

Center Research Report 10-2, October 2010.

© graphic used with permission of the designer, Richard Hawkins, Design & Illustration, P.O. Box 21181, Des Moines, IA 50321-0101
Phone: 515.288.4431, FAX: 515.243.1979

*These reports have been peer reviewed by colleagues at the University of Nebraska. Any questions, suggestions, or concerns should be sent directly to the author(s).

All of the Center's research reports detailing Nebraska Rural Poll results are located on the Center's World Wide Web page at <http://cari.unl.edu/ruralpoll/>

Funding for this project was provided by the Cooperative Extension Division of the Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Agricultural Research Division of the Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Center for Applied Rural Innovation. Additionally, considerable in-kind support and contributions were provided by a number of individuals and organizations associated with the Partnership for Rural Nebraska and the University of Nebraska Rural Initiative.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2010)	2
<i>Figure 1. Community Change, 1996 - 2010.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2010</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 1. Proportions of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2010</i>	<i>5</i>
The Community and Its Attributes in 2010	4
<i>Figure 3. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Figure 4. Satisfaction with Cellular Phone Service by Community Size.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Figure 5. Feelings About Community</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Figure 6. Difficulty or Ease of Leaving Community</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Figure 7. Ease or Difficulty of Leaving Community by Length of Residence in Community</i>	<i>11</i>
Plans to Leave the Community.....	11
Retail Shopping.....	12
<i>Figure 8. Percentage of Goods and Services Purchased in Community</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Figure 9. Items Purchased Online in 2000 and 2010.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Figure 10. Where Normally Purchased Items Before Purchasing Online</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Figure 11. How Often Made Online Purchases During Past Year in 2000 and 2010.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Figure 12. Amount Spent on Online Purchases During Past Year</i>	<i>17</i>
Conclusion	17

List of Appendix Tables and Figures

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska	19
Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2000 Census	20
Appendix Table 2. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	21
Appendix Table 3. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	23
Appendix Table 4. Level of Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities	25
Appendix Table 5. Measures of Satisfaction with Ten Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	26
Appendix Table 6. Feelings About Community by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes	29
Appendix Table 7. Opinions About Leaving Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	32
Appendix Table 8. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	33
Appendix Table 9. Percentage of Goods and Services Purchased in Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	34
Appendix Table 10. Purchased Goods and Services Online During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	35
Appendix Table 11. Items Purchased Online During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	36
Appendix Table 12. Where Normally Purchased Items Before Purchasing Online by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	38
Appendix Table 13. How Often Made Online Purchases During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	39
Appendix Table 14. Amount Spent on Online Purchases During Past Twelve Months by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	40

Executive Summary

Recent community level Census data show that most small communities in Nebraska have experienced population decline since 2000. However, most larger communities have experienced population growth during this same time period. In addition, small rural communities in Nebraska have experienced a decline in retailing activity in the past few decades. The Internet has also impacted retail shopping behaviors, allowing customers to purchase goods and services online that they normally purchased from businesses in their community. Given these conditions, how do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided by their community? Are they planning to move from their community in the next year? Have these views changed over the past fifteen years? Are rural Nebraskans purchasing the majority of their households' retail goods and services in their own community? How often do rural Nebraskans buy goods and services using the Internet? How have rural Nebraskans' purchasing behaviors changed during the past ten years? Does their purchasing behavior differ depending on their region, age, income, or size of community? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 2,797 responses to the 2010 Nebraska Rural Poll, the fifteenth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and retail shopping. Trends for some of these questions are examined by comparing data from the fourteen previous polls to this year's results. In addition, data from the retail shopping questions will be compared to data collected in 2000. For all questions, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, that is, comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- ***By many different measures, rural Nebraskans are positive about their community.***
 - ✓ *Many rural Nebraskans rate their community favorably on its social dimensions.*
Many rural Nebraskans rate their communities as friendly (75%), trusting (62%) and supportive (66%).
 - ✓ *Many rural Nebraskans express positive sentiments about their community.*
Just over two-thirds (68%) agree with the statement that "my community is very special to me." And 60 percent agree with the statement that "I feel I can really be myself in my community."
 - ✓ *One-half of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community.*
Fifty percent say it would be difficult for their household to leave their community. Less than one-third (32%) indicate it would be easy for their household to leave their community and 18 percent gave a neutral response.

- ***Residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to rate their community favorably on its social dimensions and to have positive sentiments about their community.***
 - ✓ *Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community.*
Forty-nine percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree with the statement that my community is the best place to live. In

comparison, 38 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more agree with this statement.

- ✓ *Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to say it would be difficult to leave their community.*

- ***Except for a few services that are largely unavailable in rural communities, rural Nebraskans are generally satisfied with basic community services and amenities.*** At least 70 percent of rural Nebraskans are satisfied with the following services or amenities: fire protection (85%), parks and recreation (74%), library services (73%), and religious organizations (71%). On the other hand, at least one-third of rural Nebraskans are dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping, streets and roads, restaurants, arts/cultural activities, and local government in their community.
- ***Most rural Nebraskans purchased at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their own community or nearest community in the past year.*** Sixty percent purchased at least one-half of the retail goods and services their household bought during the past year in their community or nearest community. Over one-third (37%) purchased between 1% and 49% of their retail goods and services in their community, while three percent purchased none of their goods and services in their community (or nearest community). In 2000, just over two-thirds (67%) of rural Nebraskans purchased at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their community or nearest community.
- ***Over two-thirds of rural Nebraskans made online purchases during the past year, compared to less than one-third in 2000.*** Sixty-eight percent of rural Nebraska purchased goods and services online during the past year. In comparison, in 2000 less than one-third (29%) of rural Nebraskans had purchased goods and services online. Thus the incidence of online shopping more than doubled during the past ten years.
- ***Many rural Nebraskans who make online purchases do so at least once a month.*** Forty-two percent of rural Nebraskans who make online purchases do so at least once a month. Just under one-half (46%) make online purchases several times a year. In 2000, only 22 percent of the respondents made online purchases at least once a month. And, over one-quarter (28%) in 2000 made online purchases once a year or less, compared to 12 percent this year.
- ***Over one-half of rural Nebraskans who made online purchases during the past year spent \$500 or more on those purchases.*** Fifty-three percent of rural Nebraskans who made online purchases during the past year spent at least \$500 on those purchases. Ten percent spent less than \$100 on their online purchases and over one-third (37%) spent between \$100 and \$499 on their household's online purchases during the past year.

Introduction

Recent community level Census data show that most small communities in Nebraska have experienced population decline since 2000. However, most larger communities have experienced population growth during this same time period. In addition, small rural communities in Nebraska have experienced a decline in retailing activity in the past few decades. Research has shown that an increasing share of the state's total retail sales has been captured by the larger retailing centers across the state. As an example, Omaha and Lincoln captured more than 64 percent of the state's total taxable retail sales in 2005. These two cities had captured 57 percent of the taxable retail sales in 1990.¹ The Internet has also impacted retail shopping behaviors, allowing customers to purchase goods and services online that they normally purchased from businesses in their community.

Given these conditions, how do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided by their community? Are they planning to move from their community in the next year? Have these views changed over the past fifteen years? Are rural Nebraskans purchasing the majority of their households' retail goods and services in their own community? How often do rural Nebraskans buy goods and services using the Internet? How have rural Nebraskans' purchasing behaviors changed during the past ten years? Does their purchasing behavior differ depending on their region, age, income, or size of community? This

1 "Retail Sale Trends Across Nebraska Counties and Localities" by Bruce B. Johnson and Ben Blomendahl, located online at <http://www.agecon.unl.edu/resource/DRNo182retailtrends.pdf>.

paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

The 2010 Nebraska Rural Poll is the fifteenth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and retail shopping. Trends for some of these questions will be examined by comparing the data from the fourteen previous polls to this year's results. In addition, data from the retail shopping questions will be compared to data collected in 2000.

Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 2,797 responses from Nebraskans living in the 84 non-metropolitan counties in the state. A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in March and April to approximately 6,500 randomly selected households. Metropolitan counties not included in the sample were Cass, Dakota, Dixon, Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward and Washington. The 14-page questionnaire included questions pertaining to well-being, community, agriculture and food, energy, retail shopping, care giving and work. This paper reports only results from the community and retail shopping portions of the survey.

A 43% response rate was achieved using the total design method (Dillman, 1978). The sequence of steps used follow:

1. A pre-notification letter was sent requesting participation in the study.
2. The questionnaire was mailed with an informal letter signed by the project director approximately seven days later.
3. A reminder postcard was sent to the entire sample approximately seven days after the questionnaire had been sent.
4. Those who had not yet responded within approximately 14 days of the original mailing were sent a replacement questionnaire.

Appendix Table 1 shows demographic data from this year's study and previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire nonmetropolitan population of Nebraska (using 2000 U.S. Census data). As can be seen from the table, there are some marked differences between some of the demographic variables in our sample compared to the Census data. Certainly some variance from 2000 Census data is to be expected as a result of changes that have occurred in the intervening ten years. Nonetheless, we suggest the reader use caution in generalizing our data to all rural Nebraska. However, given the random sampling frame used for this survey, the acceptable percentage of responses, and the large number of respondents, we feel the data provide useful insights into opinions of rural Nebraskans on the various issues presented in this report. The margin of error for this study is plus or minus two percent.

Since younger residents have typically been under-represented by survey respondents and older residents have been over-represented, weights were used to adjust the sample to match the age distribution in the nonmetropolitan counties in Nebraska (using U.S. Census figures).

The average age of respondents is 50 years. Seventy-one percent are married (Appendix Table 1) and 69 percent live within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 43 years and have lived in their current community 28 years. Fifty-two percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety-five percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Forty-one percent of the respondents report their 2009 approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, as below \$40,000.

Forty-seven percent report incomes over \$50,000.

Seventy-six percent were employed in 2009 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Eighteen percent are retired. Thirty-five percent of those employed reported working in a management, professional, or education occupation. Twelve percent indicated they were employed in agriculture.

Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2010)

Comparisons are made between the community data collected this year to the fourteen previous studies. These were independent samples (the same people were not surveyed each year).


Community Change

To examine respondents' perceptions of how their community has changed, they were asked the question, "Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say...My community has changed for the..." Answer categories were better, no change or worse.

One difference in the wording of this question has occurred over the past fifteen years. Starting in 1998, the phrase "this past year" was added to the question; no time frame was given to the respondents in the first two studies. Also, in 2007 the middle response "same" was replaced with "no change."

Rural Nebraskans' views about the change in their community are about the same as last year. The proportion of rural Nebraskans that viewed positive change in their communities increased slightly this year (Figure 1). Following a seven year period of general decline, the proportion saying their community has changed

Figure 1. Community Change 1996 - 2010



for the better increased from 23 percent in 2003 to 33 percent in both 2006 and 2007. It then dipped slightly to 30 percent in 2008 and declined further to 23 percent last year (the lowest proportion of all fifteen years, also occurring in 2003). However, the proportion viewing positive change in their community increased slightly to 26 percent this year.

The proportion saying their community has stayed the same first increased from 1996 to 1998. It then remained fairly steady during the following eight years but declined in both 2006 and 2007. However, the proportion increased slightly to 48 percent in 2008 and increased further to 51 percent both last year and this year. The proportion saying their community has changed for the worse has remained fairly steady across all fifteen years, but increased from 22 percent in 2008 to 26 percent last year (the highest proportion in all years of this study), then decreased slightly to 24 percent this year.

