

Decision Resources, Ltd.  
 3128 Dean Court  
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

JUSTICE AT STAKE STUDY  
 MINNESOTA STATEWIDE  
 FINAL January 2008

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ of Decision Resources, Ltd., a national survey research firm located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. We are conducting a survey of residents in your area and would like to ask you a few questions about issues facing both your area and the State. Before we begin, I want to assure you all of your responses will be held strictly confidential; only summaries of the entire sample will be reported.

A. First, are you a judge in Minnesota or an employee of its Court System? YES...THANK AND TERMINATE  
 NO.....CONTINUE

I would like to ask you some questions about your personal experiences with the court system....

1. Have you ever served on a jury? YES.....20%  
 NO.....80%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

2. Have you ever been a defendant in a court case? YES.....10%  
 NO.....90%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

3. Have you ever been a plaintiff in a court case? YES.....8%  
 NO.....92%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

4. Have you ever testified as a witness in a court proceeding? YES.....17%  
 NO.....83%  
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

Now, I am going to read a list of public institutions here in Minnesota. Please tell me how much confidence you have in each of these institutions. Tell me if you have a great deal of confidence, some confidence, only a little confidence, or no confidence at all. (ROTATE LIST)

	GDC	SMC	LTC	NCN	DKR
5. The media?	8%	56%	28%	8%	0%
6. The Minnesota State Legislature?	3%	55%	33%	9%	1%
7. Political parties?	3%	45%	41%	10%	2%
8. The medical profession?	35%	53%	9%	2%	1%
	GDC	SMC	LTC	NCN	DKR

9.	The Minnesota Court System?	12%	62%	18%	5%	3%	
10.	The Governor?	15%	41%	32%	12%	1%	
11.	Judges?	10%	66%	17%	5%	2%	
12.	Lawyers?	4%	51%	34%	10%	2%	
13.	Overall, how much do you know about the Minnesota court system -- would you say you know a lot, some, a little, or nothing at all?	A LOT.....	5%	SOME.....	47%	A LITTLE.....	41%
		NOTHING AT ALL.....	7%	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%		
14.	Thinking of the judges in Minnesota, what is your opinion of their overall performance -- would you say their overall performance is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....	0%	VERY GOOD.....	11%	GOOD.....	53%
		FAIR.....	28%	POOR.....	2%	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	6%

I am going to read you a list of words and phrases some people use to describe judges in Minnesota courts. For each word or phrase, please tell me whether it describes Minnesota judges very well, well, not too well, or not well at all. (ROTATE LIST)

	VRW	WEL	NTW	NAA	DKR
15. Impartial?	12%	66%	11%	2%	10%
16. Qualified?	23%	64%	5%	1%	7%
17. Swayed by public opinion?	5%	42%	34%	6%	13%
18. Controlled by special interests?	6%	35%	38%	6%	15%
19. Share your values?	4%	57%	20%	5%	14%
20. Fair?	9%	73%	10%	1%	7%
21. Political?	11%	54%	23%	2%	10%
22. Honest and trustworthy?	10%	70%	10%	1%	10%
23. Favor campaign contributors?	7%	40%	32%	4%	17%
24. Dedicated to facts?	11%	70%	9%	1%	9%
25. Responsive to citizens?	7%	62%	16%	3%	12%
26. Accountable to the law and constitution?	18%	67%	6%	1%	8%

27. If your case came before the court, what quality, in general, would be MOST important to you for a judge to possess?

QUALIFIED, 18%; FAIR, 15%; IMPARTIAL, 17%; HONEST, 31%; INTEGRITY, 2%; LISTENS, 2%; FOLLOWS THE LAW, 3%; KNOWLEDGEABLE, 4%; DEDICATED TO FACTS, 2%; LISTENS TO BOTH SIDES, 3%; SCATTERED, 3%.

28. And, what quality would be second most important to you for a judge to possess?

QUALIFIED, 6%; FAIR, 29%; IMPARTIAL, 18%; ACCOUNTABLE, 2%; HONEST, 24%; LISTENS, 4%; FOLLOWS THE LAW, 4%; KNOWLEDGEABLE, 3%; DEDICATED TO FACTS, 4%; LISTENS TO BOTH SIDES, 3%; SCATTERED, 3%.

