly	Minn. Dept. of Natural Resources	RFP consultation	.50
June 92	Amy Carlson	Minneapolis Public Schools - Community Education	Study design	.50
June 92	Pat Simmons	Minn. Office of Tourism	Telephone data collection	.50
			TOTAL HOURS:	8.25

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>	<u>STA</u>
Faculty	July 91	Erica Stein	Occupational Therapy	Questionnaire design	2.00	Fac Gra
Staff	July 91	Debra Stein	Humphrey Institute	Questionnaire design	1.25	Gra
Faculty	July 91	David Ward	Sociology	Data file work	0.50	Sta
Staff	August 91	Chuck Lawrence	Housing Services	Study design	0.25	
Grad student	Aug - Sept 91	Chris Uting	Veterinary Medicine	Questionnaire review	0.75	Fac
Grad student	August 91	Pam Vinitzky	Educational Psychology	Refusals on panel study	0.25	Sta
Faculty	September 91	Cheryl Meyers	Occupational Therapy	Questionnaire design	1.50	Und Fac
Staff	Oct - Nov 91	Cheryl King Thomas	Long-term Care Center	Mail survey procedures and questionnaire design	2.25	Sta
Undergrad	October 91	Ann Cody	Carlson School of Management	Qualifications for research jobs	0.25	Gra
Staff	Oct - Nov 91	Vicky Wellsandt	Housing Services	Survey critique	0.25	Sta
Staff	Oct - Nov 91	Joan Slater	Medical School - Family Practice	Mail survey procedures	2.00	Gra
Grad student	November 91	Clint Lunde	Business Administration	Research ethics	1.50	Fac
Faculty	November 91	Leslie Bruvold	Public Affairs	Access to data	0.50	Fac
Faculty	December 91	Oliver Williams	Social Work	Experimental design	0.25	Gra
Staff	Nov - Dec 91	Stephen Klein	CLA Office of Career Development	Data file setup	2.50	Gra
Faculty	January 92	Sara Evans	History	Data reduction	0.75	
Grad student	February 92	Terry Haverlick	Geography	Data analysis	0.50	

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	February 92	Leo McAvoy	Kinesiology & Leisure studies	Research proposal	6.25
Grad student	February 92	Timothy Landon	Industrial Relations	Mail survey procedures	0.25
Grad student	February 92	Larry Klingbeil	Vocational Educ	Mail survey procedures	2.00
Staff	February 92	Marsha Mueller	MN Extension	Questionnaire review	0.50
Faculty	February 92	Walter Enloe	International Studies	Access to data	0.75
Staff	March 92	Steve Baker	Student Support Services	Focus groups	0.25
Undergrad	March 92	Derek Scholtz	Geography	Data analysis	1.25
Faculty	March 92	Bogdan Madsur	Center for Inter-facial Engineering	Questionnaire review	0.50
Staff	March 92	Sharon Grimes	Univ. Relations	Questionnaire review	2.25
Grad student	March 92	Mary Jackson	Forest Resources	Study design & questionnaire review	1.75
Staff	April 92	Larry Coyle	MN Extension	Questionnaire review	0.75
Grad student	May 92	Miles Graonic	Marketing	Focus groups	1.00
Faculty	May 92	Anne Auten	Educ. Policy & Administration	Questionnaire design	1.75
Faculty	June 92	William Larson	Soil Science	Questionnaire review	2.00
Grad student	Apr - June 92	Patricia Carlson	Carlson School of Management	Coding	45.00
Grad student	June 92	Alanna Tyler	Humphrey Institute	Questionnaire design	0.50
TOTAL HOURS:					84.00

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>	<u>TI</u>
July 91	Jon Gossett	Lindon Hills Food Co-op	Survey design	4.25	Ma
July - Nov 91	Florence Gray	League of Women Voters	Mail survey procedures	1.00	Ma
August 91	Holly Trittipo	League of Women Voters	Questionnaire design	0.75	Ap
August 91	Dale Kurschner	The Word	Questionnaire design & mail survey procedures	3.50	Ap
August 91	David Hepenstal	Westminster Corporation	Questionnaire design	1.50	
August 91	John Oughton	St Paul NEC	Questionnaire review	1.00	
Oct-Nov 91	Mike Samuelson	Como Neighborhood	Community survey	1.50	
Sept 91 - April 92	Elizabeth Carlson	William Mitchell College of Law	Data reduction & report review	2.25	
January 92	Marilyn Bok	Mansfield University	Data release & copyright issues	0.25	
Feb - May 92	Carmen Reyes	Westminster Corporation	Questionnaire design	1.50	
February 92	Mike McCarthy	Heart of the Earth	Questionnaire review	1.00	
February 92	Kay Pranis	Citizens Council	Study design	0.25	
February 92	Mike Quinn	St. Rita's - Cottage Grove	Mail survey procedures	0.50	
Feb - Mar 92	Cary Williams	Rochester United Way	Study design & questionnaire review	0.75	
Mar - Apr 92	Pam Finamore	Humane Society	Questionnaire review & interviewer training	5.75	
Mar - Apr 92	Ted Greenfield	MPIRG	Data sources	1.00	

