

User's Guide and Codebook  
Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets:  
Fall 2016 Data

CENTER FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND URBAN POLICY (CLOSUP)

FORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**ABOUT THE DATASET:**

Title: Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets: Fall 2016 Data

Responses: 1,419 total surveys from 1,315 distinct local jurisdictions

Sample: census survey of 3,712 top elected and top appointed officials from all 1,856 Michigan counties, cities, villages, and townships

Field period: October 3 - December 13, 2016

Response rate: 71% by jurisdiction

Dataset Version: Version 1

Dataset Release Date: September 20, 2018

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:**

The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) is a program of state-wide surveys of local government leaders in Michigan. The MPPS is administered online and via hard copy questionnaire and takes place twice each year, in spring and fall. Each wave investigates local officials' opinions and perspectives on a variety of important public policy issues. Respondents for the MPPS include county administrators and board chairs, mayors and city managers, village presidents and managers, and township supervisors, clerks, and managers from every general-purpose unit of government across the state.

**SURVEY WAVE CONTENT:**

The Fall 2016 MPPS wave included content on the relationship between the State and local governments, Michigan's emergency manager law, and citizen engagement with local jurisdictions.

**WEIGHTS AND DATA ANALYSIS:**

The Fall 2016 dataset includes two separate weights—one for individual-level (`ind_wgt`) and one for jurisdiction-level (`juris_wgt`) analyses—that should be used to account for nonresponse at the individual and jurisdictional levels, respectively. The variable `samp_juris` can be used to select cases according to whether analysis is being done at the individual-level or jurisdiction-level.

**MISSING DATA:**

Missing data in the Fall 2016 datasets can reflect two distinct types of missing data: questions that a respondent chose to not answer (refused), and questions that were not asked due to skip patterns in the data (not applicable). Skip patterns are indicated where applicable in this codebook.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS:**

I. About the dataset .....	3
II. Contact information .....	6
III. How to cite the dataset .....	7
IV. Data collection overview .....	8
V. Issues of respondent confidentiality .....	10
VI. List of variables .....	12
VII. Full variable text and frequencies .....	15
VIII. Appendices	
a. Hardcopy questionnaire.....	65

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) is administered by the Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP) at the University of Michigan.

For the benefit of users of MPPS data, we have prepared this guide to the design, methods, and content of the Fall 2016 wave of the survey. Please address questions or comments to:

**Debra Horner, Project Manager**

or

**Tom Ivacko, Center Administrator**

Center for Local, State, and, Urban Policy (CLOSUP)  
735 S. State Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
Phone: (734) 647-4091  
Email: [closup-mpps@umich.edu](mailto:closup-mpps@umich.edu)

**HOW TO CITE MPPS DATA:**

When using data from the Michigan Public Policy Survey, please use the folder citation provided by ICPSR, including DOI.

Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy. Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets: Fall 2016 Data. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2018-09-20 <http://doi.org/>

**DATA COLLECTION OVERVIEW:**

*Sample:*

The sample for the Fall 2016 MPPS included on average two officials from each of the local general purpose units of government (83 counties, 279 cities, 254 villages, and 1,240 townships) in the state of Michigan. The sample frame included, where the position existed and was not vacant, the top elected and top appointed official in each jurisdiction. For counties, this consisted of county administrators and board chairs; for cities, mayors and city managers; for villages, village presidents and managers. Townships are a special case, in that, typically, their governing officials are all elected. Therefore, in townships, both the elected supervisors and the elected clerks were administered surveys, as well as the few appointed township managers.

Sample frame:

	<i>Elected Officials</i>	<i>Appointed Officials</i>	<i>Total</i>
Counties (83)	109	55	164
Townships (1,240)	2,400	44	2,444
Cities (279)	299	252	551
Villages (254)	345	157	502
<i>Total (1856)</i>	<i>3,153</i>	<i>508</i>	<i>3,661</i>

*Method:*

The Fall 2016 MPPS was administered via two modes. For those officials for whom an email address could be identified, an email invitation was sent containing a url link to the survey instrument online. For those officials for whom no email address was available, hard copy questionnaires were mailed out in the week prior to the launch of the survey via USPS, scheduled for delivery during the first week of field period.

Survey administration:

	<i>Electronic ally</i>	<i>Via hardcopy</i>	<i>Total</i>
Surveys sent	3,223	438	3,661
Responses in full database	1,343	76	1,419
Responses in public use dataset	1,243	72	1,315

*Field dates and recontacts to non-respondents:*

Respondents received initial email invitations and hard copy questionnaires during the week of October 3, 2016. Non-respondents with valid email addresses were recontacted each Monday of field period by email to urge them to participate. Respondents with invalid addresses were subsequently mailed hard copy questionnaires. Non-respondents who had been originally sent a hard copy questionnaire and for whom a fax number was



available were sent another questionnaire by fax. Field period closed on December 13. Partially-completed ("partials") surveys captured by the online survey software are included in the dataset if respondents completed through Q9 on the questionnaire.

*Data anomalies:*

Known data anomalies are noted at the appropriate variable in the codebook below. If you notice possible undocumented errors in the dataset, we would appreciate an email to "closup-mpps@umich.edu" describing the problem so that we can research and address it.

## ISSUES OF RESPONDENT CONFIDENTIALITY:

The MPPS program pledges to all of its respondents that all survey answers will remain confidential, meaning that researchers will not link survey responses to individual respondents or jurisdictions in any publications or public analysis of the data. Thus, users of the MPPS datasets should only publish statistical summary information that does not permit the identification, either directly or inferentially, of any individual person, official position, or local jurisdiction.

In order to protect respondent confidentiality, CLOSUP made the following modifications to the dataset available for use by researchers:

- 1) Open-ended responses were extracted from the main datafile. Identifying information from open-ended responses was redacted (denoted in the data as [redacted]). These responses can be linked back to the main datafile using the variables: respondent\_id, ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, ID.end, and ID.time.
- 2) Certain identifying variables were removed from the dataset
  - Direct identifiers for jurisdiction such as FIPS codes, county names, and jurisdiction names
  - Direct identifiers for respondents, such as name and contact information (corresponding to survey questions Q27a, Q27b, Q27c)
  - Other information potentially identifying individual respondents, including year of birth (corresponding to survey question q29), years in office (corresponding to survey question q30). Recoded versions of these variables are available.
- 3) The original population variables taken from US census data were removed/masked from the dataset. New categorical population variables were created for the different jurisdiction types: pop\_county, pop\_township, pop\_city, pop\_village. Additionally, a population density variable was added to the dataset.

Any intentional identification of a research subject (whether an individual or a jurisdiction) or unauthorized disclosure of his or her confidential information violates the promise of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data agree:

To use these datasets solely for research or statistical purposes and not for investigation of specific research subjects.

To make no use of the identity of any research subject discovered inadvertently, and to advise CLOSUP of any such discovery (closup-mpps@umich.edu).

### **Merging your data with MPPS Data**

CLOSUP recognizes that there is significant research value in being able to link external datasets to the MPPS data. However, to protect respondent and jurisdiction confidentiality, direct geographic identifiers are not available in the MPPS datasets. Users who are interested in merging their own geographically-keyed datasets to MPPS datasets should contact CLOSUP ([closup@umich.edu](mailto:closup@umich.edu)) to apply to have wave\_id added to the researcher's dataset, in order to enable links between datasets. CLOSUP will review all applications and determine whether providing the key would pose an unacceptable risk to confidentiality. If your application is approved, you will send your dataset to CLOSUP, the wave key will be merged onto the dataset and replace any existing geographic ID variables, and you can upload this new dataset to the VDE following openICPSR's policies.