Changing topics....

29. In Minnesota, are state judges elected or are they appointed?	ELECTED.....39%
	APPOINTED.....33%
	BOTH (VOL).....17%
	UNSURE.....12%
	REFUSED.....0%

In Minnesota, most judges take office after being appointed by the Governor to fill a vacancy due to retirement or death of a current judge. But at the end of the term, the judge must run in a contested election to keep his or her seat on the bench. In many cases, judges run unopposed, as no one files for election against them. In all cases, the current judge is listed with the term "incumbent" after his or her name.

30. Generally, do you believe this method is a good way to select state judges? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?	STRONGLY YES.....10%
	YES.....42%
	NO.....34%
	STRONGLY NO.....6%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....9%

IF 1-4 IN QUESTION #30, ASK: (N=728)

31. Can you tell me why you feel that way?

UNSURE, 1%; PUBLIC GETS TO VOTE, 29%; NOT POLITICAL, 2%; WORKS WELL/NO NEED TO CHANGE, 10%; NO ONE CHALLENGES/NO CHOICE FOR VOTERS, 19%; ONLY WAY THEY KNOW HOW, 6%; NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION ABOUT JUDGES TO VOTE ON, 13%; APPOINTMENTS ARE TOO POLITICAL, 12%; JUDGES GAIN A RECORD AND EXPERIENCE BEFORE VOTE, 5%; SHOULD

BE THE GOVERNOR'S CHOICE, 3%.

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 32. | Do you think the listing of the current judge with the term "incumbent" after his or her name provides an unfair election advantage, or does it provide valuable information that voters are entitled to know? | UNFAIR ADVANTAGE.....31%<br>VALUABLE INFORMATION..48%<br>BOTH (VOL).....14%<br>NEITHER (VOL).....2%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....5%    |
| 33. | Thinking specifically about judicial elections, how frequently do you vote in elections for judges -- almost always, sometimes, not often, almost never, or never?   | ALMOST ALWAYS.....46%<br>SOMETIMES.....27%<br>NOT OFTEN.....6%<br>ALMOST NEVER.....9%<br>NEVER.....11%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1% |

IF "ALMOST NEVER" OR "NEVER" IN QUESTION #33, ASK: (N=164)

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 34. | What is the main reason you do not vote in a judicial election? (DO NOT READ THIS CIRCLE THE LETTER OF THE STATEMENT CLOSEST TO THE REASON GIVEN) | STATEMENT A.....34%<br>STATEMENT B.....2%<br>STATEMENT C.....16%<br>STATEMENT D.....21%<br>STATEMENT E.....1%<br>STATEMENT F.....4%<br>STATEMENT G.....11%<br>STATEMENT H.....7%<br>STATEMENT I.....0%<br>STATEMENT J.....1%<br>SOMETHING ELSE.....4%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1% |
|     | A. Don't have enough information about candidates;  |  |
|     | B. Don't have time;   |  |
|     | C. No reason, just because;   |  |
|     | D. Not interested in judicial elections;  |  |
|     | E. Out of town;   |  |
|     | F. No one worth voting for;   |  |
|     | G. Don't know enough about courts or legal system;  |  |
|     | H. Courts don't affect my life;   |  |
|     | I. Problems with ballots or polling places;   |  |
|     | J. Not eligible to vote in judicial elections.  |  |

35. How much influence do you think campaign contributions made to judges have on their decision -- a great deal, some, just a little, or no influence at all?

A GREAT DEAL.....	20%
SOME.....	39%
JUST A LITTLE.....	27%
NONE AT ALL.....	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED....	10%

Now, I'd like to ask you how you feel about some other issues related to the courts. How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements? Would you say you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? (ROTATE LIST)

STA AGR DIS STD DKR

36. Minnesota courts are free from the influence from special interest groups.	2%	20%	48%	19%	11%
37. Judges are out of touch with what's going on in their communities.	8%	23%	47%	17%	6%
38. It is important to have the public vote on judges in Minnesota.	44%	48%	5%	2%	2%
39. Judges' decisions are influenced by the political party currently in power.	13%	44%	24%	6%	14%

For many years, judicial elections in Minnesota were free from partisanship and special interests and few judges needed to raise significant campaign funds. But, recently the United States Supreme Court ruled that political parties could endorse judicial candidates and those candidates could express opinions on political issues. And, in forty-eight other states, television advertising is being used in judicial elections.

