

CODEBOOK

Longitudinal SOSS Data File  
78,371 Cases

Weight Variable: statewt

## CONTENTS

item		page
CASE & SURVEY IDENTIFICATION VARIABLES		
CASEID	Unique SOSS ID Number (quarter + case ID)	1
quarter	Round of SOSS question administered	2
sossyr	Calendar Year in Which Particular SOSS Administered	4
GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF RESPONDENT		
newregn2	SOSS Region (revised)	5
msuereg	MSU Extension Region of Respondents Residence	6
MSUE2005	SOSS Region (2005 revised)	7
MSUE2005r5	NEW MSU Extension Region of Respondents Residence	7
typecomm	Type of Community in Which Respondent Resides (X1)	8
SAMPLE WEIGHTING VARIABLES		
statewt	Weight for Statewide Estimates	9
msuewt	weight by MSU region	9
regnwt	Weight Variable for 7 SOSS Regions	10
MSUE2005wt	weight by new MSU region	11
RESPONDENT & HOUSEHOLD BACKGROUND VARIABLES		
sex	Respondents Gender (CD1)	12
YRBORN	Year of Birth (CD2)	12
age	Respondents Age (calculated from YRBORN)	13
agecat	Respondents Age in Categories	15
educatn	Respondents Level of Education (CD3)	16
ethnic	Respondent Hispanic Background (CD5 & CD5a)	17
race3	Respondents Race (gathered from CD4a - CD4e)	17
religion	Respondents Religious Identification	18
partyid	Respondents Political Party Identification	19
marstat	Respondents Marital Status (CD8)	20
numadlts	Number of Adults in Household (CD10)	21
employed	Respondents Employment Status (CD15)	22
jobs	Respondent Has Multiple Jobs (CD17)	22
selfemp	Self-Employed? (CD22)	23
income8	Household Income in 8 Categories	24
income11	Household Income in 11 Categories	25
newinc50	Household Income in 10 Categories	26
SOSS50inc	Household Income in 7 Categories	27

item		page
CONSUMER ATTITUDES & HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING		
cc1	Consumer Attitudes: Financially Better/Worse Than Past	28
cc2	Consumer Attitudes: Expect Future Better/Worse Off	28
cc3	Consumer Attitudes: Present Financial Situation	29
cc4	Consumer Attitudes: Expect Inflation	29
cc5	Consumer Attitudes: Future Unemployment	30
cc6	Consumer Attitudes: Business Conditions Future	30
MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM		
probcomm	Most Important Problem Facing Community (A1)	32
govprob	Most Important Problem for Gov. & Legislature (GL1/P4a)	34
QUALITY OF LIFE		
quallife	Overall Quality of Life in Community (B1)	35
RATING PERFORMANCE OF & TRUST IN GOVERNMENT/OFFICIALS		
rateprCl	Rate Performance of President--Clinton (PO1-Clinton, PO1	36
rateprBu	Rate Performance of President--Bush, G.W. (PO1 - Bush, P	37
rateprOb	Rate Performance of President--Obama (PO1-Obama, PO10)	37
rategvEn	Rate Performance of Governor -- Engler (po2)	38
rategvGr	Rate Performance of Governor -- Granholm (po2)	38
rategvSn	Rate Performance of Governor -- Snyder (po2)	39
ratecong	Rate Performance of US Congress (po3)	39
rateMiLg	Rate Performance of Michigan Legislature (po4)	40
rateMiGv	Rate Performance of Michigan Government (po12, soss24 d4	40
trustfed	How Often Can Trust Federal Govt. (po8)	41
truststt	How Often Trust State Govt. (po9)	42
trustlcl	How Often Trust Local Govt. (po10)	42
terror	Concern about Terrorist Attack	43
respterr	US Responsibility for Terrorism	43
TERMLIMT	Attitude Toward Term Limits	44
perfrep	Performance of Representative	44
contrmlm	Should Term Limits Continue	45
CL1	Civil Liberties Trade-Off	45
CL1flup	Civil Liberties Trade-Off Follow-Up	46
P18	Approve/Disapprove Legislature	46
UNIVERSITY'S ECONOMIC ROLE		
univrole	Role University Play in Economy (B12)	47

---

CASE & SURVEY IDENTIFICATION VARIABLES

---

CASEID                      Unique SOSS ID Number (quarter + case ID)

78,371 cases (Range of valid codes: 110003-7800937)

Data type: numeric

Record/columns: 1/1-7

June 12, 2020

quarter                      Round of SOSS question administered

This indicates the approximate quarter of the year during which a question in a SOSS was administered. For more detailed field periods for any particular SOSS, please see the methodological report for that survey available from the SOSS webpage. For budgetary purposes, only 3 SOSS's were conducted in 1998 and 1999, and none were conducted in 2000.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.3	1,002	1	Fall, 1994
1.3	1,007	2	Winter, 1995
1.5	1,202	3	Spring, 1995
1.4	1,132	4	Summer, 1995
1.3	1,013	5	Fall, 1995
1.2	948	6	Winter, 1996
1.4	1,131	7	Spring, 1996
1.5	1,151	8	Summer, 1996
1.2	953	9	Fall, 1996
1.2	975	10	Winter, 1997
1.2	952	11	Spring, 1997
1.3	1,010	12	Summer, 1997
1.2	971	13	Fall, 1997
1.2	954	14	Winter/Spring, 1998
1.2	950	15	Summer, 1998
1.2	963	16	Fall, 1998
1.2	974	17	Spring, 1999
1.2	950	18	Summer, 1999
1.9	1,457	19	Fall, 1999
1.2	954	20	Winter, 2001
1.2	958	21	Spring, 2001
1.2	978	22	Summer, 2001
1.3	1,001	23	Fall, 2001
1.3	1,012	24	Winter, 2002
1.2	951	25	Spring, 2002
1.2	933	26	Summer, 2002
1.2	945	27	Fall, 2002 A
1.3	989	28	Fall, 2002 B
1.3	1,017	29	Winter, 2003
1.2	975	30	Spring, 2003
1.2	960	31	Summer, 2003
1.3	990	32	Fall, 2003
1.2	940	33	Winter, 2004
1.2	962	34	Spring, 2004
1.3	1,000	35	Summer/Fall, 2004
1.2	965	36	Fall, 2004
1.2	965	37	Winter, 2005
1.2	949	38	Spring, 2005