**LIST OF VARIABLES:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Variable Label</u>
respondent_id	Unique ID for each case
master_id	Longitudinal Jurisdiction ID
wave_id	Single-wave Jurisdiction ID
idcompleted	Completion status
source	Hardcopies/online completes/partial
idenddate	ID.endDate
idend	ID.end
idstart	ID.start
iddate	ID.date
idtime	ID.time
jtype	Jurisdiction Type
samp_juris	Identifies unique survey responses for each jurisdiction
snap_elec_app	Elected or appointed to position
snap_pos	Position held--numeric
q2a	Michigan state govt officials value input from local govt officials
q2b	State is taking too much decision-making authority away from local govts
q2c	State holds local govts to higher standard than it holds itself to
q2d	State's decision-making is transparent to local officials
q2e	State unfairly treats some jurisdictions (or types) better than others
q3a	Impact on relationship: Communication between state and local officials
q3b	Impact on relationship: Term limits for state officials
q3c	Impact on relationship: Behavior of state officials
q3d	Impact on relationship: Behavior of local officials
q3e	Impact on relationship: The State's system of funding local government
q3f	Impact on relationship: Other
q3other	Impact on relationship: Other-specify
q4	State officials' trust in local governments
q5a	Trust in the federal government
q5b	Trust in the state government
q5c	Trust in other local governments
q6a	Local officials should try to influence state policy issues affecting loc. govts
q6b	State officials should frequently reach out to local officials to get feedback
q7a	How often do you or a representative of your juris. contact state officials
q7b	How often does a state official contact your jurisdiction
q8a	State vs. local authority: Economic development
q8b	State vs. local authority: Local finance and tax policy
q8c	State vs. local authority: Environment and natural resources
q8d	State vs. local authority: Land use and planning
q8e	State vs. local authority: Business issues
q8f	State vs. local authority: Anti-discrimination policies
q8g	State vs. local authority: Social issues
q8h	State vs. local authority: How local governments conduct business
q9a	Overall relationship between the State government and your jurisdiction
q9b	Overall relationship between the State government and other local jurisdictions

q10 What could the State do to improve relationship between State & local govts

q11 What could local govts do to improve relationship between State & local govts

q12a Population loss as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12b Economic decline as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12c Rising costs to provide services as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12d Citizen opposition to revenue increases as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12e State decisions affecting local govt as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12f Local govt corruption/mismanagement as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q12g Retiree pensions/benefits decisions as factor in local govt fiscal distress

q13a EM law provision: Choice between consent agreement, EM, or bankruptcy

q13b EM Law provision: Reject/modify/terminate collective bargaining agreements

q13c EM Law provision: Set aside decision-making powers of local elected officials

q13d EM Law provision: Recommend sale/transfer/lease of local assets

q13e EM Law provision: State-appointed advisory board w/ ongoing oversight powers

q14 EM law effectiveness at restoring fiscal health in the short-term

q15 EM law effectiveness at establishing sustainable financial conditions

q16a EM law is undemocratic

q16b EM law helps difficult decisions be made b/c EM is an outsider

q16c EM law is racially discriminatory (by design, or as implemented)

q16d EM law pays insufficient attention to underlying structural problems

q16e EM law serves the interest of local residents by improving fiscal sustainability

q16f EM law leads to over-emphasis on cost-cutting at expense of other considerations

q17 Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose the Emergency Manager Law

q18a EM law reforms: Require plan for improving factors beyond just finances

q18b EM law reform: Include provisions for possible new revenue options

q18c EM law reform: Require EMs to analyze impact on disadvantaged groups

q18d EM law reform: Require EMs to consider local elected official input

q18e EM law reform: Require EMs to consider citizen input

q18f EM law reform: Add state-level ombudsperson oversight for appeals

q18g EM law reform: Other

q18other EM law reform: Other-specify

q19 Support for proactive State monitoring of finances for all local govts in MI

q20 Overall level of local citizen engagement

q21 Extent juris. offer opportunities to citizens for engagement in policymaking

q22a We make opportunities for engagement available but citizens don't take advantage

q22b	Some of best engagement with citizens happens informally around the community
q22c	Most citizens are more interested in complaining than finding solutions
q22d	Citizens in our juris. want access to info about gov't finances & operations
q22e	Citizens aren't willing to take time to become informed on issues facing juris.
q22f	Juris. reaches out to groups that might not engage in policymaking processes
q22g	Citizens tend to only be engaged on issues that affect them directly
q22h	Jurisdiction's decision-making is transparent to our citizens
q22i	We struggle to find enough citizens to serve in juris's app. or elec. positions
q23	How often can you trust citizens to be responsible participants?
q24a	The majority of juris. citizens believe role of citizen engagement is to...
q24b	You personally believe the role of citizen engagement is to...
q25	Who should have the final say on controversial decisions?
q26	How satisfied are you with citizen engagement in juris?
q28	Gender
age_category	Respondent Age
tenure	Respondent's time in office
q31	Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent
q32a	Race: White
q32b	Race: Black or African American
q32c	Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native
q32d	Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
q32e	Race: Asian
q32f	Race: Multiracial
q32g	Race: Other
q32h	Race: Don't Know
q33	Highest level of education
q34	Political affiliation
q35	Strength of political affiliation
q36	As an Independent, which party are you closer to?
partyid	7-point partisanship scale
threeply	3-point partisanship scale
pop_density	Population Density
region	MI regions based on State of the State Survey
juris_rr	Jurisdiction-level Response Rate
juris_wgt	Jurisdiction-level Weight
ind_rr	Individual-level Response Rate
ind_wgt	Individual-level Weight
grp_pct_minority	% of Juris. population non-white - grouped
pop_township	Population Category: Township
pop_city	Population Category: City
pop_village	Population Category: Village
pop_county	Population Category: County

**FULL VARIABLE TEXT AND FREQUENCIES:**

-----  
respondent\_id  
Unique ID for each case  
-----

type: numeric (int)

range:	[1,1426]	units:	1		
unique values:	1,419	missing .:	0/1,419		
mean:	712.438				
std. dev:	411.144				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	142	357	712	1069	1282

CODEBOOK NOTE: respondent\_id is a unique identifier for each MPPS respondent. It varies between datasets, and cannot be used to link datasets from multiple waves.

-----  
master\_id  
Longitudinal Jurisdiction ID  
-----

type: numeric (int)

range:	[1,1999]	units:	1		
unique values:	1,314	missing .:	1/1,419		
mean:	1010.34				
std. dev:	577.112				
percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	221	519	999.5	1515	1809

CODEBOOK NOTE: master\_id is an anonymized jurisdiction-level identifier that allows datasets to be linked across multiple waves of the MPPS at the jurisdiction level. Datasets cannot be linked at the individual respondent level. Users should be aware that master\_id is linked to a unique combination of fips code and jurisdiction type, so when a jurisdiction type changes (for example, when a village incorporates into a city), the master\_id for that jurisdiction also changes.

-----  
wave\_id  
Single-wave Jurisdiction ID  
-----

type: numeric (int)

range:	[1,1315]	units:	1
unique values:	1,315	missing .:	0/1,419
mean:	656.082		
std. dev:	378.252		





unique values: 59 missing "": 0/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates date on which respondent submitted survey online or on which an unfinished "partial" response was closed.

