



CENTER FOR APPLIED RURAL INNOVATION

A Research Report*

Living and Serving in Rural Nebraska

2004 Nebraska Rural Poll Results

John C. Allen
Rebecca Vogt
Randolph L. Cantrell

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Lincoln **N**
IANR

Center Research Report 04-4, July 2004.

© 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.htm>.

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. A special note of appreciation is extended to the staff at the Pierce County Extension Office for the space needed to conduct this survey and to the Nebraska Library Commission for use of the laptops.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2004)	2
<i>Figure 1. Community Change, 1996 - 2004</i>	2
<i>Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2004</i>	4
<i>Table 1. Proportions of Respondents “Very Satisfied” with Each Service, 1997 - 2004</i>	5
The Community and Its Attributes in 2004	4
<i>Figure 3. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size</i>	6
<i>Figure 4. Dissatisfaction with Law Enforcement by Community Size</i>	8
Plans to Leave the Community	9
<i>Figure 5. Plans to Move from Community by Age</i>	9
Community Service	10
<i>Figure 6. Percent Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office by Gender</i> .	10
<i>Table 2. Reasons for Not Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office</i>	11
<i>Table 3. Importance of Reasons for Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office</i>	14
Conclusion	15

List of Appendix Tables and Figures

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska 16

Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2000
Census 17

Appendix Table 2. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size, Region and
Individual Attributes 18

Appendix Table 3. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Size, Region
and Individual Attributes 20

Appendix Table 4. Level of Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities 22

Appendix Table 5. Measures of Satisfaction with Ten Services and Amenities in Relation to
Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes 23

Appendix Table 6. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual
Attributes 26

Appendix Table 7. Proportion of Residents Who Have Run for or Accepted Appointment to
Public Office in Local Community or County by Region, Community Size and
Individual Attributes 28

Appendix Table 8. Reasons for Not Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office by
Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes 30

Appendix Table 9. Importance of Reasons for Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public
Office by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes 32

Executive Summary

Many rural communities are experiencing population decline. However, rural residents have continued to show a strong attachment to their communities. How do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided? Have they served their community or county by holding a public office? Why or why not?

This report details 2,915 responses to the 2004 Nebraska Rural Poll, the ninth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and their community service experiences. Trends for some of these questions are examined by comparing data from the eight previous polls to this year's results. For all questions, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, i.e., comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- ***Rural Nebraskans are more positive about the change in their communities than they were last year.*** This year, 26 percent believe their community has changed for the better, compared to only 22 percent last year. And, only 22 percent think their community has changed for the worse, compared to 25 percent last year.
- ***The proportion of expected movers who plan to leave Nebraska increased this year.*** Last year, only 46 percent of the persons planning to move from their community expected to leave the state. That proportion increased to 56 percent this year.
- ***Rural Nebraskans living in or near the largest communities are more likely than the persons living in or near the smaller communities to say their community has changed for the better.*** Thirty-four percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe their community has changed for the better, but only 16 percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people share this opinion.
- ***The community services and amenities that rural Nebraskans are most dissatisfied with include: entertainment, retail shopping, restaurants and city/village government.*** They are most satisfied with parks and recreation, library services, basic medical care services, highways and bridges, and education (K - 12).
- ***Larger community residents are more likely than residents of smaller communities to be dissatisfied with their city/village government.*** Thirty-eight percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more are dissatisfied with their city/village government, compared to 24 percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.
- ***Smaller community residents are more likely than residents of larger communities to express dissatisfaction with their law enforcement.*** Thirty-five percent of the persons

living in or near communities with less than 500 people are dissatisfied with their law enforcement. However, only 19 percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more are dissatisfied with this service.

- ***Younger persons are more likely than older persons to be planning to move from their community next year.*** Thirteen percent of the persons between the ages of 19 and 29 are planning to move next year, compared to only three percent of the persons age 65 and older. An additional 16 percent of the younger persons indicate they are uncertain if they plan to move.
- ***Fourteen percent of rural Nebraskans have run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county.***
- ***Males are more likely than females to have run for or accepted appointment to public office.*** Eighteen percent of males have run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county. However, only seven percent of females have done so.
- ***Over one-half of rural Nebraskans who have not held public office say they have no interest in doing so.*** Sixty-one percent gave this reason for not running for or accepting appointment to public office. Thirty-five percent say no one has asked them to run/hold office and 32 percent say they don't have enough time.
- ***Over one-half of rural Nebraskans who have run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county say the following reasons were very important in their decision: I am interested in the future of my community or county (75%), I feel it is important to help my community (72%), I feel I can make a difference in my community or county (57%), and I can do something for a cause that is important to me (55%).***

Introduction

Many smaller communities in rural Nebraska are experiencing population decline. Between 1990 and 2000, 230 of Nebraska's 500 communities with populations of 5,000 or fewer persons saw absolute population declines. However, rural residents have continued to show a strong attachment to their communities. By enhancing and promoting their amenities and services, many of these rural communities may be able to attract new residents as well as maintain their current population. Also, there is great potential through the utilization of technology to attract and create new businesses to provide economic opportunities for residents.

Given these challenges and opportunities, 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 they served their community or county by holding a public office? Why or why not? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

The 2004 Nebraska Rural Poll is the ninth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and their community service experiences.

Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 2,915 responses from Nebraskans living in the 84 non-metropolitan counties in the state. A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in

February and March to approximately 6,300 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, work, water issues, and health care. This paper reports only results from the community portion of the survey.

A 47% 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.

The average respondent is 55 years of age. Sixty-nine percent are married (Appendix Table 1¹) and seventy-one percent live within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 47 years and have lived in their current community 31 years. Fifty-two percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000.

¹ Appendix Table 1 also includes demographic data from previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire non-metropolitan population of Nebraska (using 2000 U.S. Census data).

Fifty-six percent of the respondents reported their approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, for 2003 was below \$40,000. Thirty-one percent reported incomes over \$50,000. Ninety-three percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Seventy percent were employed in 2003 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Twenty-five percent are retired. Thirty-two percent of those employed reported working in a professional, technical or administrative occupation. Thirteen percent indicated they were farmers or ranchers. The employed respondents who do not work in their home or their nearest community reported having to drive an average of 32 miles, one way, to their primary job.

Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2004)

Comparisons are made between the community data collected this year to the eight 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, same or worse.


One difference in the wording of this question has occurred over the past nine 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.

Rural Nebraskans felt more positive about their communities this year than they did last year. This year, 26 percent believe their community has changed for the better, compared to only 22 percent last year (Figure 1). And, in 2004, only 22 percent think their community has changed for the worse, compared to 25 percent last year.

During the nine-year period, there has been a general decline in the proportion of respondents indicating their community has changed for the better. Thirty-eight percent of the 1996 respondents stated their community had changed for the better. The proportion decreased to 26 percent this year.

The proportion saying their community has stayed the same first increased from 1996 to 1998. It has since remained fairly steady across the last seven years. The proportion



saying their community has changed for the worse has remained fairly steady across all nine years.

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 remained about the same when compared to last year. This year, 76 percent rate their community as friendly, compared to 74 percent last year.² Seventy-five percent thought their community was friendly in 2002, up from 73 percent in 2001 and 68 percent in 2000. In the first four studies, approximately 73 percent felt their community was friendly.

The proportion of respondents who viewed their community as trusting increased from 62 percent in 1996 to 66 percent in 1999. It then decreased to 59 percent in 2000, rose to 65 percent in 2002, decreased to 63 percent last year and then increased to 65 percent this year. A similar pattern emerged when examining the proportion of respondents who rated their community as supportive. The proportion stating their community was supportive first increased from 62 percent in

² The responses on the 7-point scale are converted to percentages as follows: values of 1, 2, and 3 are categorized as friendly, trusting, and supportive; values of 5, 6, and 7 are categorized as unfriendly, distrusting, and hostile; and a value of 4 is categorized as no opinion.

1996 to 65 percent in 1999, then it dropped to 60 percent in 2000. It then increased slightly to 62 percent in 2001, rose to 68 percent in 2002, decreased slightly to 67 percent in 2003 and remained at 67 percent this year.


Plans to Leave the Community

To determine whether or not respondents planned to leave their community, they were asked, “Do you plan to move from your community in the next year?” This question was only included in the studies starting in 1998. The proportion planning to leave their community has remained relatively stable during the past seven years. Approximately three percent of the respondents each year indicated they were planning to leave their community in the next year. The last two years, that proportion was five percent.

The expected destination for the persons planning to move has changed over time (Figure 2). The proportion planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha metropolitan areas steadily increased between 1999 and 2001 (from 10 to 18 percent). However, the proportion planning to move to one of those cities declined to 14 percent in 2002, increased slightly last year to 15 percent and then declined to 7 percent this year.

The proportion of expected movers planning to leave the state decreased from 1999 to 2003 (from 52 percent to 46 percent), but increased to 56 percent this year – the highest proportion in all seven years that this question has been asked.

Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2004



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 nine studies; however, in 1996 they were also asked about the availability of these services. Therefore, comparisons will only be made between the last eight studies, when the question wording was identical. The respondents were asked how satisfied they were with a list of 26 services and amenities, taking into consideration availability, cost, and quality.

Table 1 shows the proportions very satisfied with the service each year. The rank ordering of these items has remained

relatively stable over the eight years. In addition, many of the proportions remained fairly consistent between the years.

The Community and Its Attributes in 2004

In this section, the 2004 data on respondents' evaluations of their communities and its attributes are first summarized and then examined in terms of any 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

Over one-half (52%) of the respondents state their community has stayed the same during the past year, 26 percent say their community has changed for the better, and 22 percent believe it has changed for the worse (see Figure 1).

The perceptions of the change occurring in their community by various demographic subgroups are examined (Appendix Table 2).

Residents living in or near the largest communities are more likely than the persons living in or near the smallest communities to say that their community has changed for the better. Thirty-four percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe their community has changed for the better, but only 16 percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people share this opinion (Figure 3).

The other groups most likely to say their

Table 1. Proportions of Respondents “Very Satisfied” with Each Service, 1997 - 2004


<i>Service/Amenity</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>1997</i>
Library services	40	41	41	40	43	40	41	44
Education (K - 12)	30	32	32	31	32	36	33	35
Parks and recreation	29	31	29	29	31	30	29	34
Basic medical care services	28	29	30	27	26	27	27	31
Sewage disposal	27	26	28	24	26	28	23	31
Senior centers	25	27	27	25	25	27	25	31
Water disposal	24	24	26	22	24	26	21	29
Solid waste disposal	24	24	24	22	22	24	19	25
Nursing home care	22	24	23	21	20	25	24	27
Law enforcement	22	22	21	19	19	19	17	22
Highways and bridges	19	20	20	16	16	18	15	NA
Housing	18	18	17	16	16	19	14	17
Restaurants	16	14	15	15	14	17	16	19
Day care services	14	14	13	13	13	16	15	17
Head start programs	13	13	13	13	12	13	12	16
Streets	12	14	14	11	12	16	12	NA
Airport	12	12	12	11	11	NA	NA	NA
Retail shopping	11	10	11	11	11	12	10	14
Mental health services	10	9	9	10	9	9	8	11
City/village government	9	10	9	10	8	11	7	10
County government	9	9	8	9	7	10	6	9
Entertainment	7	6	7	7	5	6	6	8
Airline service	5	5	5	4	4	NA	NA	NA
Taxi service	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	3
Rail service	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5
Bus service	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	4
Air service	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	5	6
Streets and highways	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1

NA = Not asked that particular year

community has changed for the better include: persons living in the South Central region (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region), the youngest respondents, persons with the highest education levels and respondents with administrative support positions.

Community Social Dimensions

In addition to asking respondents about their 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 (76%), trusting (65%) and supportive (67%).

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 the persons living in or near the largest communities to rate their community as trusting. Sixty-nine percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people say their community is trusting, compared to approximately 60 percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more.

Persons living in the Panhandle are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to view their community as supportive. Seventy-three percent of the Panhandle residents rate their community as supportive, compared to only 61 percent of the persons living in the Southeast region.

Persons with the highest household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to rate their community as supportive. When comparing responses by age, the older respondents are more likely than the younger respondents to view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. As an example, 72 percent of the persons age 65 and older say their community is trusting. Yet, only 56 percent of the persons age 19 to 29 share this opinion.

Males are more likely than females to view their community as trusting. The widowed respondents are the marital group most likely to view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. However, the married respondents are also most likely to view their community as friendly. When examining differences by education, persons with at least a four-year college degree are the group most likely to rate their community as both friendly and supportive.

One difference occurred by occupation. The farmers and ranchers are the group most likely to rate their community as friendly. Eighty-two percent of farmers and ranchers view their community as friendly, compared to 68 percent of the manual laborers.

Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

Next, rural residents were asked to rate how satisfied they were with a list of 26 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.

At least one-third of the respondents are either “very dissatisfied” or “somewhat dissatisfied” with entertainment (41%), retail shopping (39%), restaurants (34%) and city/village government (33%) (Appendix Table 4). The services or amenities respondents are most satisfied with (based on the combined percentage of “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” responses) include: parks and recreation (75%), library services (74%), basic medical care services (73%), highways and bridges (70%) and education (K - 12) (69%).

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, 56 percent of the persons between the ages of 19 and 39 are dissatisfied with entertainment, compared to only 24 percent of the persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with the entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants in their community include: persons living in or near the larger communities, persons with higher household incomes, persons with higher education levels and respondents with professional occupations.

Persons living in the North Central region are more likely than persons living elsewhere to be dissatisfied with the entertainment in their community. However, residents of the Southeast region are the group most likely to express

dissatisfaction with their retail shopping.

Females are more likely than males to be dissatisfied with the retail shopping in their community. Forty-three percent of the females are dissatisfied with the retail shopping, compared to 37 percent of males.

The married respondents are the marital group most likely to be dissatisfied with the retail shopping and restaurants in their community, but the divorced/separated respondents are the group most likely to express dissatisfaction with entertainment.

Persons living in or near the larger communities are more likely than the persons living in or near the smaller communities to be dissatisfied with their city/village government. Thirty-eight percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more are dissatisfied with their city/village government, compared to 24 percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.

The laborers are the occupation group most likely to express dissatisfaction with their city/village government. Forty-three percent of the laborers are dissatisfied with their city/village government, compared to only 22 percent of the farmers and ranchers.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their city/village government include: persons living in both the Panhandle and North Central regions, persons with higher household incomes, persons between the ages of 40 and 64, males, the divorced/separated respondents and the persons with some college education.


The groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their streets include: persons living in or near the larger communities, persons with household incomes ranging from \$40,000 to \$59,999, younger respondents, females, the divorced/separated respondents and persons with some college education. When comparing responses by occupation, the farmers and ranchers are *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with the streets in their community.

Persons living in or near the larger communities, persons with higher household incomes, the younger respondents, males, married persons, respondents with some college education and the laborers are the groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their county government.

Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than the persons living in or near the larger communities to express dissatisfaction with their law enforcement. Thirty-five percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people are dissatisfied with their law enforcement (Figure 4). However, only 19 percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more are dissatisfied with this service.

The other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s law enforcement include: persons living in the North Central region, persons with lower household incomes, younger respondents, the divorced/separated persons and respondents with some college education.

Persons living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other



regions of the state to be dissatisfied with the airline service in their community. Twenty-seven percent of the persons living in this region are dissatisfied with their airline service, compared to only 13 percent of the persons living in the Southeast region.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their airline service include: persons living in or near the larger communities, persons with higher incomes, persons between the ages of 40 and 64, males, the divorced/separated respondents, persons with higher education levels and respondents with professional occupations.

The groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their bus service include: persons living in or near the larger communities, Panhandle residents, persons with lower household incomes, older respondents, the divorced/separated persons, respondents with higher education levels and persons with occupations classified as “other.”

Panhandle residents are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to

be dissatisfied with the housing in their community. Twenty-nine percent of the Panhandle residents are dissatisfied with their community's housing, compared to only 19 percent of the persons living in the Northeast region of the state.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with the housing in their community include: persons with lower household incomes, younger respondents, females, the divorced/separated respondents, persons with higher education levels and persons with occupations classified as "other." When comparing responses by community size, persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 4,999 are the group *least* likely to be dissatisfied with the housing in their community.

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 five percent indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year, seven percent are uncertain and 88 percent have no plans to move. Of those who are planning to move, 44 percent plan to remain in the state, with seven percent planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha area and 37 percent plan to move to

another part of the state. Fifty-six percent are planning to leave the state.

Intentions to move from their community differed by income, age, marital status, education and occupation (Appendix Table 6). Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to be planning to move from their community in the next year (Figure 5). Thirteen percent of the persons between the ages of 19 and 29 are planning to move next year, compared to only three percent of the persons age 65 and older. An additional 16 percent of the younger respondents indicate they are uncertain if they plan to move.

The other groups most likely to be planning to move from their community next year include persons who have never married and persons with service occupations. Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower household incomes to *not* be planning to move next year. And, the persons with less education are more likely than the persons with more education to be uncertain if they plan to

Figure 5. Plans to Move from Community by Age



move.

When comparing the destinations of the expected movers, statistically significant differences occur only by age and marital status. The expected movers between the ages of 50 and 64 are the group most likely to be planning to leave the state. Eighty-one percent of the expected movers in this age group plan to leave the state, compared to only 27 percent of the expected movers between the ages of 40 and 49.

The expected movers who have never married are the marital group most likely to be planning to move some place in Nebraska outside the Omaha/Lincoln metro areas.