Community Social Dimensions

Respondents were also asked each year if they would describe their communities as friendly or unfriendly, trusting or distrusting, and supportive or hostile. For each of these three dimensions, respondents were asked to rate their community using a seven-point scale between each pair of contrasting views.

The proportion of respondents who view their community as friendly has remained fairly steady over the fifteen year period, ranging from 69 to 75 percent. The proportion of respondents who view their community as trusting has also remained fairly steady, ranging from 59 to 66 percent.


A similar pattern emerged when examining the proportion of respondents who rated their community as supportive. The proportions rating their community as supportive have ranged from 60 percent to 67 percent over the fifteen year period.

Plans to Leave the Community

Starting in 1998, respondents were asked, “Do you plan to move from your community in the next year?” The proportion planning to leave their community has remained relatively stable during the past thirteen years, ranging from 3 percent to 6 percent.

The expected destination for the persons planning to move has changed over time (Figure 2). Since the highest proportion in this study (54 percent in 2004), the proportion of expected movers planning to leave the state has generally decreased to 39 percent in 2007. However, it spiked upward in 2008 before declining sharply last year to 33 percent. It declined slightly to 31 percent this year. The proportion of expected movers planning to move to either the Omaha or Lincoln area

Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2010



increased from 8 percent in 2004 to 21 percent in 2006. That proportion then held fairly steady during the next three years before declining to 14 percent this year. After the proportion of expected movers planning to move to other areas of rural Nebraska declined from 44 percent in 2006 to 29 percent in 2008, it increased sharply to 48 percent last year and increased again to 55 percent this year.

Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

Respondents were also asked how satisfied they are with various community services and amenities each year. They were asked this in all fifteen studies; however, in 1996 they were also asked about the availability of these services. Therefore, comparisons will only be made between the last fourteen studies, when the question wording was identical. The

respondents were asked how satisfied they were with a list of 25 services and amenities, taking into consideration availability, cost, and quality.

Table 1 shows the proportions very or somewhat satisfied with the service each year. The rank ordering of these items has remained relatively stable over the fourteen years. However, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with many social services has declined across all fourteen years of the study. As an example, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with nursing home care has dropped from 63 percent in 1997 to 46 percent this year. In addition, satisfaction with entertainment services (entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants) have also generally declined over the past fourteen years. Two services added in 2006 have shown steady increases in their satisfaction levels during the past three years before declining slightly this year- cellular phone service and Internet service. In 2006, 49 percent of rural Nebraskans were satisfied with their cellular phone service. That proportion increased to 61 percent last year and stayed about the same with 60 percent this year.

The Community and Its Attributes in 2010

In this section, the 2010 data on respondents' evaluations of their communities and its attributes are examined in terms of any significant differences that may exist depending upon the size of the respondent's community, the region in which they live, or various individual attributes such as household income or age.

Community Change

The perceptions of the change occurring in their community by various demographic subgroups

Table 1. Proportion of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2010

Service/Amenity	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Fire protection	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	86	85	86	87	85
Parks/recreation	77	77	75	77	73	74	76	75	74	75	74	75	74	74
Library services	78	78	72	79	71	74	74	74	72	73	74	75	74	73
Religious org.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72	72	73	71	71
Education (K-12)	71	74	72	73	69	69	69	68	68	68	68	70	68	68
Medical care services	73	73	70	72	71	69	71	71	71	71	63	66	67	67
Sewage/waste disposal*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	66	66	67	66	65
Sewage disposal	68	63	63	63	61	66	64	67	63	*	*	*	*	*
Water disposal	66	61	60	61	60	64	62	65	62	*	*	*	*	*
Solid waste disp.	61	59	60	60	60	64	63	65	63	64	*	*	*	*
Law enforcement	66	64	63	64	61	63	65	63	63	64	63	62	64	65
Cell phone services	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	49	54	58	61	60
Housing	61	63	62	56	57	62	60	61	60	61	59	59	61	59
Internet service	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	51	57	58	56
Community recycling	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	48	52	54
Streets and roads*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	55	49	51	47
Streets	*	59	62	59	51	61	62	59	60	60	*	*	*	*
Highways/ bridges	*	66	68	68	65	69	70	69	70	69	*	*	*	*
Senior centers	66	65	62	59	58	62	61	58	59	55	48	47	47	47
Restaurants	59	57	56	55	53	51	54	56	54	54	50	45	47	47
Nursing home care	63	62	59	56	55	57	57	55	55	53	46	47	45	46
Retail shopping	53	48	49	47	47	45	45	49	47	45	41	39	40	41
Local government	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	41	40	38	41	40
County govt.	48	53	53	49	49	47	51	48	47	*	*	*	*	*
City/village govt.	46	50	51	45	46	45	48	45	46	*	*	*	*	*
Day care services	51	50	45	46	43	44	45	47	45	42	31	28	*	*
Child day care services	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32	34
Entertainment	38	35	34	33	33	32	33	36	32	34	30	26	29	32
Head start programs	44	41	37	40	39	38	40	41	39	37	29	26	28	29
Arts/cultural activities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26	25	24	27
Mental health services	34	32	29	30	29	30	30	31	30	27	23	23	24	23
Adult day care services	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	22	21
Airport	*	*	*	30	29	32	32	32	31	26	*	*	*	*
Public transportation svcs*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	17	17	19	18
Airline service	*	*	*	15	15	16	17	18	15	15	*	*	*	*
Taxi service	11	9	8	9	10	10	11	12	12	11	*	*	*	*
Rail service	14	11	11	10	10	11	11	13	11	9	*	*	*	*
Bus service	13	11	10	9	10	9	10	11	7	7	*	*	*	*

* = Not asked that particular year; * New items added in 2007 that combine previous items (indented below each).


are examined (Appendix Table 2). Residents living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say that their community has changed for the better. Twenty-nine percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe their community has changed for the better, compared to 18 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people (Figure 3). Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to say they have seen no change in their community during the past year.

Other groups most likely to say their community has changed for the better during the past year include: persons with the highest household incomes, females, persons who have never married, persons with higher education levels and persons with food service or personal care occupations.

Community Social Dimensions

In addition to asking respondents about their

Figure 3. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size



perceptions of the change occurring in their community, they were also asked to rate its social dimensions. They were asked if they would describe their communities as friendly or unfriendly, trusting or distrusting, and supportive or hostile. Overall, respondents rate their communities as friendly (75%), trusting (62%) and supportive (66%).

Respondents' ratings of their community on these dimensions differ by some of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 3). Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the largest communities to rate their community as trusting. Two-thirds (66%) of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 say their community is trusting, compared to 58 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Persons with higher income levels are more likely than persons with lower incomes to rate their community as friendly and trusting. Seventy-nine percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more rate their community as friendly, compared to 68 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000.

When comparing responses by age, younger persons are more likely than older persons to rate their community as friendly. However, older persons are more likely than younger persons to rate their community as both trusting and supportive. Sixty-eight percent of persons age 65 and older rate their community as trusting, compared to 57 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Respondents who are divorced/separated are the marital group *least* likely to view their community as being friendly or trusting. Persons with the highest education levels are

more likely than persons with less education to rate their community as trusting. However, persons with the lowest education levels are more likely than persons with higher education levels to view their community as supportive. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with production, transportation or warehousing occupations are the group *least* likely to view their community as both trusting and supportive.

Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

Next, rural residents were asked to rate how satisfied they are with 25 different services and amenities, taking into consideration cost, availability, and quality. Residents report high levels of satisfaction with some services, but other services and amenities have higher levels of dissatisfaction. Only five services listed have a higher proportion of dissatisfied responses than satisfied responses and those services are largely unavailable in rural communities.

The services or amenities respondents are most satisfied with (based on the combined percentage of “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” responses) include: fire protection (85%), parks and recreation (74%), library services (73%), religious organizations (71%), education (K-12) (68%) and medical care services (67%) (Appendix Table 4). At least one-third of the respondents are either “very dissatisfied” or “somewhat dissatisfied” with entertainment (49%), retail shopping (48%), streets and roads (48%), restaurants (44%), arts/cultural activities (36%), and local government (33%).

The ten services and amenities with the greatest dissatisfaction ratings were analyzed by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 5). Many differences emerge.

Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to be dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants in their community. As an example, 62 percent of persons between the ages of 19 and 29 are dissatisfied with entertainment, compared to only 29 percent of persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants include persons with higher household incomes and persons with higher education levels.

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 are more likely than persons from different sized communities to express dissatisfaction with the entertainment and retail shopping in their community. Persons living in or near communities with populations between 500 and 999 are the community size group most likely to be dissatisfied with the restaurants in their community.

When comparing responses by region, residents of the South Central region are the group *least* likely to report being dissatisfied with the entertainment and retail shopping in their community (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region). Persons with occupations in agriculture are the occupation group *least* likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s entertainment and retail shopping.

Panhandle residents are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with the streets and roads in their community. Sixty-two percent of Panhandle residents are dissatisfied with the streets and roads, compared to 47 percent of residents of the Southeast region.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their streets and roads include: persons under the age of 65, persons with some college education but not a four year degree, persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations, and persons with occupations classified as other.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to be dissatisfied with the arts/cultural activities in their community. Just under one-half (47%) of persons age 19 to 29 are dissatisfied with their community's arts/cultural activities, compared to 19 percent of persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their arts/cultural activities include: persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999; Southeast region residents; persons with the highest household incomes; and persons with the highest education levels. Persons with occupations in agriculture are *less* likely than persons with different occupations to report being dissatisfied with the arts/cultural activities in their community.

The groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their local government include: persons with the highest household incomes, persons age 40 to 64, persons with a high school diploma or some college education, and persons with occupations classified as other.


Panhandle residents are more likely than persons from other regions of the state to be dissatisfied with public transportation services in their community. Forty-three percent of Panhandle residents are dissatisfied with their public transportation services, compared to 24 percent of persons living in the South Central region of the state.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their public transportation services include: persons living in or near the largest communities, persons under the age of 65, persons with higher education levels and persons with healthcare support and public safety occupations.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express dissatisfaction with the cellular phone service in their community (Figure 4). Forty-four percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people are dissatisfied with their community's cellular phone service, compared to 17 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Other groups most likely to report being dissatisfied with the cellular phone service in their community include: residents of the Southeast region, persons under the age of 50, persons with higher education levels, persons with occupations in agriculture and persons with occupations classified as other.

Figure 4. Satisfaction with Cellular Phone Service by Community Size



Persons with the highest education levels are more likely than persons with lower educational levels to be dissatisfied with their community recycling. Thirty percent of persons with at least a four-year college degree are dissatisfied with their community recycling, compared to 13 percent of persons with less than a high school diploma.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their community recycling include: persons living in or near the smallest communities, persons with the highest household incomes, persons between the ages of 30 and 39, and persons with occupations classified as other. Residents of the South Central region are the regional group *least* likely to be dissatisfied with their community recycling.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to express dissatisfaction with the housing in their community. Thirty-one percent of persons age 19 to 29 are dissatisfied with the housing in their community, compared to 14 percent of persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s housing include: persons


living in both the Panhandle and North Central regions, persons with higher education levels and persons with food service or personal care occupations.

