Alternative Development Strategies for Rural Communities: Views from the Great Plains

*John C. Allen,**
Rebecca Filkins
and
*Sam Cordes**

Center for Applied Rural Innovation
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
58 Filley Hall
Lincoln, NE 68583-0947
(402) 472-1772

** Department of Agricultural Economics,*
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Presented at the Annual Rural Sociological Society Meeting in Washington, D.C. on August 13 - 17, 2000.

Funding provided by the Partnership for Rural Nebraska, the Center for Rural Community Revitalization and Development, the University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension Division, and the University of Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station.

Alternative Development Strategies for Rural Communities: Views from the Great Plains

John C. Allen, Rebecca Filkins and Sam Cordes
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

ABSTRACT. In the past, rural economic development policies have traditionally taken one of two forms: direct aid (various forms of financial incentives granted to individual firms) or the provision of infrastructure, such as buildings or roads. However, some argue that these policies have become less efficient and that new alternatives should be considered. These new alternatives include indirect aid to businesses (improved access to capital and business services) as well as active labor market policies (which seek to help match demand and supply in the labor markets). Which policies would be most successful in promoting economic development in rural areas? This paper presents findings from the 2000 Nebraska Rural Poll to address this question. A sample of approximately 7,000 rural Nebraskans were sent a mail questionnaire that asked how effective various economic development policies or strategies would be for their communities. This paper will examine which types of policies rural residents believe will be successful in their communities. It will also explore whether or not respondents' individual characteristics or characteristics of their current community are related to their perceptions toward development.

Introduction

Traditional economic development policies have usually involved either direct aid (various forms of financial incentives granted to individual firms) or the provision of infrastructure, such as roads or water and sewage systems (Muheim and Freshwater, 1999). These incentives are offered to improve the business climate in the area in order to attract new businesses. The business or firm is seen as mobile and can choose the area whose fiscal policies best suit them (Rubin and Zorn, 1985). The incentives offered have typically included: information and advertising about the area; financial incentives that include industrial revenue bonds, direct state loans, property tax abatements, and other forms of tax relief; and nonfinancial incentives which include customized training of potential employees, provision of infrastructure for the business site and help with regulatory problems (Bartik, 1991). These incentives are believed to influence businesses' decisions to locate or expand in an area.

Some citizens have viewed tax incentives for businesses as unjustifiable subsidies. They

don't believe that businesses need lower taxes to be profitable (Eisinger, 1988). And citizen involvement in the decisions to offer incentives has been limited. The incentives are usually proposed, debated and granted by state legislators, city councils and urban administrators. The approval of these incentives is rarely preceded by public debate or referenda (Nunn, 1994).

Fasenfest, Ciancanelli and Reese (1997) also argue that these type of development policies fail to deliver the desired level of assistance to communities because they are structured according to the market instead of looking at community needs. With these type of policies, there is no concern about unequal distribution of power, status or economic well-being (Schneider and Ingram, 1997).

These traditional economic development policies (also known as "smokestack chasing" policies) have focused on traditional outcome measures, such as jobs created. Cernea (1991) argues that development efforts are too often focused on market efficiency rather than looking at more generalized improvement or development of community residents. Thus it is argued that the policies that work best are no longer those that merely increase the number of jobs or businesses. Instead, policies that work should foster "structural and institutional changes which promote a more equitable distribution of new jobs and income generated by growth and enhance a locality's capacity to act and innovate" (Reese and Fasenfest, 1997: 198). Community development policies should incorporate local capacity building concerns that many feel are as important to local development as the narrowly defined economic gains (Smoke, 1997).

Thus, other alternatives have been offered to fit these new criteria. These new alternatives have been labeled as "new wave" economic development policies (Bartik, 1991). They are primarily targeted at small or existing businesses. They involve capital market programs,

information/education for small businesses, research and high technology, and export assistance. Another set of policies that fit under this label are active labor market policies. These policies include efforts such as apprenticeships, support for unemployed workers who want to start up businesses, training and job search assistance. These policies ensure a better match between demand and supply in regional labor markets (Muheim and Freshwater, 1999).

These "new wave" policies work to improve the rural quality of life by benefitting existing businesses and, in areas of high development potential, also attract new businesses. They also encourage local leaders to play a greater role in economic development. Another benefit is the promotion of entrepreneurship and innovation.

The merits of each type of policy can be, and often are, debated. However, what is perhaps more important to explore is how effective rural citizens believe these policies are. Economic development policies have important consequences for the community. Thus, it is important that the community and its members be actively involved in choosing among the various alternatives (Ilvento, 2000). Therefore, this paper will examine rural Nebraskans' perceptions of economic development strategies that could be used in their community.

Methods

Sample and respondent profile

The data used in this analysis were collected from the 2000 Nebraska Rural Poll, an annual self-administered survey sent to a random sample of residents living in the 87 non-metropolitan counties in the state during March of 2000. The respondents were asked questions about their individual well-being, their community, rural economic development, retail shopping, the future of agriculture and their general demographic characteristics. The random sample included 7,000

non-metropolitan residents. This paper is based on 4,536 completed questionnaires received out of approximately 6,700 deliverable surveys (response rate = 67%). The total design method was used in developing and administering the survey (Dillman, 1978).

The average respondent was 53 years of age. Ninety-five percent were married and 74 percent lived within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents had lived in Nebraska 45 years and had lived in their current community 30 years. Fifty percent were living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Forty-seven percent of the respondents reported their approximate household income from all sources, before taxes for 1999 was below $40,000. Thirty-six percent reported incomes over $50,000. Ninety-four percent had attained at least a high school diploma. Seventy-three percent were employed in 1999 on a full-time, part-time or seasonal basis. Nineteen percent were retired. Thirty-seven percent of those employed reported working in a professional/technical or administrative occupation. Eight percent indicated they were farmers or ranchers. A complete demographic profile of respondents is shown in Appendix Table 1.