June 12, 2020

1.3	988	39	Summer, 2005
1.3	1,003	40	Fall, 2005
1.3	1,023	41	Winter, 2006
1.2	960	42	Spring/summer, 2006
1.3	993	43	Fall, 2006
1.2	958	44	Winter/Spring, 2007
1.1	889	45	Summer, 2007
1.3	1,001	46	Fall, 2007
1.3	1,012	47	Winter, 2008
1.3	1,008	48	Spring, 2008
1.3	1,010	49	Summer, 2008
1.2	953	50	Fall, 2008
1.3	1,001	51	Winter, 2009
1.3	1,036	52	Spring, 2009
1.3	1,022	53	Summer, 2009
1.3	991	54	Fall, 2009
2.5	1,969	55	Winter, 2010
1.2	979	56	Spring, 2010
1.3	1,000	57	Fall, 2010
1.2	979	58	Winter, 2011
1.2	947	59	Summer, 2011
1.0	807	60	Fall, 2011
1.2	963	61	Winter, 2012
1.3	1,015	62	Spring/Summer,2012
1.3	1,018	63	Fall, 2012
1.3	1,013	64	Winter, 2013
1.3	1,012	65	Spring, 2013
1.2	978	66	Summer, 2013
1.3	1,008	67	Winter, 2014
1.3	997	68	Spring, 2014
1.3	1,002	69	Fall, 2014
1.2	966	70	Winter, 2015
1.2	972	71	Fall, 2015
1.3	995	72	Winter, 2016
1.3	1,010	73	Fall, 2016
1.2	954	74	Spring, 2017
1.2	963	75	Fall, 2017
1.2	948	76	Winter, 2018
1.2	955	77	Fall, 2018
1.2	937	78	Fall, 2019

-----  
 100.0 78,371 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Record/columns: 1/14-15

soissyr                      Calendar Year in Which Particular SOSS Administered

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.3	1,002	1994	
5.6	4,354	1995	
5.3	4,183	1996	
5.0	3,908	1997	
3.7	2,866	1998	
4.3	3,382	1999	
5.0	3,891	2001	
6.2	4,830	2002	
5.0	3,941	2003	
4.9	3,866	2004	
5.0	3,906	2005	
3.8	2,976	2006	
3.6	2,848	2007	
5.1	3,983	2008	
5.2	4,050	2009	
5.0	3,948	2010	
3.5	2,733	2011	
3.8	2,996	2012	
3.8	3,003	2013	
3.8	3,007	2014	
2.5	1,938	2015	
2.6	2,005	2016	
1.2	954	2017	
3.7	2,866	2018	
1.2	937	2019	
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Record/columns: 1/16-19

---

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF RESPONDENT

---

newregn2                    SOSS Region (revised)

These 7 regions are based on the FIPS code assignment of the respondents telephone number, and generally is the same as the county of residence. The counties aggregated into each region are based on the MSU Extension regions except that Detroit was kept separate from Region 6 to form its own region. The telephone number sampling frame was stratified by these regions and samples were drawn within strata disproportionately to facilitate comparisons across regions. To make these direct comparisons, the data should be weighted by REGNWT. For statewide analysis, the data should be weighted by STATEWT. To make direct comparison across MSU Extension regions with Detroit included in Region 6, the data should be weighted by MSUEWT.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.4	2,641	1	Upper Peninsula
5.1	4,014	2	Northern Lower Peninsula
14.2	11,158	3	West Central L.P.
8.7	6,781	4	East Central L.P.
13.9	10,931	5	Southwest L.P.
45.9	35,939	6	Southeast L.P. (-Detroit)
8.8	6,907	7	Detroit
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Record/column: 1/25

msuereg                    MSU Extension Region of Respondents Residence

Regional configuration of counties (based on FIPS) that is the same as the SOSS regions except that Detroit is proportionately folded into Region 6. These are the regions used by MSU Extension.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.4	2,641	1	U.P.
5.1	4,014	2	NORTH LP
14.2	11,154	3	W. CENTRAL
8.7	6,800	4	E. CENTRAL
13.9	10,917	5	SOUTHWEST
54.7	42,842	6	SOUTHEAST URBAN
	2	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Record/column: 1/26

MSUE2005 SOSS Region (2005 revised)

These 6 regions are based on the FIPS code assignment of the respondents telephone number, and generally is the same as the county of residence. The counties aggregated into each region are based on the new (2005) MSU Extension regions except that Detroit was kept separate from Region 5 to form its own region. The telephone number sampling frame was stratified by these regions and samples were drawn within strata disproportionately to facilitate comparisons across regions. To make direct comparison across MSU Extension regions with Detroit included in Region 5, the data should be weighted by MSUE2005WT.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.4	663	1	Upper Peninsula
6.0	1,192	2	Northern Lower Peninsula
13.4	2,650	3	Central L.P.
20.8	4,112	4	Southwest L.P.
47.7	9,409	5	Southeast L.P.
8.7	1,720	6	Detroit
	58,625	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Record/column: 2/45

MSUE2005r5 NEW MSU Extension Region of Respondents Residence

New (2005) Regional configuration of counties (based on FIPS) that is the same as the MSUE2005 regions except that Detroit is proportionately folded into Region 5. These are the new regions used by MSU Extension.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.4	663	1	Upper Peninsula
6.0	1,192	2	Northern Lower Peninsula
13.4	2,650	3	Central L.P.
20.8	4,112	4	Southwest L.P.
56.4	11,129	5	Southeast L.P.
	58,625	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Record/column: 2/52

typecomm            Type of Community in Which Respondent Resides (X1)

Would you say you live in a rural community, a small city or town, a suburb, or an urban community?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
0.8	521	0	OTHER
25.4	16,009	1	RURAL COMMUNITY
32.6	20,564	2	SMALL CITY OR TOWN, VILLAGE
27.7	17,436	3	A SUBURB
13.5	8,486	4	URBAN COMMUNITY
	280	8	DO NOT KNOW
	230	9	REFUSED
	14,845	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 8,9  
 Record/column: 1/27

---

SAMPLE WEIGHTING VARIABLES

---

statewt                    Weight for Statewide Estimates

This is a caseweight variable. This is the one that should be turned on for statewide analyses. It adjusts the sample for unequal probabilities of selection based on the number of phone lines to each household and the number of adults in each household. It adjusts for differential response rates within regions based on Census profiles regarding sex X race, and by age. And it makes a post-stratification weighting adjustment for the designed disproportionate sampling across SOSS regions.