40. How concerned are you about judicial candidates having to raise more money, run television advertising, and potentially seek political party and special interest group support -- very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

VERY CONCERNED.....	48%
SOMEWHAT CONCERNED....	30%
NOT TOO CONCERNED.....	15%
NOT AT ALL CONCERNED...	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

41. How important is it that judges remove themselves from cases involving their campaign contributors -- very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

VERY IMPORTANT.....	77%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT....	18%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT.....	3%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT...	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED....	2%

I am going to read you a list of factors that people believe may influence the impartiality or fairness of the decisions judges make. For each, tell me if you think the factor is a great risk to impartiality or fairness, somewhat of a risk, not too great, or not at all a potential risk to impartiality or fairness. If you are unsure, just say so.... (ROTATE LIST)

	VGR	SMG	NTG	NAA	DKR
42. The governor's power to appoint judges?	21%	34%	30%	12%	3%
43. Political party endorsements of judges?	31%	46%	14%	7%	3%
44. Requiring judges to run in contested elections?	18%	31%	32%	16%	4%
45. Having judicial candidates make campaign pledges about political issues?	37%	41%	13%	6%	3%
46. Campaign fund raising by judges?	33%	42%	15%	7%	3%
47. Advertising in judicial campaigns?	34%	40%	17%	7%	3%
48. Having judicial candidates make campaign pledges about potential court cases?	50%	35%	8%	5%	3%
49. Having special interest groups demand political opinions of judicial candidates?	50%	34%	9%	5%	3%

A proposal has been made to change the way in which judges are selected in Minnesota.

Under this proposal, a panel of both lawyers and non-lawyers, called the Merit Selection Committee, would evaluate and recommend potential judges to the Governor. The Governor would then choose a nominee from the list and appoint that individual to the bench. During his or her term, a Performance Evaluation Commission, also including both lawyers and non-lawyers, would review the performance of the judge and release their findings to the public. At the end of the judge's fourth year, the public would vote on whether a judge should retain the seat or be removed from office. No opponent would be listed on the ballot for this seat, and if the judge is retained, he/she would be retained for an eight year term. But if the judge were rejected by voters, the selection process begins again with the Merit Selection Committee.

Now, let's discuss each part of this proposal....

Do you strongly support, support, oppose, or strongly oppose it?

	STS	SUP	OPP	STO	DKR
50. Evaluation and recommendation of potential judges by a merit selection panel including lawyers and non-lawyers?	33%	46%	15%	3%	4%
51. Requiring the Governor to appoint judges from the list of recommendations from the Merit Selection Committee?	34%	43%	17%	3%	4%
52. Creating an evaluation of the performance of all judges by a commission including lawyers and non-lawyers?	38%	44%	13%	3%	3%
53. Releasing the findings of the Performance Evaluation Commission to the public?	45%	43%	8%	2%	3%
54. Allowing the public to vote on whether judges should be retained in office?	50%	43%	4%	1%	3%
55. Increasing the length of judges' terms from six years to eight years?	12%	36%	33%	13%	6%
56. Which ONE of the following three do you think should be the composition of the Merit Selection Committee to recommend potential judges to the Governor -- most of the members should be lawyers and retired judges OR most of the members should be citizens outside of the legal profession OR citizens outside of the legal profession and lawyers and retired judges should be equally represented?	LAWYERS/RET	JUDGES.....	8%		
	OUTSIDE OF LEGAL PROF..	5%			
	EQUALLY REPRESENTED...	86%			
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%			
57. And, which ONE of the following THREE do you think should be the composition of the commission to evaluate the performance of judges -- most should be lawyers and retired judges OR the most should be citizens outside of the legal profession OR citizens outside of the legal profession and lawyers and retired judges should be equally represented?	LAWYERS/RET	JUDGES....	11%		
	OUTSIDE OF LEGAL PROF..	3%			
	EQUALLY REPRESENTED...	84%			
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%			