UNREIMBURSED CONSULTING

Provided to Non-Profit Groups (Continued)

<u>TIME FRAME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT OR UNIT</u>	<u>TYPE OF SERVICE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>
25 March 92	Brian Aldrich	Winona State University	Interviewing time estimates	0.25
00 March 92	Joel Peskay	Child Psych Task Force	Questionnaire review	1.25
75 April 92	Janet Donaldson	Women's History	Study design	0.25
50 April 92	David McGill	Augsburg College	Study design	1.50
			TOTAL HOURS:	30.00

50

00

50

25

25

50

00

25

50

75

75

00

APPENDIX C

1991-92 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

Michael Munson, Metropolitan Council

* The representative from the Minnesota Department of Health moved to Wisconsin and resigned from the Advisory Committee. A replacement has not yet been named.

APPENDIX D

MCSR RESEARCH DOCUMENTATION

CLIENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE, page D-2

This questionnaire was developed to evaluate and improve service to your clients. It is sent to our primary contact at the end of each project. This questionnaire was initially used in 1988, and was revised in 1991.

MCSR PROJECT RESPONSIBILITY WORKSHEET, page D-5

This worksheet is completed with the client before the initiation of the project. It serves as a checklist on all aspects of any survey. It also ensures that both parties are clear about who has responsibility for each task. The Project Responsibility Worksheet was initially used in 1988, and was revised in 1992.

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY OPTIONS, page D-7

This worksheet was developed for the Neighborhood Revitalization Program surveys, since most neighborhood groups were not aware of the choices they would need to make when making the initial plans for a survey project.

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW FOR A SUCCESSFUL MAILED SURVEY, page D-9

This listing of procedures was adapted from Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, by Don A. Dillman, and has been to clients and others by MCSR for years but never documented in an annual report. Its inclusion in this report is an attempt to more consistently document the resources available at MCSR.

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS, page D-10

This one page instruction sheet was developed by MCSR in response to requests from organizations using volunteers as interviewers. These volunteer interviewers needed to have the essentials of the interviewing task communicated to them in an efficient, concise manner. This instruction sheet has been used by MCSR to train volunteer interviewers, and has been made available to anyone who requests information about training volunteers as interviewers. It has been in use for years at MCSR but never documented in an annual report. Its inclusion in this report is an attempt to more consistently document the resources available at MCSR.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

*Minnesota Center for Survey Research
2122 Riverside Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-627-4282*

CLIENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDY: _____

Please give us your evaluation of MCSR performance on the study named above.

Your responses will help us to do a better job in the future.

Your completed questionnaire will be used by itself and as part of a continuing database.

The questionnaire uses the same answer categories for most of the questions.

Please turn the page and begin.

PLEASE
UNHE
NDICA
CSR F
SCRI
ATING
PLEASE
ACH I
G
C
o
f
T
I
e
F
M
S
E
N
G
a
t
o
F
T
c
C
R
b
u
s
R
C
e
P
D
N
e
O
P

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER OPPOSITE EACH ITEM TO INDICATE YOUR EVALUATION OF CSR PERFORMANCE IN THE AREAS DESCRIBED BELOW. APPLY YOUR RATINGS TO THIS STUDY ONLY.

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM.

	1 OUTSTANDING	2 SATISFACTORY	3 SATISFACTORY WITH RESERVATIONS	4 UNSATISFACTORY	5 NOT SURE HOW TO REPLY	6 DOES NOT APPLY
GOOD GRASP OF THE ISSUES Complete understanding of the project's objectives and of management's reasons for doing the research.	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	1	2	3	4	5	6
TECHNICAL COMPETENCE In study design, data collection, editing, and coding; project management	1	2	3	4	5	6
FOLLOWING THE SCHEDULE Meeting deadlines, timelines	1	2	3	4	5	6
STAYING WITHIN YOUR BUDGET EXPECTATIONS	1	2	3	4	5	6
NO SURPRISES Giving you prompt information about problems that developed with the work, or with meeting deadlines, or with costs	1	2	3	4	5	6
FLEXIBILITY Taking it in stride when asked for changes after the project is underway	1	2	3	4	5	6
CLIENT SERVICE Returning phone calls promptly, being available for a meeting on short notice, giving plenty of unhurried time and attention to situations that need it	1	2	3	4	5	6
REPORTING RESULTS Clear, useful written report; no errors in data, excellent spelling, punctuation, and grammar	1	2	3	4	5	6
DATA FILE No errors in data, well-documented, easy to read, in proper format	1	2	3	4	5	6
OVERALL EVALUATION Putting it all together	1	2	3	4	5	6

*** Turn to the next page to answer the last few questions ***

A. If any of your ratings were "Unsatisfactory" (4) or "Satisfactory with reservations" (3), we would appreciate knowing more. Please use the space below to elaborate on your responses.

ITEM # _____.

ITEM # _____.