Variables

Respondents were given a list of 17 different development options for communities in rural Nebraska. They were asked to indicate how effective each would be in ensuring that over the long run their community has a stable or growing population, a variety of businesses and a reasonable number of high quality jobs. A five-point scale was used to indicate their responses, where 1 denoted “very ineffective,” 3 indicated “don’t know” and 5 denoted “very effective.” The respondents were also asked to pick which options they would be most willing to pay for through additional taxes, user fees, bond issues or other forms of public financing.

The responses to these questions were analyzed by the following characteristics: community size, perceptions of community change, age, household income, gender, occupation, community social attributes and satisfaction with community services and amenities. The respondents were given seven answer categories to indicate their community size: less than 100; 100 - 499; 500 - 999; 1,000 - 4,999; 5,000 - 9,999; 10,000 - 19,999; and over 20,000. These answer categories were coded so that 1 equals less than 100 and 7 equals more than 20,000. Household income and education were coded so that higher numbers represent higher levels on these variables.

Respondents were asked to indicate how their community had changed during the past year. The specific question wording was, "When you think about this past year, would you say...My community has changed for the..." The answer categories were better, same or worse. This variable was coded so that 1 indicates better and 0 denotes either same or worse.

The remaining eight variables used in this analysis were generated by applying factor analysis (principal factor extraction with varimax rotation). The first factor, community social attributes, includes respondents' assessments of three aspects of their community. They were asked whether 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. Each scale was coded so that 7 indicated friendly, trusting and supportive.

The remaining seven variables were based on a question in which the respondents indicated their degree of satisfaction with 26 different services and amenities (taking into consideration availability, cost and quality). The respondents rated the services and amenities

using a five-point scale, on which 1 denoted "very dissatisfied" and 5 "very satisfied." One factor includes evaluations of three environmental services: sewage disposal, water disposal and solid waste disposal. Another factor is composed of evaluations of five transportation services: airport, airline service, bus service, rail service and taxi service. The next factor consists of evaluations of two recreation services: parks and recreation and library services. Evaluations of two levels of local government (county and city/village) make up the next factor. The fifth factor includes evaluations of six human services: head start programs, day care services, senior centers, nursing home care, basic medical care and mental health services. The next factor consists of evaluations of three consumer services: retail shopping, restaurants and entertainment. The final factor is composed of evaluations of the transportation infrastructure: satisfaction with streets as well as highways and bridges.

Results

At least one-half of rural Nebraskans believed the following development options would be effective in their communities: enhancing the educational system (K - 12), developing affordable housing, providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs and developing distance learning opportunities. Table 1 shows the responses to these questions.

The responses to this question were analyzed by the respondents' individual characteristics and characteristics of their current community (Appendix Table 2). Community size was related to respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of each economic development strategy, with the exception of three strategies. Current community size was not related to their perceptions of how effective the following strategies would be: promoting telework initiatives, enhancing the educational system (K - 12), and developing affordable housing. For most of the

Table 1. *Perceived Effectiveness of Different Community Development Strategies*

	Very or somewhat ineffective	*Don't know*	*Very or somewhat effective*
Enhancing the educational system (K - 12) in your community	14%	20%	66%
Developing affordable housing in your community	22	20	58
Providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs in your community	16	32	52
Developing distance learning opportunities in your community	13	37	50
Promoting tourism in your community	27	25	48
Providing training or technical assistance to small businesses and entrepreneurs in your community	19	34	47
Emphasizing job creation in nonagricultural industries in your community	26	29	45
Developing retail shopping centers in your community	36	22	42
Developing industrial parks in your community	29	30	41
Providing funds to businesses to train their employees or upgrade their skills	24	36	40
Providing tax incentives to any company that located in your community	24	37	38
Providing tax incentives only to companies that locate in your community and meet a job quality requirement (e.g., the jobs must be at a specified salary level)	21	43	36
Providing job training for dislocated workers	23	42	35
Developing your community into a retirement community	32	35	34
Promoting telework initiatives in your community (employees in your community use technology to work for employers located elsewhere)	21	47	33
Developing your community into a residential			

	Very or somewhat ineffective	*Don't know*	*Very or somewhat effective*
community (with many residents traveling to jobs in another community)	38%	34%	28%
Developing information networks among communities using telecommunications technology (e.g., list servs or chat rooms)	19	55	26

other strategies, persons living in larger communities were more likely than those living in smaller communities to believe that each strategy would be effective for their community. For example, 59 percent of the respondents who lived in communities with populations of 10,000 or more felt that developing retail shopping centers in their community would be effective in ensuring their community has a stable or growing population, a variety of businesses and a reasonable number of high quality jobs. In contrast, only 21 percent of those living in communities with less than 500 people shared this opinion. The exceptions to this pattern occurred when rating the effectiveness of providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs, developing the community into a residential community and developing distance learning opportunities. Persons living in towns with populations ranging from 1,000 to 4,999 were the community size group most likely to believe providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs would be an effective strategy for their community. When asked about developing their community into a residential community and developing distance learning opportunities in their community, the persons living in communities with populations from 500 to 999 were most likely to feel these strategies would work for their community.

Respondents' perceptions of recent change in their community was also related to their

ratings of how effective these strategies would be for their community. Those who felt their community had changed for the better during the past year were the group most likely to believe each strategy would be effective for their community. Those who believed their community had changed for the worse during the past year were the ones least likely to feel these strategies would work in their community.

Household income was also related to respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of each development strategy. In all cases but two, the respondents with higher levels of household income were more likely than those with lower incomes to believe the strategy would be effective for their community. As an example, 61 percent of those with household incomes of $75,000 or more believed emphasizing job creation in nonagricultural industries would be an effective economic development strategy for their community, but only 24 percent of those with incomes under $20,000 felt the same. The two strategies where this pattern changed included developing the community into a retirement community and developing the community into a residential community. In each of these cases, the respondents with lower incomes were the group most likely to believe these two strategies would be effective for their community.