78,371 cases (Range of valid codes: 0.0047-45.3578)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Record/columns: 1/30-35

---

msuewt                    weight by MSU region

This is a caseweight variable. This is the one that should be turned on for analyses that directly compares MSU Extension regions (with Detroit included in Region 6). It adjusts the sample for unequal probabilities of selection based on the number of phone lines to each household and the number of adults in each household. It adjusts for differential response rates within regions based on Census profiles regarding sex X race, and by age. It does NOT make the post-stratification weighting adjustment for the designed disproportionate sampling across SOSS regions. That way the number of cases within regions will reflect the actual number interviewed so that the confidence intervals on within region estimates will be correct.

78,371 cases (Range of valid codes: 0.0037-29.3959)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Record/columns: 1/37-42

regnwt                      Weight Variable for 7 SOSS Regions

This is a caseweight variable. This is the one that should be turned on for analyses that directly compares SOSS regions (with Detroit separate from Region 6). It adjusts the sample for unequal probabilities of selection based on the number of phone lines to each household and the number of adults in each household. It adjusts for differential response rates within regions based on Census profiles regarding sex X race, and by age. It does NOT make the post-stratification weighting adjustment for the designed disproportionate sampling across SOSS regions. That way the number of cases within regions will reflect the actual number interviewed so that the confidence intervals on within region estimates will be correct.

78,371 cases (Range of valid codes: 0.0101-23.4351)

Data type: numeric  
Decimals: 4  
Record/columns: 1/44-49

MSUE2005wt                    weight by new MSU region

This is a caseweight variable. This is the one that should be turned on for analyses that directly compares the new MSU Extension regions (with Detroit included in Region 5). It adjusts the sample for unequal probabilities of selection based on the number of phone lines to each household and the number of adults in each household. It adjusts for differential response rates within regions based on Census profiles regarding sex X race x by age. It does NOT make the post-stratification weighting adjustment for the designed disproportionate sampling across SOSS regions. That way the number of cases within regions will reflect the actual number interviewed so that the confidence intervals on within region estimates will be correct.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.5	2,725	0.0000	
9.8	7,669	0.0001	
3.9	3,077	0.0002	
2.6	2,040	0.0003	
1.4	1,129	0.0004	
1.1	857	0.0005	
0.8	661	0.0006	
0.4	312	0.0007	
0.4	295	0.0008	
0.4	276	0.0009	
0.2	119	0.0010	
0.1	115	0.0011	
0.1	78	0.0012	
0.2	157	0.0013	
0.0	14	0.0014	
0.1	64	0.0015	
0.1	52	0.0016	
0.0	10	0.0017	
0.0	8	0.0018	
0.1	75	0.0019	
0.0	5	0.0021	
74.8	58,635	1.0000	
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Decimals: 4  
 Record/columns: 2/46-51

RESPONDENT & HOUSEHOLD BACKGROUND VARIABLES

sex Respondents Gender (CD1)

Now, I have a few background questions. These are for statistical analysis purposes only.

IWER CODES GENDER WITHOUT ASKING UNLESS IWER IS UNCERTAIN AND BASED ON HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION AND RESPONDENT SELECTION

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
47.8	37,446	1	MALE
52.2	40,918	2	FEMALE
0.0	4	3	
0.0	3	9	

-----  
 100.0 78,371 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Record/column: 1/51

YRBORN Year of Birth (CD2)

In what year were you born? 19\_\_ (if less than 84)  
 18\_\_ (if greater than 90)

78,371 cases (Range of valid codes: 0-99)

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 999,998  
 Record/columns: 1/52-54

age Respondents Age (calculated from YRBORN)

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.7	1,271	18	
1.8	1,410	19	
1.8	1,368	20	
1.8	1,398	21	
1.8	1,390	22	
1.8	1,377	23	
2.0	1,560	24	
1.7	1,281	25	
1.9	1,427	26	
2.0	1,541	27	
2.0	1,495	28	
1.9	1,482	29	
1.7	1,279	30	
1.8	1,350	31	
1.8	1,389	32	
1.8	1,384	33	
2.0	1,519	34	
2.2	1,669	35	
2.2	1,645	36	
1.9	1,463	37	
2.2	1,720	38	
2.4	1,813	39	
1.7	1,335	40	
1.7	1,301	41	
1.7	1,332	42	
1.8	1,411	43	
1.9	1,430	44	
2.1	1,580	45	
2.0	1,525	46	
2.0	1,562	47	
2.2	1,654	48	
2.2	1,648	49	
1.6	1,209	50	
1.6	1,256	51	
1.6	1,190	52	
1.7	1,307	53	
1.6	1,200	54	
1.5	1,172	55	
1.5	1,154	56	
1.4	1,103	57	
1.4	1,105	58	
1.3	1,013	59	
1.3	980	60	
1.3	986	61	
1.2	925	62	

June 12, 2020

1.1	834	63	
1.1	852	64	
1.2	955	65	
1.1	859	66	
1.0	800	67	
1.1	863	68	
1.0	790	69	
0.9	725	70	
1.0	758	71	
0.9	705	72	
0.8	578	73	
0.8	585	74	
0.7	568	75	
0.9	677	76	
0.8	591	77	
0.6	495	78	
0.6	440	79	
0.7	531	80	
0.5	382	81	
0.5	348	82	
0.4	288	83	
0.3	229	84	
0.3	204	85	
0.2	168	86	
0.1	109	87	
0.1	95	88	
0.1	62	89	
0.1	58	90	
0.1	59	91	
0.2	184	92	
0.0	29	93	
0.0	15	94	
0.0	6	95	
0.0	6	96	
0.0	7	97	
0.0	10	98	
0.0	13	99	
0.0	3	100	
0.0	0	998	DONT KNOW
	589	0	MISSING
	375	999	REFUSED
	918	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 0,999  
 Record/columns: 1/55-57

June 12, 2020

agecat                      Respondents Age in Categories

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
12.8	9,812	1	18 - 24 Yrs
9.4	7,226	2	25 - 29 Yrs
19.9	15,230	3	30 - 39 Yrs
19.3	14,777	4	40 - 49 Yrs
15.3	11,710	5	50 - 59 Yrs
6.0	4,577	6	60 - 64 Yrs
17.3	13,223	7	65 or older
	1,816	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,0  
 Record/column: 1/58

educatn                      Respondents Level of Education (CD3)