B. If there is anything else you want to tell us about what you liked or did not like, please use this space.

Please give us your name (optional):

_____ Date: ___/___/___

Thank you for your assistance. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope or send it to:

Rossana Armson, Acting Director
Minnesota Center for Survey Research
2122 Riverside Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55454-1320

PF
A.
B.
C.
D.
E.
F.
G.
H.

MCSR PROJECT RESPONSIBILITY WORKSHEET
(Circle one number per topic unless instructed otherwise)

PROJECT NAME: _____

I. GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

A. SURVEY TYPE

1. Telephone (complete Part II on reverse side).
2. Mail (complete Part III on reverse side).
3. Personal interview (cover all details separately in contract).
4. Group administration (cover all details separately in contract).

B. SAMPLE SIZE (N=_____), defined as follows:

1. A specified number of surveys will be completed.
2. As many surveys as possible will be completed from the given sample.

C. APPLICATION TO UNIVERSITY'S HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE

1. Client will submit and receive approval before survey work starts (includes all University research, except omnibus surveys).
2. Covered by MCSR blanket application (includes omnibus surveys and non-university research except surveys on sensitive topics and/or surveys of populations other than competent adults).

D. SAMPLE

1. Client will provide.
2. MCSR will sample from material provided by client.
3. MCSR will purchase sample.
4. MCSR will generate sample.

E. QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT AND ORDER

1. Client will provide questions in "final" form and order.
2. Client will draft questionnaire, MCSR will comment/critique with the final questions agreed to mutually.
3. MCSR will draft questions from client list of issues and needs.
4. MCSR will work with client to define dimensions of problem; moving through to issues that are salient to respondents, and finally question drafting.

F. PRETEST SIZE: (N=_____)

G. QUESTIONNAIRE TYPING/RETYPING

1. Client's responsibility
2. MCSR's responsibility

H. PRINTING OF INSTRUMENT

1. Client's responsibility
2. MCSR's responsibility

I. CODING AND EDITING (Circle all that apply)

1. MCSR will edit completed surveys (look for clear markings, etc.).
2. Client will edit completed surveys (look for clear markings, etc.).
3. MCSR will develop code scheme for open-ended responses.
4. Client will develop code scheme for open-ended responses.
5. MCSR will code open-ended responses.
6. Client will code open-ended responses.
7. "Coders" will keep lists of responses to specified open-ended questions.
8. None of the above.

J. COMPUTER DATA PROCESSING BY MCSR (Circle all that apply)

1. Not applicable (edited interview forms delivered to client)
2. Raw data file only; entered and verified (subcontracted to a professional data entry firm)
3. Clean data file in SPSS format
 - a. SPSS-PC
 - b. SPSS-X on the University VAX
4. Clean data file in other format _____
5. Selected crosstabulations (specified a priori)
6. More complex runs to support detailed analysis

K. REPORTS REQUIRED FROM MCSR (Circle all that apply)

1. Technical report, including methodology and numeric results (if applicable)
2. Analytical/summary report
3. Public presentation

L. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT THIS PROJECT (Required by 18 months after completion)

- 1 = When available
2 = After client specified release date
3 = 18 months after completion

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Client's identity and nature of survey |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Questionnaire |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Technical report/frequency distribution |

M. PUBLIC ACCESS TO DATA FILES (Required by 18 months after completion)

1. Provided by MCSR
2. Provided by client
3. Summary report only, data are confidential
4. No computer data file

APPENDIX D

N. QUESTIONNAIRE DISPOSITION

- 1. MCSR should recycle/destroy after the project is completed.
- 2. Deliver to client (usually personal identifiers will be removed).

O. PERSONAL IDENTIFIER DISPOSITION (Includes name, address, or phone number) *[NOTE: Usually respondents are guaranteed anonymity; identifiers are almost always separated from survey responses.]*

- 1. MCSR should destroy after the project is completed
- 2. MCSR should retain since there is a possibility of a follow-up survey. *[NOTE: If this is suspected, proper etiquette would be to ask permission to recontact.]*
- 3. Deliver to client

II. PHONE SURVEYS ONLY

MCSR will typically make up to 6 calls attempting to reach a number. Calls are made at different times of the day and different days of the week.

P. PERSON TO INTERVIEW (Only in special circumstances will MCSR interview a minor.)

- 1. Any adult
- 2. Knowledgeable adult
- 3. Random adult
- 4. Specified adult
- 5. Other _____

Q. DATA COLLECTION METHOD

- 1. Computer Assisted (CATI)
- 2. Paper and pencil

R. CALLBACK/CLARIFICATION (MCSR usually reviews completed surveys and calls back to re-ask unanswered questions or clarify responses.)

- 1. Required throughout
- 2. Required on selected crucial items
- 3. Not required

S. MONITORING RATE _____% (5-10% standard)

T. VERIFICATION RATE _____% (usually none)

III. MAIL SURVEYS ONLY

MCSR uses the Dillman technique of three mailings (initial mailing, post card reminder, follow-up to non-respondent). This technique typically yields response rates of 70 percent or better.