Feelings About Community

The respondents were next given some statements about their community and were asked the extent to which they agree or disagree with each. Just over two-thirds (68%) agree with the statement that “my community is very special to me.” (Figure 5) And 60 percent agree with the statement that “I feel I can really be myself in my community.”

Responses to this question differ by many of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 6). Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community. Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to agree with most of these statements about their community. As an example, 49 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree

Figure 5. Feelings About Community



with the statement that my community is the best place to live. In comparison, 38 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more agree with this statement. Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree with each statement listed. For example, 80 percent of persons age 65 and older agree with the statement that my community is very special to me, compared to 59 percent of persons age 19 to 29. Similarly, widowed respondents are the marital group most likely to agree with each of the statements listed.

Long term residents are more likely than newcomers to the community to express positive sentiments about their community. As an example, 45 percent of persons living in their community for more than five years agree with the statement my community is the best place to live, compared to 27 percent of persons living in the community for five years or less.

Persons with agriculture occupations are the occupation group most likely to express positive sentiments about their community. Just over three-quarters (76%) of persons with occupations in agriculture agree with the statement that my community is very special to me, compared to 54 percent of persons with production, transportation or warehousing occupations.

Residents of the South Central region are more likely than persons living in different regions of the state to agree with the statements that no other place can compare to my community and my community is the best place to live. Thirty-eight percent of South Central residents agree that no other place can compare to my community, compared to 29 percent of Panhandle residents.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to

agree with the statements that no other place can compare to my community and I really miss my community when I am away too long.

Persons with lower education levels are more likely than persons with more education to agree with the statements that no other place can compare to my community, my community is the best place to live, and I really miss my community when I am away too long.


Next, respondents were asked a question about how easy or difficult it would be to leave their community. The exact question wording was “Assume you were to have a discussion in your household about leaving your community for a reasonably good opportunity elsewhere. Some people might be happy to live in a new place and meet new people. Others might be very sorry to leave. How easy or difficult would it be for your household to leave your community?” They were given a seven point scale where 1 indicated very easy and 7 denoted very difficult. One-half (50%) of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community¹ (Figure 6). Less than one-third (32%) indicate it would be easy for their household to leave their community.

Responses to this question are examined by region, community size and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 7). Many differences emerge.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Sixty-two percent of persons age 65 or older think it would be difficult to leave

¹ The responses on the 7-point scale are converted to percentages as follows: values of 1, 2, and 3 are categorized as easy; values of 5, 6, and 7 are categorized as difficult; and a value of 4 is categorized as neutral.


Figure 6. Difficulty or Ease of Leaving Community



their community, compared to 42 percent of persons age 19 to 29. Similarly, widowed persons are the marital group most likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Fifty-nine percent of widowed respondents believe it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 36 percent of persons who are divorced or separated.

Long term residents of the community are more likely than newcomers to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Fifty-four percent of persons who have lived in their community for more than five years say it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 32 percent of persons living in the community for five years or less (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Ease or Difficulty of Leaving Community by Length of Residence in Community



Other groups most likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community include: persons living in or near the smallest communities, residents of the South Central region, persons with lower education levels and persons with occupations in agriculture.

Plans to Leave the Community

To determine rural Nebraskans' migration intentions, respondents were asked, "Do you plan to move from your community in the next year?" Response options included yes, no or uncertain. A follow-up question (asked only of those who indicated they were planning to move) asked where they planned to move. The answer categories for this question were: Lincoln/Omaha metro areas, some place in Nebraska outside the Lincoln/Omaha metro areas, or some place other than Nebraska.

Only six percent indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year, 11 percent are uncertain and 83 percent have no plans to move. Of those who are planning to move, over two-thirds (69%) plan to remain in the state, with 14 percent planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha area and 55 percent plan to move to another part of the state. Less than one-third (31%) are planning to leave Nebraska.

Intentions to move from their community differed by many of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 8). Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to be planning to move from their community in the next year. Thirteen percent of persons between the ages of 19 and 29 are planning to move next year, compared to only three percent of persons age 65 and older. An additional 21 percent of the younger respondents indicate they are uncertain if they plan to move.

Persons who are divorced/separated are the marital group most likely to be planning to move from their community. Ten percent of divorced/separated persons are planning to move in the next year, compared to five percent of both the married and widowed respondents. An additional 22 percent of the divorced/separated persons are uncertain if they plan to move.

Newcomers to the community are more likely than long-term residents to be planning to leave their community in the next year. Thirteen percent of persons who have lived in their community five years or less are planning to move in the next year, compared to five percent of persons who have lived in their community for more than five years. An additional 20 percent of newcomers are uncertain if they are planning to leave their community in the next year.

Persons living in communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 are more likely than persons living in or near different sized communities to be planning to move from their community in the next year. And, the potential movers from communities of this size are more likely than potential movers from different sized communities to be planning to move to the Lincoln or Omaha metropolitan areas. However, over one-third (36%) of the potential movers from communities of this size are planning to leave Nebraska.

Potential movers with higher household incomes are more likely than potential movers with lower household incomes to be planning to leave the state. Over one-half (55%) of potential movers with household incomes of \$60,000 or more are planning to leave Nebraska.

Potential movers age 40 to 49 are more likely than potential movers who are both younger and older to be planning to leave the state.

Persons with higher educational levels that are planning to move in the next year are more likely than persons with less education who are planning to move to expect to leave the state. Thirty-three percent of potential movers with at least some college education plan to leave Nebraska.


Potential movers with production, transportation and warehousing occupations are more likely than potential movers with different occupations to be planning to move to the metropolitan areas within the state. One-half (50%) of potential movers with these types of occupations are planning to move to either the Omaha or Lincoln metropolitan areas. Potential movers with healthcare support or public safety occupations are the group most likely to be planning to leave the state.

Retail Shopping

Retail shopping is a community service that many rural Nebraskans express dissatisfaction with each year. In fact, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with the retail shopping in their community has declined from 53 percent in 1997 to 41 percent this year. Questions about retail shopping were included in the 2000 study and some of these questions were repeated in this year's survey to determine if any changes have occurred in rural Nebraskans' retail and online shopping behaviors in the past ten years. First, they were asked approximately what percentage of the retail goods and services their household bought during the past year were purchased in their community (or nearest community if they lived in the country).

Most rural Nebraskans (60%) purchased at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their own community or nearest community in the past year (Figure 8). Over one-third (37%) purchased between 1% and 49% of their retail goods and services in their community, while

Figure 8. Percentage of Goods and Services Purchased in Community



three percent purchased none of their goods and services in their community (or nearest community).

In 2000, just over two-thirds (67%) of rural Nebraskans purchased at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their community or nearest community. Thus, rural Nebraskans are less likely now to purchase the majority of their retail goods and services in their community than they were ten years ago.

The percentage of goods and services purchased in their community differ by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 9). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to purchase the majority of their goods and services in their community or nearest community. Eighty-five percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more purchase at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their community or nearest community. In comparison, 32 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 purchased at least one-half of their goods and services in their community or nearest community.

Other groups most likely to purchase at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their community or nearest community include older persons and persons with lower education levels. Residents of both the Northeast and Southeast regions are *less* likely than residents of other regions to purchase at least one-half of their retail goods and services in their community or nearest community.

Next, respondents were asked if anyone in their household had used the Internet to purchase goods or services during the past year. Over two-thirds (68%) of rural Nebraskans have purchased goods and services online during the past year. In comparison, in 2000 less than one-third (29%) of rural Nebraskans had purchased goods and services online. Thus the incidence of online shopping more than doubled during the past ten years.

Certain groups were more likely than others to have purchased goods and services online (Appendix Table 10). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to have purchased online during the past year. Seventy-three percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more have made online purchases during the past year, compared to 59 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people. This difference can likely be partially explained by the quality of Internet services available in larger communities as compared to smaller ones. In fact, residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to express dissatisfaction with the Internet services available in their community. So, as Internet connectivity continues to improve across the state, one would expect a growth in online shopping in these smaller communities.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to have made online purchases during the past year. At least 80 percent of persons under the age of 50 have purchased goods and services online during the past year, compared to 31 percent of persons age 65 and older.


Other groups most likely to have made online purchases during the past year include: persons with higher household incomes, females, married persons, persons with higher education levels and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

The respondents who had made online purchases during the past year were asked what types of items were purchased online during the past year. Most households that shopped online purchased clothing/apparel (70%) and music or books (58%) (Figure 9). Many households also purchased airline tickets (40%), housewares (39%), computer hardware or software (36%) and video/audio equipment (31%).

In the 2000 study, the most popular online purchase was music or books, made by 48 percent of those making an online purchase. Just over one-third (34%) of the 2000 respondents had purchased clothing online. Two categories not showing increases in the past ten years are computer hardware and software and stocks and mutual funds. Thirty-eight percent of the 2000 respondents had purchased computer hardware or software online, compared to 36 percent this year.

Items purchased online differ by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 11). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to have purchased airline tickets and computer hardware or software online during the past year. Persons living in or near smaller

Figure 9. Items Purchased Online in 2000 and 2010



communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to have purchased agricultural inputs online. Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are the group most likely to have purchased music or books online during the past year.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to have purchased motor vehicles, computer hardware or software, music or books, clothing/apparel, video/audio equipment, flowers, and housewares online during the past year. Older persons are more likely than younger persons to have purchased airline tickets and stocks/mutual funds during the past year.

Panhandle residents are the regional group most likely to have purchased airline tickets and stocks and mutual funds online during the past year.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to have purchased the following items online during the past year: airline tickets, computer hardware or software, music or books, clothing/apparel, video/audio equipment, stocks/mutual funds, flowers, and housewares.

Males are more likely than females to have purchased computer hardware or software, video/audio equipment, and stocks/mutual funds online during the past year. Females are more likely than males to have purchased clothing/apparel, flowers and housewares online.


Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to have purchased the following items online during the past year: airline tickets, computer hardware or software, music or books, clothing/apparel, video/audio equipment, stocks/mutual funds, flowers, and housewares.

Persons with management, professional or education occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to have purchased the following items online during the past year: computer hardware or software, music or books and stocks/mutual funds.

Persons with occupations in agriculture are the occupation group most likely to have purchased airline tickets and agricultural inputs online. Persons with healthcare support and public safety occupations are the group most likely to have purchased clothing/apparel and housewares online. Persons with production, transportation and warehousing occupations are the group most likely to have purchased services online and persons with construction, installation and maintenance occupations are the group most likely to have purchased video/audio equipment online.

When asked where their household normally purchased the items before they purchased them online, most rural Nebraskans (59%) had purchased them from a business in a nearby larger community (with a population of 5,000 or more) (Figure 10). Some had also purchased the items from a catalogue (27%) or from a business

Figure 10. Where Normally Purchased Items Before Purchasing Online



in their community (26%).

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to have normally purchased these items from a nearby larger community. At least 71 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 10,000 had normally purchased the items from a business in a nearby larger community, compared to 35 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more (Appendix Table 12). Persons living in or near smaller communities are also most likely to have normally purchased the items from a business in a nearby smaller community. Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to have normally purchased the items from a business in their community or say they didn't normally purchase the item. Thus, residents of larger communities are more likely to be substituting online purchases for local purchases; whereas residents of smaller communities are substituting online purchases for purchases typically made in larger retail centers.