Respondents' perceptions of how effective each economic development strategy would be for their community were also related to age. The younger respondents were typically more likely than the older respondents to believe each strategy would be effective for their community. However, the older respondents were more likely than the younger respondents to believe developing the community into a retirement community would be an effective strategy.

Gender also influenced the responses to these questions. Generally, females were more likely than males to believe that each strategy would be effective for their community. However,

males were more likely than females to believe the following would be effective economic development strategies for their community: emphasizing job creation in nonagricultural industries, developing industrial parks, providing tax incentives to any company that locates in the community and providing tax incentives only to companies that locate in the community and meet a job quality requirement.

For all the development strategies except one, the respondents with higher educational levels were more likely than those with less education to believe each strategy would be effective for their community. The exception to this rule was the strategy of developing the community into a residential community. In this case, the respondents whose highest level of formal education included either a high school diploma or some college (with no degree) were the groups most likely to believe this strategy would be an effective one for their community.

The final individual characteristic examined was occupation. The strategy of providing funds to businesses to train their employees or upgrade their skills was the only one where differences in perceived effectiveness did not occur by occupation. The respondents with professional occupations were generally the group most likely to believe that each strategy would be effective for their community. But, those with sales occupations were the group most likely to believe the following would be effective economic development strategies for their community: developing retail shopping centers, developing the community into a retirement community, and promoting tourism. The skilled laborers were the group most likely to believe that developing their community into a residential community would be beneficial.

The respondents were then asked which of the development options they would be most willing to pay for through additional taxes, user fees, bond issues or other forms of public

financing. They were allowed to choose up to four strategies. Many respondents indicated they were unwilling to pay for any of the strategies listed. However, of those that chose at least one (65 percent of the total respondents), 61 percent were willing to pay additional taxes or user fees for enhancing the educational system (K - 12). This was the only strategy that at least one-half of those answering the question were willing to pay additional monies to implement. Table 2 shows the proportions willing to pay for each strategy.

In addition, a regression analysis was performed to learn more precisely the importance of

Table 2. *Proportions willing to pay for each strategy*

Strategy	Proportion*
Enhancing the educational system (K - 12)	61
Developing affordable housing	34
Emphasizing job creation in nonagricultural industries	30
Providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs	24
Developing retail shopping centers	23
Providing tax incentives only to businesses that locate in your community and meet a job quality requirement	20
Developing distance learning opportunities	19
Providing funds to businesses to train their employees or upgrade their skills	18
Providing training or technical assistance to small businesses and entrepreneurs	17
Providing job training for dislocated workers	16
Promoting telework initiatives	14
Providing tax incentives to any company that locates in your community	14
Promoting tourism	14
Developing industrial parks	13
Developing your community into a retirement community	9
Developing your community into a residential community	7
Developing information networks among communities using telecommunications technology	6

* Proportions were calculated out of those choosing at least one strategy.

each independent variable in explaining the perceived effectiveness of community capacity building development strategies. Seven of the development strategies were identified as capacity building strategies. These seven strategies include: providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs, providing training or technical assistance to small businesses and entrepreneurs, promoting telework initiatives, developing information networks among communities using telecommunications technology, developing distance learning opportunities, providing job training for dislocated workers and enhancing the educational system (K - 12). The responses to these seven strategies were summed together to create a single scale that measures the perceived effectiveness of these strategies. Most of the variables analyzed in Appendix Table 2 were included in the analysis along with the community social attributes variable and the seven variables that measure satisfaction with community services.

The results of the analysis are included in Table 3. These variables account for 12 percent of the variation in respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of capacity building development strategies. All of the variables were statistically significant except for three: satisfaction with environmental services, satisfaction with transportation services, and satisfaction with transportation infrastructure.

Overall, age appears to influence perceptions about these strategies more strongly than the other variables (according to the strength of the beta scores). The younger respondents had higher expectations that these types of strategies would succeed in their community as compared to the older respondents. The variable next in importance in explaining the perceived effectiveness of these strategies was satisfaction with government. The more satisfied people

Table 3. *Perceived Effectiveness of Capacity Building Strategies by Community Attributes and Personal Characteristics*

Independent Variables	*B*	Beta
Community Attributes:		
Perceptions of community change	.616	.083***
Community social attributes	.098	.075***
Satisfaction with environmental services	-.030	-.016
Satisfaction with transportation services	.034	.024
Satisfaction with recreation services	.114	.040*
Satisfaction with local government	.273	.108***
Satisfaction with human services	.092	.073***
Satisfaction with consumer services	.070	.043*
Satisfaction with transportation infrastructure	-.010	-.004
Community size	.116	.039*
Personal Characteristics:		
Age	-.051	-.138***
Household income	.178	.064***
Education	.318	.089***
Variance explained (percentage)	12.2	
F	38.305***	
Number of observations	3,601	

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

were with their local government, the higher their expectations were for these strategies. The respondents' education level and their perceptions of community change were next in importance in influencing their perceptions of the effectiveness of these strategies. Those with higher educational levels and those believing their community has changed for the better during the past year had higher scores on the perceived effectiveness scale.

Conclusion

Rural Nebraskans appear to believe many of the "new wave" economic development policies would be effective in their community. The strategies they felt would be most effective in their community include enhancing the educational system, developing affordable housing, providing loans to small businesses or entrepreneurs and developing distance learning

opportunities. Most of these strategies involve building capacity among community residents. The traditional economic development policies that involve providing tax incentives to companies or developing more industry in the community were not viewed as effective as the others for rural Nebraskan communities.

Different groups of rural Nebraskans were more likely than others to view the strategies as effective. For the most part, persons living in larger communities were more likely than those living in smaller communities to believe most of these strategies would be effective ones for their community. However, persons living in towns with populations ranging from 1,000 to 4,999 were more likely to think that providing loans to small businesses or entrepreneurs would be effective in their community. And, persons living in towns of at least 500 people but less than 1,000 were more likely to view developing their community into a residential community and developing distance learning opportunities as effective strategies. These results suggest that these strategies should not be viewed as "one-size-fits-all." Communities of different sizes have different beliefs about what would work for them.