U. COVER ART

- 1. Provided by client
- 2. Provided by MCSR

V. LAYOUT AND DESIGN

- 1. Client's sole responsibility
- 2. Client draft, MCSR finalize
- 3. MCSR draft, client review and approval

W. POSTAGE

- 1. Provided by client
- 2. Provided by MCSR

X. MAILING ADDRESS AND SUPPLIES (Letter, return envelope, and signature)

- 1. Client's address and supplies signature of: _____
- 2. MCSR's address and supplies (choose one) signature of Rossana Armson, Director, or: _____

Y. MANAGEMENT OF LISTS FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILINGS TO NON-RESPONDENTS

- 1. MCSR will check-off responses prior to follow-up mailings
- 2. Client will check-off responses prior to follow-up mailings

Z. MANPOWER FOR SIGNING, COLLATING, STAMPING, STUFFING

- 1. Client's responsibility
- 2. Client will provide staff to assist
- 3. MCSR's responsibility

AA. SENDING RESULTS TO RESPONDENTS

- 1. Client's responsibility
- 2. MCSR's responsibility

Project Managers/Contact People:

MCSR: Main _____ Phone: 612/627-4282

Secondary: _____ Phone: 612/627-4282

Client: Main: _____ Phone: _____

Secondary: _____ Phone: _____

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY OPTIONS

1. Method of data collection

- Door-to-door survey (most labor-intensive, volunteers need more training and supervision, takes longer than you would ever expect it to)
- Telephone survey (volunteers need training and supervision, moderately labor-intensive, can be done quickly if you can find volunteers to work on it)
- Mailed survey (can use untrained volunteers, least labor-intensive, takes at least six weeks to collect data, needs a good mailing list, people can fill it out when they want to)
- Personal drop-off and pick-up (variation on mailed survey, more personalized request for participation, can make people less likely to write negative comments)

2) Follow-up contacts

- Multiple contacts for all methods of data collection
- Potential for follow-up from community residents, either by phone or in person, asking people to participate in the survey

3) Sampling (name & address or telephone number lists)

- List of names and addresses can be compiled by volunteers who have been trained for the task. This is necessary for neighborhoods with high proportions of rental units. Existing lists for renters are very bad and usually out-dated.
- Listed random samples (by name & address or telephone number) can be purchased by census tract. (Does this ever correspond to neighborhood boundaries?) This is suitable for neighborhoods with high rates of home ownership and low turnover, but excludes households with unlisted telephone numbers because the list comes from the telephone company.
- Sample can be done in stages. First we select random blocks or random buildings. Then we select random houses on those blocks or random residents from the building.
- Random digit telephone samples can be purchased. This would include households with unlisted numbers, but households that are contacted would need to be screened to be sure they were located within the geographic boundaries of the neighborhood.

(CONTINUED ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE)

APPENDIX D

4. Additional requests for data analysis.

- Copy of the data diskette. We would need to know what kind of computer and what computer program you will be using.
- Crosstabulations. Requests for two-way crosstabulation tables should be collected by someone in the neighborhood and submitted all at one time.
- More complex analyses. Requests for these will need to be made by special arrangement, since they will not be included in the services provided by the NRP.

NOTE: All neighborhoods will receive up to five copies of a report on results and data collection methods, which will include a replica of their neighborhood survey with response frequencies and percentages added.

POTENTIAL SURVEY TOPICS

Public Safety

Housing

Education

Social Service Programs

Parks & Recreation

Transportation

Jobs

Community Image/Appearance

Community Involvement/Neighborhood Organization Involvement

Others??

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW FOR A SUCCESSFUL MAILED SURVEY

Using these procedures it is possible to achieve a 70% or better response rate to a mailed survey.

- 1) Send out at least three waves
 - WAVE 1: Initial copy of survey, with cover letter(s) and stamped return envelope, sent to entire sample.
 - WAVE 2: Reminder postcard, sent to entire sample. Send these out one week after initial mailing.
 - WAVE 3: Follow-up copy of survey, with cover letter(s) and stamped return envelope, sent to all who have not returned initial survey. Send these out two weeks after postcard mailing.
- 2) Number entire sample. Number each survey form before mailing, so that you can keep track of who has returned their form.
- 3) Have three copies of mailing labels printed, in addition to one paper copy of the entire sample.
- 4) Other devices to increase response rate.
 - A) Hand stamp mailings of survey form with commemorative stamps.
 - B) Hand sign cover letters after they have been copied.
 - C) Print surveys in small booklet form. Remember to number each copy before mailing.
 - D) Hand address each envelope. (NOTE: MCSR rarely does this, because of the huge time investment and potential for error.)
 - E) Have one person responsible for checking in returns each day and marking their ID numbers off on the final mailing list.
- 5) Items to be included in initial mailing (#10 envelope with numbered label, corresponding to number on survey, and with colorful commemorative stamp).
 - A) Hand-signed cover letter(s).
 - B) Numbered copy of survey form.
 - C) Hand-stamped and pre-addressed return envelope (#9 envelope).
- 6) Time estimates for mailings.
 - A) 2.5 minutes per survey for each mailing.
 - B) .5 minutes per postcard.