Community Service

New questions were added to this year's survey to determine who has run for or accepted public office in their community or county and why or why not they have done so.

Respondents were first asked if they have ever run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county. Fourteen percent of the respondents have done so. The characteristics of those who have run for or accepted appointment to public office are examined (Appendix Table 7).

Persons living in or near the smaller communities are more likely than the persons living in or near the larger communities to have run for or accepted appointment to public office. Approximately 27 percent of the persons living in or near communities with less than 1,000 people have run for or accepted


appointment to public office, compared to only six percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to have run for or accepted appointment to public office. Eighteen percent of the persons age 65 and older have done so, compared to only one percent of the persons age 19 to 29.

Males are more likely than females to have run for or accepted appointment to public office. Eighteen percent of males have either run for or accepted appointment to public office, compared to seven percent of females (Figure 6).

The other groups most likely to have run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county include: persons living in the North Central region, persons with higher household incomes, the married respondents, the persons with higher education levels and the farmers and ranchers.

The persons who have not run for or accepted appointment to public office were



asked why they haven't done so. Sixty-one percent say they have no interest in holding office (Table 2). Thirty-five percent say no one has asked them to run/hold office and 32 percent say they don't have enough time.

The responses to this question are analyzed by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 8).

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are the

group most likely to say they haven't run for or accepted appointment to public office for the following reasons: there have not been any opportunities, I don't feel a part of the community or county, I'm already involved in other ways and I feel I have not lived here long enough. Persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more are most likely to say they don't know how to go about it.

Three differences occur by region. The Panhandle residents are the group most

Table 2. Reasons for Not Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>Percent circling each item</i>
I have no interest in holding office	61
No one has asked me to run/hold office	35
I don't have enough time	32
I don't have the skills involved to hold office	24
I don't know enough about the issues	23
I'm already involved in other ways	19
I don't feel a part of the community or county	11
I don't know how to go about it	11
There have not been any opportunities	10
I feel I have not lived here long enough	9
My ideas are not appreciated in my community or county	6
Other	6
I would rather donate my money than my time	5
I do not get along with the other people in leadership positions	4
I am afraid my reputation would suffer	4

likely to say they would rather donate their money than their time and that they are afraid their reputation would suffer. Persons living in the North Central region are most likely to say they haven't lived there long enough.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to give the following reasons for not running for or accepting appointment to public office: there have not been any opportunities, I don't know how to go about it, I don't know enough about the issues, I don't have the skills involved to hold office and I have no interest in holding office. Persons with the highest household incomes are most likely to say they would rather donate their money than their time and that they are already involved in other ways.

Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to give the following reasons for not holding public office: no one has asked me to run/hold office, there have not been any opportunities, I don't know how to go about it, I don't feel a part of the community, I don't know enough about the issues, and I feel I have not lived here long enough. The older respondents were most likely to give the following reasons: I would rather donate my money than my time, I'm already involved in other ways, I don't have the skills involved to hold office and I have no interest in holding office. Persons between the ages of 30 and 39 are the group most likely to have say I don't have enough time and I'm afraid my reputation would suffer.

Females are more likely than males to say there have not been any opportunities, they don't know how to go about it, they don't

know enough about the issues and they don't have the skills involved to hold office. Males are more likely than females to say they don't have enough time and they are afraid their reputation would suffer.

When comparing responses by marital groups, the persons who have never married are most likely to have given the following reasons: no one has asked me to run/hold office, I don't know how to go about it and I don't know enough about the issues. The widowed respondents are most likely to say they would rather donate their money than their time and they don't have the skills involved to hold office. Married respondents are most likely to say they don't have enough time and they are afraid their reputation would suffer. The divorced or separated respondents are most likely to not feel a part of the community or county.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to give the following reasons for not holding public office: no one has asked me to run/hold office, I don't have enough time, I'm already involved in other ways and I feel I have not lived here long enough. Persons with the lowest education levels are most likely to give the following reasons: I don't know how to go about it, I don't know enough about the issues, I don't have the skills involved to hold office, and I have no interest in holding office.

The manual laborers are the occupation group most likely to say they don't know how to go about holding office, they don't know enough about the issues, they don't have the skills involved and they have no interest in holding office. The persons with professional occupations are most likely to

say they are already involved in other ways. Farmers and ranchers are most likely to say they don't have enough time. And, the skilled laborers are the group most likely to say they don't get along with the other people in leadership positions.

The persons who have run for or accepted appointment to public office were also asked additional questions. They have run for public office an average of 2.4 times. They have held an average of 1.4 elected offices for an average of 2.8 total terms. They have held an average of 1 appointed office for an average of 2.2 total terms. Twenty percent have not held any elected office and 28 percent have held multiple elected offices. Forty-two percent have not held any appointed office. Fourteen percent have held multiple appointed offices.

Twenty-six percent of the respondents who have run for or accepted appointment to public office are currently an elected official and 21 percent currently hold an appointed position. Fifty-six percent do not currently hold an elected office or appointed position.

The persons who have run for or accepted appointment to public office were also asked how important various reasons were to them when deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office. Over one-half rate the following reasons as very important: I am interested in the future of my community or county (75%), I feel it is important to help my community (72%), I feel I can make a difference in my community or county (57%), and I can do something for a cause that is important to me (55%) (Table 3).

The responses to this question are analyzed

by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 9). A few differences occur.

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 4,999 are the groups most likely to rate "I am interested in the future of my community or county" as either a very or somewhat important reason for running for or accepting appointment to public office.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to rate "I feel it is important to help my community or county" as very important. Persons with lower incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to rate the following as very important reasons: it will look good on my resume and I can learn new skills and explore my strengths.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to rate the following reasons as very important: it will look good on my resume and I can learn new skills and explore my strengths. Persons between the ages of 40 and 49 are most likely to rate the following reasons as very important: I feel it is important to help my community or county and I feel I can make a difference in my community or county. The older respondents are most likely to rate "it is an important activity to the people I respect" as a very important reason for running or accepting appointment to public office.

Females are more likely than males to rate "I can make new contacts that might help my business/career" and "it makes me feel included in my community or county" as very important reasons for running for or

Table 3. Importance of Reasons for Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office

	<i>Don't Know</i>	<i>Not at All Important</i>	<i>Somewhat Important</i>	<i>Very Important</i>
I am interested in the future of my community or county	1%	1%	22%	75%
I feel it is important to help my community or county	3	1	24	72
I feel I can make a difference in my community or county	3	5	36	57
I can do something for a cause that is important to me	3	7	36	55
I feel an obligation to serve	2	13	37	48
I wanted an opportunity to participate in the decision making process	2	9	42	46
It is an important activity to the people I respect	4	13	44	39
It makes me feel included in the community or county	2	24	48	25
I can learn new skills & explore my strengths	5	24	48	23
I was recruited to run	5	37	39	19
I can make new contacts that might help my business/career.	5	64	24	7
It will look good on my resume	4	79	12	4

accepting appointment to public office.

The widowed respondents are the marital group most likely to rate “it is an important activity to the people I respect” as a very important reason. Persons who have never married are the group most likely to rate “it makes me feel included in my community or county” as a very important reason to them.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to rate the following as very important: I wanted an opportunity to participate in the decision making process and I feel an obligation to serve. Persons with lower education levels are most likely to rate “it makes me feel included in the community or county” as a very important reason.

When comparing responses by occupation, the persons with administrative support positions are the group most likely to say “I can make new contacts that might help my business/career” and “it will look good on my resume” are very important reasons for running for or accepting appointment to public office. The persons with sales occupations are the group most likely to rate “I feel an obligation to serve” as very important. The persons with service occupations are the group most likely to rate “I am interested in the future of my community or county” as a very important reason. Persons with professional occupations are the group most likely to rate “I feel I can make a difference in my community or county” as a very important reason for running for or accepting appointment to public office.

Conclusion

Rural Nebraskans are more positive about the change occurring in their communities this year than they were last year. And, the majority believe their community has either stayed the same or changed for the better during the past year. In addition, most also characterize their communities as friendly, trusting and supportive.

The community services or amenities that residents are most dissatisfied with include: entertainment, retail shopping, restaurants and city/village government. The services and amenities with the highest satisfaction ratings include: parks and recreation, library services, basic medical care, highways and bridges, and education (K - 12).


Most rural Nebraskans are planning to stay in their community next year. Only five

percent are planning to move and seven percent are uncertain. However, 56 percent of the persons planning to move say they will move out of Nebraska.

The majority of rural Nebraskans have not run for or accepted appointment to public office in their local community or county. Most of those persons say they have no interest in holding office. Other sizeable proportions say they have not been asked to run or hold office or that they don't have enough time.

The persons who have held public office gave community-minded reasons for doing so. Most said they were interested in the future of their community or county, they felt it was important to help their community or county and that they could make a difference in their community or county.