IF 2 OR 3 IN QUESTION #57, ASK: (N=698)

58. How credible would you consider the report of a Performance Evaluation Commission which includes a majority of members who are lawyers and retired judges -- very credible, somewhat credible, not too credible, or not at all credible?	VERY CREDIBLE.....21%
	SOMEWHAT CREDIBLE.....57%
	NOT TOO CREDIBLE.....16%
	NOT AT ALL CRED.....4%
	DON'T KNOW/REF.....2%

In 2008, the Minnesota Legislature will consider a constitutional amendment to change the way state judges are selected and retained. Here is the wording of a proposed constitutional amendment:

"Shall the Minnesota Constitution be amended to provide that judges shall be appointed by the Governor from a list of names provided by a Merit Selection Committee, evaluated based on performance, and retained or removed according to the decision of the voters."

59. If the election were held today, would you vote yes in favor or no to oppose this constitutional amendment? (IF "YES/NO," ASK:) Is that strongly (yes/no) or just (yes/no)? (IF "UNSURE," ASK:) Well, do you lean towards voting yes or no?	STRONGLY YES.....20%
	YES.....54%
	UNSURE/LEAN YES.....3%
	UNSURE.....3%
	UNSURE/LEAN NO.....2%
	NO.....14%
	STRONGLY NO.....2%
	REFUSED.....3%

IF RESPONSE #1-#7 IN QUESTION 59, ASK: (N=778)

60. Could you tell me one or two reasons for your decision?

UNSURE, 3%; PUBLIC GETS TO VOTE, 41%; NOT POLITICAL, 6%; TOO POLITICAL, 11%; GIVES PUBLIC MORE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT JUDGES, 13%; PUBLIC SHOULD NOT VOTE, 2%; LIKE EXPERTS INVOLVED, 6%; RESULT IN BETTER JUDGES, 2%; NO NEED TO CHANGE, 2%; LIKE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, 5%; WANT THE GOVERNOR TO MAKE THE DECISION, 2%; COMMITTEES WILL BE POLITICAL, 3%; EIGHT YEAR TERM IS TOO LONG, 2%; SCATTERED, 2%.

Another option being considered by the Legislature also provides for the Governor to appoint judges based on the recommendations of

the Merit Selection Committee. It would also use a Commission to evaluate the performance of judges. The difference is that the commission would have the sole power to reappoint or terminate judges. If this system were used, there would be no elections for judges, as the Performance Evaluation Commission would have the power to decide whether judges should continue in office.

Let me read you the wording of a proposed constitutional amendment for this proposal:

"Shall the Minnesota Constitution be amended to provide that judges shall be appointed by the Governor from a list of names provided by a Merit Selection Committee, and retained or removed according to the decision of a Performance Evaluation Commission."

61. If the election were held today,	STRONGLY YES.....	2%
would you vote yes in favor or no	YES.....	6%
to oppose this constitutional	UNSURE/LEAN YES.....	1%
amendment? (IF "YES/NO," ASK:) Is	UNSURE.....	2%
that strongly (yes/no) or just	UNSURE/LEAN NO.....	2%
(yes/no)? (IF "UNSURE," ASK:)	NO.....	61%
Well, do you lean towards voting	STRONGLY NO.....	24%
yes or no?	REFUSED.....	3%

IF RESPONSE #1-#7 IN QUESTION 61, ASK: (N=780)

62. Could you tell me one or two reasons for your decision?

DOES NOT ALLOW THE PUBLIC TO VOTE, 64%; COMMITTEE WILL BE POLITICAL, 14%; NO PUBLIC INPUT, 12%; EXPERTS SHOULD DECIDE, 7%; SCATTERED, 3%.