Residents of the Panhandle are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to not have normally purchased the items before they purchased them online. Residents of the South Central region are the group most likely to have normally purchased the item from a business in their community.


Older persons are more likely than younger persons to have normally purchased the items from a business in their community or from a catalogue. Just over one-third (35%) of persons age 50 and older normally purchased the items from a catalogue before purchasing them online, compared to 17 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Many rural Nebraskans who make online purchases do so at least once a month (42%) (Figure 11). Just under one-half (46%) make online purchases several times a year. Rural Nebraskans make online purchases more frequently than they did ten years ago. In 2000, only 22 percent of the respondents made online purchases at least once a month. And, over one-quarter (28%) in 2000 made online purchases once a year or less, compared to 12 percent this year.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to have purchased items online more frequently (Appendix Table 13). Fifty-five percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more made online purchases at least once a month, compared to 30 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to have made online purchases more frequently during the past year. Forty-two percent of persons age 19 to 29 made online purchases at least once a month during the past

Figure 11. How Often Made Online Purchases During Past Year in 2000 and 2010



year, compared to 19 percent of persons age 65 and older.


Other groups most likely to have made online purchases at least once a month during the past year include persons with higher education levels and persons with occupations classified as other.

Finally, respondents were also asked approximately how much their household had spent on online purchases during the past year. Over one-half (53%) of rural Nebraskans who made online purchases during the past year spent \$500 or more on those purchases (Figure 12). Ten percent spent less than \$100 on their online purchases and over one-third (37%) spent between \$100 and \$499 on their household's online purchases during the past year.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to have spent more on online purchases during the past year (Appendix Table 14). Forty-four percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more spent at least \$1,000 on online purchases during the past year, compared to 14 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000.

Persons age 30 to 39 are the age group most likely to have spent at least \$1,000 on online

Figure 12. Amount Spent on Online Purchases During Past Year



purchases during the past year. Approximately one-third (34%) of persons age 30 to 39 spent at least \$1,000 on online purchases during the past year, compared to 16 percent of persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to have spent at least \$1,000 on online purchases include persons living in or near larger communities and persons with higher education levels. The occupation groups most likely to have spent at least \$1,000 on online purchases include: those classified as other; healthcare support and public safety; and management, professional or education.

Conclusion

Most rural Nebraskans characterize their communities as friendly, trusting and supportive. Many also say their community is very special to them and that they can be themselves in their community. One-half indicate it would be difficult for their household to move from their community.

Furthermore, most rural Nebraskans are planning to stay in their community next year. Only six percent are planning to move and eleven percent are uncertain of their plans to move.


Many differences are detected by community size. Residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community. The smaller community residents are also more likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Thus, smaller communities have positive attributes that can be marketed to potential new residents.

Most rural Nebraska households purchase the majority of their goods and services in their own community. However, households in smaller communities purchase a smaller

percentage of their goods and services in their own community as compared with those living in larger communities.

In addition to traditional retail shopping, most rural Nebraskans are purchasing goods and services online. Over two-thirds (68%) of rural Nebraska households made online purchases during the past year. In comparison, only 29 percent of rural Nebraskans had made online purchases in 2000. Items that were purchased most often online include: clothing/apparel, music and books, airline tickets, housewares, and computer hardware and software. Many purchased frequently during the year but did not spend much on these online purchases.

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska



■ Metropolitan counties (not surveyed)

Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents¹ Compared to 2000 Census

	2000 Census	2005 Poll	2006 Poll	2007 Poll	2008 Poll	2009 Poll	2010 Poll
Age : ²							
20 - 39	33%	34%	33%	31%	32%	32%	32%
40 - 64	42%	42%	43%	44%	44%	44%	44%
65 and over	24%	24%	24%	25%	24%	24%	24%
Gender: ³							
Female	51%	32%	30%	59%	56%	57%	59%
Male	49%	68%	70%	41%	44%	43%	41%
Education: ⁴							
Less than 9 th grade	7%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%
9 th to 12 th grade (no diploma)	10%	4%	4%	6%	3%	3%	3%
High school diploma (or equiv.)	35%	28%	28%	26%	26%	26%	25%
Some college, no degree	25%	24%	25%	23%	25%	25%	25%
Associate degree	7%	15%	13%	14%	12%	15%	14%
Bachelors degree	11%	17%	18%	18%	21%	20%	20%
Graduate or professional degree	4%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%
Household Income: ⁵							
Less than \$10,000	10%	7%	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	16%	12%	12%	13%	10%	9%	10%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	17%	15%	14%	15%	14%	13%	13%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	15%	16%	15%	14%	14%	13%	12%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	12%	15%	16%	13%	13%	12%	13%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	10%	12%	12%	12%	11%	13%	11%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	9%	10%	12%	11%	13%	14%	13%
\$75,000 or more	11%	14%	13%	16%	18%	21%	23%
Marital Status: ⁶							
Married	61%	72%	70%	70%	70%	68%	71%
Never married	22%	10%	11%	10%	10%	10%	9%
Divorced/separated	9%	10%	9%	10%	11%	11%	11%
Widowed/widower	8%	8%	10%	10%	9%	11%	9%

¹ Data from the Rural Polls have been weighted by age.

² 2000 Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

³ 2000 Census universe is total non-metro population.

⁴ 2000 Census universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

⁵ 2000 Census universe is all non-metro households.

⁶ 2000 Census universe is non-metro population 15 years of age and over.

Appendix Table 2. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say... My community has changed for the</i>				
	<u>Worse</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Better</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<u>Total</u>	24	51	26	
		<i>Percentages</i>		
<u>Community Size</u>		(n = 2510)		
Less than 500	24	58	18	
500 - 999	25	52	23	
1,000 - 4,999	21	52	27	$\chi^2 = 22.69^*$ (.004)
5,000 - 9,999	25	50	25	
10,000 and up	24	47	29	
<u>Region</u>		(n = 2545)		
Panhandle	31	50	19	
North Central	21	53	26	
South Central	25	45	30	$\chi^2 = 38.00^*$ (.000)
Northeast	20	54	26	
Southeast	23	56	21	
<u>Income Level</u>		(n = 2341)		
Under \$20,000	23	49	28	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	25	54	21	$\chi^2 = 26.51^*$ (.000)
\$40,000 - \$59,999	24	51	25	
\$60,000 and over	20	46	34	
<u>Age</u>		(n = 2559)		
19 - 29	17	59	24	
30 - 39	20	50	30	
40 - 49	27	50	23	$\chi^2 = 32.36^*$ (.000)
50 - 64	27	46	27	
65 and older	24	51	26	
<u>Gender</u>		(n = 2547)		
Male	25	53	23	$\chi^2 = 11.19^*$ (.004)
Female	22	50	28	
<u>Marital Status</u>		(n = 2551)		
Married	23	51	25	
Never married	20	48	32	
Divorced/separated	32	45	23	$\chi^2 = 20.60^*$ (.002)
Widowed	17	54	29	

Appendix Table 2 continued.

<i>Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say... My community has changed for the</i>				
	<i>Worse</i>	<i>No Change</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>
<u>Education</u>				
Less than H.S. diploma	23	49	28	$\chi^2 = 37.18^*$ (.000)
H.S. diploma	25	52	23	
Some college	26	53	22	
Bachelors or grad degree	19	47	34	
<u>Occupation</u> (n = 1817)				
Mgt, prof or education	23	49	29	$\chi^2 = 29.12^*$ (.010)
Sales or office support	25	51	24	
Constrn, inst or maint	27	49	24	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	33	48	20	
Agriculture	22	55	23	
Food serv/pers. care	20	47	33	
Hlthcare supp/safety	17	56	28	
Other	32	56	13	
<u>Yrs Lived in Community</u> (n = 2502)				
Five years or less	17	57	26	$\chi^2 = 12.00^*$ (.002)
More than five years	25	50	26	

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 3. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

	<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>			
	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Friendly</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>opinion</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>opinion</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	11	14	75		16	22	62		14	20	66	
Community Size	(n = 2502)				(n = 2435)				(n = 2419)			
Less than 500	13	12	74		15	19	66		13	18	69	
500 - 999	8	12	80		13	20	67		13	15	72	
1,000 - 4,999	11	15	74	$\chi^2 =$	14	23	63	$\chi^2 =$	12	19	69	$\chi^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	9	15	76	10.41	14	25	62	17.36*	14	22	65	12.89
10,000 and up	13	15	73	(.237)	19	23	58	(.027)	16	22	63	(.116)
Region	(n = 2534)				(n = 2462)				(n = 2450)			
Panhandle	11	12	78		13	22	65		13	20	67	
North Central	12	16	72		17	20	63		15	20	65	
South Central	11	14	75	$\chi^2 =$	14	25	60	$\chi^2 =$	12	21	67	$\chi^2 =$
Northeast	11	12	77	9.06	17	20	63	10.97	13	19	68	7.64
Southeast	12	17	71	(.338)	17	23	60	(.203)	17	18	65	(.470)
Individual Attributes	(n = 2335)				(n = 2284)				(n = 2272)			
Income Level	(n = 2335)				(n = 2284)				(n = 2272)			
Under \$20,000	13	19	68		16	26	58		13	25	62	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	15	73	$\chi^2 =$	16	25	59	$\chi^2 =$	16	18	66	$\chi^2 =$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	11	12	77	17.01*	15	23	62	14.21*	14	20	66	11.49
\$60,000 and over	9	12	79	(.009)	16	17	67	(.027)	13	18	70	(.074)
Age	(n = 2548)				(n = 2477)				(n = 2462)			
19 - 29	9	12	79		15	28	57		13	24	63	
30 - 39	15	11	74		18	18	64		15	18	67	
40 - 49	13	16	71	$\chi^2 =$	17	23	60	$\chi^2 =$	16	21	63	$\chi^2 =$
50 - 64	12	15	73	23.63*	17	22	61	25.30*	14	20	66	15.95*
65 and older	8	16	77	(.003)	11	21	68	(.001)	12	16	72	(.043)
Gender	(n = 2537)				(n = 2467)				(n = 2455)			
Male	11	12	77	$\chi^2 =$	16	20	65	$\chi^2 =$	13	18	69	$\chi^2 =$
Female	12	15	73	5.61	16	24	60	8.30*	14	21	65	5.47
				(.060)				(.016)				(.065)

Appendix Table 3 continued.