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska



■ Metropolitan counties (not surveyed)

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

	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	2000
	Poll	Poll	Poll	Poll	Poll	Census
Age : ¹						
20 - 39	18%	18%	16%	17%	20%	33%
40 - 64	49%	51%	51%	49%	54%	42%
65 and over	32%	32%	32%	33%	26%	24%
Gender: ²						
Female	32%	51%	36%	37%	57%	51%
Male	68%	49%	64%	63%	43%	49%
Education: ³						
Less than 9 th grade	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	7%
9 th to 12 th grade (no diploma)	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	10%
High school diploma (or equivalent)	34%	34%	32%	35%	34%	35%
Some college, no degree	24%	23%	25%	26%	28%	25%
Associate degree	12%	11%	10%	8%	9%	7%
Bachelors degree	15%	16%	16%	13%	15%	11%
Graduate or professional degree	8%	9%	10%	8%	9%	4%
Household income: ⁴						
Less than \$10,000	9%	8%	8%	9%	3%	10%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	15%	14%	15%	16%	10%	16%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	16%	16%	17%	20%	15%	17%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	16%	16%	17%	16%	19%	15%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	13%	13%	14%	14%	17%	12%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	11%	11%	11%	9%	15%	10%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	10%	11%	9%	8%	11%	9%
\$75,000 or more	11%	11%	10%	8%	11%	11%
Marital Status: ⁵						
Married	69%	73%	73%	70%	95%	61%
Never married	9%	7%	6%	7%	0.2%	22%
Divorced/separated	10%	9%	9%	10%	2%	9%
Widowed/widower	12%	11%	12%	14%	4%	8%

¹ 2000 Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

² 2000 Census universe is total non-metro population.

³ 2000 Census universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

⁴ 2000 Census universe is all non-metro households.

⁵ 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

Communities across the nation are undergoing change.				
When you think about this past year, would you say...				
My community has changed for the				
	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Better</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Community Size				
	<i>Percentages</i>			
	(n = 2722)			
Less than 500	28	56	16	
500 - 999	21	56	22	
1,000 - 4,999	20	56	24	P ² = 73.82
5,000 - 9,999	26	53	21	(.000)
10,000 and up	19	46	34	
Region				
	(n = 2767)			
Panhandle	21	55	24	
North Central	24	51	25	
South Central	19	50	31	P ² = 28.36
Northeast	22	53	25	(.000)
Southeast	26	56	19	
Individual Attributes:				
<i>Income Level</i>				
	(n = 2556)			
Under \$20,000	24	51	25	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	20	56	24	P ² = 12.16
\$40,000 - \$59,999	22	52	27	(.058)
\$60,000 and over	21	49	31	
<i>Age</i>				
	(n = 2783)			
19 - 29	14	57	29	
30 - 39	20	50	29	
40 - 49	22	56	23	P ² = 21.05
50 - 64	26	50	24	(.007)
65 and older	21	52	27	
<i>Gender</i>				
	(n = 2749)			
Male	22	53	26	P ² = 0.32
Female	23	52	26	(.853)
<i>Marital Status</i>				
	(n = 2752)			
Married	22	53	25	
Never married	20	52	28	
Divorced/separated	26	51	23	P ² = 7.87
Widowed	21	50	30	(.248)

Appendix Table 2 Continued.

<i>Communities across the nation are undergoing change.</i>				
<i>When you think about this past year, would you say...</i>				
<i>My community has changed for the</i>				
	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Better</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<i>Education</i>		(n = 2746)		
No H.S. diploma	25	55	20	
H.S. diploma	22	55	23	
Some college	22	53	26	P ² = 23.03
Bachelors or grad degree	21	47	32	(.001)
<i>Occupation</i>		(n = 1859)		
Sales	24	51	24	
Manual laborer	24	57	19	
Professional/tech/admin	21	49	30	
Service	25	50	25	
Farming/ranching	20	58	22	
Skilled laborer	19	57	25	P ² = 27.04
Administrative support	24	43	34	(.019)

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>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>
Community Size	(n = 2687)				Percentages (n = 2579)				(n = 2574)			
Less than 500	7	17	76		11	20	69		11	22	67	
500 - 999	10	14	76		11	22	67		12	18	70	
1,000 - 4,999	8	17	76	P ² =	12	21	67	P ² =	11	20	69	P ² =
5,000 - 9,999	12	17	72	11.17	19	21	60	22.94	11	24	66	6.73
10,000 and up	9	15	76	(.192)	16	23	61	(.003)	13	22	65	(.566)
Region	(n = 2730)				(n = 2620)				(n = 2614)			
Panhandle	9	14	77		14	21	66		9	18	73	
North Central	8	16	76		16	19	65		12	22	66	
South Central	7	16	77	P ² =	12	20	68	P ² =	11	19	70	P ² =
Northeast	11	15	75	7.78	15	23	62	14.58	11	23	66	17.25
Southeast	10	17	73	(.455)	15	26	60	(.068)	15	24	61	(.028)
Individual Attributes:												
Income Level	(n = 2533)				(n = 2437)				(n = 2434)			
Under \$20,000	11	18	71		16	23	62		10	24	66	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	9	15	76	P ² =	12	23	65	P ² =	11	23	67	P ² =
\$40,000 - \$59,999	9	14	76	11.42	17	20	63	11.66	16	20	65	18.04
\$60,000 and over	7	14	79	(.076)	13	19	68	(.070)	11	17	72	(.006)
Age	(n = 2745)				(n = 2635)				(n = 2629)			
19 - 29	8	18	74		15	29	56		13	24	63	
30 - 39	9	17	73		16	23	61		13	22	65	
40 - 49	10	18	73	P ² =	16	23	61	P ² =	13	24	63	P ² =
50 - 64	10	16	74	15.91	16	21	64	32.79	14	22	64	38.09
65 and older	7	13	80	(.044)	9	19	72	(.000)	7	18	75	(.000)

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>Unfriendly</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>Gender</i>	(n = 2713)				(n = 2604)				(n = 2599)			
Male	8	15	77	P ² = 5.05	13	20	67	P ² = 9.65	11	21	68	P ² = 2.58
Female	10	18	73	(.080)	15	24	60	(.008)	12	23	65	(.275)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2715)				(n = 2606)				(n = 2599)			
Married	8	15	77		14	21	65		12	21	67	
Never married	12	16	72	P ² = 15.56	19	26	55	P ² = 22.65	15	22	63	P ² = 19.88
Divorced/separated	13	20	68	(.016)	18	25	58	(.001)	14	26	60	(.003)
Widowed	8	15	77		9	20	71		6	18	76	
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2711)				(n = 2601)				(n = 2597)			
No H.S. diploma	13	15	73		11	23	67		10	25	65	
H.S. diploma	9	18	73	P ² = 19.43	14	23	63	P ² = 8.80	11	24	65	P ² = 15.95
Some college	10	16	75	(.003)	16	22	63	(.185)	13	20	67	(.014)
Bachelors degree	7	12	81		13	19	68		11	18	72	
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1851)				(n = 1828)				(n = 1819)			
Sales	10	11	79		17	21	62		13	22	65	
Manual laborer	10	22	68		19	22	59		16	28	57	
Prof/tech/admin	8	14	78		14	20	66		12	20	68	
Service	9	19	72		16	21	63		10	26	64	
Farming/ranching	8	11	82	P ² = 24.98	12	18	70	P ² = 15.15	11	19	70	P ² = 22.81
Skilled laborer	10	19	71	(.035)	19	23	59	(.368)	14	20	66	(.063)
Admin support	12	16	72		16	25	59		22	17	61	

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	41	22	37
Retail shopping	39	11	50
Restaurants	34	9	57
City/village government	33	21	46
Streets	31	8	61
County government	28	22	50
Law enforcement	23	12	64
Airline service	21	61	19
Bus service	21	68	12
Housing	21	17	62
Rail service	20	67	14
Highways and bridges	18	12	70
Basic medical care services	17	11	73
Mental health services	16	52	32
Taxi service	15	71	14
Airport	15	51	34
Education (K - 12)	15	16	69
Parks and recreation	13	12	75
Solid waste disposal	12	22	65
Nursing home care	12	29	59
Day care services	9	44	47
Sewage disposal	9	23	68
Water disposal	9	25	66
Library services	7	19	74
Senior centers	7	31	63
Head start programs	6	52	42