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
0.1	51	0	DID NOT GO TO SCHOOL
0.1	55	1	GRADE
0.0	34	2	GRADE
0.0	28	3	GRADE
0.0	18	4	GRADE
0.0	26	5	GRADE
0.1	84	6	GRADE
0.1	100	7	GRADE
0.7	531	8	GRADE
0.8	590	9	GRADE
1.2	949	10	GRADE
2.4	1,873	11	GRADE
27.0	21,060	12	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR GED HOLDER
10.1	7,868	13	COLLEGE (ONE YEAR)
13.8	10,759	14	COLLEGE (TWO YEARS)
5.1	3,983	15	COLLEGE (THREE YEARS)
19.9	15,492	16	COLLEGE GRADUATE (FOUR YEARS)
3.5	2,721	17	SOME POST GRADUATE
11.2	8,734	18	GRADUATE DEGREE
3.7	2,920	20	TECHNICAL/JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADUATE
	92	98	DO NOT KNOW
	402	99	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 99,98  
 Record/columns: 1/59-60

ethnic                      Respondent Hispanic Background (CD5 & CD5a)

Now a couple of questions about your ethnicity and race.  
 Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.0	2,303	1	YES- HISPANIC/LATINO/SPANISH ORIGIN
97.0	73,974	5	NO - NOT HISPANIC/LATINO/SPANISH ORIGIN
	142	8	DO NOT KNOW
	1,951	9	REFUSED, NOT ASKED (not asked in SOSS 13)
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 1/61

race3                      Respondents Race (gathered from CD4a - CD4e)

What is your race?            Are you . . .  
 White? African American or Black? Hawaiian Pacific Islander?  
 Asian? American Indian or Alaska Native?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
83.4	63,307	1	White
13.1	9,930	2	African American
3.6	2,710	3	Other
	2,424	9	Refuse-Not codable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,7  
 Record/column: 1/62

religion Respondents Religious Identification

What is the religious group which you feel most closely represents your religious views? (Is it Catholic, Islamic, Jewish, Protestant, some other religion, or no religion)?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
0.0	0	0	NONE; NO RELIGIOUS GROUP
0.0	0	1	CATHOLIC; ROMAN CATHOLIC, ORTHODOX
0.0	0	2	ISLAMIC/MUSLIM
0.0	0	3	JEWISH
0.0	0	4	PROTESTANT
0.0	0	5	OTHER NON-CHRISTIAN (Hindu, Buddhist, witches)
0.0	0	6	OTHER CHRISTIAN
0.0	0	95	MISCELLANEOUS OTHER
0.0	0	99	REFUSED
	78,371	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 98,98  
 Record/column: 1/63

partyid                      Respondents Political Party Identification

(Responses gathered from CD7a-CD7d)

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or something else?

[IF REPUBLICAN]

    Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?

[IF DEMOCRAT]

    Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or not a very strong Democrat?

[IF INDEPENDENT]

    Do you generally think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
6.3	4,666	0	Other/Nothing
13.0	9,541	1	Strong Republican
12.6	9,295	2	Not Strong Republican
10.5	7,698	3	Lean Republican
10.9	8,034	4	Neither, Independent
14.0	10,342	5	Lean Democrat
14.1	10,378	6	Not Strong Democrat
18.6	13,678	7	Strong Democrat
	1,840	8	DO NOT KNOW
	1,939	9	REFUSED
	959	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 1/64

marstat                      Respondents Marital Status    (CD8)

Are you currently married, divorced, separated, widowed,  
 member of an unmarried couple, or have you never been  
 married?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
58.0	45,127	1	MARRIED, REMARRIED
8.8	6,814	2	DIVORCED
1.2	911	3	SEPARATED
6.1	4,726	4	WIDOWED
2.3	1,821	5	MEMBER OF AN UNMARRIED COUPLE
23.6	18,336	6	SINGLE, NEVER BEEN MARRIED
0.1	83	7	OTHER
	20	8	DO NOT KNOW
	532	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 1/65

numadlts                    Number of Adults in Household (CD10)

Including yourself, how many individuals who are 18 years of age or older live in your household?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
21.0	16,443	1	ADULT
53.8	42,094	2	ADULTS
15.8	12,355	3	ADULTS
7.1	5,556	4	ADULTS
1.6	1,272	5	ADULTS
0.5	354	6	ADULTS
0.1	67	7	ADULTS
0.0	22	8	ADULTS
0.1	57	9	ADULTS
0.0	3	10	ADULTS
0.0	2	11	
0.0	2	13	
	27	98	DO NOT KNOW
	113	99	REFUSED
	3	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 99,98  
 Record/columns: 1/66-67

employed Respondents Employment Status (CD15)

We are interested in learning about the different ways people may earn their living. Last week, were you working full-time, part-time, going to school, a home-maker or something else?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
47.9	37,103	1	WORK FULL TIME
11.8	9,130	2	WORK PART TIME
2.7	2,125	3	WORK AND GO TO SCHOOL
0.1	78	4	THE ARMED FORCES
1.1	874	5	HAVE A JOB, BUT NOT AT WORK LAST WEEK
3.2	2,459	6	UNEMPLOYED, LAID OFF, LOOK FOR WORK
16.1	12,431	7	RETIRED
3.4	2,605	8	SCHOOL FULL TIME
9.7	7,483	9	HOMEMAKER
2.5	1,918	10	DISABLED
0.1	108	11	SEMI-RETIRED, RETIRED AND WORKING PART-TIME
0.0	4	20	
0.0	0	21	
1.4	1,120	95	MISC/OTHER
	221	98	DO NOT KNOW
	712	99	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 99,98  
 Record/columns: 1/68-69

jobs Respondent Has Multiple Jobs(CD17)

Do you currently work for pay at more than one job?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
13.8	1,802	1	YES
86.2	11,227	5	NO
	12	8	DONT KNOW
	113	9	REFUSED
	65,218	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 8,9  
 Record/column: 1/72

selfemp                    Self-Employed? (CD22)

In your main (last) job, are (were) you self-employed or do (did) you work for someone else?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
13.1	2,351	1	SELF-EMPLOYED
86.9	15,613	5	WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE
	209	8	DONT KNOW
	336	9	REFUSED
	59,862	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 1/73

income8 Household Income in 8 Categories

To get a picture of people's financial situations, we'd like to know the general range of incomes of all households we interview. This is for statistical analysis purposes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Now, thinking about your household's total annual income from all sources (including your job), did your household receive \$30,000 or more in 2001?