In addition, people's perceptions about their community influenced how effective they thought each strategy would be for their community. Those who believed their community had changed for the better during the past year were more likely than those who believed their community had either stayed the same or changed for the worse to believe each strategy would be effective for their community. This suggests that those with a positive view of their community also feel positively about its future prospects. Those with a negative view of their community were not as optimistic that any of the strategies could help their town.

The individual characteristics of the respondents also influenced their perceptions of the

effectiveness of the development strategies. Generally, those with higher incomes, the younger respondents, females, those with higher educational levels and persons with professional occupations were the groups most likely to view each strategy as effective in ensuring that over the long run their community has a stable or growing population, a variety of businesses and a reasonable number of high quality jobs.

The regression analysis results show that age and satisfaction with local government are important influences on their perceptions of how effective capacity building development strategies would be for their community. Younger respondents were more likely to believe these types of strategies would be effective in their community. Also, those reporting higher levels of satisfaction with local government were also more likely to believe these strategies would work for their community. This finding suggests that satisfaction with local government is related to the types of development strategies they employ in their community. Those who are dissatisfied with their local government may disagree with the development strategies used by local officials. Therefore, the quality of local officials does seem to impact the perception of the potential success of economic development strategies.

These findings illustrate the continued need for capacity building at the local community level. As the data presented show, those individuals who perceive their community as becoming better over the last year are more likely to be optimistic about alternative development strategies for their community. The diverse opinions held by alternative segments of the population about effective options provides another example as to why it is important to have a diverse cross-section of the community engaged in development activities and in planning processes that identify strategic directions for the community.

Overall, these findings support scale appropriate development strategies for rural communities. One caution is that the rural residents studied were basically unwilling to invest additional tax dollars for local development. The creation of local foundations focused on local development may be one option to overcome this barrier.

Additional research is needed to more clearly understand how local capacity influences the perceptions of community residents toward development efforts and how these perceptions influence action at a local level.

References

Muheim, Philippe and David Freshwater. 1999. "The territorial imperative," *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy*. 14: 90-96.

Rubin, Barry M. and C. Kurt Zorn. 1985. "Sensible State and Local Economic Development," *Public Administration Review*. 45: 333-340.

Bartik, Timothy J. 1991. Who Benefits From State and Local Economic Development Policies? Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Eisinger, Peter K. 1988. The Rise of the Entrepreneurial State. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Nunn, Samuel. 1994. "Regulating Local Tax Abatement Policies: Arguments and Alternative Policies for Urban Planners and Administrators," *Policy Studies Journal*. 22: 574-588.

Fasenfest, David, Penelope Ciancanelli and Laura A. Reese. 1997. "Value, Exchange and the Social Economy: Framework and Paradigm Shift in Urban Policy," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.* 21: 5-20.

Schneider, Anne Larason and Helen Ingram. 1997. Policy Design for Democracy. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Cernea, Michael M. 1991. "Knowledge from Social Science for Development Policies and Projects." In M. Cernea (ed.), Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reese, Laura A. and David Fasenfest. 1997. "What works best? Values and the evaluation of local economic development policy." *Economic Development Quarterly*. 11: 195-213.

Smoke, Paul. 1997. "Response: Making progress in relating values, goals, and results in the evaluation of local economic development policy," *Economic Development Quarterly.* 11: 212-215.

Ilvento, Thomas W. 2000. "Community Opinions on Economic Development in the Rural South," TVA Rural Studies Program, Contractor Paper 00-04.

Dillman, Don A. 1978. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. Wiley and Sons: New York.

Appendix Table 1. *Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 1990 Census*

	2000 Poll	***1999 Poll***	***1998 Poll***	***1997 Poll***	***1990 Census***
Age : [1]					
20 - 39	20%	21%	25%	24%	38%
40 - 64	54%	52%	55%	48%	36%
65 and over	26%	28%	20%	28%	26%
Gender: [2]					
Female	57%	31%	58%	28%	49%
Male	43%	69%	42%	72%	51%
Education: [3]					
Less than 9th grade	2%	3%	2%	5%	10%
9th to 12th grade (no diploma)	4%	5%	3%	5%	12%
High school diploma (or equivalent)	34%	36%	33%	34%	38%
Some college, no degree	28%	25%	27%	25%	21%
Associate degree	9%	9%	10%	8%	7%
Bachelors degree	15%	15%	16%	14%	9%
Graduate or professional degree	9%	8%	9%	9%	3%
Household income: [4]					
Less than $10,000	3%	8%	3%	7%	19%
$10,000 - $19,999	10%	15%	10%	16%	25%
$20,000 - $29,999	15%	18%	17%	19%	21%
$30,000 - $39,999	19%	18%	20%	18%	15%
$40,000 - $49,999	17%	15%	18%	14%	9%
$50,000 - $59,999	15%	9%	12%	10%	5%
$60,000 - $74,999	11%	8%	10%	7%	3%
$75,000 or more	11%	10%	10%	8%	3%
Marital Status: [5]					
Married	95%	76%	95%	73%	64%
Never married	0.2%	7%	0.4%	8%	20%
Divorced/separated	2%	8%	1%	9%	7%
Widowed/widower	4%	10%	3%	10%	10%

[1] 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

[2] 1990 Census universe is total non-metro population.

[3] 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

[4] 1990 Census universe is all non-metro households.

[5] 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 15 years of age and over.