* 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			Restaurants			City/village government		
	<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 = 2716)			(n = 2746)			(n = 2774)			(n = 2780)		
Less than 500	36	29	35	34	24	42	31	15	54	24	26	50
500 - 4,999	41	25	34	40	13	47	35	11	55	30	21	50
5,000 and over	43	17	41	40	6	55	34	6	60	38	20	42
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 41.86 (.000)			P ² = 116.42 (.000)			P ² = 35.22 (.000)			P ² = 38.56 (.000)		
Region	(n = 2759)			(n = 2789)			(n = 2819)			(n = 2826)		
Panhandle	41	20	39	36	10	55	32	9	59	35	19	46
North Central	45	23	33	43	10	47	34	9	57	35	26	39
South Central	36	20	44	33	11	56	33	8	59	33	20	48
Northeast	43	23	34	40	13	48	34	11	56	30	22	48
Southeast	44	22	34	45	12	44	35	10	55	32	20	48
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 24.41 (.002)			P ² = 28.82 (.000)			P ² = 6.54 (.587)			P ² = 16.03 (.042)		
Income Level	(n = 2553)			(n = 2574)			(n = 2601)			(n = 2613)		
Under \$20,000	36	27	38	34	14	52	27	10	63	28	26	46
\$20,000 - \$39,999	42	20	38	38	11	52	31	9	60	32	23	46
\$40,000 - \$59,999	44	19	37	43	10	48	39	8	53	37	18	45
\$60,000 and over	46	18	35	43	9	48	42	8	50	36	16	49
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 22.79 (.001)			P ² = 17.03 (.009)			P ² = 36.67 (.000)			P ² = 29.10 (.000)		
Age	(n = 2775)			(n = 2805)			(n = 2834)			(n = 2842)		
19 - 39	56	13	31	46	10	44	42	8	50	33	26	41
40 - 64	46	19	35	41	11	48	37	10	54	37	20	43
65 and over	24	31	46	31	12	58	24	10	66	25	21	54
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 174.81 (.000)			P ² = 39.72 (.000)			P ² = 61.17 (.000)			P ² = 52.05 (.000)		
Gender	(n = 2743)			(n = 2770)			(n = 2799)			(n = 2808)		
Male	40	22	38	37	11	52	34	9	57	34	20	46
Female	44	20	36	43	11	46	33	10	58	29	24	47
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 5.41 (.067)			P ² = 10.68 (.005)			P ² = 0.37 (.833)			P ² = 9.09 (.011)		
Marital Status	(n = 2747)			(n = 2773)			(n = 2802)			(n = 2810)		
Married	41	22	37	40	11	49	36	9	55	34	19	46
Never married	48	15	37	37	11	52	30	8	63	27	30	43
Divorced/separate	50	12	38	36	10	54	33	8	59	40	25	35
Widowed	25	31	44	34	15	51	24	11	65	21	23	56
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 61.60 (.000)			P ² = 8.85 (.182)			P ² = 22.25 (.001)			P ² = 49.63 (.000)		
Education	(n = 2739)			(n = 2766)			(n = 2794)			(n = 2802)		
High school or less	35	27	39	34	14	52	29	11	60	32	23	44
Some college	46	19	34	41	11	48	36	9	55	34	21	45
College grad	44	16	40	42	8	50	37	8	55	31	18	51
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 46.08 (.000)			P ² = 23.60 (.000)			P ² = 16.83 (.002)			P ² = 10.08 (.039)		
Occupation	(n = 1872)			(n = 1885)			(n = 1894)			(n = 1897)		
Prof/tech/admin.	49	18	33	47	9	43	42	9	49	35	16	48
Farming/ranching	34	28	38	28	20	52	27	15	58	22	35	43
Laborer	47	17	36	40	11	50	34	7	59	43	18	39
Other	48	18	34	44	9	47	39	8	53	35	23	42
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 22.23 (.001)			P ² = 39.40 (.000)			P ² = 28.72 (.000)			P ² = 53.25 (.000)		

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

Appendix Table 5 Continued.

	<i>Streets</i>			<i>County Government</i>			<i>Law Enforcement</i>			<i>Airline 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 = 2776)			(n = 2772)			(n = 2774)			(n = 2619)		
Less than 500	29	10	61	26	22	52	35	15	50	18	68	14
500 - 4,999	27	8	65	24	21	55	24	12	64	15	74	11
5,000 and over	36	7	57	31	24	45	19	12	69	25	49	25
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 22.23 (.000)			P ² = 24.95 (.000)			P ² = 65.68 (.000)			P ² = 153.88 (.000)		
Region	(n = 2823)			(n = 2815)			(n = 2819)			(n = 2662)		
Panhandle	34	7	58	28	22	51	22	13	65	21	50	29
North Central	27	10	64	32	22	46	32	11	58	21	60	20
South Central	31	8	60	27	23	51	21	11	67	27	53	21
Northeast	33	8	59	24	24	52	19	13	69	17	69	14
Southeast	33	7	60	31	20	49	26	15	58	13	73	14
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 8.40 (.396)			P ² = 13.30 (.102)			P ² = 38.22 (.000)			P ² = 92.51 (.000)		
Income Level	(n = 2610)			(n = 2602)			(n = 2604)			(n = 2462)		
Under \$20,000	29	10	60	24	26	50	26	11	62	17	62	20
\$20,000 - \$39,999	33	8	59	28	23	49	24	13	63	18	64	18
\$40,000 - \$59,999	35	7	58	30	21	50	25	12	63	22	59	18
\$60,000 and over	30	5	66	31	18	51	18	12	70	27	55	18
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 19.11 (.004)			P ² = 14.37 (.026)			P ² = 13.84 (.031)			P ² = 23.92 (.001)		
Age	(n = 2839)			(n = 2831)			(n = 2835)			(n = 2677)		
19 - 39	40	8	52	30	29	42	25	15	60	17	69	15
40 - 64	35	8	58	32	21	47	26	12	62	23	60	16
65 and over	21	9	70	20	20	60	19	11	70	18	57	25
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 66.61 (.000)			P ² = 72.57 (.000)			P ² = 21.78 (.000)			P ² = 45.50 (.000)		
Gender	(n = 2804)			(n = 2798)			(n = 2801)			(n = 2645)		
Male	30	8	62	30	20	50	23	13	65	22	60	18
Female	34	9	57	23	27	50	25	12	64	17	63	20
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 7.32 (.026)			P ² = 27.55 (.000)			P ² = 2.14 (.343)			P ² = 7.33 (.026)		
Marital Status	(n = 2807)			(n = 2802)			(n = 2803)			(n = 2647)		
Married	30	8	62	29	20	50	23	12	65	21	62	17
Never married	38	10	52	26	28	46	23	16	61	17	62	22
Divorced/separate	41	8	51	35	27	37	31	13	56	23	58	19
Widowed	25	9	66	14	27	60	19	13	68	16	60	24
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 29.05 (.000)			P ² = 61.79 (.000)			P ² = 16.32 (.012)			P ² = 13.31 (.038)		
Education	(n = 2800)			(n = 2793)			(n = 2796)			(n = 2642)		
High school or less	29	9	62	26	25	49	23	14	63	15	67	19
Some college	36	8	56	30	23	48	26	12	62	22	61	17
College grad	29	6	65	28	18	55	19	10	71	27	52	21
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 21.26 (.000)			P ² = 16.08 (.003)			P ² = 19.28 (.001)			P ² = 50.64 (.000)		
Occupation	(n = 1889)			(n = 1893)			(n = 1890)			(n = 1829)		
Prof/tech/admin.	36	6	57	31	19	50	23	13	64	27	55	18
Farming/ranching	26	11	63	26	19	55	23	10	67	16	72	12
Laborer	37	7	56	35	24	40	26	14	60	19	64	18
Other	37	7	56	30	26	45	25	12	64	21	64	15
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	P ² = 13.35 (.038)			P ² = 20.57 (.002)			P ² = 5.20 (.518)			P ² = 24.89 (.000)		

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

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	Bus Service			Housing		
	<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 = 2616)			(n = 2765)	
Less than 500	18	73	9	24	24	52
500 - 4,999	18	75	8	18	17	65
5,000 and over	23	62	15	23	14	63
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 49.55 (.000)			P ² = 35.16 (.000)	
Region		(n = 2661)			(n = 2812)	
Panhandle	27	63	10	29	16	54
North Central	20	67	13	22	21	57
South Central	23	63	13	21	15	65
Northeast	15	74	11	19	16	65
Southeast	18	72	10	20	18	62
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 32.94 (.000)			P ² = 26.50 (.001)	
Income Level		(n = 2465)			(n = 2596)	
Under \$20,000	24	61	16	23	20	57
\$20,000 - \$39,999	21	68	11	22	16	62
\$40,000 - \$59,999	19	69	12	23	15	62
\$60,000 and over	19	72	8	20	12	68
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 22.77 (.001)			P ² = 20.41 (.002)	
Age		(n = 2675)			(n = 2828)	
19 - 39	14	77	9	27	14	59
40 - 64	21	70	10	25	16	59
65 and over	24	59	17	11	20	68
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 60.16 (.000)			P ² = 80.18 (.000)	
Gender		(n = 2642)			(n = 2794)	
Male	20	69	11	19	17	64
Female	21	66	13	26	16	58
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 3.58 (.167)			P ² = 17.20 (.000)	
Marital Status		(n = 2644)			(n = 2796)	
Married	19	70	11	20	17	63
Never married	22	66	12	29	13	58
Divorced/separated	26	64	10	33	14	53
Widowed	23	56	21	12	20	68
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 37.04 (.000)			P ² = 49.82 (.000)	
Education		(n = 2639)			(n = 2788)	
High school or less	18	68	14	19	21	61
Some college	21	69	10	24	17	59
College grad	24	65	11	22	10	69
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 15.08 (.005)			P ² = 42.00 (.000)	
Occupation		(n = 1821)			(n = 1879)	
Prof/tech/admin.	17	74	9	25	12	64
Farming/ranching	11	80	9	17	24	59
Laborer	18	71	11	22	17	61
Other	24	67	9	27	16	57
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		P ² = 22.15 (.001)			P ² = 27.26 (.000)	