-----  
idend  
ID.end  
-----

type: string (str8)

unique values: 1,313 missing "": 0/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates time at which respondent submitted survey online or at which an unfinished "partial" response was closed.

-----  
idstart  
ID.start  
-----

type: string (str8)

unique values: 1,394 missing "": 0/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates time at which respondent started survey online

-----  
iddate  
ID.date  
-----

type: string (str10)

unique values: 58 missing "": 0/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates date on which respondent started survey online.

-----  
idtime  
ID.time  
-----

type: numeric (float)

range: [2.62,15076.43] units: .01  
unique values: 1,110 missing .: 0/1,419

mean: 660.424  
std. dev: 2344.53

percentiles:	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%
	11.57	15.18	21.98	35.85	224.33



```

label: elec_app
range: [1,2]
unique values: 2
units: 1
missing .: 0/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             1,124      1   Elected
             295       2   Appointed

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable designates whether respondent is an elected or appointed official. Elected officials include Chairs of County Commission, County Executives, Mayors, Village Presidents, Township Supervisors, Township Clerks, City Clerks, Village Clerks, self-identified "Other" elected; Appointed officials include County Administrators/Controllers, City Administrators/Managers/Superintendents, Village Managers/Superintendents, Township Managers/Superintendents, City Clerks, Village Clerks, self-identified "Other" appointed.

---

```

snap_pos
Position held--numeric

```

---

```

type: numeric (byte)
range: [1,10]
unique values: 10
units: 1
missing .: 1/1,419
mean: 6.73484
std. dev: 2.56136
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%
              2 5 8 9 9

```

Elected officials:

- 1 - Chair of County Commission
- 2 - County Clerk
- 3 - County Executive
- 4 - Mayor
- 5 - City Clerk
- 6 - Village President
- 7 - Village Clerk
- 8 - Township Supervisor
- 9 - Township Clerk
- 10 - Other

Appointed officials:

- 1 - County Administrator/Controller
  - 2 - City Administrator/Manager/Superintendent
  - 3 - City Clerk
  - 4 - Village Manager/Superintendent
  - 5 - Village Clerk
  - 6 - Township Manager/Superintendent
  - 7 - Other
-



QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the relationship between the State government and local jurisdictions, overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? The State holds local governments to a higher standard than it holds itself to.

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 42/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	480	1	Strongly Agree
	452	2	Somewhat Agree
	286	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	70	4	Somewhat Disagree
	49	5	Strongly Disagree
	40	6	Don't Know
	42	.	

---

q2d  
State's decision-making is transparent to local officials

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the relationship between the State government and local jurisdictions, overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? The State's decision-making is transparent to local officials.

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 53/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	42	1	Strongly Agree
	215	2	Somewhat Agree
	370	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	440	4	Somewhat Disagree
	259	5	Strongly Disagree
	40	6	Don't Know
	53	.	

---

q2e  
State unfairly treats some jurisdictions (or types) better than others

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the relationship between the State government and local jurisdictions, overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? The State unfairly treats some jurisdictions (or types of jurisdictions) better than others.

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree
```

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 46/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	311	1	Strongly Agree
	473	2	Somewhat Agree
	383	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	67	4	Somewhat Disagree
	22	5	Strongly Disagree
	117	6	Don't Know
	46	.	

-----  
q3a

Impact on relationship: Communication between state and local officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan? Communication between state and local officials

type: numeric (byte)  
label: impact

range: [1,7] units: 1  
unique values: 7 missing .: 55/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	76	1	Very Positive Impact
	333	2	Somewhat Positive Impact
	617	3	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact
	170	4	Somewhat Negative Impact
	64	5	Very Negative Impact
	46	6	No Impact
	58	7	Don't Know
	55	.	

-----  
q3b

Impact on relationship: Term limits for state officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan? Term limits for state officials

type: numeric (byte)  
label: impact

range: [1,7] units: 1  
unique values: 7 missing .: 50/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	96	1	Very Positive Impact
	205	2	Somewhat Positive Impact

385	3	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact
272	4	Somewhat Negative Impact
280	5	Very Negative Impact
53	6	No Impact
78	7	Don't Know
50	.	

-----  
q3c

Impact on relationship: Behavior of state officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan? Behavior of state officials (professionalism, ethics, etc.)

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: impact

      range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 62/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	85	1	Very Positive Impact
	254	2	Somewhat Positive Impact
	486	3	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact
	277	4	Somewhat Negative Impact
	133	5	Very Negative Impact
	51	6	No Impact
	71	7	Don't Know
	62	.	

-----  
q3d

Impact on relationship: Behavior of local officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan? Behavior of local officials (professionalism, ethics, etc.)

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: impact

      range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 63/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	162	1	Very Positive Impact
	416	2	Somewhat Positive Impact
	468	3	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact
	123	4	Somewhat Negative Impact
	47	5	Very Negative Impact
	65	6	No Impact





q3other  
Impact on relationship: Other-specify

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan? Other (please specify)

type: string (str243)  
unique values: 75 missing "": 1,343/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q3other are available in the excel file 2016-Fall-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent\_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

---

q4  
State officials' trust in local governments

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How much of the time do you think Michigan's state officials trust local governments to do what is right?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: trust  
range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 34/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	48	1	Nearly always
	359	2	Most of the Time
	514	3	Some of the Time
	258	4	Seldom
	77	5	Almost Never
	129	6	Don't Know
	34	.	

---

q5a  
Trust in the federal government

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How much of the time do you think you can trust each of the following levels of government to do what is right? The federal government in Washington

type: numeric (byte)  
label: trust  
range: [1,6] units: 1

unique values: 6 missing .: 32/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	12	1	Nearly always
	140	2	Most of the Time
	586	3	Some of the Time
	404	4	Seldom
	223	5	Almost Never
	22	6	Don't Know
	32	.	

---

q5b

Trust in the state government

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How much of the time do you think you can trust each of the following levels of government to do what is right? The state government in Lansing

type: numeric (byte)  
label: trust

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 36/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	16	1	Nearly always
	273	2	Most of the Time
	714	3	Some of the Time
	271	4	Seldom
	88	5	Almost Never
	21	6	Don't Know
	36	.	

---

q5c

Trust in other local governments

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How much of the time do you think you can trust each of the following levels of government to do what is right? Other local governments

type: numeric (byte)  
label: trust

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 72/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	124	1	Nearly always
	763	2	Most of the Time
	371	3	Some of the Time
	31	4	Seldom
	10	5	Almost Never
	48	6	Don't Know
	72	.	

-----  
q6a

Local officials should try to influence state policy issues affecting loc. govts  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Local officials should try to influence state policy issues affecting local governments.

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 31/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	786	1	Strongly Agree
	463	2	Somewhat Agree
	102	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	14	4	Somewhat Disagree
	5	5	Strongly Disagree
	18	6	Don't Know
	31	.	

-----  
q6b

State officials should frequently reach out to local officials to get feedback  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? State officials should frequently reach out to local officials to get feedback on pending policy changes.

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 38/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1,041	1	Strongly Agree
	285	2	Somewhat Agree
	34	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	6	4	Somewhat Disagree
	4	5	Strongly Disagree
	11	6	Don't Know
	38	.	

-----  
q7a

How often do you or a representative of your juris. contact state officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about communication between state and local officials specifically regarding State actions affecting your jurisdiction, in a typical 12-month period, how often... do you or a representative of your jurisdiction contact state officials?