Adapted from Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, Don A. Dillman (Wiley, 1978)

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

1. **Approach Professional and Positively**
 - Create a friendly setting. Your task is to make the respondent want to participate.
 - Establish the legitimacy of the study. Use your full name when introducing yourself. Read the introduction as written. Refer questions about the study to the coordinator.
2. **Ask All Questions Exactly as Worded and in the Order Presented**
 - It is important that each respondent receive the exact same question as every other respondent, so this means that the wording of the question cannot be changed in any circumstance. This is important for the reliability of the study itself.
3. **Be Absolutely Neutral**
 - Never reveal your own opinions about the questions asked or the answers given.
4. **Ask Every Appropriate Question**
 - Surveys often include dependent, or branching, questions which are only asked if the respondent gives a specific response to a prior question.
5. **Seek Responses in Terms of the Questions Asked**
 - This rule is the heart of interviewing. Do not assume you know what the respondent means. For example:

Question: Do you consider yourself to be well informed, moderately informed, or not too well informed?

Response: Fairly informed.

Interviewer: (probe) Which of these terms best describes your situation: well informed, moderately informed, or not too well informed?
 - In this situation, the interviewer cannot assume that "fairly" means "moderately" and that's why a probe is necessary.
6. **Probe When Necessary**
 - Probing is necessary whenever the respondent has not answered in terms of the question. For example:

Question: How would you describe the freeway. . .excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Response: Between excellent and good.

Interviewer: (probe) Would you say it was closer to excellent or good?

Response: Good.
7. **Open-Ended Question**
 - The response must answer the open-ended question.
 - Use neutral probes. Do not suggest answers.
 - Record the answer exactly as the person says it.
8. **Confidentiality**
 - Never interview someone you know.
 - Never discuss a person's answers with anyone else.
9. **Ending**
 - Leave a good impression. Thank the respondent and end the interview as quickly as possible.

APPENDIX E

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.

MCSR Methodological Research 1987-1990
(1989-90 Annual Report, Appendix F)

This appendix briefly summarizes eight methodological studies. In general, these were small research efforts embedded in real surveys which attempted to improve response rates, validate samples, or otherwise improve efficiency.

Minimum Criteria for MCSR Involvement in a Mail Survey
(1989-90 Annual Report, Appendix D)

Many people or organizations would like to use University of Minnesota letterhead to give status to their mail surveys. Often the purpose of the survey would justify that use, but MCSR was uncomfortable about losing control of the survey and the impact of a bad survey operation on our reputation. This document specifies the minimum level of MCSR involvement required to justify using our letterhead.

MCSR Publication Resource Collection
(1990-91 Annual Report, Appendix D)

Over the years, MCSR has accumulated a small collection of survey research publications. This collection is available for use by University researchers and the public.

Abstracts of Earlier Surveys

For surveys from 1982 through 1989, see MCSR's 1988-89 Annual Report, Appendix F. For surveys conducted during the 1989-90 academic year, see the 1989-90 Annual Report, Appendix H. For surveys conducted during the 1990-91 academic year, see the 1990-91 Annual Report, Appendix F.

APPENDIX F

ABSTRACTS OF 1991-92 SURVEYS

INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains abstracts of surveys completed during the past academic year. Abstracts of surveys from earlier years are available from MCSR (see Appendix E). 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., (#92-17) was the 17th technical report completed in 1992.

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., (#92-1,1) means that the 1991 Minnesota State 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

APPENDIX F

LAWN CARE: A SURVEY OF METROPOLITAN AND LAKE AREA HOMEOWNERS (91-24, 3)

The Lawn Care surveys, commissioned by the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics at the University of Minnesota, were telephone surveys conducted in the Summer of 1991. The goal of the Lawn Care Surveys was to assist the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics in assessing homeowners' lawn care practices. A total of 410 interviews were completed for the metropolitan survey; 243 interviews were completed for the lake area survey.

GLENDALE COMMUNITY SURVEY (91-25, 1)

The Glendale Community Survey was conducted as a mail survey of all Glendale residents during the Summer of 1991, and was completed by 109 residents. The survey included questions about housing, safety, community information, job development, public and social services, and the Glendale Residents Action Council.

MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY SURVEY (91-26, 1)

The Minneapolis Community Survey was conducted as a mail survey of residents in the downtown Minneapolis, Loring Park, and Stevens Square neighborhoods. It was conducted in the Summer/Fall of 1991 for the Central Community Council. The survey included questions about neighborhoods, transportation, shopping, crime and safety, recreation, housing, downtown development, and citizen participation.

Questionnaires were completed and returned by 243 Minneapolis community residents. Of these, 131 were from Loring Park residents, 60 were from Stevens Square residents, and 52 were from downtown Minneapolis residents.

TRANSFER STUDENT SURVEY: A SURVEY OF MINNESOTA COLLEGE STUDENT TRANSFER EXPERIENCES (91-27, 3)

This was a telephone survey of 788 transfer students that was conducted in the Fall of 1991 for the Minnesota Community Colleges System.