We have discussed three approaches to the appointment and election of judges. (ROTATE)

A. The current system with direct election of judges every six years, where candidates file for office to oppose incumbent judges and political parties and special interests can endorse candidates;

B. A retention election system where all judges are initially appointed by the Governor, publicly evaluated by a performance evaluation commission, and then are retained or removed by voters every eight years;

C. An appointive system where all judges are initially appointed by the Governor and publicly evaluated by a performance evaluation commission, and that commission has the power to decide if a judge should continue in office.

63. Which of these options do you most favor? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?
- |                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| APPROACH A/STRONG.....     | 2%  |
| APPROACH A.....            | 6%  |
| APPROACH B/STRONG.....     | 33% |
| APPROACH B.....            | 34% |
| APPROACH C/STRONG.....     | 2%  |
| APPROACH C.....            | 4%  |
| NONE OF OPTIONS (VOL)..... | 13% |
| INDIFFERENT (VOL).....     | 3%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....    | 3%  |

IF 1 TO 6 IN QUESTION #63, ASK: (N=649)

64. Could you tell me one or two reasons why you most prefer that option?

NON-POLITICAL, 5%; VOTER'S WILL HAVE THE FINAL SAY, 57%; NO NEED TO CHANGE, 4%; GIVES VOTERS MORE KNOWLEDGE, 14%; EXPERTS SHOULD CHOOSE, 7%; EIGHT YEAR TERM IS TOO LONG, 3%; APPROACH B ALLOWS EVERYONE TO HAVE A SAY, 2%; LIKE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, 3%; PREFER DIRECT ELECTION, 5%.

Unlike the state court system, the federal court system is already an appointive system, and federal judges serve lifetime terms once they are appointed by the President.

65. Does knowing this make you much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support an appointive system for judges in Minnesota?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| MUCH MORE LIKELY.....   | 2%  |
| SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY... | 7%  |
| SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY..  | 10% |
| MUCH LESS LIKELY.....   | 45% |
| NO DIFFERENCE (VOL)...  | 35% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1%  |

Some believe an appointive system will work if the Governor submits the name of judicial nominees to the State Legislature, which would then confirm or reject each nominee.

66. Would legislative confirmation make you much more likely, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support an appointive system for judges in Minnesota?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| MUCH MORE LIKELY.....   | 4%  |
| SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY..  | 11% |
| SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY..  | 12% |
| MUCH LESS LIKELY.....   | 56% |
| NO DIFFERENCE (VOL)...  | 16% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 2%  |

Moving on....

Suppose your State Legislator was asked to take a position on reforming judicial elections. For each of the following, would you be much more likely to support him or her, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support him or her. If it makes no difference to your support, just say so....

	MML	SML	NOD	SLL	MLL	DKR
67. Opposes any reform of the current system of direct elections of judicial candidates which allows for party endorsements of judicial candidates?	29%	8%	12%	15%	34%	2%
68. Supports changing the system to eliminate the right of voters to decide whether judges should remain in office?	4%	4%	5%	16%	71%	2%

Suppose a judge in your area took a position on reforming of judicial elections. For each of the following, would you be much more likely to support him or her, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, or much less likely to support him or her. If it makes no difference to your support, just say so....

	MML	SML	NOD	SLL	MLL	DKR
69. Opposes any reform of the current system of direct elections of judicial candidates which allows for party endorsements of judicial candidates?	28%	8%	12%	14%	37%	2%
70. Supports changing the system to eliminate the right of voters to decide whether judges should remain in office?	3%	4%	5%	14%	73%	1%
71. Which of the following is your PRIMARY source of news -- (ROTATE) local television news stations, national television news stations, local newspapers, internet, local radio programs, national radio programs, OR national newspapers?	LOCAL TV NEWS STAT....	49%				
	NATL TV NEWS STAT.....	18%				
	LOCAL NEWSPAPERS.....	14%				
	INTERNET.....	10%				
	LOCAL RADIO PROGRAMS...	5%				
	NATL RADIO PROGRAMS....	1%				
	NATIONAL NEWSPAPERS....	2%				
	SOMETHING ELSE (VOL)...	0%				
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%				

72. Can you name any specific television or movie role models for a "good judge?" (IF "YES," ASK:) Who would that be?

UNSURE, 3%; NO, 74%; JUDGE JUDY, 7%; JUDGE JOE BROWN, 2%; JUDGE MATHIS, 2%; FRED THOMPSON, 2%; SCATTERED TELEVISION JUDGES, 4%; SCATTERED ACTORS, 3%; SCATTERED NEWS ANCHORS, 3%.