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: how_often

range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 26/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
             251      1 At least once a month
             702      2 A few times a year
             398      3 Rarely or never
              42      4 Don't Know
              26      .
```

-----  
q7b

How often does a state official contact your jurisdiction  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about communication between state and local officials specifically regarding State actions affecting your jurisdiction, in a typical 12-month period, how often... does a state official contact your jurisdiction?

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: how_often

range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 43/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
             99      1 At least once a month
            463      2 A few times a year
            771      3 Rarely or never
             43      4 Don't Know
             43      .
```

-----  
q8a

State vs. local authority: Economic development  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government?  
Economic development

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: authority

range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 57/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
             11      1 Completely state authority
            418      2 Mostly state, some local
```

```

748      3  Mostly local, some state
116      4  Completely local authority
69       5  Don't Know
57       .

```

-----  
q8b

State vs. local authority: Local finance and tax policy  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Local finance and tax policy

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: authority

      range: [1,5]                units: 1
unique values: 5                  missing .: 70/1,419

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              20     1  Completely state authority
              251    2  Mostly state, some local
              672    3  Mostly local, some state
              347    4  Completely local authority
              59     5  Don't Know
              70     .

```

-----  
q8c

State vs. local authority: Environment and natural resources  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Environment and natural resources (e.g., water, solid waste, agriculture, forestry)

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: authority

      range: [1,5]                units: 1
unique values: 5                  missing .: 50/1,419

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              119    1  Completely state authority
              696    2  Mostly state, some local
              413    3  Mostly local, some state
              96     4  Completely local authority
              45     5  Don't Know
              50     .

```

-----  
q8d

State vs. local authority: Land use and planning  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Land use and planning (e.g., zoning, permitting)

type: numeric (byte)  
label: authority

range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing .: 59/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	8	1	Completely state authority
	63	2	Mostly state, some local
	578	3	Mostly local, some state
	678	4	Completely local authority
	33	5	Don't Know
	59	.	

-----  
q8e

State vs. local authority: Business issues  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Business issues (e.g., minimum wage, plastic bags, puppy mills, Uber, Airbnb)

type: numeric (byte)  
label: authority

range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing .: 45/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	261	1	Completely state authority
	641	2	Mostly state, some local
	327	3	Mostly local, some state
	91	4	Completely local authority
	54	5	Don't Know
	45	.	

-----  
q8f

State vs. local authority: Anti-discrimination policies  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Anti-discrimination policies (e.g., LGBTQ, equal opportunity)

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: authority

range: [1,5]
unique values: 5

units: 1
missing .: 53/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	444	1	Completely state authority
	576	2	Mostly state, some local
	218	3	Mostly local, some state
	71	4	Completely local authority
	57	5	Don't Know
	53	.	

---

q8g  
State vs. local authority: Social issues

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? Social issues (e.g., public welfare, homelessness, gun policies)

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: authority

range: [1,5]
unique values: 5

units: 1
missing .: 54/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	338	1	Completely state authority
	616	2	Mostly state, some local
	298	3	Mostly local, some state
	67	4	Completely local authority
	46	5	Don't Know
	54	.	

---

q8h  
State vs. local authority: How local governments conduct business

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think that certain policy issues should be managed at the state level rather than the local level for a variety of reasons (for example, efficiency or consistency across jurisdictions). Others think local home rule is more important. In each of the following broad policy areas, how do you generally think

authority should be divided between the state and local levels of government? How local governments conduct business (e.g., open meetings, public notices)

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: authority

      range: [1,5]
unique values: 5                               units: 1
                                                missing .: 50/1,419

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  129      1      Completely state authority
                  353      2      Mostly state, some local
                  533      3      Mostly local, some state
                  316      4      Completely local authority
                   38      5      Don't Know
                   50      .
```

---

q9a  
Overall relationship between the State government and your jurisdiction

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, how would you describe the overall relationship between the State government and... your jurisdiction in particular?

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: relations

      range: [1,5]
unique values: 5                               units: 1
                                                missing .: 29/1,419

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  85      1      Excellent
                  557     2      Good
                  502     3      Fair
                  171     4      Poor
                   75     5      Don't Know
                   29     .
```

---

q9b  
Overall relationship between the State government and other local jurisdictions

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, how would you describe the overall relationship between the State government and... other local jurisdictions overall?

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: relations

      range: [1,5]
unique values: 5                               units: 1
                                                missing .: 55/1,419

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  120     1      Excellent
                  496     2      Good
                  414     3      Fair
```



```
121      4  Poor
213      5  Don't Know
55      .
```

-----  
q10

What could the State do to improve relationship between State & local govts  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What do you think the State could do to improve the relationship between the State and local governments?

type: string (str2040)

unique values: 732

missing "": 681/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q10 are available in the excel file 2016-Fall-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent\_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

-----  
q11

What could local govts do to improve relationship between State & local govts  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What do you think local governments could do to improve the relationship between the State and local governments?

type: string (str1826)

unique values: 653

missing "": 746/1,419

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q11 are available in the excel file 2016-Fall-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent\_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

-----  
q12a

Population loss as factor in local govt fiscal distress  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First, while any particular jurisdiction in fiscal distress faces unique challenges, in general, how important—if at all—do you think each of the following factors are in contributing to local government fiscal distress in Michigan? Population loss

type: numeric (byte)

label: importance

range: [1,4] units: 1  
unique values: 4 missing .: 94/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	676	1	Very Important
	552	2	Somewhat Important
	54	3	Not Important at All
	43	4	Don't Know
	94	.	

---

q12b

Economic decline as factor in local govt fiscal distress

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First, while any particular jurisdiction in fiscal distress faces unique challenges, in general, how important—if at all—do you think each of the following factors are in contributing to local government fiscal distress in Michigan? Economic decline

type: numeric (byte)  
label: importance

range: [1,4] units: 1  
unique values: 4 missing .: 99/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	903	1	Very Important
	363	2	Somewhat Important
	19	3	Not Important at All
	35	4	Don't Know
	99	.	

---

q12c

Rising costs to provide services as factor in local govt fiscal distress

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First, while any particular jurisdiction in fiscal distress faces unique challenges, in general, how important—if at all—do you think each of the following factors are in contributing to local government fiscal distress in Michigan? Rising costs to provide services

type: numeric (byte)  
label: importance

range: [1,4] units: 1  
unique values: 4 missing .: 102/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	895	1	Very Important
	374	2	Somewhat Important
	17	3	Not Important at All
	31	4	Don't Know
	102	.	

---



label: importance  
range: [1,4] units: 1  
unique values: 4 missing .: 100/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	583	1	Very Important
	416	2	Somewhat Important
	196	3	Not Important at All
	124	4	Don't Know
	100	.	

-----  
q12g

Retiree pensions/benefits decisions as factor in local govt fiscal distress  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First, while any particular jurisdiction in fiscal distress faces unique challenges, in general, how important—if at all—do you think each of the following factors are in contributing to local government fiscal distress in Michigan? Local government decisions to provide generous retiree pensions/benefits and/or decisions to underfund retiree obligations

type: numeric (byte)  
label: importance

range: [1,4] units: 1  
unique values: 4 missing .: 106/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	631	1	Very Important
	387	2	Somewhat Important
	133	3	Not Important at All
	162	4	Don't Know
	106	.	