Appendix Table 2. *Perceived Effectiveness of Economic Development Strategies in Relation to Community and Individual Attributes.*

	Emphasizing job creation in nonagricultural industries				***Developing industrial parks***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4284)				(n = 4284)		
Less than 500	36	36	28		46	36	19	
500 - 999	36	31	33		37	39	24	
1,000 - 4,999	30	25	44		33	30	37	
5,000 - 9,999	20	26	53	$\chi^2 = 159.05$	24	30	46	$\chi^2 = 283.73$
10,000 and up	20	28	52	(.000)	21	26	53	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4195)				(n = 4197)		
Better	17	26	57		22	27	52	
Same	28	33	40	$\chi^2 = 184.36$	31	34	35	$\chi^2 = 140.19$
Worse	39	22	39	(.000)	40	26	35	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3956)				(n = 3958)		
Under $20,000	31	45	24		31	42	27	
$20,000 - $29,999	29	33	38		28	35	37	
$30,000 - $39,999	26	26	48		30	29	41	
$40,000 - $49,999	27	24	49		30	28	42	
$50,000 - $59,999	22	25	53		28	27	45	
$60,000 - $74,999	26	22	52	$\chi^2 = 190.76$	31	24	45	$\chi^2 = 95.14$
$75,000 and over	20	19	61	(.000)	26	22	53	(.000)
Age		(n = 4302)				(n = 4303)		
19 - 29	16	36	47		18	34	48	
30 - 39	22	27	51		28	30	42	
40 - 49	26	22	52		32	26	42	
50 - 64	29	26	45	$\chi^2 = 113.89$	31	29	40	$\chi^2 = 40.42$
65 and older	28	38	35	(.000)	26	36	38	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4316)				(n = 4317)		
Male	29	24	46	$\chi^2 = 33.55$	31	27	43	$\chi^2 = 20.67$
Female	24	32	44	(.000)	28	33	39	(.000)
Education		(n = 4300)				(n = 4301)		
No H.S. diploma	29	48	24		24	50	27	
High school diploma	29	34	37		31	33	36	
Some college	27	27	46		30	29	41	
Associate degree	26	23	51		29	27	44	
Bachelors degree	20	21	60	$\chi^2 = 189.03$	27	26	47	$\chi^2 = 94.41$
Graduate/prof. degree	25	17	58	(.000)	28	21	51	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3047)				(n = 3049)		
Prof./technical/admin.	25	19	56		30	22	48	
Admin. support	23	26	51		26	32	41	
Sales	27	22	51		27	25	48	
Service	26	29	45		32	30	38	
Farming/ranching	37	29	34		40	36	23	
Skilled laborer	26	26	48		28	30	42	
Manual laborer	28	32	40	$\chi^2 = 68.10$	28	32	39	$\chi^2 = 72.10$
Other	23	34	43	(.000)	27	36	37	(.000)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Providing tax incentives to any company that locates in the community				***Providing tax incentives only to companies that locate in the community and meet a job quality requirement***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4285)				(n = 4278)		
Less than 500	31	41	28		27	45	28	
500 - 999	28	40	32		28	44	28	
1,000 - 4,999	26	36	39		22	43	36	
5,000 - 9,999	20	37	42	$\chi^2 = 50.78$	17	46	38	$\chi^2 = 46.09$
10,000 and up	22	35	42	(.000)	19	41	39	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4197)				(n = 4189)		
Better	17	36	47		16	44	41	
Same	26	38	35	$\chi^2 = 93.25$	23	45	33	$\chi^2 = 68.70$
Worse	33	34	33	(.000)	28	35	36	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3955)				(n = 3951)		
Under $20,000	25	52	23		23	55	22	
$20,000 - $29,999	24	41	35		22	48	30	
$30,000 - $39,999	25	34	40		21	41	37	
$40,000 - $49,999	26	35	39		22	40	39	
$50,000 - $59,999	21	33	47		19	41	41	
$60,000 - $74,999	28	28	44	$\chi^2 = 113.49$	23	34	43	$\chi^2 = 104.11$
$75,000 and over	23	30	48	(.000)	18	33	49	(.000)
Age		(n = 4303)				(n = 4296)		
19 - 29	12	38	51		12	38	50	
30 - 39	20	38	43		20	41	40	
40 - 49	28	32	40		23	35	42	
50 - 64	27	34	39	$\chi^2 = 89.56$	22	41	36	$\chi^2 = 137.19$
65 and older	22	47	31	(.000)	20	56	24	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4318)				(n = 4312)		
Male	27	33	40	$\chi^2 = 23.22$	24	39	37	$\chi^2 = 24.88$
Female	23	40	37	(.000)	19	46	35	(.000)
Education		(n = 4302)				(n = 4295)		
No H.S. diploma	19	59	22		20	58	21	
High school diploma	26	41	33		24	47	29	
Some college	24	35	41		22	40	38	
Associate degree	25	32	43		19	41	40	
Bachelors degree	23	29	49	$\chi^2 = 113.61$	17	36	47	$\chi^2 = 104.08$
Graduate/prof. degree	25	32	44	(.000)	19	41	40	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3051)				(n = 3043)		
Prof./technical/admin.	25	30	45		22	36	43	
Admin. support	26	34	40		21	35	44	
Sales	22	35	44		18	41	41	
Service	26	35	38		20	43	37	
Farming/ranching	30	36	34		25	44	32	
Skilled laborer	26	37	37		22	40	37	
Manual laborer	21	38	41	$\chi^2 = 24.63$	24	42	35	$\chi^2 = 25.41$
Other	22	38	39	(.038)	26	36	37	(.031)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Providing loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs				***Providing training or technical assistance to small businesses***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4294)				(n = 4282)		
Less than 500	22	27	51		27	29	43	
500 - 999	21	27	52		25	32	43	
1,000 - 4,999	17	27	56		22	33	45	
5,000 - 9,999	13	37	50	$\chi^2 = 70.16$	16	37	47	$\chi^2 = 70.05$
10,000 and up	12	36	52	(.000)	14	34	52	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4206)				(n = 4195)		
Better	12	29	60		14	32	54	
Same	16	35	50	$\chi^2 = 75.64$	19	37	45	$\chi^2 = 83.36$
Worse	24	28	48	(.000)	29	28	44	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3962)				(n = 3954)		
Under $20,000	18	46	36		24	44	32	
$20,000 - $29,999	19	35	46		21	35	44	
$30,000 - $39,999	16	30	54		20	33	47	
$40,000 - $49,999	14	29	57		17	32	51	
$50,000 - $59,999	14	27	59		16	32	52	
$60,000 - $74,999	16	26	58	$\chi^2 = 123.79$	19	26	55	$\chi^2 = 93.45$
$75,000 and over	11	22	67	(.000)	14	26	60	(.000)
Age		(n = 4313)				(n = 4302)		
19 - 29	6	29	65		11	32	57	
30 - 39	14	27	60		16	30	54	
40 - 49	16	24	60		19	28	53	
50 - 64	18	31	52	$\chi^2 = 157.99$	20	32	48	$\chi^2 = 104.24$
65 and older	17	45	39	(.000)	21	43	35	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4328)				(n = 4315)		