	<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>			
	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Friendly</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2538)				(n = 2470)				(n = 2455)			
Married	11	13	76		16	21	63		13	20	66	
Never married	11	13	76	$\chi^2 =$	12	25	64	$\chi^2 =$	12	15	72	$\chi^2 =$
Divorced/separated	13	20	67	18.17*	22	24	53	20.33*	19	21	61	10.37
Widowed	8	19	73	(.006)	11	28	61	(.002)	12	21	67	(.110)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2473)				(n = 2410)				(n = 2395)			
Less than H.S. diploma	4	16	80		8	28	65		8	17	76	
H.S. diploma	13	15	72	$\chi^2 =$	18	24	59	$\chi^2 =$	14	20	66	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	12	16	72	22.72*	17	24	59	24.57*	15	23	62	21.77*
Bachelors degree	9	11	80	(.001)	12	20	68	(.000)	12	16	71	(.001)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1829)				(n = 1808)				(n = 1797)			
Mgt, prof or education	10	12	78		14	21	65		12	18	70	
Sales or office support	10	14	76		15	26	59		17	21	62	
Constrn, inst or maint	13	11	76		20	20	59		13	17	71	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	17	15	68		27	26	47		18	32	49	
Agriculture	9	13	79	$\chi^2 =$	16	18	66	$\chi^2 =$	15	12	73	$\chi^2 =$
Food serv/pers. care	15	9	76	22.76	20	15	65	40.84*	17	18	65	40.58*
Hlthcare supp/safety	11	18	71	(.064)	11	23	66	(.000)	14	21	66	(.000)
Other	18	16	67		18	32	51		22	22	56	
<i>Yrs Lived in Comm.</i>	(n = 2493)				(n = 2428)				(n = 2418)			
Five years or less	14	12	74	$\chi^2 =$	17	23	59	$\chi^2 =$	16	21	63	$\chi^2 =$
More than five years	11	14	75	3.42	15	22	62	1.49	13	20	67	3.09
				(.181)				(.474)				(.213)

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 4. Level of Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

<i>Service/Amenity</i>	<i>Dissatisfied*</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied*</i>
		<i>Percentages</i>	
Entertainment	49	20	32
Retail shopping	48	11	41
Streets and roads	48	5	47
Restaurants	44	9	47
Arts/cultural activities	36	38	27
Local government	33	27	40
Public transportation services	29	53	18
Cellular phone service	26	14	60
Community recycling	25	22	54
Housing	22	19	59
Internet service	22	22	56
Law enforcement	21	14	65
Medical care services	20	14	67
Mental health services	19	59	23
Education (K - 12)	15	17	68
Parks and recreation	14	12	74
Child day care services	12	54	34
Nursing home care	12	42	46
Adult day care services	12	67	21
Sewage/waste disposal	11	24	65
Senior centers	7	46	47
Library services	7	20	73
Head Start programs	6	65	29
Religious organizations	5	24	71
Fire protection	4	11	85

* Dissatisfied represents the combined percentage of "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied" responses. Similarly, satisfied is the combination of "very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied" responses.

Appendix Table 5. Measures of Satisfaction with Ten Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

	Entertainment			Retail shopping			Streets and roads			Restaurants		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>											
Community Size	(n = 2544)			(n = 2552)			(n = 2552)			(n = 2563)		
Less than 500	40	31	30	39	21	40	44	6	50	36	19	46
500 - 999	50	26	24	51	16	34	44	6	51	54	8	38
1,000 - 4,999	54	18	29	52	11	38	50	6	44	49	9	42
5,000 - 9,999	56	16	28	57	9	35	48	3	49	49	6	45
10,000 and over	46	16	39	46	8	47	49	5	47	38	7	55
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 73.07^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 77.13^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 11.11 (.196)$			$\chi^2 = 84.72^* (.000)$		
Region	(n = 2578)			(n = 2587)			(n = 2590)			(n = 2597)		
Panhandle	50	20	29	54	11	35	62	5	33	40	8	53
North Central	52	20	28	51	11	38	49	7	45	42	13	45
South Central	43	18	39	42	11	47	42	5	53	43	9	48
Northeast	53	18	30	53	10	37	48	6	46	45	7	48
Southeast	52	23	25	47	12	41	47	4	49	47	11	42
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 36.06^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 27.53^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 42.27^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 20.78^* (.008)$		
Income Level	(n = 2379)			(n = 2382)			(n = 2380)			(n = 2392)		
Under \$20,000	42	27	31	40	14	45	47	6	47	36	16	49
\$20,000 - \$39,999	50	20	30	49	13	39	51	6	43	45	10	46
\$40,000 - \$59,999	53	18	30	49	10	41	49	5	46	46	9	45
\$60,000 and over	51	15	34	55	8	37	45	4	51	45	6	49
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 25.99^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 22.43^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 10.72 (.097)$			$\chi^2 = 30.24^* (.000)$		
Age	(n = 2590)			(n = 2599)			(n = 2602)			(n = 2608)		
19 - 29	62	13	25	53	12	35	50	9	42	48	9	43
30 - 39	57	15	28	53	11	36	52	4	44	50	7	44
40 - 49	54	15	32	54	10	36	54	5	41	49	10	41
50 - 64	49	19	33	48	11	41	48	4	48	44	8	48
65 and over	29	33	38	37	11	52	37	6	57	32	11	57
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 155.79^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 52.55^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 55.15^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 54.17^* (.000)$		
Education	(n = 2512)			(n = 2521)			(n = 2523)			(n = 2532)		
No H.S. diploma	35	35	30	31	19	50	38	11	51	35	14	51
High school diploma	44	24	32	42	14	45	48	6	46	38	11	50
Some college	55	19	26	53	12	36	53	6	41	49	9	42
College grad	48	15	37	51	8	42	43	3	53	44	7	49
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 54.63^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 44.91^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 38.56^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 28.58^* (.000)$		
Occupation	(n = 1852)			(n = 1856)			(n = 1845)			(n = 1859)		
Mgt, prof, education	57	14	29	56	8	37	50	3	47	49	7	45
Sales/office support	54	16	30	54	9	37	49	5	46	46	9	46
Const, inst or maint	47	27	27	45	12	43	45	11	44	37	8	55
Prodn/trans/warehs	62	13	25	55	13	33	54	3	43	46	11	44
Agriculture	37	25	38	37	14	49	47	4	50	42	6	52
Food serv/pers. care	56	11	32	48	13	40	50	5	46	46	7	47
Hlthcare supp/safety	53	15	32	53	10	37	57	3	40	48	10	42
Other	61	19	19	66	5	30	57	8	36	62	8	30
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 53.78^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 37.30^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 28.06^* (.014)$			$\chi^2 = 22.18 (.075)$		

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Only the ten services with the highest combined percentage of very or somewhat dissatisfied are included in this table.

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	<i>Arts/cultural activities</i>			<i>Local government</i>			<i>Public transportation</i>			<i>Cellular phone service</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>											
Community Size	(n = 2523)			(n = 2558)			(n = 2526)			(n = 2543)		
Less than 500	31	53	17	30	32	39	25	67	9	44	10	46
500 - 999	43	40	17	33	24	43	23	71	6	38	11	51
1,000 - 4,999	38	39	23	35	29	36	25	56	19	28	12	60
5,000 - 9,999	31	36	33	30	30	40	34	45	21	20	17	63
10,000 and over	36	30	34	35	23	42	34	45	22	17	15	68
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 94.14^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 21.63^* (.006)$			$\chi^2 = 109.61^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 125.58^* (.000)$		
Region	(n = 2559)			(n = 2590)			(n = 2561)			(n = 2574)		
Panhandle	35	36	30	37	21	42	43	42	16	30	14	56
North Central	38	40	22	36	29	35	27	52	21	28	12	60
South Central	31	37	32	33	23	44	24	56	20	20	14	67
Northeast	37	38	25	31	28	42	27	57	16	27	14	59
Southeast	42	38	20	34	34	32	33	51	16	32	15	53
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 32.57^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 34.09^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 49.77^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 33.49^* (.000)$		
Income Level	(n = 2362)			(n = 2387)			(n = 2359)			(n = 2381)		
Under \$20,000	27	43	29	28	33	39	29	43	28	23	26	52
\$20,000 - \$39,999	36	42	23	35	29	36	29	55	17	27	15	58
\$40,000 - \$59,999	40	38	23	35	26	38	30	53	16	27	9	64
\$60,000 and over	39	28	33	33	22	46	30	56	14	25	9	65
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 50.50^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 23.08^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 36.73^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 77.28^* (.000)$		
Age	(n = 2572)			(n = 2602)			(n = 2576)			(n = 2590)		
19 - 29	47	37	16	23	50	26	28	55	16	31	9	61
30 - 39	42	36	22	36	25	39	30	60	11	34	8	59
40 - 49	39	33	28	39	26	35	31	54	15	30	12	58
50 - 64	37	36	27	39	21	40	32	50	18	26	13	61
65 and over	19	46	35	28	18	54	23	49	28	13	24	63
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 116.83^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 196.83^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 68.16^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 121.01^* (.000)$		
Education	(n = 2496)			(n = 2527)			(n = 2498)			(n = 2515)		
No H.S. diploma	16	56	28	28	31	41	23	47	31	18	24	57
High school diploma	29	49	23	37	25	39	25	50	25	24	18	58
Some college	40	36	24	38	28	34	29	55	16	28	12	60
College grad	39	29	32	26	27	47	33	55	13	27	10	63
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 90.72^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 42.91^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 55.40^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 30.45^* (.000)$		
Occupation	(n = 1841)			(n = 1857)			(n = 1843)			(n = 1855)		
Mgt, prof, education	42	29	29	34	23	43	35	54	11	26	10	64
Sales/office support	39	38	23	38	30	32	25	58	17	27	12	61
Const, inst or maint	30	51	19	38	22	40	24	54	21	29	14	57
Prodn/trans/warehs	43	40	17	39	26	35	32	47	20	29	10	61
Agriculture	23	46	30	33	22	45	20	66	14	36	8	55
Food serv/pers. care	42	33	25	35	36	30	33	45	21	20	16	64
Hlthcare supp/safety	46	30	23	33	34	32	39	41	20	29	9	63
Other	45	39	16	41	27	32	32	59	10	36	13	52
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 66.39^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 34.53^* (.002)$			$\chi^2 = 60.05^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 24.17^* (.044)$		

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Only the ten services with the highest combined percentage of very or somewhat dissatisfied are included in this table.

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	<i>Community recycling</i>			<i>Housing</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>					
Community Size		(n = 2545)			(n = 2555)	
Less than 500	28	29	43	22	27	51
500 - 999	27	21	52	26	25	50
1,000 - 4,999	26	23	51	22	21	57
5,000 - 9,999	28	18	54	24	17	59
10,000 and over	22	19	60	20	14	66
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 34.52^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 50.96^* (.000)$	
Region		(n = 2581)			(n = 2586)	
Panhandle	30	18	52	28	19	54
North Central	29	25	47	28	23	49
South Central	19	19	62	21	15	64
Northeast	25	23	52	19	20	62
Southeast	31	23	47	20	24	57
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 45.05^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 42.47^* (.000)$	
Income Level		(n = 2379)			(n = 2377)	
Under \$20,000	20	25	55	23	23	55
\$20,000 - \$39,999	26	23	52	23	21	57
\$40,000 - \$59,999	26	21	54	22	20	58
\$60,000 and over	29	17	54	23	11	67
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 14.16^* (.028)$			$\chi^2 = 31.06^* (.000)$	
Age		(n = 2594)			(n = 2601)	
19 - 29	27	29	44	31	19	50
30 - 39	32	23	46	20	18	61
40 - 49	28	20	52	25	19	56
50 - 64	23	18	59	22	19	59
65 and over	18	20	62	14	20	67
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 61.49^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 51.52^* (.000)$	
Education		(n = 2515)			(n = 2520)	
No H.S. diploma	13	27	60	10	25	65
High school diploma	19	23	58	22	23	54
Some college	27	25	49	25	22	54
College grad	30	16	55	20	12	68
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 50.85^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 62.25^* (.000)$	
Occupation		(n = 1849)			(n = 1850)	
Mgt, prof, education	32	19	49	23	14	63
Sales/office support	27	23	50	24	22	55
Const, inst or maint	23	26	52	22	21	57
Prodn/trans/warehs	20	26	55	28	21	52
Agriculture	19	26	55	14	29	58
Food serv/pers. care	22	18	60	35	9	56
Hlthcare supp/safety	28	17	55	24	16	60
Other	36	18	47	38	16	47
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 33.46^* (.002)$			$\chi^2 = 57.96^* (.000)$	

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Only the ten services with the highest combined percentage of very or somewhat dissatisfied are included in this table.