-----  
q13a

EM law provision: Choice between consent agreement, EM, or bankruptcy  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now we would like your opinion on different elements of the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent do you support or oppose the following aspects of the Law? Allowing local units in a financial emergency the choice between a consent agreement, Emergency Manager (EM), mediation (e.g., with creditors), or bankruptcy proceedings.

type: numeric (byte)  
label: support\_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 137/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	336	1	Strongly Support
	437	2	Somewhat Support
	263	3	Neither Support nor Oppose

```

          57          4 Somewhat Oppose
          36          5 Strongly Oppose
         153          6 Don't Know
         137          .

```

-----  
q13b

EM Law provision: Reject/modify/terminate collective bargaining agreements  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now we would like your opinion on different elements of the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent do you support or oppose the following aspects of the Law? Allowing an EM to reject, modify, or terminate collective bargaining agreements.

```

          type: numeric (byte)
          label: support_oppose

          range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                    missing .: 135/1,419

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              225      1  Strongly Support
              323      2  Somewhat Support
              245      3  Neither Support nor Oppose
              169      4  Somewhat Oppose
              173      5  Strongly Oppose
              149      6  Don't Know
              135      .

```

-----  
q13c

EM Law provision: Set aside decision-making powers of local elected officials  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now we would like your opinion on different elements of the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent do you support or oppose the following aspects of the Law? Allowing an EM to set aside decision-making powers of local elected officials.

```

          type: numeric (byte)
          label: support_oppose

          range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                    missing .: 142/1,419

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              142      1  Strongly Support
              260      2  Somewhat Support
              209      3  Neither Support nor Oppose
              269      4  Somewhat Oppose
              281      5  Strongly Oppose
              116      6  Don't Know
              142      .

```

-----



Manager Law has been, or will be, at restoring fiscal health in the short-term (i.e., balancing the books)?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: effective

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 117/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	141	1	Very Effective
	502	2	Somewhat Effective
	142	3	Neither Effective nor Ineffective
	152	4	Somewhat Ineffective
	109	5	Very Ineffective
	256	6	Don't Know
	117	.	

-----  
q15

EM law effectiveness at establishing sustainable financial conditions  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, still thinking overall about local governments that have faced—or will face—a financial emergency, how effective or ineffective do you believe the Law will be at establishing sustainable financial conditions for the long-term?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: effective

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 123/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	61	1	Very Effective
	409	2	Somewhat Effective
	202	3	Neither Effective nor Ineffective
	187	4	Somewhat Ineffective
	134	5	Very Ineffective
	303	6	Don't Know
	123	.	

-----  
q16a

EM law is undemocratic  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Emergency Manager Law... is undemocratic?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 150/1,419





-----  
q16d

EM law pays insufficient attention to underlying structural problems  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Emergency Manager Law...pays insufficient attention to the underlying structural problems leading to local fiscal stress?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 159/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	197	1	Strongly Agree
	377	2	Somewhat Agree
	282	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	126	4	Somewhat Disagree
	58	5	Strongly Disagree
	220	6	Don't Know
	159	.	

-----  
q16e

EM law serves the interest of local residents by improving fiscal sustainability  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Emergency Manager Law... serves the interests of local residents by improving their jurisdiction's fiscal sustainability?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 161/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	110	1	Strongly Agree
	420	2	Somewhat Agree
	318	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	154	4	Somewhat Disagree
	75	5	Strongly Disagree
	181	6	Don't Know
	161	.	

-----  
q16f

EM law leads to over-emphasis on cost-cutting at expense of other considerations  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Emergency Manager Law... leads to an overemphasis on cost-cutting at the expense of service quality, public health and safety, or other important considerations?

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: agree_disagree

      range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 166/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             195     1   Strongly Agree
             364     2   Somewhat Agree
             318     3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
             138     4   Somewhat Disagree
              50     5   Strongly Disagree
             188     6   Don't Know
             166     .
```

-----

q17

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose the Emergency Manager Law

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking overall, to what extent do you support or oppose the Emergency Manager Law?

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: support_oppose

      range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 130/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             150     1   Strongly Support
             417     2   Somewhat Support
             270     3   Neither Support nor Oppose
             203     4   Somewhat Oppose
             126     5   Strongly Oppose
             123     6   Don't Know
             130     .
```

-----

q18a

EM law reforms: Require plan for improving factors beyond just finances

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Require Emergency Managers (EMs) to plan for improving factors beyond just finances (e.g., service delivery, infrastructure, quality of life)

```
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: support_oppose

      range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 176/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             285     1   Strongly Support
```



-----  
q18d

EM law reform: Require EMs to consider local elected official input  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Require EMs to consider local elected official input before making decisions

type: numeric (byte)  
label: support\_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 173/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	533	1	Strongly Support
	407	2	Somewhat Support
	125	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	45	4	Somewhat Oppose
	23	5	Strongly Oppose
	113	6	Don't Know
	173	.	

-----  
q18e

EM law reform: Require EMs to consider citizen input  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Require EMs to consider citizen input before making decisions

type: numeric (byte)  
label: support\_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 175/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	418	1	Strongly Support
	455	2	Somewhat Support
	181	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	54	4	Somewhat Oppose
	24	5	Strongly Oppose
	112	6	Don't Know
	175	.	

-----  
q18f

EM law reform: Add state-level ombudsperson oversight for appeals  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential

changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Add state-level ombudsperson oversight for citizens and local officials to appeal any EM decision

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 196/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	316	1	Strongly Support
	386	2	Somewhat Support
	242	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	84	4	Somewhat Oppose
	44	5	Strongly Oppose
	151	6	Don't Know
	196	.	

-----  
q18g  
EM law reform: Other  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Other (please specify)

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 1,143/1,419
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	34	1	Strongly Support
	17	2	Somewhat Support
	61	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	3	4	Somewhat Oppose
	3	5	Strongly Oppose
	158	6	Don't Know
	1,143	.	

-----  
q18other  
EM law reform: Other-specify  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law? Other (please specify)

```
type: string (str244)

unique values: 66 missing "": 1,353/1,419
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q18other are available in the excel file 2016-Fall-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent\_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start,

ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

-----  
q19

Support for proactive State monitoring of finances for all local govts in MI  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some believe that more proactive monitoring of local government finances by the State could help avoid local fiscal emergencies through earlier detection and intervention. Others believe this may be unnecessary or even counterproductive. To what extent would you support or oppose more proactive State monitoring of finances for all local governments in Michigan?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: support\_oppose  
range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 149/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	81	1	Strongly Support
	261	2	Somewhat Support
	250	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	312	4	Somewhat Oppose
	303	5	Strongly Oppose
	63	6	Don't Know
	149	.	

-----  
q20

Overall level of local citizen engagement  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We want to start by getting a very broad sense of citizen engagement with your local government. How would you describe current levels of citizen engagement with your jurisdiction? Overall, would you say citizens in your jurisdiction are...

type: numeric (byte)  
label: engagement  
range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing .: 134/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	133	1	Very engaged
	593	2	Somewhat engaged
	456	3	Not very engaged
	83	4	Not at all engaged
	20	5	Don't know
	134	.	



```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: agree_disagree

        range: [1,6]
        unique values: 6
        units: 1
        missing .: 164/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             332       1   Strongly Agree
             595       2   Somewhat Agree
             219       3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
              60       4   Somewhat Disagree
              13       5   Strongly Disagree
              36       6   Don't Know
             164       .

```

-----

q22c

Most citizens are more interested in complaining than finding solutions

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Most citizens we hear from are more interested in complaining than in finding solutions.