Male	18	30	52	$\chi^2 = 13.31$	21	33	46	$\chi^2 = 6.28$
Female	14	33	53	(.001)	18	34	48	(.043)
Education		(n = 4312)				(n = 4300)		
No H.S. diploma	19	46	36		21	45	33	
High school diploma	18	36	46		21	38	41	
Some college	17	30	53		20	32	48	
Associate degree	12	29	59		18	28	55	
Bachelors degree	13	23	64	$\chi^2 = 108.12$	16	27	57	$\chi^2 = 91.98$
Graduate/prof. degree	13	27	60	(.000)	16	29	55	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3050)				(n = 3045)		
Prof./technical/admin.	14	24	62		18	27	55	
Admin. support	14	31	55		15	35	51	
Sales	13	29	58		17	30	54	
Service	17	29	54		22	31	47	
Farming/ranching	20	28	52		23	33	44	
Skilled laborer	16	29	55		19	33	49	
Manual laborer	18	32	50	$\chi^2 = 24.54$	18	38	43	$\chi^2 = 37.50$
Other	17	24	59	(.039)	27	22	51	(.001)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Developing retail shopping centers				***Developing community into a retirement community***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4286)				(n = 4280)		
Less than 500	49	31	21		38	36	26	
500 - 999	47	29	24		37	33	30	
1,000 - 4,999	42	23	35		33	31	36	
5,000 - 9,999	32	22	46	$\chi^2 = 359.06$	32	32	36	$\chi^2 = 41.23$
10,000 and up	25	16	59	(.000)	28	38	35	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4195)				(n = 4190)		
Better	29	20	52		29	30	41	
Same	37	26	37	$\chi^2 = 109.90$	31	39	31	$\chi^2 = 87.80$
Worse	45	16	39	(.000)	42	30	28	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3955)				(n = 3950)		
Under $20,000	38	30	32		29	40	31	
$20,000 - $29,999	34	25	41		27	34	39	
$30,000 - $39,999	40	19	41		32	32	36	
$40,000 - $49,999	36	20	44		35	36	30	
$50,000 - $59,999	33	23	44		31	35	35	
$60,000 - $74,999	33	17	51	$\chi^2 = 60.47$	34	34	32	$\chi^2 = 31.59$
$75,000 and over	30	20	50	(.000)	37	31	33	(.002)
Age		(n = 4304)				(n = 4297)		
19 - 29	23	25	52		32	46	22	
30 - 39	31	21	48		37	36	27	
40 - 49	37	18	44		37	34	29	
50 - 64	39	20	41	$\chi^2 = 67.36$	30	33	37	$\chi^2 = 89.92$
65 and older	34	29	37	(.000)	25	34	41	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4319)				(n = 4313)		
Male	37	22	41	$\chi^2 = 5.08$	34	33	33	$\chi^2 = 8.43$
Female	34	23	43	(.079)	30	36	34	(.015)
Education		(n = 4304)				(n = 4296)		
No H.S. diploma	32	33	35		25	43	32	
High school diploma	38	23	39		30	36	34	
Some college	35	20	45		33	34	34	
Associate degree	34	23	43		34	37	29	
Bachelors degree	36	21	43	$\chi^2 = 32.85$	36	31	33	$\chi^2 = 26.27$
Graduate/prof. degree	35	19	47	(.000)	34	30	37	(.003)
Occupation		(n = 3048)				(n = 3049)		
Prof./technical/admin.	36	19	45		37	32	31	
Admin. support	36	17	47		37	32	31	
Sales	31	19	50		30	32	38	
Service	37	21	42		26	37	37	
Farming/ranching	44	30	26		35	35	29	
Skilled laborer	33	26	42		37	32	31	
Manual laborer	38	20	42	$\chi^2 = 51.72$	28	42	31	$\chi^2 = 30.01$
Other	30	20	50	(.000)	32	34	33	(.008)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Promoting tourism				***Developing community into a residential community***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4294)				(n = 4285)		
Less than 500	40	30	30		31	28	41	
500 - 999	36	29	34		28	23	49	
1,000 - 4,999	27	24	48		36	31	33	
5,000 - 9,999	24	23	54	χ^2 = 153.92	39	37	24	χ^2 =229.00
10,000 and up	21	23	56	(.000)	44	39	17	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4204)				(n = 4192)		
Better	19	20	61		37	32	31	
Same	28	29	43	χ^2 = 157.16	36	36	29	χ^2 = 34.86
Worse	37	23	40	(.000)	46	32	22	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3962)				(n = 3959)		
Under $20,000	27	32	40		28	44	29	
$20,000 - $29,999	25	28	47		30	40	30	
$30,000 - $39,999	28	22	50		41	28	30	
$40,000 - $49,999	27	24	49		40	31	30	
$50,000 - $59,999	26	23	50		41	32	28	
$60,000 - $74,999	29	20	51	χ^2 = 36.83	45	29	26	χ^2 = 79.03
$75,000 and over	26	20	54	(.000)	45	30	25	(.000)
Age		(n = 4312)				(n = 4303)		
19 - 29	26	26	49		40	30	31	
30 - 39	29	26	45		42	31	27	
40 - 49	28	22	50		46	27	27	
50 - 64	27	24	50	χ^2 = 19.39	37	34	29	χ^2 = 115.67
65 and older	23	28	49	(.013)	26	44	30	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4327)				(n = 4318)		
Male	30	24	46	χ^2 = 15.91	41	32	27	χ^2 = 11.92
Female	24	26	50	(.000)	36	35	29	(.003)
Education		(n = 4311)				(n = 4303)		
No H.S. diploma	19	38	43		25	52	23	
High school diploma	30	27	43		33	38	29	
Some college	26	24	50		38	33	29	
Associate degree	26	22	51		43	30	27	
Bachelors degree	25	21	54	χ^2 = 60.08	46	27	28	χ^2 = 91.61
Graduate/prof. degree	28	19	53	(.000)	45	26	28	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3052)				(n = 3047)		
Prof./technical/admin.	26	22	52		46	27	27	
Admin. support	29	20	52		41	29	30	
Sales	24	20	56		42	31	27	
Service	28	23	50		38	35	27	
Farming/ranching	34	30	36		42	30	28	
Skilled laborer	28	26	46		40	30	31	
Manual laborer	30	33	38	χ^2 = 45.68	32	41	28	χ^2 = 27.77
Other	27	27	46	(.000)	46	30	24	(.015)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Promoting telework initiatives				***Developing information networks among communities***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4275)				(n = 4263)		
Less than 500	25	43	32		26	52	22	
500 - 999	21	44	35		22	52	26	
1,000 - 4,999	22	45	34		21	55	25	
5,000 - 9,999	18	49	32	$\chi^2 = 14.80$	16	58	26	$\chi^2 = 31.74$
10,000 and up	20	49	32	(.063)	17	55	28	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4183)				(n = 4173)		
Better	19	44	37		17	52	31	
Same	19	50	32	$\chi^2 = 65.85$	18	58	24	$\chi^2 = 63.96$
Worse	31	41	29	(.000)	28	52	21	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3953)				(n = 3942)		
Under $20,000	20	59	21		18	66	17	
$20,000 - $29,999	21	55	24		16	62	22	