Questions were asked about the experience of transferring from a two-year Minnesota community college to a four-year academic institution. Specific questions queried respondents about the kind and type of transferring information received, sources of help, and problems encountered in the transfer experience. Respondents were also asked factual questions regarding the credit transfer process from the community college as well as to the university.

THE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT SURVEYS (91-28, 3)

The Community Affairs Department Surveys were conducted as mail surveys in the Fall of 1991. Questions to be included were specified by a consultant who was conducting an external evaluation of a Twin Cities area company's Community Affairs Department. Respondents answered questions about their perceptions of the Community Affairs Department: its services to the community, the staff, and the grant application process in general.

These mail surveys were sent to two discrete samples: (1) recipients of grants from the Department and (2) grant applicants whose grant proposals were not funded. A total of 104 grant recipients and 16 grant applicants completed surveys.

BRYANT NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENT SURVEY (91-29, 1)

This mail survey was conducted for the Bryant neighborhood in the Fall of 1991 and was funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. It was completed by 227 neighborhood residents. The survey included questions regarding overall living conditions, safety, youth issues, city services, and general concerns about the neighborhood.

1991 MINNESOTA STATE SURVEY (92-1, 1)

The 1991 Minnesota State Survey was an omnibus telephone survey of 825 Minnesota residents conducted during the Fall of 1991. Eleven topics were included in the survey. *

- 1) Quality of Life asked about the most important problem in the state.
- 2) Public Education included questions about salary levels for beginning and experienced teachers, willingness to pay higher taxes to maintain the present public education system or to improve public education, and the need to reorganize/consolidate school districts. These questions were funded by the Minnesota Education Association.
- 3) Organizational Awareness questions concerned knowledge of what the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency does and evaluating how it does at protecting the environment. These questions were funded by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
- 4) Transportation questions concerned satisfaction with the time it takes people to travel to the places they want to go and the degree of support or opposition to a series of things that can be done to improve air quality in the Twin Cities area. These questions were funded by the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

 *An oversample of 324 adults in Region Three of Minnesota were interviewed. People in the oversample were asked only the first two quality of life questions, the business questions, and the demographic items. Results for the 324 individuals who were interviewed for the oversample are published separately in Report # 92-2.

APPENDIX F

- 5) Attractions included a question about museums. It was funded by the Science Museum of Minnesota.
- 6) Crime included a question about willingness to participate in victim offender mediation programs.

Additional questions concerned preferred sentencing for a specific crime scenario, and whether additional money should be spent on more prisons or spent on education, job training, and community programs. These questions were funded by the Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice.

- 7) Business questions asked about plans for starting a new business, past inventions, and attitudes toward the idea of people starting a business. These questions were funded by the Center for Economic Development at the University of Minnesota Duluth.
- 8) Energy questions concerned the health or environmental effects from electric and magnetic fields, or EMF. These questions were funded by Northern States Power Company.
- 9) Children questions focused on the consequences of poor early child development for society in general and for the children themselves, as well as awareness of Success by Six. These questions were funded by United Way of Minneapolis Area.
- 10) Elderly included a question on the need for a hotline about programs and services for older adults. This question was funded by the Metropolitan Council.

An additional question asked about the respondent's ability to care for an elderly family member if they became injured.

- 11) Gambling questions were about types of gambling during the past year, the amount of money spent, and whether the state should allow gambling only under certain conditions. These questions were funded by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota.

REGION THREE SUPPLEMENT (92-2, 5)

See 1991 Minnesota State Survey (#92-1).

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BOATING SURVEY (92-3, 3)

The Mississippi River Boating Survey was conducted during the Summer of 1991 as enumeration of boats and face-to-face interviews with boaters. It was conducted for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. The goal of the survey was to obtain information on the number of boats entering and leaving the river at specific access points and to obtain both trip-specific information and opinions from boaters.

The study area included 135 miles of the Mississippi River between Minneapolis and Winona, Minnesota, as well as 25 miles of the St. Croix River and 7 miles of the Minnesota River. The sampling design involved stratification by pool, type of access, and type of day. Tally sheets recording boats entering and leaving the river were completed for 253 full half-day locations. Questionnaires and detailed trip records were completed by 741 boaters leaving the river.

MINNESOTA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SURVEY (92-4, 5)

This mail survey was conducted for Dr. Robert Kvavik and the Association of Minnesota Counties, and was funded by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. During the Fall of 1991, 358 individuals completed surveys. They answered questions about their experiences as County Commissioner and their opinions about county government and the Association for Minnesota Counties.

THE JUDICIAL EVALUATION AND RETENTION SURVEY (92-5, 5)

The Judicial Evaluation and Retention Survey was conducted as a mail survey by the Hennepin County Bar Association in consultation with the Minnesota Center for Survey Research. Data collection occurred during late 1991. A total of 3,821 Hennepin County attorneys returned surveys. On average, lawyers who completed the survey rated 13 judges. Each judge was rated by an average of 534 lawyers.