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

Appendix Table 6. 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>	
Community Size	(n = 2753)				<i>Percentages</i>			
Less than 500	4	89	7		5	53	42	
500 - 999	7	85	8		6	39	56	
1,000 - 4,999	4	91	6		9	36	55	
5,000 - 9,999	7	86	7	P ² = 12.18	8	24	68	P ² = 4.06
10,000 and up	5	88	7	(.144)	6	38	55	(.852)
Region	(n = 2799)				(n = 134)			
Panhandle	6	86	9		0	15	85	
North Central	5	87	8		5	21	74	
South Central	5	88	7		7	46	46	
Northeast	5	89	6	P ² = 7.29	9	44	47	P ² = 10.26
Southeast	6	89	5	(.506)	11	37	52	(.247)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level	(n = 2583)				(n = 127)			
Under \$20,000	6	85	9		12	35	53	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	6	87	8		7	42	51	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	90	6	P ² = 15.91	4	33	63	P ² = 3.19
\$60,000 and over	5	91	4	(.014)	4	31	65	(.785)
Age	(n = 2815)				(n = 135)			
19 - 29	13	71	16		13	48	39	
30 - 39	10	82	8		7	36	58	
40 - 49	5	89	7		12	62	27	
50 - 64	4	89	7	P ² = 88.09	3	16	81	P ² = 20.75
65 and older	3	93	4	(.000)	4	29	67	(.008)
Gender	(n = 2780)				(n = 130)			
Male	5	89	7	P ² = 2.44	5	35	61	P ² = 2.79
Female	6	87	8	(.295)	10	43	47	(.248)
Marital Status	(n = 2783)				(n = 133)			
Married	4	91	5		3	35	62	
Never married	11	75	14		19	54	27	
Divorced/separated	7	79	14	P ² = 87.22	10	29	62	P ² = 17.14
Widowed	3	92	5	(.000)	0*	22*	78*	(.009)

Appendix Table 6 Continued.

	<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>	
<i>Education</i>	<i>(n = 2776)</i>				<i>(n = 132)</i>			
No H.S. diploma	4	86	10		0*	29*	71*	
H.S. diploma	3	90	7		4	31	65	
Some college	6	86	8	$P^2 = 16.99$	2	43	55	$P^2 = 12.52$
Bachelors degree	6	88	6	(.009)	18	33	49	(.051)
<i>Occupation</i>	<i>(n = 1881)</i>				<i>(n = 97)</i>			
Sales	4	92	5		14*	57*	29*	
Manual laborer	6	85	10		11*	33*	56*	
Prof/tech/admin	6	88	7		6	41	53	
Service	10	84	6		12	31	58	
Farming/ranching	3	92	5		17*	33*	50*	
Skilled laborer	5	87	9	$P^2 = 30.58$	0	36	64	$P^2 = 9.97$
Admin support	3	88	9	(.006)	33*	67*	0*	(.765)

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

Appendix Table 7. Proportion of Residents Who Have Run for or Accepted Appointment to Public Office in Local Community or County by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes

Have you ever run for or accepted appointment to public office in your local community or county?			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Size (n = 2788)			
Less than 500	28	72	
500 - 999	27	74	
1,000 - 4,999	15	85	
5,000 - 9,999	10	90	P ² = 154.59
10,000 and up	6	94	(.000)
Region (n = 2836)			
Panhandle	12	88	
North Central	21	79	
South Central	13	87	
Northeast	12	88	P ² = 27.00
Southeast	18	82	(.000)
Individual Attributes:			
<i>Income Level</i> (n = 2618)			
Under \$20,000	12	88	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	88	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	18	82	P ² = 13.84
\$60,000 and over	17	84	(.003)
<i>Age</i> (n = 2851)			
19 - 29	1	99	
30 - 39	9	91	
40 - 49	14	86	
50 - 64	16	84	P ² = 46.81
65 and older	18	82	(.000)
<i>Gender</i> (n = 2815)			
Male	18	82	P ² = 68.20
Female	7	94	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i> (n = 2818)			
Married	18	83	
Never married	5	95	
Divorced/separated	6	94	P ² = 52.65
Widowed	10	90	(.000)

Appendix Table 7 Continued.

<i>Have you ever run for or accepted appointment to public office in your local community or county?</i>			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2810)		
No H.S. diploma	10	90	
H.S. diploma	13	87	
Some college	15	85	P ² = 9.24
Bachelors degree	17	83	(.026)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1884)		
Sales	16	84	
Manual laborer	5	95	
Prof/tech/admin	14	86	
Service	11	89	
Farming/ranching	29	71	
Skilled laborer	8	92	P ² = 65.02
Admin support	15	85	(.000)

Appendix Table 8. Reasons for Not Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes

<i>Which of the following reasons describe why you haven't run for or accepted appointment to public office in your community or county?</i>							
	<i>No one has asked</i>	<i>Not been opportunities</i>	<i>Don't know how to go about it</i>	<i>Rather donate money than time</i>	<i>Not enough time</i>	<i>Don't feel part of community</i>	<i>Don't know enough about issues</i>
<i>Percent circling each</i>							
Community Size (n = 2244)							
Less than 500	29	13	7	4	34	11	19
500 - 999	37	14	11	5	35	17	22
1,000 - 4,999	34	9	8	6	34	10	21
5,000 - 9,999	35	7	12	4	32	13	24
10,000 and up	37	10	14	6	31	10	26
Region (n = 2282)							
Panhandle	32	11	11	8	32	11	22
North Central	32	13	8	3	30	11	23
South Central	36	8	12	6	32	12	25
Northeast	37	11	12	4	33	10	23
Southeast	34	9	11	7	33	11	20
Individual Att.:							
<i>Income Level</i> (n = 2116)							
Under \$20,000	34	12	13	4	23	11	29
\$20,000 - \$39,999	37	11	12	5	28	11	25
\$40,000 - \$59,999	35	10	12	6	39	12	22
\$60,000 and over	38	6	7	6	45	10	16
<i>Age</i> (n = 2294)							
19 - 29	45	15	23	3	29	16	35
30 - 39	41	10	14	4	45	11	24
40 - 49	37	7	10	3	43	13	23
50 - 64	33	10	10	6	36	13	19
65 and older	30	11	9	7	16	7	24
<i>Gender</i> (n = 2267)							
Male	36	9	10	5	36	11	19
Female	32	12	13	6	25	12	30
<i>Marital Status</i> (n = 2270)							
Married	35	9	10	5	36	10	21
Never married	40	15	17	5	30	12	32
Divorced/separated	37	10	16	4	27	18	26
Widowed	27	10	7	9	16	7	26
<i>Education</i> (n = 2264)							
No H.S. diploma	28	9	14	5	21	11	34
H.S. diploma	30	10	12	5	27	10	26
Some college	37	12	13	5	34	12	23
Bachelors degree	41	7	7	7	41	10	16
<i>Occupation</i> (n = 1506)							
Sales	37	8	17	6	40	9	25
Manual laborer	38	12	21	2	33	14	37
Prof/tech/admin	38	8	7	6	44	10	19
Service	38	9	11	4	33	15	27
Farming/ranching	35	8	5	7	54	6	11
Skilled laborer	32	13	14	5	43	13	24
Admin. support	35	10	9	5	25	11	37

Appendix Table 8 Continued.

Which of the following reasons describe why you haven't run for or accepted appointment to public office in your community or county?