- [IF NO] Was it less than \$20,000?
- [IF YES] Was it less than \$10,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$60,000? or more?
- [IF NO] Was it \$40,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$50,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it more than \$70,000?

NOTE: A PROGRAMMING ERROR IN SOSS 20 THROUGH 24 PREVENTED THE DIFFERENTIATION OF \$50,000-59,999 FROM THE \$40,000 - \$59,999 CATEGORY  
 NEW VERSION OF INCOME QUESTION BEGINNING SOSS-50

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.1	2,143	1	Less than \$10,000
9.2	6,370	2	\$10,000-19,999
11.6	7,991	3	\$20,000-29,999
12.4	8,577	4	\$30,000-39,999
12.3	8,499	5	\$40,000-49,999
8.8	6,050	6	\$50,000-59,999
11.6	7,991	7	\$60,000-69,999
31.0	21,420	8	\$70,000 or more
	7,218	0	Refused
	1,985	9	DONT KNOW
	127	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 0,9  
 Record/column: 1/74

income11 Household Income in 11 Categories

To get a picture of people's financial situations, we'd like to know the general range of incomes of all households we interview. This is for statistical analysis purposes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Now, thinking about your household's total annual income from all sources (including your job), did your household receive \$40,000 or more in 2001?

- [IF NO] Was it less than \$20,000?
- [IF YES] Was it less than \$10,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$60,000? or more?
- [IF NO] Was it \$40,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$50,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it more than \$70,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$100,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$150,000 or more?
- [IF NO] Was it \$90,000 or more?

THIS IS THE VERSION OF THE INCOME QUESTION THAT SOSS BEGAN USING IN Quarter 51.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
3.5	875	1	Less than \$10,000
9.2	2,291	2	\$10,000-19,999
9.0	2,238	3	\$20,000-29,999
8.8	2,187	4	\$30,000-39,999
11.2	2,783	5	\$40,000-49,999
9.4	2,346	6	\$50,000-59,999
11.6	2,894	7	\$60,000-69,999
12.7	3,172	8	\$70,000-89,999
3.6	895	9	\$90,000-99,999
13.3	3,320	10	\$100,000-\$149,999
7.7	1,909	11	\$150,000 or more
	637	98	DONT KNOW
	1,686	99	Refused
	51,138	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 98,99  
 Record/columns: 2/65-66

newinc50 Household Income in 10 Categories

To get a picture of people's financial situations, we'd like to know the general range of incomes of all households we interview. This is for statistical analysis purposes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Now, thinking about your household's total annual income from all sources (including your job), did your household receive \$40,000 or more in 2001?

- [IF NO] Was it less than \$20,000?
- [IF YES] Was it less than \$10,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$60,000? or more?
- [IF NO] Was it \$40,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$50,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it more than \$70,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$100,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$150,000 or more?

ONLY ASKED OF RDD CASES in SOSS-50

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.7	11	1	Less than \$10,000
7.2	45	2	\$10,000-19,999
24.8	154	3	\$20,000-29,999
2.9	18	4	\$30,000-39,999
7.8	49	5	\$40,000-49,999
11.4	71	6	\$50,000-59,999
14.4	90	7	\$60,000-69,999
13.6	85	8	\$70,000-99,000
13.1	82	9	\$100,000 - 149,999
3.0	18	10	\$150,000 or more
	32	98	DONT KNOW
	58	99	Refused
	77,657	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 98,99  
 Record/columns: 2/59-60

SOSS50inc Household Income in 7 Categories

To get a picture of people's financial situations, we'd like to know the general range of incomes of all households we interview. This is for statistical analysis purposes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Now, thinking about your household's total annual income from all sources (including your job), did your household receive \$40,000 or more in 2001?

- [IF NO] Was it less than \$20,000?
- [IF YES] Was it less than \$10,000?
- [IF YES] Was it \$60,000? or more?
- [IF NO] Was it \$40,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it \$50,000 or more?
- [IF YES] Was it more than \$70,000?

THIS IS THE VERSION OF SOSS-50's INCOME QUESTION THAT MOST NEARLY APPROXIMATES THE INCOME VARIABLE IN THE SOSSES PRIOR TO SOSS-50. HOWEVER, A PROGRAMMING OVERSIGHT GROUPED THE \$20-29k INCOMES IN WITH THE \$30-39K INCOMES.

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
1.5	13	1	Less than \$10,000
6.7	57	2	\$10,000-19,999
25.5	217	3	\$20,000-39,999
8.5	72	4	\$40,000-49,999
10.3	87	5	\$50,000-59,999
13.6	116	6	\$60,000-69,999
33.9	288	7	\$70,000 or more
	32	98	DONT KNOW
	70	99	Refused
	77,418	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 98,99  
 Record/columns: 2/62-63

CONSUMER ATTITUDES & HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING

cc1 Consumer Attitudes: Financially Better/Worse Than Past

In this part of the survey, I'd like to ask you a few questions about how things are going for Michigan residents in general.

Would you say that you (and your family living there) are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
39.4	30,610	1	BETTER OFF
27.7	21,570	3	ABOUT THE SAME
32.9	25,599	5	WORSE OFF
	368	8	DO NOT KNOW
	216	9	REFUSED
	7	.	Not Applicable

-----  
 100.0 78,371 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/9

cc2 Consumer Attitudes: Expect Future Better/Worse Off

Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now, you (and your family living there) will be better off financially or worse off financially?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
57.3	42,199	1	BETTER OFF
21.7	15,964	3	ABOUT THE SAME
21.1	15,518	5	WORSE OFF
	4,469	8	DO NOT KNOW
	221	9	REFUSED