The survey form listed all current members of the Fourth District Bench. Performance evaluation categories included legal ability, communication skills, administrative ability and case management, settlement ability, trial and hearing conduct skills, fairness and lack of bias, punctuality, time management and/or work effort, judicial demeanor and temperament, and retention. Confidentiality procedures were extremely rigorous on this project.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT SURVEY (92-6, 3)

This mail survey of 511 Civil Services employees in selected departments at the University of Minnesota was conducted in late 1991 for the University's Personnel Department. The respondents answered questions about their career development concerns and the types of career development services they would like the University to provide.

APPENDIX F

CHILDREN AND SEXUALITY: THE OBSERVATIONS AND OPINIONS OF FAMILY DAYCARE PROVIDERS (92-7, 5)

This mail survey of 564 licensed family daycare providers was conducted in Winter 1992 and funded by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. This study was initiated by and conducted for Michael Kauper and Marion Turner, licensed family daycare providers, Prof. Albert Yonas from the Institute of Child Development, and Dr. Susan Phipps-Yonas, a licensed clinical psychologist. The respondents answered questions about their observations and opinions regarding early childhood sexuality.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL SYSTEM PROJECT: A SURVEY OF THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (92-8, 5)

This telephone survey of 24 professionals who worked on the University of Minnesota's Financial Management System Project was conducted for one of the service-providing companies in Winter 1992. Questions sought respondents' perceptions of the quality of service provided by the vendors, the innovativeness of vendor solutions, the vendors' comprehension of the University and University objectives, vendor knowledge of the software package, and the ability of the vendor to perform as a long-range business partner of the University.

CULTURAL DIVERSITY (92-9, 3)

This mail survey of 47 organizations known to the concerned about diversity in the workplace was conducted for a management consulting firm in Spring 1992. Respondents answered questions about diversity inservice training, organizational 'climate', and policies regarding cultural diversity, as well as approaches and techniques used to overcome barriers to diversity.

CONSUMER ATTITUDES ABOUT SOY FOODS AND INGREDIENTS (92-10, 5)

This mail survey of 933 Minnesota households was conducted in Spring 1992 in cooperation with the the University's Department of Food Science and Nutrition for the Minnesota Soybean Research and Promotion Council. The survey included questions about shopping habits, product knowledge, and awareness of the health benefits of soy foods and soy ingredients.

THE WHITTIER NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SURVEY (92-11, 1)

This telephone survey of 205 neighborhood parents was conducted in Winter 1992 for the Whittier Alliance and the Minneapolis Public Schools. It was funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program.

The goals of this survey were to gather information about parents' knowledge and opinions regarding the programs and schools their children attend, to determine how many parents in Whittier filled out choice cards in order to select their children's program and school, and to find out whether having a neighborhood school in Whittier would be beneficial to their family.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY (92-12, 3)

This mail survey of 448 Civil Services employees in selected departments at the University of Minnesota was conducted in late Spring 1992 for the University's Personnel Department. Respondents answered questions about their participation in the Career Development Project and their career development concerns. This survey was a follow-up to one conducted in late Winter 1991 (#91-6).

DISABILITY ACCOMODATIONS SURVEY (92-13, 1)

This mail survey of 13,019 employees at the University of Minnesota was conducted in Spring 1992 for the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. Respondents answered questions about their current employment classification status, any disabling condition they might have, and accommodations received at their University work site.

A SURVEY ABOUT USING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (92-14, 1)

The Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Survey was conducted as a mail survey in early Summer 1992 and funded by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Questionnaires were completed by 416 members and affiliates of the Government Information Systems Management Organization. Respondents answered questions about the type of GIS used by their organization, how the system was used, and other technical questions regarding ownership and utilization.

HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL RECYCLING SURVEY (92-16, 5)

This telephone and in-person survey was funded by the Hennepin County Department of Environmental Management. A total of 234 interviews were completed in the Summer of 1992. Only organizations that recycled over 5,000 pounds a month, and who agreed to participate, were included in the study.

Respondents were asked questions about their organization's recycling activities. The survey included questions about the types and average amounts of metal, paper, glass, wood, plastic, and other materials being recycled each month, as well as questions regarding the longevity, growth, and cost of their recycling program.

APPENDIX F

ATLANTA-FULTON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY USER SURVEY (92-17, 3)

This was a self-administered survey of 4,694 library users which was conducted in Spring 1992. It was conducted for George D'Elia, a professor in the University's Department of Information and Decision Sciences and a consultant to the Atlanta-Fulton County Public Library (AFPL).

The library's users answered questions about their reasons for visiting the library, the activities they engaged in during the visit, their opinions about the services and facilities, their reasons for choosing to visit that particular library, and demographic characteristics. The survey was administered by staff and volunteers at AFPL.

UPDATE READERSHIP SURVEY (92-18, 1)

This mail survey of 776 University of Minnesota alumni who receive Update was conducted in Summer 1992 for University Relations. Respondents answered questions about readership interests, about the quality of the publication in general, about the articles in the most recent issue of Update, and about recommendations for revisions in style and layout.