	<i>Already involved in other ways</i>	<i>Don't have skills</i>	<i>No interest</i>	<i>Don't get along with other leaders</i>	<i>Have not lived here long enough</i>	<i>My ideas aren't appreciated</i>	<i>Afraid reputation would suffer</i>
<i>Percent circling each</i>							
<i>(n = 2244)</i>							
Community Size							
Less than 500	14	22	57	2	9	6	2
500 - 999	27	22	55	5	12	8	5
1,000 - 4,999	19	22	62	4	10	6	4
5,000 - 9,999	17	25	63	4	10	5	4
10,000 and up	19	27	62	5	6	5	4
Region							
<i>(n = 2282)</i>							
Panhandle	17	25	61	4	7	5	6
North Central	17	24	57	4	13	6	5
South Central	20	25	61	4	8	5	2
Northeast	19	25	61	3	9	6	4
Southeast	18	22	61	4	8	7	3
Individual Att.:							
<i>Income Level</i>							
<i>(n = 2116)</i>							
Under \$20,000	14	34	65	3	8	6	3
\$20,000 - \$39,999	19	30	60	4	9	6	3
\$40,000 - \$59,999	19	20	58	7	10	6	5
\$60,000 and over	23	11	54	2	8	4	4
<i>Age</i>							
<i>(n = 2294)</i>							
19 - 29	7	20	55	5	24	8	1
30 - 39	14	19	57	6	13	6	6
40 - 49	22	19	55	5	6	6	4
50 - 64	20	22	59	4	6	6	4
65 and older	21	33	70	2	6	5	2
<i>Gender</i>							
<i>(n = 2267)</i>							
Male	19	21	60	5	8	6	4
Female	18	31	62	3	9	4	2
<i>Marital Status</i>							
<i>(n = 2270)</i>							
Married	19	21	59	4	8	6	4
Never married	14	29	61	5	12	5	1
Divorced/separated	16	26	58	5	10	6	3
Widowed	19	40	68	2	7	4	1
<i>Education</i>							
<i>(n = 2264)</i>							
No H.S. diploma	8	47	71	6	9	6	4
H.S. diploma	12	31	67	5	5	6	3
Some college	19	22	59	4	9	6	4
Bachelors degree	31	12	51	3	13	5	4
<i>Occupation</i>							
<i>(n = 1506)</i>							
Sales	17	20	56	2	7	4	8
Manual laborer	8	40	67	8	9	9	3
Prof/tech/admin	26	15	50	3	11	4	4
Service	18	26	64	3	10	7	3
Farming/ranching	20	15	59	3	10	3	3
Skilled laborer	9	22	60	9	6	6	3
Admin. support	22	22	63	2	7	2	2

Note: Columns in bold font have statistically significant differences (based on .05 level).

Appendix Table 9. Importance of Reasons for Running for or Accepting Appointment to Public Office by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes.

How important were the following reasons to you in deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office?										
<i>I feel it is important to help my community or county</i>					<i>I can do something for a cause that is important to me</i>					
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>
<i>Percentages</i>										
Community Size	(n = 379)					(n = 371)				
Less than 500	4	2	27	67		4	7	40	50	
500 - 999	4	0	28	68		3	9	29	59	
1,000 - 4,999	1	1	22	76	P ² =	1	5	35	59	P ² =
5,000 - 9,999	0	0	32	68	11.75	0	9	47	44	9.86
10,000 and up	2	0	15	83	(.466)	4	4	34	59	(.628)
Region	(n = 381)					(n = 374)				
Panhandle	0	0	39	61		3	10	26	61	
North Central	6	1	21	72		6	7	30	57	
South Central	2	1	22	75	P ² =	1	7	38	54	P ² =
Northeast	2	0	22	76	11.23	3	5	39	53	8.40
Southeast	1	1	29	68	(.509)	1	7	40	52	(.754)
Individual Att.:	(n = 350)					(n = 344)				
<i>Income Level</i>	(n = 350)					(n = 344)				
Under \$20,000	7	0	28	65		6	7	34	53	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	3	2	27	68	P ² =	4	6	36	54	P ² =
\$40,000 - \$59,999	1	1	26	72	17.68	1	9	41	49	13.52
\$60,000 and over	0	0	16	84	(.039)	0	2	33	65	(.141)
<i>Age*</i>	(n = 381)					(n = 373)				
30 - 39	0	0	35	66		0	7	39	54	
40 - 49	1	3	17	80	P ² =	1	6	35	58	P ² =
50 - 64	0	0	24	76	20.87	1	9	36	55	9.54
65 and older	6	1	26	67	(.013)	6	5	36	53	(.389)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 377)				P ² =	(n = 369)				P ² =
Male	3	1	24	72	3.46	3	7	36	54	2.79
Female	0	0	32	69	(.326)	0	4	36	60	(.426)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 378)					(n = 370)				
Married	3	1	24	73		3	7	36	54	
Never married	9	0	36	55	P ² =	9	9	27	55	P ² =
Divorced/separated	0	0	13	87	11.15	0	0	36	64	6.06
Widowed	0	3	38	59	(.266)	3	0	40	57	(.734)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 377)					(n = 369)				
No H.S. diploma	11	0	22	67		11	6	33	50	
H.S. diploma	4	1	26	70	P ² =	3	8	32	57	P ² =
Some college	2	1	23	74	7.18	2	7	41	51	8.37
Bachelors degree	1	1	25	73	(.619)	2	5	34	59	(.498)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 255)					(n = 253)				
Sales	0	0	23	77		0	0	36	65	
Manual laborer	0	0	29	71		0	0	43	57	
Prof/tech/admin	0	1	17	82		1	7	29	62	
Service	0	4	22	74		0	15	27	58	
Farming/ranching	8	0	26	66	P ² =	8	5	40	48	P ² =
Skilled laborer	5	0	26	68	20.96	5	11	42	42	21.14
Admin. support	0	0	31	69	(.462)	0	6	38	56	(.451)

*Persons age 19 to 29 were excluded from this analysis as there is only 1 person in this category.

How important were the following reasons to you in deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office?

	<i>I can make new contacts that might help my business/career</i>					<i>It will look good on my resume</i>					
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>										
Community Size	(n = 367)						(n = 362)				
Less than 500	8	69	19	4		7	83	10	1		
500 - 999	8	63	20	9		3	76	14	8		
1,000 - 4,999	1	58	34	7	P ² =	1	78	16	5	P ² =	
5,000 - 9,999	6	72	22	0	18.35	10	84	3	3	16.98	
10,000 and up	6	57	26	11	(.105)	4	75	15	6	(.150)	
Region	(n = 369)						(n = 364)				
Panhandle	3	71	16	10		7	81	10	3		
North Central	7	65	23	5		6	78	12	4		
South Central	3	68	21	9	P ² =	2	83	10	5	P ² =	
Northeast	9	53	33	6	11.40	5	71	20	4	9.28	
Southeast	4	64	26	6	(.495)	4	84	8	4	(.679)	
Individual Att.:											
Income Level	(n = 342)						(n = 338)				
Under \$20,000	13	57	22	7		10	71	10	9		
\$20,000 - \$39,999	9	56	28	7	P ² =	6	80	12	2	P ² =	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	2	68	23	7	19.03	2	80	15	4	17.94	
\$60,000 and over	0	65	29	6	(.025)	0	84	13	2	(.036)	
Age	(n = 369)						(n = 364)				
30 - 39	10	52	24	14		0	71	21	7		
40 - 49	1	63	28	8	P ² =	1	86	11	1	P ² =	
50 - 64	2	69	24	5	15.52	1	80	15	4	26.43	
65 and older	10	60	23	7	(.072)	11	76	8	5	(.002)	
Gender	(n = 366)						(n = 361)				
Male	5	66	23	5	8.18	4	80	12	4	2.29	
Female	7	48	32	13	(.042)	4	72	18	6	(.515)	
Marital Status	(n = 366)						(n = 361)				
Married	5	66	24	6		4	80	12	4		
Never married	18	46	18	18	P ² =	18	64	0	18	P ² =	
Divorced/separated	0	67	20	13	11.96	0	80	13	7	14.62	
Widowed	10	50	33	7	(.216)	7	70	19	4	(.102)	
Education	(n = 365)						(n = 360)				
No H.S. diploma	18	65	12	6		18	65	12	6		
H.S. diploma	8	64	24	5	P ² =	5	81	13	2	P ² =	
Some college	4	62	27	7	9.02	4	76	13	7	12.79	
Bachelors degree	4	64	25	8	(.435)	2	83	13	3	(.172)	
Occupation	(n = 255)						(n = 253)				
Sales	6	53	38	3		3	83	7	7		
Manual laborer	0	86	14	0		0	86	14	0		
Prof/tech/admin	1	66	24	8		1	77	18	4		
Service	0	78	15	7		0	85	15	0		
Farming/ranching	13	66	19	3	P ² =	9	81	8	2	P ² =	
Skilled laborer	5	79	5	11	42.64	5	90	5	0	36.07	
Admin. support	0	31	44	25	(.003)	0	50	31	19	(.022)	

Appendix Table 9 Continued.

How important were the following reasons to you in deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office?