$30,000 - $39,999	21	44	35		21	55	25	
$40,000 - $49,999	20	44	36		20	52	28	
$50,000 - $59,999	21	44	35		20	54	26	
$60,000 - $74,999	21	37	43	$\chi^2 = 114.83$	20	47	34	$\chi^2 = 92.39$
$75,000 and over	21	35	44	(.000)	19	43	38	(.000)
Age		(n = 4293)				(n = 4281)		
19 - 29	18	43	39		17	49	34	
30 - 39	18	40	41		19	53	28	
40 - 49	23	39	39		23	47	30	
50 - 64	22	46	33	$\chi^2 = 164.56$	19	53	28	$\chi^2 = 118.57$
65 and older	19	61	19	(.000)	15	68	16	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4307)				(n = 4295)		
Male	23	45	32	$\chi^2 = 15.00$	21	55	24	$\chi^2 = 8.00$
Female	19	48	33	(.001)	18	55	27	(.018)
Education		(n = 4294)				(n = 4282)		
No H.S. diploma	21	62	17		13	72	14	
High school diploma	21	55	24		19	63	18	
Some college	21	46	33		19	53	28	
Associate degree	23	40	37		21	50	28	
Bachelors degree	18	35	47	$\chi^2 = 185.66$	20	45	35	$\chi^2 = 158.62$
Graduate/prof. degree	23	33	44	(.000)	21	41	38	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3042)				(n = 3031)		
Prof./technical/admin.	22	36	43		21	44	35	
Admin. support	18	41	41		20	50	31	
Sales	23	45	31		20	50	30	
Service	23	45	32		19	58	22	
Farming/ranching	23	45	32		22	56	22	
Skilled laborer	22	47	31		20	56	24	
Manual laborer	18	52	31	$\chi^2 = 49.98$	18	61	21	$\chi^2 = 52.42$
Other	25	46	29	(.000)	21	54	26	(.000)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Developing distance learning opportunities				***Providing job training for dislocated workers***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4207)				(n = 4231)		
Less than 500	17	35	48		30	41	28	
500 - 999	15	30	55		31	39	30	
1,000 - 4,999	14	38	48		26	43	31	
5,000 - 9,999	13	35	52	$\chi^2 = 26.45$	22	43	36	$\chi^2 = 96.26$
10,000 and up	11	38	51	(.001)	16	41	43	(.000)
Community Change		(n = 4116)				(n = 4138)		
Better	9	33	58		18	41	42	
Same	13	39	47	$\chi^2 = 65.04$	22	45	33	$\chi^2 = 91.46$
Worse	19	35	46	(.000)	34	35	31	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3889)				(n = 3912)		
Under $20,000	13	51	37		24	52	24	
$20,000 - $29,999	12	44	44		25	45	30	
$30,000 - $39,999	13	36	52		22	38	40	
$40,000 - $49,999	15	33	52		21	40	39	
$50,000 - $59,999	12	33	55		22	41	37	
$60,000 - $74,999	13	26	62	$\chi^2 = 99.51$	21	37	42	$\chi^2 = 67.84$
$75,000 and over	14	29	57	(.000)	23	34	43	(.000)
Age		(n = 4220)				(n = 4248)		
19 - 29	9	38	53		11	51	38	
30 - 39	12	31	57		18	41	41	
40 - 49	15	29	55		24	38	38	
50 - 64	13	37	50	$\chi^2 = 119.60$	26	37	38	$\chi^2 = 97.76$
65 and older	12	50	39	(.000)	23	52	26	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4235)				(n = 4260)		
Male	14	39	47	$\chi^2 = 14.12$	26	42	32	$\chi^2 = 20.18$
Female	12	35	53	(.001)	21	42	38	(.000)
Education		(n = 4222)				(n = 4248)		
No H.S. diploma	14	60	26		23	53	24	
High school diploma	14	48	39		25	45	30	
Some college	13	34	53		23	41	35	
Associate degree	14	27	60		22	37	42	
Bachelors degree	11	25	64	$\chi^2 = 267.61$	18	39	43	$\chi^2 = 73.94$
Graduate/prof. degree	13	20	67	(.000)	21	35	45	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3005)				(n = 3012)		
Prof./technical/admin.	13	25	62		22	37	42	
Admin. support	13	28	59		25	37	39	
Sales	12	37	51		24	36	41	
Service	16	37	47		23	39	39	
Farming/ranching	14	37	49		31	44	25	
Skilled laborer	14	42	44		23	40	37	
Manual laborer	12	45	44	$\chi^2 = 80.26$	22	43	35	$\chi^2 = 27.93$
Other	19	37	44	(.000)	20	39	41	(.015)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Providing funds to businesses to train their employees				***Enhancing the educational system (K - 12)***			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*	*Ineffective*	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
				Percentages				
Community Attributes:								
Community Size		(n = 4246)				(n = 4264)		
Less than 500	31	33	36		17	19	65	
500 - 999	31	35	35		16	17	67	
1,000 - 4,999	26	35	38		14	17	69	
5,000 - 9,999	22	39	39	$\chi^2 = 58.10$	15	20	65	$\chi^2 = 12.89$
10,000 and up	19	36	45	(.000)	13	21	66	(.116)
Community Change		(n = 4155)				(n = 4172)		
Better	18	37	46		10	15	75	
Same	24	38	38	$\chi^2 = 78.08$	15	22	63	$\chi^2 = 84.28$
Worse	34	30	36	(.000)	21	18	61	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
Income Level		(n = 3924)				(n = 3939)		
Under $20,000	25	49	26		16	29	55	
$20,000 - $29,999	22	40	38		13	25	62	
$30,000 - $39,999	23	36	42		15	18	68	
$40,000 - $49,999	24	33	43		13	17	70	
$50,000 - $59,999	23	33	45		13	15	72	
$60,000 - $74,999	25	28	47	$\chi^2 = 83.84$	15	13	72	$\chi^2 = 86.20$
$75,000 and over	21	29	50	(.000)	15	14	72	(.000)
Age		(n = 4264)				(n = 4280)		
19 - 29	17	25	58		7	15	79	
30 - 39	18	30	52		14	15	71	
40 - 49	23	30	47		16	14	70	
50 - 64	27	35	38	$\chi^2 = 207.17$	13	21	66	$\chi^2 = 85.60$
65 and older	25	50	26	(.000)	14	27	59	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4278)				(n = 4294)		
Male	27	35	39	$\chi^2 = 18.44$	15	20	65	$\chi^2 = 1.74$
Female	21	37	41	(.000)	14	19	67	(.419)
Education		(n = 4264)				(n = 4281)		
No H.S. diploma	22	51	27		12	43	45	
High school diploma	26	39	35		14	24	63	
Some college	24	36	40		16	18	67	
Associate degree	22	30	48		17	14	69	
Bachelors degree	20	32	48	$\chi^2 = 78.38$	11	13	75	$\chi^2 = 166.84$
Graduate/prof. degree	22	29	49	(.000)	15	8	77	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3026)				(n = 3034)		
Prof./technical/admin.	23	30	48		15	13	72	
Admin. support	26	31	44		14	15	71	
Sales	24	32	44		14	20	67	
Service	25	32	43		15	15	69	
Farming/ranching	26	39	36		16	15	69	
Skilled laborer	24	30	46		14	22	64	
Manual laborer	25	31	45	$\chi^2 = 17.32$	13	24	64	$\chi^2 = 30.69$
Other	18	38	44	(.239)	15	22	64	(.006)