```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: agree_disagree

        range: [1,6]
        unique values: 6
        units: 1
        missing .: 164/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             358       1   Strongly Agree
             507       2   Somewhat Agree
             211       3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
             130       4   Somewhat Disagree
              31       5   Strongly Disagree
              18       6   Don't Know
             164       .

```

-----

q22d

Citizens in our juris. want access to info about gov't finances & operations

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Citizens in our jurisdiction want access to information about the government's finances and operations.

```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: agree_disagree

        range: [1,6]
        unique values: 6
        units: 1
        missing .: 169/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             125       1   Strongly Agree
             340       2   Somewhat Agree

```



421	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
243	4	Somewhat Disagree
77	5	Strongly Disagree
44	6	Don't Know
169	.	

-----  
q22e

Citizens aren't willing to take time to become informed on issues facing juris.  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Most citizens aren't willing to take the time to become well-informed on issues facing the jurisdiction.

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 162/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	362	1	Strongly Agree
	611	2	Somewhat Agree
	142	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	100	4	Somewhat Disagree
	24	5	Strongly Disagree
	18	6	Don't Know
	162	.	

-----  
q22f

Juris. reaches out to groups that might not engage in policymaking processes  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Our jurisdiction reaches out to groups that typically might not engage in our policymaking processes (e.g., low-income or racially diverse populations).

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 169/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	60	1	Strongly Agree
	272	2	Somewhat Agree
	637	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	184	4	Somewhat Disagree
	62	5	Strongly Disagree
	35	6	Don't Know
	169	.	

-----

q22g

Citizens tend to only be engaged on issues that affect them directly

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Citizens tend to only be engaged on issues that affect them directly and not on issues affecting the community overall.

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing : 164/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	544	1	Strongly Agree
	576	2	Somewhat Agree
	70	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	40	4	Somewhat Disagree
	8	5	Strongly Disagree
	17	6	Don't Know
	164	.	

q22h

Jurisdiction's decision-making is transparent to our citizens

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? Our jurisdiction's decision-making is transparent to our citizens.

type: numeric (byte)  
label: agree\_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing : 168/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	738	1	Strongly Agree
	345	2	Somewhat Agree
	104	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	29	4	Somewhat Disagree
	17	5	Strongly Disagree
	18	6	Don't Know
	168	.	

q22i

We struggle to find enough citizens to serve in juris's app. or elec. positions

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement? We struggle to find enough citizens to serve on our jurisdiction's appointed boards/commissions or elected offices.

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 162/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             479      1   Strongly Agree
             416      2   Somewhat Agree
             148      3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
             135      4   Somewhat Disagree
              62      5   Strongly Disagree
              17      6   Don't Know
             162      .

```

-----

q23

How often can you trust citizens to be responsible participants?

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Citizens are often asked on opinion surveys how much trust they have in their government. Now we'd like to ask you, as a local official, about trust you have in your jurisdiction's citizens. In terms of their engagement in your jurisdiction's policymaking and/or operations, how much of the time do you think you can trust the citizens in your community to be responsible participants?

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: trust

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 154/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             145      1   Nearly always
             545      2   Most of the Time
             392      3   Some of the Time
             120      4   Seldom
              38      5   Almost Never
              25      6   Don't Know
             154      .

```

-----

q24a

The majority of juris. citizens believe role of citizen engagement is to...

-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: One way of thinking about the proper role for citizen engagement in local policymaking is along a spectrum from low engagement to high engagement. At the low end, citizen engagement would focus just on keeping citizens informed about issues. At the high end, citizens would actually make decisions for the jurisdiction. While it might differ depending on the issue, in general, what do you think the following people believe is the proper role for citizen engagement in local governance? The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens believe the role of citizen engagement is to...

```

type: numeric (byte)

```

label: role  
range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing : 174/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	325	1	Low Engagement: just keep citizens informed
	612	2	Have citizens provide input
	144	3	Have citizens recommend decisions
	42	4	High engagement: Have citizens make decisions
	122	5	Don't Know
	174	.	

---

q24b

You personally believe the role of citizen engagement is to...

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: One way of thinking about the proper role for citizen engagement in local policymaking is along a spectrum from low engagement to high engagement. At the low end, citizen engagement would focus just on keeping citizens informed about issues. At the high end, citizens would actually make decisions for the jurisdiction. While it might differ depending on the issue, in general, what do you think the following people believe is the proper role for citizen engagement in local governance? You personally believe the role of citizen engagement is to..

type: numeric (byte)  
label: role  
range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing : 222/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	52	1	Low Engagement: just keep citizens informed
	769	2	Have citizens provide input
	301	3	Have citizens recommend decisions
	35	4	High engagement: Have citizens make decisions
	40	5	Don't Know
	222	.	

---

q25

Who should have the final say on controversial decisions?

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now thinking about particularly controversial issues, who do you think should have the final say on the most controversial issues in your jurisdiction?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: controversy

range: [1,3] units: 1  
unique values: 3 missing .: 174/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	238	1	Citizens
	910	2	Public officials
	97	3	Don't Know
	174	.	

---

q26

How satisfied are you with citizen engagement in juris?

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Overall, how satisfied are you regarding citizen engagement in your jurisdiction's policymaking and/or operations today?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: satisfaction

range: [1,6] units: 1  
unique values: 6 missing .: 146/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	141	1	Very satisfied
	517	2	Somewhat satisfied
	313	3	Neither
	203	4	Somewhat dissatisfied
	78	5	Very dissatisfied
	21	6	Don't know
	146	.	

---

q28

Gender

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What is your gender?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: gender

range: [1,2] units: 1  
unique values: 2 missing .: 191/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	718	1	Male
	510	2	Female
	191	.	

---

age\_category

Respondent Age

---

type: numeric (byte)  
label: age

range: [1,8] units: 1  
unique values: 8 missing .: 241/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	7	1	20s
	57	2	30s
	152	3	40s
	314	4	50s
	429	5	60s
	193	6	70s
	25	7	80s
	1	8	90s
	241	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: In order to protect respondent confidentiality, CLOSUP recoded the continuous variable q29 "In what year were you born" into age\_category, a categorical variable. Original responses to q29 are not available to secondary users of the data.

-----  
tenure  
Respondent's time in office  
-----

type: numeric (byte)  
label: tenure

range: [1,5] units: 1  
unique values: 5 missing .: 196/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	213	1	Two or less years
	279	2	Three to five years
	288	3	Six to ten years
	294	4	Eleven to twenty years
	149	5	More than twenty years
	196	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: In order to protect respondent confidentiality, CLOSUP recoded the continuous variable q30 "How many years have you served in your current position" into tenure, a categorical variable. Original responses to q30 are not available to secondary users of the data.

-----  
q31  
Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent?

type: numeric (byte)  
label: y\_n

range: [1,2] units: 1  
unique values: 2 missing .: 229/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	19	1	Yes
	1,171	2	No
	229	.	

-----  
q32a

Race: White  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. White

type: numeric (byte)  
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1  
unique values: 2 missing .: 232/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	37	0	Not Selected
	1,150	1	Selected
	232	.	

-----  
q32b

Race: Black or African American  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Black or African American

type: numeric (byte)  
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1  
unique values: 2 missing .: 232/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1,176	0	Not Selected
	11	1	Selected
	232	.	

-----  
q32c

Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. American Indian or Alaskan Native

type: numeric (byte)  
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1  
unique values: 2 missing .: 232/1,419

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,166      0  Not Selected
              21         1  Selected
              232         .
```