LOWRY HILL NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEYS (92-23, 1)

Two mail surveys were conducted for the Lowry Hill neighborhood during Summer 1992. Both surveys were funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Surveys were completed by 575 Lowry Hill neighborhood residents and 19 Lowry Hill businesses and institutions. Respondents answered questions about overall living and business conditions, parking, city services, and general concerns about the neighborhood.

BANCROFT NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEYS (92-24, 1)

Two mail surveys were conducted for the Bancroft neighborhood during Summer 1992 and were funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Surveys were completed by 871 Bancroft residents and 39 Bancroft businesses and organizations. Respondents answered questions about overall living and business conditions, city services, and general concerns about the neighborhood.

PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENT SURVEY (92-25, 1)

This personal interview survey was conducted in Spring 1992 by the People of Phillips neighborhood organization and funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. All interviewing was conducted by volunteer interviewers who were residents of the Phillips neighborhood. Surveys were completed by 2,236 Phillips residents. Respondents answered questions about overall living conditions, neighborhood services, housing, crime, and general concerns about the neighborhood.

PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS SURVEY (92-26, 1)

This mail survey was conducted in Spring 1992 by the People of Phillips neighborhood organization and funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Surveys were completed by 81 Phillips neighborhood businesses. Respondents answered questions about their business, the Phillips neighborhood business environment, employment opportunities, and other general concerns about the neighborhood.

PHILLIPS NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY OF NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (92-27, 1)

This mail survey was conducted in Summer 1992 by the People of Phillips neighborhood organization and funded by the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Surveys were completed by 51 non-profit organizations. Respondents answered questions about their programs and services, revenues and budget allocation, health care, youth, neighborhood services, and other general concerns about the neighborhood.

APPENDIX G

INDEX TO PAST SURVEYS AND DATA FILES, 1982-1992

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, 90-18, 90-21, 91-11, 92-1, 92-2, 92-8, 92-26

Career Development 92-6, 92-12

Children 92-1, 92-7,

Community Surveys 87-4, 87-7, 87-8, 88-5, 88-15, 89-17, 89-19, 90-13, 90-14, 91-12, 91-16, 91-25, 91-26, 91-29, 92-11, 92-23, 92-24, 92-25, 92-26, 92-27,

Computer Usage 83-2, 84-1, 92-14

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, 91-16, 92-1

Economy, Economic Well-Being 83-2, 85-1, 85-8, 86-1, 86-2, 86-4, 88-15, 89-5, 90-9, 90-11, 91-1

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, 91-1, 91-4, 91-12, 91-13, 91-18, 91-27, 92-1, 92-11,

Elderly 85-1, 86-2, 87-1, 88-1, 88-23, 89-1, 89-2, 92-1

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

Energy 83-2, 84-4, 92-1

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, 90-21, 91-2, 91-11, 91-18, 91-24, 92-1, 92-16

Food and Food Sufficiency 85-1, 86-2, (86-3) 88-3, (88-8), 90-4, 92-10,

Foreign Opinion 88-12, 91-13

Foundations 90-22, 91-21, 91-28

Gambling 85-1, 85-7, 90-4, 92-1

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, 90-21, 91-2, 91-16, 91-23, 92-4

APPENDIX G

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, 90-20, 91-1, 91-9, 91-15, 92-13

Housing 84-1, 85-1, 85-8, 87-1, 87-7, 87-8, 87-15, 88-5, 88-15, 89-19,
90-12, 91-2

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, 91-3, 91-5

Judicial Evaluation 92-5

Library 86-2, 88-14, 90-16, 91-7, 91-19, 92-17

Low-Income Population 85-1, 85-8, 86-2, (86-3), 88-3, (88-8), 89-9, 89-19,
90-12, 91-15

Migration 86-2, 88-23

Metropolitan Omnibus Surveys 83-2, 84-1, 85-1, 86-2, 87-2, 88-3, 89-2,
90-5, 91-2

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

Organization Surveys 85-7, 87-9, 88-19, 89-12, 89-18, 90-15, 90-16, 90-22,
91-2, 91-5, 91-6, 91-9, 91-10, 91-20, 91-21

Participation, Volunteer 85-7, 88-13, 88-23, 89-6, 90-4, 90-5, 90-17, 90-19

Patriotism 88-17, 88-24

Political Candidates 85-7

Readership Surveys 91-21, 92-18

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, 91-2, 91-17, 91-23, 92-1, 92-3

Retail Shopping and Entertainment 85-1, 86-4, 88-2, 88-15, 89-1, 89-2, 92-1

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, 91-1, 91-2, 92-1

Social Issues 83-2, 84-1, 85-7, 88-17, 90-4, 91-1, 92-9

State Omnibus Surveys 84-4, 85-7, 86-1, 87-6, 88-2, 89-1, 90-4, 91-1, 92-1

Taxes and Tax Compliance 85-7, 86-1, 88-2, 88-10, 91-1

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, 90-19, 91-1, 91-2, 92-1

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, 91-14, 91-19, 91-22, 92-6, 92-8,
92-12, 92-13, 92-18