	<i>I can learn new skills and explore my strengths</i>				<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>It is an important activity to the people I respect</i>				<i>Chi-square</i>
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	
	(n = 367)					(n = 371)				
	Percentages					Percentages				
Community Size										
Less than 500	6	33	44	17		6	13	51	31	
500 - 999	5	25	46	24		3	10	48	39	
1,000 - 4,999	3	17	51	29	$P^2 =$	3	12	39	46	$P^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	3	36	48	13	20.52	3	25	31	41	13.20
10,000 and up	6	9	56	30	(.058)	6	9	43	43	(.354)
Region										
		(n = 369)					(n = 373)			
Panhandle	3	23	48	26		7	16	39	39	
North Central	8	21	42	29		6	13	40	41	
South Central	3	20	52	24	$P^2 =$	2	9	51	39	$P^2 =$
Northeast	5	26	53	16	10.82	4	11	45	40	8.11
Southeast	3	31	45	21	(.545)	6	18	38	38	(.777)
Individual Att.:										
<i>Income Level</i>										
		(n = 342)					(n = 345)			
Under \$20,000	10	28	40	22		7	15	31	47	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	8	27	42	23	$P^2 =$	8	10	45	37	$P^2 =$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	3	15	58	24	20.30	3	10	51	37	12.48
\$60,000 and over	0	28	53	19	(.016)	1	15	47	37	(.188)
<i>Age</i>										
		(n = 369)					(n = 373)			
30 - 39	7	17	41	35		10	7	52	31	
40 - 49	1	18	56	25	$P^2 =$	3	14	43	41	$P^2 =$
50 - 64	2	22	54	21	18.26	2	19	46	33	18.21
65 and older	8	31	40	22	(.032)	6	7	41	46	(.033)
<i>Gender</i>										
		(n = 365)					(n = 369)			
Male	5	24	50	22	2.58	4	12	47	37	6.16
Female	4	26	40	30	(.461)	4	15	30	52	(.104)
<i>Marital Status</i>										
		(n = 366)					(n = 370)			
Married	5	23	50	23		4	12	46	38	
Never married	18	36	27	18	$P^2 =$	18	27	18	36	$P^2 =$
Divorced/separated	7	20	40	33	10.94	0	27	40	33	18.55
Widowed	0	33	40	27	(.280)	0	3	38	59	(.029)
<i>Education</i>										
		(n = 365)					(n = 369)			
No H.S. diploma	19	25	38	19		12	12	29	47	
H.S. diploma	6	22	46	26	$P^2 =$	6	6	47	41	$P^2 =$
Some college	3	24	50	24	9.60	4	15	45	37	9.82
Bachelors degree	4	25	51	21	(.384)	3	16	43	39	(.365)
<i>Occupation</i>										
		(n = 253)					(n = 254)			
Sales	6	22	56	16		3	6	47	44	
Manual laborer	0	43	43	14		0	0	57	43	
Prof/tech/admin	1	23	48	28		2	21	39	38	
Service	0	30	41	30		4	7	59	30	
Farming/ranching	11	22	54	13	$P^2 =$	11	14	50	25	$P^2 =$
Skilled laborer	5	5	53	37	27.81	5	11	53	32	26.39
Admin. support	0	25	31	44	(.146)	0	19	25	56	(.192)

How important were the following reasons to you in deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office?

	<i>I feel an obligation to serve</i>					<i>I wanted an opportunity to participate in the decision making process</i>				
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Chi-square</i>
	Percentages									
Community Size	(n = 368)					(n = 370)				
Less than 500	3	15	37	45		4	13	43	40	
500 - 999	4	13	35	47		2	13	34	52	
1,000 - 4,999	1	12	39	47	P ² =	1	4	47	48	P ² =
5,000 - 9,999	0	13	52	36	10.65	0	9	44	47	14.38
10,000 and up	2	7	30	61	(.559)	4	6	39	52	(.277)
Region	(n = 370)					(n = 372)				
Panhandle	0	10	39	52		3	10	42	45	
North Central	4	12	37	48		4	10	45	42	
South Central	2	9	42	47	P ² =	2	6	44	48	P ² =
Northeast	3	14	30	54	7.74	3	9	40	49	4.19
Southeast	1	17	39	43	(.805)	1	12	39	47	(.980)
Individual Att.:										
<i>Income Level</i>	(n = 341)					(n = 346)				
Under \$20,000	3	12	36	49		7	7	46	40	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	6	15	39	40	P ² =	3	9	42	46	P ² =
\$40,000 - \$59,999	1	12	40	47	11.18	1	8	46	46	12.62
\$60,000 and over	0	11	32	57	(.264)	0	12	36	52	(.181)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 370)					(n = 372)				
30 - 39	0	10	55	35		0	0	55	45	
40 - 49	1	20	31	48	P ² =	1	11	41	47	P ² =
50 - 64	1	11	38	50	13.39	1	10	37	52	13.66
65 and older	4	10	36	49	(.146)	5	9	45	42	(.135)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 366)					(n = 369)				
Male	2	13	39	47	1.83	2	9	42	47	1.84
Female	4	14	31	52	(.608)	4	13	42	42	(.607)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 367)					(n = 369)				
Married	2	13	38	47		2	9	43	47	
Never married	10	10	40	40	P ² =	9	9	27	55	P ² =
Divorced/separated	0	13	40	47	4.07	0	20	33	47	5.84
Widowed	4	11	33	52	(.907)	3	10	45	41	(.755)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 366)					(n = 368)				
No H.S. diploma	12	18	24	47		17	6	28	50	
H.S. diploma	4	19	33	44	P ² =	3	13	44	41	P ² =
Some college	2	10	41	48	20.44	2	8	44	46	21.55
Bachelors degree	0	9	39	52	(.015)	1	8	40	52	(.010)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 253)					(n = 255)				
Sales	0	13	26	61		0	9	47	44	
Manual laborer	0	29	29	43		0	0	43	57	
Prof/tech/admin	0	10	37	54		0	10	39	52	
Service	4	15	22	59		0	11	26	63	
Farming/ranching	6	9	48	36	P ² =	8	5	48	39	P ² =
Skilled laborer	0	26	47	26	33.80	5	21	37	37	26.71
Admin. support	0	6	44	50	(.038)	0	6	31	63	(.181)

How important were the following reasons to you in deciding to run for or accepting appointment to public office?

	<i>I was recruited to run</i>				<i>Chi-square</i>	<i>It makes me feel included in the community or county</i>				<i>Chi-square</i>
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Some-what</i>	<i>Very</i>	
	Percentages					Percentages				
Community Size	(n = 363)					(n = 367)				
Less than 500	4	33	40	23		4	23	52	21	
500 - 999	2	45	42	12		2	27	47	24	
1,000 - 4,999	4	33	42	20	P ² =	2	27	43	27	P ² =
5,000 - 9,999	13	50	25	13	16.76	0	29	48	23	8.83
10,000 and up	6	41	29	24	(.159)	2	15	53	31	(.717)
Region	(n = 365)					(n = 369)				
Panhandle	0	39	39	23		0	30	47	23	
North Central	5	29	41	25		5	24	48	24	
South Central	5	39	39	17	P ² =	1	21	48	30	P ² =
Northeast	4	35	42	20	10.34	3	20	49	28	8.80
Southeast	7	47	32	14	(.587)	3	31	48	18	(.720)
Individual Att.:										
<i>Income Level</i>	(n = 336)					(n = 342)				
Under \$20,000	2	32	42	25		4	21	44	31	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	8	29	46	17	P ² =	6	29	39	27	P ² =
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	46	31	19	13.14	1	21	54	25	12.47
\$60,000 and over	5	44	33	18	(.157)	0	27	50	23	(.188)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 365)					(n = 369)				
30 - 39	3	41	41	14		0	32	39	29	
40 - 49	5	35	44	17	P ² =	0	22	55	23	P ² =
50 - 64	2	46	37	15	13.16	0	29	50	21	23.13
65 and older	7	30	37	26	(.155)	7	19	45	30	(.006)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 361)				P ² =	(n = 365)				P ² =
Male	5	39	39	17	5.80	3	26	49	22	9.38
Female	4	31	33	31	(.122)	0	15	44	40	(.025)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 362)					(n = 366)				
Married	5	39	40	17		2	24	51	23	
Never married	10	40	20	30	P ² =	18	27	9	46	P ² =
Divorced/separated	7	53	27	13	12.93	0	40	40	20	23.10
Widowed	4	21	36	39	(.166)	3	17	41	38	(.006)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 361)					(n = 365)				
No H.S. diploma	12	24	47	18		11	11	33	44	
H.S. diploma	5	38	37	21	P ² =	3	24	49	25	P ² =
Some college	5	38	41	17	4.46	2	23	46	29	17.40
Bachelors degree	4	41	35	20	(.878)	2	29	53	16	(.043)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 251)					(n = 251)				
Sales	3	47	28	22		0	16	58	26	
Manual laborer	0	57	29	14		0	29	43	29	
Prof/tech/admin	7	44	31	17		0	26	47	27	
Service	7	37	30	26		0	26	52	22	
Farming/ranching	3	29	57	11	P ² =	5	33	51	11	P ² =
Skilled laborer	5	63	21	11	31.53	5	16	53	26	21.09
Admin. support	0	44	44	13	(.065)	0	25	31	44	(.454)

CARI Research Report 04-4, July 2004

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.