-----  
q32d

Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: selected
```

```
range: [0,1]                units: 1
unique values: 2             missing .: 232/1,419
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,186      0  Not Selected
              1         1  Selected
              232         .
```

-----  
q32e

Race: Asian  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Asian

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: selected
```

```
range: [0,0]                units: 1
unique values: 1             missing .: 232/1,419
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,187      0  Not Selected
              232         .
```

-----  
q32f

Race: Multiracial  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Multiracial

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: selected
```

```
range: [0,1]                units: 1
unique values: 2             missing .: 232/1,419
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
```



```
1,177    0 Not Selected
  10     1 Selected
  232    .
```

-----  
q32g  
Race: Other  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Other

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: selected

range: [0,1]                units: 1
unique values: 2            missing .: 232/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
             1,177      0    Not Selected
             10         1    Selected
             232         .
```

-----  
q32h  
Race: Don't Know  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. Don't know

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: selected

range: [0,1]                units: 1
unique values: 2            missing .: 232/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
             1,184      0    Not Selected
             3          1    Selected
             232         .
```

-----  
q33  
Highest level of education  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

```
type: numeric (byte)
label: schooling

range: [1,7]                units: 1
unique values: 7            missing .: 204/1,419
```

```
tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
             28          1  12th grade or less, no diploma
```

151	2	High school graduate or GED
354	3	Some college, no degree
159	4	Associate degree
266	5	Bachelor's degree
216	6	Master's degree
41	7	Professional/Doctorate degree
204	.	

-----  
q34  
Political affiliation  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a... ?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: party

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 253/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	541	1	Republican
	335	2	Independent
	240	3	Democrat
	50	4	Something Else
	253	.	

-----  
q35  
Strength of political affiliation  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Would you consider yourself a strong or not very strong Republican/Democrat?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: strength

      range: [1,3]
unique values: 3
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 649/1,419

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	359	1	Very Strong
	363	2	Not Very Strong
	48	3	Don't Know
	649	.	

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q34=1 or q34=3  
-----

q36  
As an Independent, which party are you closer to?  
-----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Would you consider yourself closer to... ?

```

    type: numeric (byte)
    label: political_leaning

    range: [1,3]
    unique values: 3

    units: 1
    missing .: 1,045/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             82         1  Democratic Party
             113        2  Republican Party
             179        3  Neither
             1,045      .

```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q34=2 or q34=4

-----  
partyid  
7-point partisanship scale  
-----

```

    type: numeric (byte)
    label: partisanship

    range: [1,7]
    unique values: 7

    units: 1
    missing .: 323/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             246         1  Strong Republican
             249         2  Weak Republican
             113         3  Independent leaning Republican
             179         4  Independent
             82          5  Independent leaning Democrat
             114         6  Weak Democrat
             113         7  Strong Democrat
             323        .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable is a recoded version of q34, q35, and q36, which measure political affiliation and strength of party affiliation.

-----  
threeparty  
3-point partisanship scale  
-----

```

    type: numeric (byte)
    label: partisanship2

    range: [1,3]
    unique values: 3

    units: 1
    missing .: 323/1,419

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             608         1  Republican
             179         2  Independent
             309         3  Democrat
             323        .

```



6. Southeast - Genesee, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, Wayne

-----  
juris\_rr  
Jurisdiction-level Response Rate  
-----

type: numeric (float)  
range: [.53571427,1] units: 1.000e-08  
unique values: 41 missing : 0/1,419  
mean: .721622  
std. dev: .098215  
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%  
.611111 .657895 .714286 .793103 .861111

CODEBOOK NOTE: Response rate used to calculate jurisdiction-level weights, jurisdictions in database compared with number of jurisdictions in sample frame.

-----  
juris\_wgt  
Jurisdiction-level Weight  
-----

type: numeric (float)  
range: [1,1.8666667] units: 1.000e-07  
unique values: 41 missing : 0/1,419  
mean: 1.40995  
std. dev: .180244  
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%  
1.16129 1.26087 1.4 1.52 1.63636

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the jurisdiction level.

-----  
ind\_rr  
Individual-level Response Rate  
-----

type: numeric (float)  
range: [.26451612,1] units: 1.000e-08  
unique values: 18 missing : 2/1,419  
mean: .39701  
std. dev: .101934  
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%

.326176 .326176 .375461 .412935 .558621

CODEBOOK NOTE: Response rate used to calculate individual-level weights, individual respondents in database compared with number of individual officials in sample frame.

-----  
ind\_wgt  
Individual-level Weight  
-----

type: numeric (float)  
range: [0,3.780488] units: 1.000e-07  
unique values: 19 missing : 0/1,419  
mean: 2.63745  
std. dev: .512714  
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%  
1.79012 2.42169 2.66339 3.06583 3.06583

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the individual level.

-----  
grp\_pct\_minority  
% of Juris. population non-white - grouped  
-----

type: numeric (byte)  
label: pct\_min  
range: [1,3] units: 1  
unique values: 3 missing : 0/1,419  
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label  
1,172 1 0%-10%  
194 2 10%-30%  
53 3 30%-100%

CODEBOOK NOTE: Based upon the 2010 US Census population data. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010. To protect respondent confidentiality, this was recoded to a categorical variable.