Appendix Table 6. Feelings About Community by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes

	<i>My community is very special to me.</i>			<i>No other place can compare to my community.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	
Total	10	23	68	32	34	34	
	<i>Percentages</i>						
Community Size		(n = 2645)			(n = 2630)		
Less than 500	8	21	71	23	37	39	
500 - 999	6	16	78	29	29	42	
1,000 - 4,999	9	22	69	31	32	38	
5,000 - 9,999	10	30	60	36	38	27	$\chi^2 = 43.26^*$
10,000 and up	12	23	65	36	34	30	(.000)
Region		(n = 2678)			(n = 2665)		
Panhandle	13	21	66	41	30	29	
North Central	11	22	67	36	29	35	
South Central	8	23	69	29	33	38	
Northeast	9	23	68	32	35	34	$\chi^2 = 28.46^*$
Southeast	9	23	67	29	38	33	(.000)
Income Level		(n = 2458)			(n = 2449)		
Under \$20,000	9	23	68	24	35	42	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	8	20	72	33	32	36	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	11	25	64	34	33	33	$\chi^2 = 29.11^*$
\$60,000 and over	11	22	67	36	36	28	(.000)
Age		(n = 2694)			(n = 2679)		
19 - 29	12	30	59	37	34	29	
30 - 39	11	20	68	36	32	32	
40 - 49	11	25	64	37	34	29	
50 - 64	10	24	66	33	35	33	$\chi^2 = 66.08^*$
65 and older	5	15	80	21	33	46	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2683)			(n = 2666)		
Male	9	22	68	31	33	35	$\chi^2 = 0.73$
Female	10	23	68	33	34	34	(.694)
Marital Status		(n = 2686)			(n = 2667)		
Married	10	21	69	33	34	34	
Never married	9	28	63	31	33	35	
Divorced/separated	11	30	59	36	38	27	$\chi^2 = 30.78^*$
Widowed	6	18	77	22	29	49	(.000)
Education		(n = 2606)			(n = 2592)		
Less than H.S. diploma	7	19	74	18	33	49	
H.S. diploma	8	23	68	28	30	41	
Some college	9	22	68	34	33	33	$\chi^2 = 43.29^*$
Bachelors degree	11	23	66	34	38	29	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1907)			(n = 1905)		
Mgt, prof, education	10	24	66	37	34	29	
Sales/office support	9	23	68	32	36	32	
Const, inst or maint	7	26	68	33	30	37	
Prodn/trans/warehs	14	32	54	41	28	31	
Agriculture	6	19	76	24	40	36	
Food serv/pers. care	12	23	65	37	28	36	
Hlthcare supp/safety	15	22	63	41	31	28	$\chi^2 = 28.31^*$
Other	17	23	61	42	31	27	(.013)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 2536)			(n = 2521)		
Five years or less	12	35	53	41	38	21	$\chi^2 = 35.36^*$
More than five years	10	20	70	31	33	36	(.000)

Appendix Table 6 continued.

	<i>I feel I can really be myself in my community.</i>			<i>My community is the best place to live.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	
Total	18	22	60	25	33	42	
	<i>Percentages</i>						
Community Size		(n = 2611)			(n = 2597)		
Less than 500	15	21	63	21	30	49	
500 - 999	14	24	62	20	34	46	
1,000 - 4,999	20	19	61	24	31	45	
5,000 - 9,999	18	24	59	29	34	37	$\chi^2 = 23.82^*$
10,000 and up	18	24	58	28	34	38	(.002)
Region		(n = 2643)			(n = 2631)		
Panhandle	22	21	58	32	27	41	
North Central	20	21	59	25	32	44	
South Central	17	23	60	23	31	46	
Northeast	16	25	60	25	36	40	$\chi^2 = 17.56^*$
Southeast	15	19	65	26	34	40	(.025)
Income Level		(n = 2432)			(n = 2415)		
Under \$20,000	18	20	63	23	29	48	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	17	23	61	24	33	42	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	19	23	58	28	33	39	$\chi^2 = 10.32$
\$60,000 and over	18	20	62	26	34	41	(.112)
Age		(n = 2658)			(n = 2644)		
19 - 29	22	24	54	34	37	30	
30 - 39	21	21	58	28	33	39	
40 - 49	20	22	58	28	35	37	
50 - 64	19	25	56	25	33	42	$\chi^2 = 120.34^*$
65 and older	9	19	72	14	27	60	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2648)			(n = 2631)		
Male	16	23	62	24	34	42	$\chi^2 = 2.46$
Female	19	22	59	26	31	43	(.292)
Marital Status		(n = 2649)			(n = 2632)		
Married	18	23	60	25	32	43	
Never married	16	19	65	24	39	37	
Divorced/separated	24	25	52	33	37	30	$\chi^2 = 47.32^*$
Widowed	12	19	70	16	26	58	(.000)
Education		(n = 2574)			(n = 2559)		
Less than H.S. diploma	10	27	63	14	36	50	
H.S. diploma	16	21	63	22	31	47	
Some college	19	22	60	28	32	41	$\chi^2 = 16.83^*$
Bachelors degree	18	23	59	26	33	41	(.010)
Occupation		(n = 1892)			(n = 1884)		
Mgt, prof, education	20	23	57	28	32	40	
Sales/office support	19	24	58	29	35	36	
Const, inst or maint	20	21	60	26	38	36	
Prodn/trans/warehse	23	25	52	32	39	29	
Agriculture	10	21	69	16	38	46	
Food serv/pers. care	22	19	58	28	28	44	
Hlthcare supp/safety	21	25	54	33	29	38	$\chi^2 = 33.04^*$
Other	24	23	53	30	35	35	(.003)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 2504)			(n = 2491)		
Five years or less	24	28	48	34	39	27	$\chi^2 = 47.67^*$
More than five years	17	21	62	24	32	45	(.000)

<i>I really miss my community when I am away too long.</i>				<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	
Total	25	31	45	
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Size		(n = 2632)		
Less than 500	20	32	49	
500 - 999	19	32	49	
1,000 - 4,999	24	31	46	
5,000 - 9,999	27	31	42	$\chi^2 = 21.61^*$
10,000 and up	29	29	42	(.006)
Region		(n = 2665)		
Panhandle	30	26	44	
North Central	24	33	43	
South Central	25	29	46	
Northeast	24	31	45	$\chi^2 = 9.92$
Southeast	23	33	44	(.271)
Income Level		(n = 2451)		
Under \$20,000	20	33	47	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	23	27	50	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	26	32	42	$\chi^2 = 24.84^*$
\$60,000 and over	30	31	39	(.000)
Age		(n = 2677)		
19 - 29	33	28	39	
30 - 39	27	31	42	
40 - 49	30	32	38	
50 - 64	25	32	43	$\chi^2 = 90.78^*$
65 and older	13	29	58	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2667)		
Male	24	31	46	$\chi^2 = 1.11$
Female	26	30	44	(.574)
Marital Status		(n = 2669)		
Married	25	31	44	
Never married	27	32	42	
Divorced/separated	31	29	40	$\chi^2 = 26.37^*$
Widowed	14	28	58	(.000)
Education		(n = 2594)		
Less than H.S. diploma	16	32	52	
H.S. diploma	21	32	47	
Some college	27	32	42	$\chi^2 = 18.83^*$
Bachelors degree	27	28	45	(.004)
Occupation		(n = 1903)		
Mgt, prof, education	30	30	40	
Sales/office support	29	32	39	
Const, inst or maint	28	21	51	
Prodn/trans/warehs	33	33	35	
Agriculture	16	34	50	
Food serv/pers. care	21	35	43	
Hlthcare supp/safety	32	26	43	$\chi^2 = 37.05^*$
Other	26	35	39	(.001)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 2522)		
Five years or less	35	35	30	$\chi^2 = 44.63^*$
More than five years	24	29	47	(.000)

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 7. Opinions About Leaving Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

Assume you were to have a discussion in your household about leaving your community for a reasonably good opportunity elsewhere. How easy or difficult would it be for your household to leave your community?

	Easy	Neutral	Difficult	Chi-square (sig.)
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Total	32	18	50	
Community Size		(n = 2642)		
Less than 500	25	20	55	
500 - 999	24	22	54	
1,000 - 4,999	32	16	52	
5,000 - 9,999	38	19	43	$\chi^2 = 29.92^*$
10,000 and up	35	16	49	(.000)
Region		(n = 2673)		
Panhandle	38	18	44	
North Central	33	22	45	
South Central	30	16	54	
Northeast	33	16	51	$\chi^2 = 21.96^*$
Southeast	29	20	51	(.005)
Income Level		(n = 2455)		
Under \$20,000	32	17	51	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	33	18	50	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	33	18	49	$\chi^2 = 0.38$
\$60,000 and over	33	17	50	(.999)
Age		(n = 2687)		
19 - 29	37	21	42	
30 - 39	33	16	52	
40 - 49	39	16	45	
50 - 64	32	19	49	$\chi^2 = 70.05^*$
65 and older	21	17	62	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2677)		
Male	31	17	52	$\chi^2 = 1.41$
Female	33	18	49	(.495)
Marital Status		(n = 2679)		
Married	31	18	52	
Never married	31	24	46	
Divorced/separated	49	15	36	$\chi^2 = 59.07^*$
Widowed	23	17	59	(.000)
Education		(n = 2598)		
Less than H.S. diploma	23	17	60	
H.S. diploma	27	20	53	
Some college	36	17	47	$\chi^2 = 20.18^*$
Bachelors degree	32	17	51	(.003)
Occupation		(n = 1910)		
Mgt, prof, education	35	17	48	
Sales/office support	38	14	48	
Const, inst or maint	27	20	54	
Prodn/trans/warehs	43	13	44	
Agriculture	23	21	56	
Food serv/pers. care	33	17	50	
Hlthcare supp/safety	34	20	46	$\chi^2 = 27.61^*$
Other	39	17	44	(.016)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 2526)		
Five years or less	47	22	32	$\chi^2 = 71.03^*$
More than five years	29	17	54	(.000)

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 8. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