-----  
 100.0 78,371 cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/10

cc3 Consumer Attitudes: Present Financial Situation

How would you rate your household's overall financial situation these days? Would you say it is excellent, good, just fair, not so good, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
8.2	6,361	1	EXCELLENT
47.6	37,047	2	GOOD
31.2	24,288	3	JUST FAIR
8.3	6,486	4	NOT SO GOOD
4.8	3,710	5	POOR
	203	8	DO NOT KNOW
	277	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/11

cc4 Consumer Attitudes: Expect Inflation

During the next twelve months, do you think the rate of inflation in this country will go up, will go down, or will stay about the same as it was in the past 12 months?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
57.9	43,704	1	GO UP
5.7	4,333	3	GO DOWN
36.3	27,410	5	STAY ABOUT THE SAME
	2,789	8	DO NOT KNOW
	135	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/12

cc5 Consumer Attitudes: Future Unemployment

Twelve months from now, do you expect the unemployment situation in this country to be better than, worse than, or about the same as it was in the last 12 months?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
25.2	19,218	1	BETTER THAN
29.3	22,336	3	WORSE THAN
45.6	34,787	5	ABOUT THE SAME
	1,874	8	DO NOT KNOW
	155	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/13

cc6 Consumer Attitudes: Business Conditions Future

Now turning to business conditions in your community, do you think that during the next twelve months your community will have good times financially, or bad times financially?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
50.7	37,912	1	GOOD TIMES
36.9	27,579	3	BAD TIMES
12.3	9,202	5	NEITHER
0.1	100	7	SOMETHING ELSE
	3,263	8	DO NOT KNOW
	315	9	REFUSED
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/14

---

MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM

June 12, 2020

probcomm                      Most Important Problem Facing Community (A1)

What would you say is the most important problem facing your community today?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
2.4	511	1	SCHOOL FINANCE/EDUCATION FUNDING
3.7	792	2	EDUCATION QUALITY/IMPROVE EDUCATION
1.9	420	9	EDUCATION:GENERAL
1.6	350	10	MEDICAL CARE/HEALTH CARE: GENERAL
0.4	88	11	ELDERLY/MEDICAL CARE ELDERLY: MEDICARE
1.2	257	12	RACISM/EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES
1.0	210	13	POVERTY/POOR
0.5	99	14	HOMELESSNESS
1.0	224	15	HOUSING/AFFORDABLE HOUSING
0.3	73	16	WELFARE REFORM/CUT WELFARE
0.0	6	17	WELFARE EXPANSION/MORE PROGRAMS
0.0	3	18	
0.4	88	19	OTHER (MEDICAL/HEALTH/WELFARE)
29.2	6,330	20	JOBS/CREATING JOBS/UNEMPLOYMENT
8.5	1,848	21	ECONOMY/DEVELOPMENT/LOSS BUSINESSES
1.2	262	22	OVER EXPANSION/TOO MUCH GROWTH
0.3	64	23	FARMING/DECLINE FARMING
1.6	340	24	COST OF GOODS/INFLATION
1.1	234	25	FAMILY INCOME/FAMILY FINANCES
1.1	236	26	FORECLOSURES/HOUSING CRISIS/PROPERTY VALUES
0.2	45	27	LACK OF REVENUE
0.0	8	28	
1.2	265	29	OTHER (ECONOMY)
1.6	357	30	TAXES: LOCAL/CITY/PROPERTY
0.8	171	31	LEADERSHIP/CITY LEADERS
0.3	59	32	CORRUPTION: LOCAL LEVEL
0.7	154	33	TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT
0.2	45	34	COURTS/JUDICIAL REFORM
1.1	239	35	TAXES: STATE/FEDERAL
0.9	198	36	LEADERSHIP: STATE/FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
0.2	48	37	CORRUPTION: STATE/FEDERAL LEVEL
0.2	37	38	WAR/TERRORISM/MILITARY CONFLICTS
0.9	186	39	OTHER (GOVERNMENT)
0.3	57	40	THEFT
0.7	156	41	SAFETY/STREET VIOLENCE
0.3	59	42	GUN CONTROL
3.9	851	43	DRUGS/DRUG DEALERS
7.6	1,639	44	CRIME: GENERAL
0.0	6	48	
0.1	17	49	OTHER (CRIME)
0.9	203	50	GANGS/TEEN VIOLENCE
0.6	134	51	LACK ACTIVITIES YOUTH

0.1	14	52	TEENAGE PREGNANCY
0.2	35	53	YOUTH AND DRUGS
0.1	22	54	YOUTH DRINKING/ALC. ABUSE
0.0	1	55	PEER PRESSURE
0.2	46	59	OTHER (YOUTH)
0.2	47	60	DIVORCE/BROKEN HOMES/SINGLE PARENTS
0.2	37	61	CHILDREN'S WELFARE/CHILD ABUSE
0.1	18	62	DISCIPLINE/PARENTAL CONTROL
0.7	159	63	VALUES/MORALITY/RELIGION
0.0	8	64	FAMILY ALCOHOLISM/DRUG ABUSE
0.2	35	69	OTHER (FAMILY)
0.3	55	70	POLLUTION
0.3	56	71	JUNK/DIRTY CITY/BLIGHT
0.0	3	72	LANDFILLS
0.3	58	73	LAND USE
0.6	120	74	POPULATION GROWTH
0.0	2	75	RECYCLING
0.2	33	76	WETLAND/NATURAL AREA
0.5	116	79	OTHER (ENVIRONMENT)
0.9	200	80	WATER/SEWERS
0.1	20	81	TRASH/GARBAGE COLLECTION
0.5	109	82	POLICE/MORE LAW ENFORCEMENT
0.1	21	83	FIRE/MORE FIRE PROTECTION
4.5	968	84	ROADS/ROAD REPAIR/STREET UPKEEP
0.2	52	85	TRANSPORTATION/BUSES
0.0	5	86	ANIMAL CONTROL
0.7	156	87	TRAFFIC CONGESTION/TRAFFIC
0.1	13	88	
0.4	87	89	OTHER (PUBLIC SERVICES)
0.4	87	90	COMMUNITY SPIRIT, COMMUNITY SUPPORT
5.2	1,134	91	MISCELLANEOUS: OTHER
0.0	6	92	
0.0	1	93	
0.0	2	94	
2.5	548	95	NO PROBLEMS
	1,471	98	DO NOT KNOW
	239	99	REFUSED/NO ANSWER
	55,012	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 99,98  
 Record/columns: 2/16-17

June 12, 2020

govprob                      Most Important Problem for Gov. & Legislature (GL1/P4a)