IF "YES," ASK: (N=614)

73. Why do you think that person is a role model for a "good judge?"

FAIR, 40%; QUALIFIED, 7%; TOUGH, 7%; HONEST, 18%; IMPARTIAL, 11%; AGREE WITH VIEWS, 5%; CARE, 2%; FOLLOWS THE LAW, 6%; SCATTERED, 4%.

Now, just a few more questions for statistical purposes only....

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 74. | Did you vote in the Gubernatorial election in 2006?   | YES.....87%<br>NO.....12%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%   |
| 75. | Which of the following categories contains your present age?<br>(READ CATEGORIES)   | 18-34.....18%<br>35-54.....47%<br>55 AND OLDER.....35%<br>REFUSED.....0%   |
| 76. | In politics, do you consider yourself to be a (ROTATE) conservative, a liberal or a moderate?<br>(IF CONSERVATIVE OR LIBERAL) Do you think of yourself as very _____?<br>(IF MODERATE) Do you lean closer to conservative or liberal? | VERY CONSERVATIVE.....4%<br>CONSERVATIVE.....30%<br>MODERATE/CONSERVATIVE..8%<br>MODERATE/MODERATE....27%<br>MODERATE/LIBERAL.....10%<br>LIBERAL.....13%<br>VERY LIBERAL.....4%<br>SOMETHING ELSE (VOL)..0%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....4% |
| 77. | Which political party do you consider yourself most closely aligned with? (READ #1-#4)  | REPUBLICAN.....32%<br>DEMOCRAT.....39%<br>INDEPENDENCE PARTY....1%<br>GREEN PARTY.....1%<br>INDEPENDENT (VOL)....23%<br>SOMETHING ELSE (VOL)...0%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....4%   |
| 78. | Do you have school-age children or pre-schoolers living with you at home?   | YES.....36%<br>NO.....64%<br>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%   |

79.	Do you own or rent your residence?	OWN.....80%
		RENT.....20%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
80.	Are you employed by: a government agency or political subdivision, such as state or local government or a school district; a business or corporation; self-employed; work on a farm; currently not working OR retired?	GOV AGENCY/POLI SUB...11%
		BUSINESS/CORPORATION..49%
		SELF-EMPLOYED.....10%
		WORK ON A FARM.....0%
		NOT WORKING.....6%
		RETIRED.....25%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
81.	What is the last grade of formal education you completed?	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE..4%
		HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE..30%
		VO-TECH/TECH COLLEGE...9%
		SOME COLLEGE.....17%
		COLLEGE GRADUATE.....32%
		POST-GRADUATE.....8%
		REFUSED.....0%
82.	How often do you attend religious services -- every week, once or twice a month, several times a year, hardly ever, or never?	EVERY WEEK.....31%
		ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH.31%
		SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR..16%
		HARDLY EVER.....14%
		NEVER.....7%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
83.	Have you ever contributed to a political campaign?	YES.....28%
		NO.....72%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
84.	Which of the following categories contains your total household income for last year?	LESS THAN \$35,000.....24%
		\$35,000 TO 75,000.....44%
		OVER \$75,000.....24%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....8%
85.	Are you currently a member of a civic organization?	YES.....9%
		NO.....91%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
86.	Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity -- White, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific Islander, Native American, or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?	WHITE.....87%
		AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....5%
		HISPANIC-LATINO.....3%
		ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLANDER.4%
		NATIVE AMERICAN.....2%
		SOMETHING ELSE (VOL.)..0%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

87. Gender	MALE.....50%
	FEMALE.....50%
88. Area of State	MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL..12%
	WEST METRO.....30%
	EAST METRO.....13%
	NORTHERN MINNESOTA....29%
	SOUTHERN MINNESOTA....17%
89. Growth Area	GROWTH.....29%
	STABLE.....71%