	<i>Do you plan to leave your community in the next year?</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>If yes, where do you plan to move?</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>		<i>Lincoln/Omaha metro areas</i>	<i>Some other place in NE</i>	<i>Some place other than Nebraska</i>	
Total	6	83	11		14	55	31	
Community Size	(n = 2651)				(n = 146)			
Less than 500	4	88	9		0	85	15	
500 - 999	5	88	8		8	85	8	
1,000 - 4,999	6	83	11		7	60	33	
5,000 - 9,999	10	78	12	$\chi^2 = 26.46^*$	30	33	36	$\chi^2 = 22.30^*$
10,000 and up	5	81	14	(.001)	14	48	38	(.004)
Region	(n = 2686)				(n = 145)			
Panhandle	9	80	11		7	55	38	
North Central	5	82	13		0	60	40	
South Central	5	83	12		16	61	24	
Northeast	5	86	10	$\chi^2 = 15.88^*$	35	39	27	$\chi^2 = 15.48$
Southeast	7	83	10	(.044)	13	63	25	(.050)
Income Level	(n = 2465)				(n = 138)			
Under \$20,000	8	75	17		13	65	23	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	5	83	12		4	64	32	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	6	84	10	$\chi^2 = 18.88^*$	29	53	18	$\chi^2 = 22.80^*$
\$60,000 and over	6	84	10	(.004)	3	42	55	(.001)
Age	(n = 2703)				(n = 146)			
19 - 29	13	66	21		20	66	14	
30 - 39	6	80	13		7	63	30	
40 - 49	5	84	11		10	33	57	
50 - 64	4	88	9	$\chi^2 = 135.17^*$	24	33	43	$\chi^2 = 22.83^*$
65 and older	3	91	6	(.000)	6	67	28	(.004)
Gender	(n = 2690)				(n = 146)			
Male	5	84	11	$\chi^2 = 2.35$	18	48	34	$\chi^2 = 1.58$
Female	6	82	11	(.309)	13	58	29	(.454)
Marital Status	(n = 2691)				(n = 146)			
Married	5	85	10		14	52	34	
Never married	6	76	18		0	50	50	
Divorced/separated	10	68	22	$\chi^2 = 69.82^*$	24	55	21	$\chi^2 = 9.49$
Widowed	5	90	6	(.000)	9	82	9	(.148)
Education	(n = 2614)				(n = 143)			
Less than H.S. diploma	2	85	13		0**	100**	0**	
H.S. diploma	4	84	12		30	47	23	
Some college	6	82	13	$\chi^2 = 12.29$	4	63	33	$\chi^2 = 14.15^*$
Bachelors degree	7	83	10	(.056)	19	48	33	(.028)
Occupation	(n = 1905)				(n = 107)			
Mgt, prof, education	6	84	10		13	46	41	
Sales/office support	7	77	16		31	38	31	
Const, inst or maint	4	89	7		17**	83**	0**	
Prodn/trans/warehs	9	75	16		50	29	21	
Agriculture	5	92	3		0**	75**	25**	
Food serv/pers. care	4	79	17		0**	100**	0**	
Hlthcare supp/safety	7	80	13	$\chi^2 = 47.01^*$	8	46	46	$\chi^2 = 26.87^*$
Other	8	72	20	(.000)	20**	60**	20**	(.020)
Yrs Lived in Comm.	(n = 2538)				(n = 142)			
Five years or less	13	67	20	$\chi^2 = 88.11^*$	10	64	27	$\chi^2 = 2.58$
More than five years	5	86	10	(.000)	18	51	31	(.275)

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

** Note: Row percentages are calculated using a row total that contains less than 10 respondents.

Appendix Table 9. Percentage of Goods and Services Purchased in Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Approximately what percentage of the retail goods and services your household bought during the past year were purchased in your own community (or nearest community if you live in the country)?</i>						
	<i>None</i>	<i>1% to 24%</i>	<i>25% to 49%</i>	<i>50% to 74%</i>	<i>75% to 100%</i>	<i>Significance</i>
<u>Total</u>	3	20	17	29	31	
	<i>Percentages</i>					
<u>Community Size</u>			(n = 2641)			
Less than 500	14	35	14	23	13	$\chi^2 =$ 808.13* (.000)
500 - 999	1	46	21	19	13	
1,000 - 4,999	3	27	24	29	17	
5,000 - 9,999	1	14	19	40	27	
10,000 and up	1	4	11	29	56	
<u>Region</u>			(n = 2678)			
Panhandle	4	17	14	30	35	$\chi^2 =$ 71.38* (.000)
North Central	3	15	19	34	30	
South Central	2	21	15	25	37	
Northeast	2	23	18	27	30	
Southeast	6	19	21	33	22	
<u>Income Level</u>			(n = 2458)			
Under \$20,000	6	19	14	22	39	$\chi^2 =$ 58.94* (.000)
\$20,000 - \$39,999	4	20	15	29	31	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	3	22	17	28	30	
\$60,000 and over	1	18	22	33	27	
<u>Age</u>			(n = 2688)			
19 - 29	4	24	21	28	25	$\chi^2 =$ 85.76* (.000)
30 - 39	4	26	14	31	25	
40 - 49	2	24	19	28	27	
50 - 64	3	16	17	31	33	
65 and older	3	15	14	26	43	
<u>Education</u>			(n = 2601)			
Less than H.S. diploma	9	11	18	22	41	$\chi^2 =$ 49.01* (.000)
H.S. diploma	3	18	14	30	36	
Some college	4	23	17	27	30	
Bachelors or grad degree	2	20	20	31	28	
<u>Occupation</u>			(n = 1904)			
Mgt, prof or education	1	17	19	32	31	$\chi^2 =$ 101.02* (.000)
Sales or office support	0.4	26	12	28	34	
Constrn, inst or maint	4	19	20	23	35	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	8	20	13	30	29	
Agriculture	3	31	13	36	17	
Food serv/pers. care	4	16	22	22	36	
Hlthcare supp/safety	3	26	21	26	24	
Other	5	26	11	31	28	

Appendix Table 10. Purchased Goods and Services Online During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Has anyone in your household used the Internet to purchase goods or services online during the past year?</i>			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	68	32	
<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Size		(n = 2661)	
Less than 500	59	41	
500 - 999	65	35	
1,000 - 4,999	68	32	$\chi^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	70	30	23.23*
10,000 and up	73	27	(.000)
Region		(n = 2700)	
Panhandle	73	27	
North Central	69	32	
South Central	67	33	$\chi^2 =$
Northeast	68	32	5.51
Southeast	66	35	(.239)
Income Level		(n = 2473)	
Under \$20,000	35	65	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	56	44	$\chi^2 =$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	82	18	483.84*
\$60,000 and over	92	8	(.000)
Age		(n = 2714)	
19 - 29	83	17	
30 - 39	87	13	
40 - 49	80	20	$\chi^2 =$
50 - 64	71	29	567.72*
65 and older	31	69	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2703)	
Male	65	35	$\chi^2 =$
Female	70	30	6.46*
			(.012)
Marital Status		(n = 2703)	
Married	77	23	
Never married	54	46	$\chi^2 =$
Divorced/separated	61	39	322.74*
Widowed	24	76	(.000)
Education		(n = 2623)	
Less than HS diploma	21	80	
H.S. diploma	45	55	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	76	25	436.37*
Bachelors degree	86	14	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1910)	
Mgt, prof or education	89	11	
Sales or office support	83	17	
Constrn, inst or maint	68	32	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	69	31	
Agriculture	67	33	$\chi^2 =$
Food serv/pers. care	67	33	102.34*
Hlthcare supp/safety	87	13	(.000)
Other	73	27	

Appendix Table 11. Items Purchased Online During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>What types of items were purchased online (using the Internet) during the past year?</i>							
	<i>Airline tickets</i>	<i>Motor vehicles</i>	<i>Computer hardware or software</i>	<i>Food</i>	<i>Music or books</i>	<i>Services (e.g., legal advice)</i>	<i>Clothing/apparel</i>
<i>Percent answering "yes" to each</i>							
Total	40	6	36	8	58	5	70
Community Size	(n = 1817)	(n = 1815)	(n = 1815)	(n = 1815)	(n = 1817)	(n = 1814)	(n = 1816)
Less than 500	21	3	29	5	48	4	70
500 - 999	40	6	38	8	63	4	69
1,000 - 4,999	39	4	33	9	58	4	74
5,000 - 9,999	40	6	41	6	58	5	72
10,000 and up	48	6	39	9	60	5	68
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.245)	(.012)*	(.248)	(.023)*	(.949)	(.197)
Region	(n = 1830)	(n = 1828)	(n = 1828)	(n = 1826)	(n = 1827)	(n = 1829)	(n = 1828)
Panhandle	45	6	43	8	65	6	67
North Central	37	3	31	10	58	3	69
South Central	41	7	37	8	56	6	70
Northeast	43	6	35	7	60	4	71
Southeast	33	6	37	6	55	4	73
<i>Significance</i>	(.032)*	(.353)	(.062)	(.688)	(.137)	(.435)	(.617)
Income Level	(n = 1736)	(n = 1733)	(n = 1732)	(n = 1731)	(n = 1733)	(n = 1731)	(n = 1732)
Under \$20,000	21	7	29	7	56	8	56
\$20,000 - \$39,999	28	5	31	7	54	6	66
\$40,000 - \$59,999	36	5	33	7	53	4	69
\$60,000 and over	60	8	47	10	68	4	81
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.086)	(.000)*	(.223)	(.000)*	(.153)	(.000)*
Age	(n = 1840)	(n = 1836)	(n = 1839)	(n = 1837)	(n = 1837)	(n = 1838)	(n = 1837)
19 - 29	29	6	35	5	59	6	79
30 - 39	40	7	41	8	66	5	78
40 - 49	41	7	39	10	59	4	73
50 - 64	49	4	34	8	54	4	64
65 and older	40	2	29	8	45	4	50
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.021)*	(.024)*	(.118)	(.000)*	(.496)	(.000)*
Gender	(n = 1835)	(n = 1835)	(n = 1835)	(n = 1834)	(n = 1834)	(n = 1834)	(n = 1835)
Male	41	6	39	7	57	6	65
Female	40	6	34	9	58	4	74
<i>Significance</i>	(.256)	(.532)	(.024)*	(.059)	(.345)	(.031)*	(.000)*
Education	(n = 1794)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1790)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)
Less than H.S. diploma	33	9	30	4	30	0	65
H.S. diploma	30	6	30	7	44	5	60
Some college	35	6	35	8	54	5	72
Bachelors degree	51	6	41	8	69	4	74
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.912)	(.003)*	(.843)	(.000)*	(.497)	(.000)*
Occupation	(n = 1517)	(n = 1516)	(n = 1517)	(n = 1519)	(n = 1518)	(n = 1517)	(n = 1518)
Mgt, prof or education	47	5	43	10	67	4	78
Sales or office support	36	6	30	5	47	3	68
Constrn, inst or maint	37	3	37	3	53	3	54
Prodn/trans/warehsing	21	7	37	5	49	13	61
Agriculture	48	5	35	8	58	1	74
Food serv/pers. care	27	5	36	11	60	8	72
Hlthcare supp/safety	43	8	34	6	61	4	81
Other	45	11	40	21	60	4	60
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.667)	(.036)*	(.002)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.000)*

Note: Only respondents whose households have made online purchases during the past year answered this question.

Appendix Table 11 continued.