There are many issues that the governor and legislature (in Lansing) could spend time dealing with in the next session. Of all the issues they could work on, which issue do you think is the most important for them to focus on?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
12.4	3,106	1	ECONOMY/ECONOMIC GROWTH/STIMULATING THE ECONOMY
25.2	6,314	2	JOBS/CREATING JOBS/UNEMPLOYMENT
6.0	1,494	3	HEALTH CARE/COST OF HEALTH CARE/HEALTH INSURANCE
4.6	1,157	4	CRIME/DRUGS/VIOLENCE/SAFETY/PRISONS
16.1	4,036	5	EDUCATION/SCHOOL FUNDING
1.9	470	6	POVERTY/HOMELESS/SOCIAL PROGRAMS
2.5	623	7	WELFARE/WELFARE REFORM
4.3	1,074	8	TAXES
1.0	261	9	SENIORS/PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE
2.2	558	10	REDUCE BUDGETS/SIZE GOVERNMENT
1.3	328	11	MORAL ISSUES/ABORTION/FAMILY VALUES
0.5	136	12	FOREIGN POLICY
2.3	565	13	ENVIRONMENT
4.2	1,063	14	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES REPAIR
0.3	67	15	CHILDREN/ISSUES WITH CHILDREN
0.2	62	16	DIVERSITY/RACE RELATIONS
0.2	61	17	ETHICS, POLITICAL REFORM
3.1	786	18	INFRASTRUCTURE OF CITIES
0.1	13	19	ELECTION REFORM
0.3	84	20	GUN CONTROL
0.6	149	21	JOB TRAINING/RETRAINING
0.0	11	22	TEACHER TESTING/ACCOUNTABILITY
0.4	89	23	REGULATION/DEREGULATION
0.4	111	24	MEAP SCORES
1.3	322	25	STATE BUDGET CRISIS/SOLVE BUDGET ISSUES
0.3	82	26	FORECLOSURES/PROPERTY VALUES/HOUSING CRISIS
2.6	659	27	EDUCATION QUALITY/STANDARDS
5.2	1,300	90	MISCELLANEOUS
0.4	94	95	NOTHING/EVERYTHING IS FINE
	1,872	98	DO NOT KNOW
	478	99	REFUSED/NO ANSWER
	50,946	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 99,98  
 Record/columns: 2/19-20

---

QUALITY OF LIFE

---

quallife Overall Quality of Life in Community (B1)

In general, how would you rate the overall quality of life in your community -- would you say the quality of life is excellent, good fair, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
17.9	883	1	EXCELLENT
56.2	2,769	2	GOOD
21.9	1,078	3	FAIR
4.0	195	4	POOR
	33	8	DONT KNOW
	3	9	REFUSED
	73,410	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/22

---

RATING PERFORMANCE OF & TRUST IN GOVERNMENT/OFFICIALS

---

rateprCl                    Rate Performance of President--Clinton (PO1-Clinton, PO1C)

Now thinking about our elected officials . . .

How would you rate the way Bill Clinton is performing his job as President -- would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
11.0	2,113	1	EXCELLENT
36.7	7,081	2	GOOD
34.9	6,736	3	FAIR
17.5	3,369	4	POOR
	59,071	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/23

rateprBu                   Rate Performance of President--Bush, G.W. (PO1 - Bush, PO1B)

Now thinking about our elected officials . . .

How would you rate the way George W. Bush is performing his job as President -- would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
11.9	3,061	1	EXCELLENT
26.8	6,870	2	GOOD
26.0	6,682	3	FAIR
35.3	9,047	4	POOR
	200	8	DO NOT KNOW
	207	9	REFUSED
	52,304	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/24

rateprOb                   Rate Performance of President--Obama (PO1-Obama, PO1O)

Now thinking about our elected officials . . .

How would you rate the way Barak Obama is performing his job as President -- would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
13.3	3,049	1	EXCELLENT
30.6	7,027	2	GOOD
29.4	6,753	3	FAIR
26.8	6,171	4	POOR
	263	8	DO NOT KNOW
	275	9	REFUSED
	54,832	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/68

rategvEn Rate Performance of Governor -- Engler (po2)

How would you rate the way John Engler is performing his job as Michigan's governor? (Would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
11.7	2,678	1	EXCELLENT
36.9	8,418	2	GOOD
31.0	7,066	3	FAIR
20.3	4,629	4	POOR
	546	8	DO NOT KNOW
	190	9	REFUSED
	54,843	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/25

rategvGr Rate Performance of Governor -- Granholm (po2)

How would you rate the way Jennifer Granholm is performing her job as Michigan's governor? (Would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
5.6	1,568	1	EXCELLENT
28.1	7,827	2	GOOD
38.2	10,612	3	FAIR
28.1	7,807	4	POOR
	776	8	DO NOT KNOW
	928	9	REFUSED
	48,854	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/34

rategvSn                    Rate Performance of Governor -- Snyder (po2)

How would you rate the way Rick Snyder is performing his  
 job as Michigan's Governor?  
                   Would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
5.8	1,059	1	EXCELLENT
27.4	5,028	2	GOOD
38.2	7,024	3	FAIR
28.7	5,268	4	POOR
	391	8	DO NOT KNOW
	157	9	REFUSED
	59,443	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/69

ratecong                    Rate Performance of US Congress (po3)

How would you rate the performance of the U.S.  
 Congress in Washington as a whole? (Would you say  
 excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
2.2	104	1	EXCELLENT
30.7	1,421	2	GOOD
49.1	2,272	3	FAIR
18.0	833	4	POOR
	230	8	DO NOT KNOW
	42	9	REFUSED
	73,470	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/26

rateMiLg                    Rate Performance of Michigan Legislature (po4)

How would you rate the performance of the Michigan Legislature (in Lansing) as a whole? (Would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
2.2	79	1	EXCELLENT
43.5	1,590	2	GOOD
45.0	1,646	3	FAIR
9.3	339	4	POOR
	250	8	DO NOT KNOW
	43	9	REFUSED
	74,423	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/27

rateMiGv                    Rate Performance of Michigan Government (po12, soss24 d4)

Now how would you rate the performance of the state government of Michigan as a whole? (Would you say excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

(IWER: By state government we mean all the units of state government, including the departments such as secretary of state, transportation, judicial as well as elected officials).