-----  
pop\_township  
Population Category: Township  
-----

type: numeric (byte)  
label: pop\_twp\_city  
range: [1,3] units: 1  
unique values: 3 missing : 504/1,419  
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label  
321 1 <1500

```

504      2  1500-10000
  90     3  >10000
504     .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction re-identification that is present when a single population variable is provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the township's 2010 US Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

---

pop\_city  
Population Category: City

---

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: pop_twp_city

      range: [1,3]                units: 1
unique values: 3                  missing .: 1,176/1,419

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  26        1  <1500
                  129       2  1500-10000
                   88       3  >10000
                  1,176     .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction re-identification that is present when a single population variable is provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the city's 2010 US Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

---

pop\_village  
Population Category: Village

---

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: popvillage

      range: [1,2]                units: 1
unique values: 2                  missing .: 1,226/1,419

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  147     1  <1500
                   46     2  >/=1500
                  1,226   .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction re-identification that is present when a single population variable is provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the village's 2010 US Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

-----  
pop\_county

Population Category: County  
-----

type: numeric (byte)

label: popcounty

range: [1,2]

units: 1

unique values: 2

missing .: 1,351/1,419

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	27	1	</=30000
	41	2	>30000
	1,351	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction re-identification that is present when a single population variable is provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the county's 2010 US Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010.



For more information, please contact: closup-mpps@umich.edu / (734) 647-4091

To start, please select:

Q1. What type of jurisdiction do you represent?

- County
- Township
- City
- Village

What is the jurisdiction's name? \_\_\_\_\_

(If not a county) In what county is it located? \_\_\_\_\_

What position do you hold? \_\_\_\_\_

First, we're interested in your views on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan. Please think about the state's legislative and executive branches overall, including both elected officials and professional staff.

Q2. Thinking about the relationship between the State government and local jurisdictions, overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Michigan state government officials value input from local government officials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The State is taking too much decision-making authority away from local governments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The State holds local governments to a higher standard than it holds itself to.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The State's decision-making is transparent to local officials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The State unfairly treats some jurisdictions (or types of jurisdictions) better than others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q3. To what extent, if any, would you say the following factors have had a positive or negative impact on the relationship between the State and local governments in Michigan?

	Very Positive Impact	Somewhat Positive Impact	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact	Somewhat Negative Impact	Very Negative Impact	No Impact	Don't Know
Communication between state and local officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Term limits for state officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behavior of <u>state</u> officials (professionalism, ethics, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behavior of <u>local</u> officials (professionalism, ethics, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The State's system of funding local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q4. How much of the time do you think Michigan's state officials trust local governments to do what is right?

- Nearly always     Most of the time     Some of the time     Seldom     Almost never     Don't know

Q5. How much of the time do you think you can trust each of the following levels of government to do what is right?

	Nearly Always	Most of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Almost Never	Don't Know
The federal government in Washington	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The state government in Lansing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other local governments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Local officials should try to influence state policy issues affecting local governments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State officials should frequently reach out to local officials to get feedback on pending policy changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q7. Thinking about communication between state and local officials specifically regarding State actions affecting your jurisdiction, in a typical 12-month period, how often...

	At least once a month	A few times a year	Rarely or never	Don't Know
... do you or a representative of your jurisdiction contact state officials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... does a state official contact your jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Q14. Thinking overall about local governments that have faced—or will face—a financial emergency, how effective or ineffective do you believe the Emergency Manager Law has been, or will be, at restoring fiscal health in the short-term (i.e., balancing the books)?

Very Effective       Somewhat Effective       Neither Effective nor Ineffective       Somewhat Ineffective       Very Ineffective       Don't Know

Q15. Now, still thinking overall about local governments that have faced—or will face—a financial emergency, how effective or ineffective do you believe the Law will be at establishing sustainable financial conditions for the long-term?

Very Effective       Somewhat Effective       Neither Effective nor Ineffective       Somewhat Ineffective       Very Ineffective       Don't Know

Q16. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Emergency Manager Law...

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
... is undemocratic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... helps difficult decisions to be made because the Emergency Manager is an "outsider?"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... is racially discriminatory (by design, or as implemented)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... pays insufficient attention to the underlying structural problems leading to local fiscal stress?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... serves the interests of local residents by improving their jurisdiction's fiscal sustainability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... leads to an overemphasis on cost-cutting at the expense of service quality, public health and safety, or other important considerations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q17. Thinking overall, to what extent do you support or oppose the Emergency Manager Law?

Strongly Support       Somewhat Support       Neither Support nor Oppose       Somewhat Oppose       Strongly Oppose       Don't Know

Q18. Recently, there have been calls for reforms to the Emergency Manager Law. To what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the Emergency Manager Law?

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
Require Emergency Managers (EMs) to plan for improving factors beyond just finances (e.g., service delivery, infrastructure, quality of life)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Include provisions for possible new (time limited) local or state revenue options for jurisdictions with EMs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Require EMs to analyze impact on disadvantaged groups when making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Require EMs to consider <u>local elected official</u> input before making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Require EMs to consider <u>citizen</u> input before making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Add state-level ombudsperson oversight for citizens and local officials to appeal any EM decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q19. Some believe that more proactive monitoring of local government finances by the State could help avoid local fiscal emergencies through earlier detection and intervention. Others believe this may be unnecessary or even counterproductive. To what extent would you support or oppose more proactive State monitoring of finances for all local governments in Michigan?

Strongly Support       Somewhat Support       Neither Support nor Oppose       Somewhat Oppose       Strongly Oppose       Don't Know

Finally, we're interested in citizen engagement with your jurisdiction's policymaking process or operations. This might include formal and informal interactions, such as contacts with local officials, attendance at local meetings, participation on local boards/commissions, voting, and more.

Q20. We want to start by getting a very broad sense of citizen engagement with your local government. How would you describe current levels of citizen engagement with your jurisdiction? Overall, would you say citizens in your jurisdiction are...

Very Engaged       Somewhat Engaged       Not Very Engaged       Not at all Engaged       Don't Know

Q21. To what extent do you feel your jurisdiction offers opportunities to citizens for engagement with your jurisdiction in its policymaking and/or operations?

A Great Deal       Somewhat       Very Little       None at all       Don't Know

**Q22. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following general statements about citizen engagement?** (We understand these might be sensitive questions, however, please remember we do not release any MPPS data that identify respondents or jurisdictions individually.)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
We make opportunities for engagement available, but our citizens rarely take advantage of them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some of our best engagement with citizens happens informally around the community (such as at the grocery store or in a restaurant, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Most citizens we hear from are more interested in complaining than in finding solutions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Citizens in our jurisdiction want access to information about the government's finances and operations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Most citizens aren't willing to take the time to become well-informed on issues facing the jurisdiction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our jurisdiction reaches out to groups that typically might not engage in our policymaking processes (e.g., low-income or racially diverse populations).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Citizens tend to only be engaged on issues that affect them directly and not on issues affecting the community overall.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our jurisdiction's decision-making is transparent to our citizens.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We struggle to find enough citizens to serve on our jurisdiction's appointed boards/commissions or elected offices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q23. Citizens are often asked on opinion surveys how much trust they have in their government. Now we'd like to ask you, as a local official, about trust you have in your jurisdiction's citizens. In terms of their engagement in your jurisdiction's policymaking and/or operations, how much of the time do you think you can trust the citizens in your community to be responsible participants?**

- Nearly always     Most of the time     Some of the time     Seldom     Almost never     Don't know

**Q24. One way of thinking about the proper role for citizen engagement in local policymaking is along a spectrum from low engagement to high engagement. At the low end, citizen engagement would focus just on keeping citizens informed about issues. At the high end, citizens would actually make decisions for the jurisdiction. While it might differ depending on the issue, in general, what do you think the following people believe is the proper role for citizen engagement in local governance?**

	Low Engagement: Just keep citizens informed	Have citizens provide input	Have citizens recommend decisions	High Engagement: Have citizens make decisions	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens believe the role of citizen engagement is to...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You personally believe the role of citizen engagement is to...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q25. Now thinking about particularly controversial issues, who do you think should have the final say on the most controversial issues in your jurisdiction?**

- Citizens     Public officials     Don't know

**Q26. Overall, how satisfied are you regarding citizen engagement in your jurisdiction's policymaking and/or operations today?**

- Very Satisfied     Somewhat Satisfied     Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied     Somewhat Dissatisfied     Very Dissatisfied     Don't Know

**Q27. CLOSUP will protect your privacy and anonymity to the full extent provided by law. We need to confirm your personal information such as name and email address for tracking and administrative purposes only. Your personal information will not be shared with any outside sources. As with all of the questions in this survey, these are optional.**

Your name \_\_\_\_\_ Your email address \_\_\_\_\_

Today's date \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / 2016

**Q28. What is your gender?**  Male  Female

**Q29. In what year were you born?** 19 \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

**Q30. How many years have you served in your current position?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Q31. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent?**  Yes  No

**Q32. Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply)**

- White     Asian  
 Black or African American     Multiracial  
 American Indian or Alaskan Native     Other  
 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander     Don't know

**Q33. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?**

- 12<sup>th</sup> grade or less/no diploma     Bachelor's degree  
 High school graduate or GED     Master's degree  
 Some college, no degree     Professional/Doctorate degree  
 Associate's degree

**Q34. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a... ?**

- Republican     Independent     Democrat  
 Something else (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q35. (if Republican or Democrat) Would you consider yourself a strong or not very strong Republican/Democrat?**

- Very strong     Not very strong     Don't know

**Q36. (if Independent or something else) Would you consider yourself closer to... ?**

- the Democratic Party     the Republican Party     Neither