<i>What types of items were purchased online (using the Internet) during the past year?</i>						
	<i>Video/audio equipment</i>	<i>Stocks, mutual funds</i>	<i>Flowers</i>	<i>Agricultural inputs</i>	<i>Housewares</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>Percent answering "yes" to each</i>						
Total	31	7	14	6	39	24
Community Size	(n = 1816)	(n = 1818)	(n = 1817)	(n = 1816)	(n = 1816)	(n = 1816)
Less than 500	29	7	10	14	33	29
500 - 999	23	5	13	4	44	26
1,000 - 4,999	34	5	12	7	41	26
5,000 - 9,999	28	6	16	4	37	22
10,000 and up	33	9	16	3	40	22
Significance	(.046)*	(.032)*	(.085)	(.000)*	(.199)	(.213)
Region	(n = 1828)	(n = 1827)	(n = 1827)	(n = 1828)	(n = 1827)	(n = 1828)
Panhandle	34	10	13	4	39	23
North Central	32	3	15	6	43	28
South Central	29	7	16	6	37	24
Northeast	33	7	11	4	42	21
Southeast	30	6	15	8	37	26
Significance	(.574)	(.025)*	(.217)	(.125)	(.344)	(.294)
Income Level	(n = 1734)	(n = 1733)	(n = 1732)	(n = 1733)	(n = 1733)	(n = 1732)
Under \$20,000	29	4	8	4	25	18
\$20,000 - \$39,999	33	2	9	7	38	27
\$40,000 - \$59,999	29	5	14	6	37	27
\$60,000 and over	37	15	19	6	48	19
Significance	(.027)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.666)	(.000)*	(.001)*
Age	(n = 1837)	(n = 1838)	(n = 1837)	(n = 1837)	(n = 1836)	(n = 1837)
19 - 29	35	4	12	3	39	19
30 - 39	36	9	18	7	44	23
40 - 49	37	7	16	5	45	26
50 - 64	25	7	13	8	35	28
65 and older	14	7	11	4	27	24
Significance	(.000)*	(.046)*	(.048)*	(.012)*	(.000)*	(.039)*
Gender	(n = 1834)	(n = 1834)	(n = 1834)	(n = 1835)	(n = 1836)	(n = 1835)
Male	34	11	11	6	34	23
Female	29	4	16	5	43	25
Significance	(.018)*	(.000)*	(.004)*	(.171)	(.000)*	(.158)
Education	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)	(n = 1791)
Less than H.S. diploma	17	0	4	0	26	17
H.S. diploma	25	3	6	3	31	29
Some college	31	5	16	7	41	25
Bachelors degree	34	11	16	5	41	22
Significance	(.018)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.072)	(.008)*	(.098)
Occupation	(n = 1518)	(n = 1518)	(n = 1518)	(n = 1517)	(n = 1519)	(n = 1517)
Mgt, prof or education	36	11	18	5	44	25
Sales or office support	24	5	14	4	39	29
Constrn, inst or maint	42	7	10	5	27	22
Prodn/trans/warehsing	35	6	13	3	30	20
Agriculture	21	4	9	14	39	23
Food serv/pers. care	34	6	3	4	38	23
Hlthcare supp/safety	37	3	18	8	49	21
Other	23	2	23	6	35	38
Significance	(.000)*	(.002)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.002)*	(.165)

Note: Only respondents whose households have made online purchases during the past year answered this question.

Appendix Table 12. Where Normally Purchased Items Before Purchasing Online by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Where did your household normally purchase the item(s) noted in Q13 before you purchased it online?</i>						
	<i>Didn't normally purchase this item</i>	<i>From business in our community</i>	<i>From business in nearby community (with population less than 5,000)</i>	<i>From business in nearby community (with population of 5,000 or more)</i>	<i>From a catalogue</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>Percent answering "yes" to each</i>						
Total	12	26	6	59	27	6
Community Size	(n = 1780)	(n = 1782)	(n = 1781)	(n = 1782)	(n = 1782)	(n = 1782)
Less than 500	5	9	20	71	25	5
500 - 999	7	4	10	78	26	7
1,000 - 4,999	10	14	7	75	27	5
5,000 - 9,999	17	25	1	71	27	8
10,000 and up	14	47	2	35	28	7
<i>Significance</i>	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.000)*	(.917)	(.542)
Region	(n = 1794)	(n = 1793)	(n = 1793)	(n = 1793)	(n = 1793)	(n = 1792)
Panhandle	19	25	4	52	32	9
North Central	8	24	9	58	34	8
South Central	12	31	5	54	27	5
Northeast	12	28	6	60	23	7
Southeast	10	19	9	76	23	5
<i>Significance</i>	(.006)*	(.002)*	(.015)*	(.000)*	(.003)*	(.131)
Income Level	(n = 1701)	(n = 1702)	(n = 1701)	(n = 1701)	(n = 1701)	(n = 1701)
Under \$20,000	15	24	7	50	20	9
\$20,000 - \$39,999	11	25	5	61	31	8
\$40,000 - \$59,999	11	27	7	59	25	5
\$60,000 and over	12	28	3	63	28	6
<i>Significance</i>	(.706)	(.547)	(.054)	(.050)	(.050)	(.230)
Age	(n = 1802)	(n = 1801)	(n = 1803)	(n = 1804)	(n = 1803)	(n = 1804)
19 - 29	14	28	5	58	17	7
30 - 39	13	24	5	64	24	7
40 - 49	12	20	7	63	26	5
50 - 64	10	32	7	56	35	7
65 and older	12	30	9	50	35	8
<i>Significance</i>	(.406)	(.001)*	(.193)	(.004)*	(.000)*	(.617)
Gender	(n = 1799)	(n = 1800)	(n = 1800)	(n = 1800)	(n = 1800)	(n = 1799)
Male	14	29	5	58	28	6
Female	11	25	7	61	27	7
<i>Significance</i>	(.032)*	(.039)*	(.160)	(.105)	(.350)	(.242)
Education	(n = 1759)	(n = 1759)	(n = 1759)	(n = 1758)	(n = 1759)	(n = 1759)
Less than H.S. diploma	5	39	13	46	18	13
H.S. diploma	14	27	7	54	23	9
Some college	12	23	6	61	27	4
Bachelors degree	11	30	6	61	29	7
<i>Significance</i>	(.323)	(.019)*	(.367)	(.094)	(.163)	(.009)*
Occupation	(n = 1491)	(n = 1494)	(n = 1493)	(n = 1493)	(n = 1496)	(n = 1496)
Mgt, prof or education	11	29	6	59	33	7
Sales or office support	8	26	5	64	22	4
Constrn, inst or maint	20	22	9	52	26	13
Prodn/trans/warehsing	17	27	4	58	21	2
Agriculture	13	20	11	70	34	3
Food serv/pers. care	13	36	4	47	21	10
Hlthcare supp/safety	11	20	3	67	20	6
Other	13	25	6	58	17	8
<i>Significance</i>	(.077)	(.041)*	(.070)	(.005)*	(.000)*	(.004)*

Note: Only respondents whose households have made online purchases during the past year answered this question.

Appendix Table 13. How Often Made Online Purchases During Past Year by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

How often did your household make purchases online during the past year?							
	<i>More than once a week</i>	<i>About once a week</i>	<i>Two to three times a month</i>	<i>About once a month</i>	<i>Several times a year</i>	<i>Once a year or less</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Total	1	4	14	23	46	12	
<i>Percentages</i>							
Community Size	(n = 1784)						
Less than 500	1	2	15	19	52	11	
500 - 999	2	4	11	30	43	9	$\chi^2 =$
1,000 - 4,999	2	4	13	23	50	9	29.76
5,000 - 9,999	0	5	16	23	42	15	(.074)
10,000 and up	2	4	15	22	44	13	
Region	(n = 1794)						
Panhandle	0.4	6	15	23	44	12	
North Central	0	4	18	23	45	11	$\chi^2 =$
South Central	2	4	11	22	49	12	30.33
Northeast	1	3	14	21	49	12	(.065)
Southeast	2	4	16	26	40	12	
Income Level	(n = 1704)						
Under \$20,000	4	2	17	7	46	23	$\chi^2 =$
\$20,000 - \$39,999	1	3	13	22	45	16	120.22*
\$40,000 - \$59,999	1	3	9	23	52	12	(.000)
\$60,000 and over	1	6	21	27	40	5	
Age	(n = 1803)						
19 - 29	2	4	17	19	43	15	
30 - 39	1	6	15	32	42	5	$\chi^2 =$
40 - 49	1	4	16	25	46	8	118.66*
50 - 64	1	3	12	22	50	12	(.000)
65 and older	1	2	7	9	55	27	
Education	(n = 1756)						
Less than H.S. diploma	0	5	9	14	41	32	
H.S. diploma	0	2	10	16	55	17	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	2	2	13	22	49	12	81.85*
Bachelors or grad degree	1	6	17	26	41	8	(.000)
Occupation	(n = 1496)						
Mgt, prof or education	1	6	18	25	43	7	
Sales or office support	0.4	1	11	21	56	11	
Constrn, inst or maint	1	2	9	17	58	13	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	0	3	7	19	60	11	
Agriculture	0	3	15	27	45	11	$\chi^2 =$
Food serv/pers. care	1	2	16	14	52	16	123.86*
Hlthcare supp/safety	0	6	17	27	34	18	(.000)
Other	10	6	15	19	38	13	

Note: Only respondents whose households have made online purchases during the past year answered this question.

Appendix Table 14. Amount Spent on Online Purchases During Past Twelve Months by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Approximately how much did your household spend on online purchases during the past twelve months?</i>						
	<i>Less than \$100</i>	<i>\$100 – \$499</i>	<i>\$500 - \$999</i>	<i>\$1,000 or more</i>	<i>Significance</i>	
Total	10	37	26	27		
<i>Percentages</i>						
Community Size		(n = 1778)				
Less than 500	11	45	25	19	$\chi^2 = 23.15^*$ (.026)	
500 - 999	13	33	26	28		
1,000 - 4,999	8	41	25	26		
5,000 - 9,999	8	37	26	28		
10,000 and up	11	32	28	29		
Region		(n = 1786)				
Panhandle	6	37	28	30	$\chi^2 = 12.00$ (.446)	
North Central	8	40	22	31		
South Central	11	37	26	27		
Northeast	11	35	27	26		
Southeast	10	39	26	25		
Income Level		(n = 1697)				
Under \$20,000	22	50	13	14	$\chi^2 = 172.10^*$ (.000)	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	45	24	19		
\$40,000 - \$59,999	10	41	26	23		
\$60,000 and over	4	22	29	44		
Age		(n = 1796)				
19 - 29	11	43	22	24	$\chi^2 = 56.26^*$ (.000)	
30 - 39	6	31	30	34		
40 - 49	9	36	26	29		
50 - 64	9	38	27	26		
65 and older	19	41	24	16		
Education		(n = 1751)				
Less than H.S. diploma	36	41	18	5	$\chi^2 = 106.95^*$ (.000)	
H.S. diploma	17	49	17	18		
Some college	11	38	27	25		
Bachelors or grad degree	5	32	28	35		
Occupation		(n = 1489)				
Mgt, prof or education	6	32	29	34	$\chi^2 = 74.99^*$ (.000)	
Sales or office support	12	41	24	23		
Constrn, inst or maint	10	52	19	19		
Prodn/trans/warehsing	12	50	20	18		
Agriculture	6	36	28	30		
Food serv/pers. care	17	43	28	12		
Hlthcare supp/safety	7	34	25	34		
Other	15	25	25	35		

Note: Only respondents whose households have made online purchases during the past year answered this question.

CARI Research Report 10-2, October 2010

It is the policy of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln not to discriminate on the basis of sex, age, disability, race, color, religion, marital status, veteran's status, national or ethnic origin, or sexual orientation.