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
4.5	44	1	EXCELLENT
54.5	532	2	GOOD
37.5	366	3	FAIR
3.5	34	4	POOR
	21	8	DO NOT KNOW
	15	9	REFUSED
	77,358	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/28

trustedf                    How Often Can Trust Federal Govt. (po8)

People have different ideas about how much they can trust government to do what is right. These ideas don't refer to Democrats or Republicans in particular, but just to the government in general. We want to see how you feel about this for each of the levels of government.

How much of the time do you think you can trust the federal government in Washington to do what is right -- nearly always or most of the time, some of the time, seldom, or almost never?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
18.5	5,158	1	NEARLY ALL OR MOST OF THE TIME
46.6	12,966	2	SOME OF THE TIME
22.7	6,303	3	SELDOM
12.2	3,395	4	NEVER
	182	8	DO NOT KNOW
	147	9	REFUSED
	50,220	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/29

truststt                    How Often Trust State Govt. (po9)

How much of the time do you think you can trust the state government in Lansing to do what is right -- nearly always or most of the time, some of the time, seldom, or almost never?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
24.0	6,219	1	NEARLY ALL OR MOST OF THE TIME
51.5	13,342	2	SOME OF THE TIME
16.5	4,263	3	SELDOM
8.0	2,062	4	NEVER
	224	8	DO NOT KNOW
	101	9	REFUSED
	52,159	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/30

trustlcl                    How Often Trust Local Govt. (po10)

How much of the time do you think you can trust your local government to do what is right -- nearly always or most of the time, some of the time, seldom, or almost never?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
40.3	8,897	1	NEARLY ALL OR MOST OF THE TIME
40.5	8,920	2	SOME OF THE TIME
11.7	2,575	3	SELDOM
7.5	1,658	4	NEVER
	184	8	DO NOT KNOW
	68	9	REFUSED
	56,068	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/31

terror                      Concern about Terrorist Attack

All in all, how concerned are you that the United States might suffer another terrorist attack in the next 3 months? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned, or not concerned at all?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
19.2	3,164	1	VERY CONCERNED
42.5	7,003	2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED
27.4	4,523	3	NOT VERY CONCERNED
10.9	1,796	4	NOT CONCERNED AT ALL
	93	8	DO NOT KNOW
	30	9	REFUSED
	61,762	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/36

respterr                      US Responsibility for Terrorism

How much responsibility do you personally believe the United States bears for the hatred that led to the 9/11 terrorist attacks? Would you say a lot of responsibility, some, a little, or none at all?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
24.9	1,164	1	A LOT
34.5	1,613	2	SOME
20.6	964	3	A LITTLE
19.9	931	4	NONE AT ALL
	121	8	DO NOT KNOW
	67	9	REFUSED
	73,512	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/38

TERMLIMIT                    Attitude Toward Term Limits

The next few questions are about term limits. In 1992, the voters approved an amendment to the state constitution that places limits on the number of terms in office that can be served by the governor and members of the state legislature. Do you approve or disapprove of these term limits?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
74.7	2,783	1	APPROVE
25.3	944	5	DISAPPROVE
	206	8	DO NOT KNOW
	41	9	REFUSED
	74,397	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/40

perfrep                    Performance of Representative

Thinking about the performance of your own representative and senator, would you say that term limits have made their performance better than before, worse than before, or about the same as before term limits came into effect?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
24.3	210	1	BETTER THAN BEFORE TERM LIMITS
7.0	60	2	WORSE THAN BEFORE TERM LIMITS
68.7	594	3	ABOUT THE SAME AS BEFORE TERM LIMITS
	67	8	DO NOT KNOW
	8	9	REFUSED
	77,431	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/42

contrmlm                    Should Term Limits Continue

Should term limits continue without change, with longer terms permitted, or should term limits be eliminated?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
62.9	1,132	1	CONTINUE WITHOUT CHANGE
15.5	279	2	CONTINUE WITH LONGER TERMS
21.6	389	3	TERM LIMITS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED
	105	8	DO NOT KNOW
	35	9	REFUSED
	76,432	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/44

CL1                            Civil Liberties Trade-Off

Next I am going to read two statements. Please tell me which one you agree with most.

The first is, in order to curb terrorism in this country, it will be necessary to give up some civil liberties.     -or-

We should preserve our freedoms above all, even if there remains some risk of terrorism.

(Which statement do you agree with most?)

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
35.5	1,395	1	NECESSARY GIVE UP CIVIL LIBERTIES
57.7	2,265	5	PRESERVE FREEDOMS
2.9	114	7	DEPENDS/NEITHER
2.1	81	8	DO NOT KNOW
1.8	72	9	REFUSED
	74,444	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371		cases

Data type: numeric  
 Record/column: 2/54

CL1flup Civil Liberties Trade-Off Follow-Up

-IF ANSWERED 7 or 8 TO CL1-

If you had to choose, which statement is closer to your opinion?

(In order to curb terrorism in this country, it will be necessary to give up some civil liberties). or

(We should preserve our freedoms above all, even if there remains some risk of terrorism.)

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
16.9	34	1	NECESSARY GIVE UP CIVIL LIBERTIES
25.2	50	5	PRESERVE FREEDOMS
35.0	70	7	DEPENDS/NEITHER
20.0	40	8	DO NOT KNOW
2.9	6	9	REFUSED
	78,171	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Record/column: 2/55

P18 Approve/Disapprove Legislature

In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way the state legislature in Lansing has been handling its job?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
43.1	1,672	1	APPROVE
46.4	1,800	5	DISAPPROVE
8.8	340	8	DO NOT KNOW
1.6	64	9	REFUSED
	74,494	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
Record/column: 2/56

UNIVERSITY'S ECONOMIC ROLE

univrole                    Role University Play in Economy (B12)

Overall, how important a role do you think the state's public colleges and universities should play in improving the state's economy -- would you say a very important role, somewhat important role, not a very important role, or no role at all?

%	N	VALUE	LABEL
35.1	669	1	VERY IMPORTANT ROLE
50.7	965	2	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT ROLE
8.7	165	3	NOT VERY
5.6	106	4	NO ROLE AT ALL
	37	8	DO NOT KNOW
	1	9	REFUSED
	76,427	.	Not Applicable
-----	-----		
100.0	78,371	cases	

Data type: numeric  
 Missing-data codes: 9,8  
 Record/column: 2/32