Appendix Table 2 Continued

	Developing affordable housing			
	Ineffective	*Don't know*	*Effective*	*Significance*
	Percentages			
Community Attributes:				
Community Size		(n = 4288)		
Less than 500	24	24	52	
500 - 999	24	21	56	
1,000 - 4,999	22	19	59	
5,000 - 9,999	22	17	61	$\chi^2 = 13.69$
10,000 and up	21	21	58	(.090)
Community Change		(n = 4196)		
Better	18	16	66	
Same	22	23	55	$\chi^2 = 79.36$
Worse	29	20	51	(.000)
Individual Attributes:				
Income Level		(n = 3961)		
Under $20,000	26	26	48	
$20,000 - $29,999	22	21	58	
$30,000 - $39,999	22	19	60	
$40,000 - $49,999	24	18	57	
$50,000 - $59,999	19	21	61	
$60,000 - $74,999	23	14	63	$\chi^2 = 41.19$
$75,000 and over	19	19	62	(.000)
Age		(n = 4306)		
19 - 29	15	18	67	
30 - 39	18	20	63	
40 - 49	23	18	59	
50 - 64	24	20	56	$\chi^2 = 30.32$
65 and older	23	24	53	(.000)
Gender		(n = 4320)		
Male	24	20	56	$\chi^2 = 8.77$
Female	20	21	59	(.012)
Education		(n = 4306)		
No H.S. diploma	28	27	45	
High school diploma	25	23	53	
Some college	22	19	59	
Associate degree	20	18	62	
Bachelors degree	18	19	63	$\chi^2 = 54.77$
Graduate/prof. degree	19	15	66	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 3047)		
Prof./technical/admin.	20	18	62	
Admin. support	23	18	60	
Sales	21	18	62	
Service	26	13	61	
Farming/ranching	23	25	52	
Skilled laborer	20	23	58	
Manual laborer	23	23	54	$\chi^2 = 26.42$
Other	22	18	60	(.023)