



# CENTER FOR APPLIED RURAL INNOVATION

A Research Report\*

**Perceptions of Individual and Community  
Well-Being Among Rural Nebraskans**

*2007 Nebraska Rural Poll Results*

Rebecca J. Vogt  
Randolph L. Cantrell  
Miguel A. Carranza  
Bruce B. Johnson  
David J. Peters

UNIVERSITY OF  
**Nebraska**  
Lincoln

**N**  
IANR

Center Research Report 07-1, August 2007.

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

Phone: 515.288.4431, FAX: 515.243.1979

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

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

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

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2007)</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<i>Figure 1. Community Change, 1996 - 2007</i> .....	3
<i>Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2007</i> .....	4
<i>Table 1. Proportions of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2007</i> .....	5
<b>Trends in Well-Being (1996 - 2007)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Figure 3. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago: 1996 - 2007</i> .....	6
<i>Figure 4. Well-Being Compared to Parents: 1996 - 2007</i> .....	6
<i>Figure 5. Expected Well-Being Ten Years from Now: 1996 - 2007</i> .....	7
<i>Figure 6. "...People are Powerless to Control Their Lives": 1996 - 2007</i> .....	7
<i>Table 2. Proportions of Respondents Satisfied with Each Factor, 1996 - 2007</i> .....	9
<b>The Community and Its Attributes in 2007</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>Figure 7. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size</i> .....	10
<i>Figure 8. Feelings About Community</i> .....	13
<i>Figure 9. Difficulty or Ease of Leaving Community</i> .....	15
<i>Figure 10. Ease or Difficulty Leaving Community by Length of Residence in Community</i> .....	15
<b>Plans to Leave the Community</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>General Well-Being by Subgroups</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<i>Figure 11. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago by Occupation</i> .....	17
<i>Figure 12. "...People are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives" by Education</i> .....	18
<b>Specific Aspects of Well-Being by Subgroups</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>20</b>

## *List of Appendix Tables and Figures*

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska .....	22
Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2000 Census .....	23
Appendix Table 2. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	24
Appendix Table 3. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	26
Appendix Table 4. Level of Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities .....	28
Appendix Table 5. Measures of Satisfaction with Ten Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	29
Appendix Table 6. Feelings About Community by Region, Community Size and Individual Attributes .....	32
Appendix Table 7. Opinions About Leaving Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	35
Appendix Table 8. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	36
Appendix Table 9. Measures of Individual Well-Being in Relation to Community Size, Region, and Individual Attributes .....	38
Appendix Table 10. Life Has Changed So Much in Our Modern World that Most People Are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives .....	40
Appendix Table 11. Satisfaction with Items Affecting Well-Being, 2007 .....	42
Appendix Table 12. Satisfaction with Items by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	43

## *Executive Summary*

Many rural communities have experienced population growth during the past decade and the state has experienced relatively stable economic conditions during the past year. How do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided? Are they planning to move from their community next year? How do rural Nebraskans perceive their quality of life? Do their perceptions differ by community size, the region in which they live, or their occupation?

This report details 2,680 responses to the 2007 Nebraska Rural Poll, the twelfth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and individual well-being. Trends for some of these questions are examined by comparing data from the eleven previous polls to this year's results. For all questions, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, that is, comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- ***During the past four years, the proportion of rural Nebraskans that have viewed positive change in their communities has increased.*** Following a seven year period of general decline, the proportion saying their community has changed for the better increased from 23 percent in 2003 (the lowest point over the twelve year period) to 33 percent this year. (page 3)
- ***By many different measures, rural Nebraskans are positive about their community.***
  - ✓ *Many rural Nebraskans rate their community favorably on its social dimensions.* Many rural Nebraskans rate their communities as friendly (72%), trusting (59%) and supportive (65%). (page 10)
  - ✓ *Many rural Nebraskans express positive sentiments about their community.* Approximately two-thirds (67%) agree with the statement that “my community is very special to me.” And 62 percent agree with the statement that “I feel I can really be myself in my community.” (page 13)
  - ✓ *One-half of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community.* Fifty percent say it would be difficult for their household to leave their community. Approximately one-third (32%) indicate it would be easy for their household to leave their community and 18 percent gave a neutral response. (page 14)
- ***Rural Nebraskans continue to be generally positive about their current situation.*** Each year the proportion of rural Nebraskans that say they are better off than they were five years ago has been greater than the proportion saying they are worse off than they were five years ago. And, during the past four years, the proportion of rural Nebraskans saying they are worse off than they were five years ago has declined from 28 percent in 2003 to 15 percent this year. The proportion believing they are better off than they were five years ago has generally increased during this same four-year time period. The proportion saying

they are better off first increased from 32 percent in 2003 to 45 percent in 2005. The proportion then dipped to 39 percent last year before increasing again to 44 percent this year. (page 6)

- ***Similarly, rural Nebraskans continue to be generally positive about their future.*** The proportion that say they will be better off ten years from now has always been greater than the proportion saying they will be worse off ten years from now. The proportion stating they will be better off ten years from now has generally remained about 41 percent. This year, the proportion was 41 percent. Eighteen percent believe they will be worse off ten years from now. (page 7)
- ***Following trends in previous years, rural Nebraskans are most satisfied with their marriage, family, friends, religion/spirituality and the outdoors. They continue to be less satisfied with job opportunities, current income level and financial security during retirement.*** (page 5)
- ***While residents living in or near larger communities are more likely to view positive change in their communities, residents of smaller communities are more likely to rate their community favorably on its social dimensions and to have positive sentiments about their community.***
  - ✓ *Residents living in or near larger communities are more likely than residents of smaller communities to say their community has changed for the better during the past year.* Thirty-eight percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe their community has changed for the better, compared to 19 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people. (page 10)
  - ✓ *Residents living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to rate their community as friendly and trusting.* Approximately 65 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 say their community is trusting, compared to 55 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more. (page 10)
  - ✓ *Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community.* Fifty-three percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree with the statement that my community is my favorite place to be. In comparison, approximately 40 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more agree with this statement. (page 13)
- ***Except for a few services that are largely unavailable in rural communities, rural Nebraskans are generally satisfied with basic community services and amenities.*** At least 70 percent of rural Nebraskans are satisfied with the following services or amenities: fire protection (85%), parks and recreation (74%), library services (74%) and religious organizations (72%). On the other hand, at least one-third of rural Nebraskans are

dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping, restaurants, streets and roads, arts/cultural activities, local government and public transportation services in their community. (page 11)

- ***Persons with the highest household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to feel they are better off compared to five years ago, are better off compared to their parents when they were their age, and will be better off ten years from now.*** For example, 62 percent of respondents with household incomes of \$60,000 or more think they are better off than they were five years ago. However, only 29 percent of respondents with household incomes under \$20,000 believe they are better off than they were five years ago. (page 17)
- ***Persons with lower education levels are more likely than persons with more education to believe that people are powerless to control their own lives.*** Forty-nine percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education agree that people are powerless to control their own lives. However, only 26 percent of persons with a four-year college degree share this opinion. (page 18)

## *Introduction*

Recent community level Census data show that many communities in Nebraska have experienced growth. In addition, Nebraska has experienced relatively stable economic conditions during the past year.

Given these conditions, how do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided by their community? Are they planning to move from their community in the next year? How do rural Nebraskans believe they are doing and how do they view their future? Have these views changed over the past twelve years? How satisfied are they with various items that influence their well-being? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

The 2007 Nebraska Rural Poll is the twelfth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community and individual well-being. Trends for these questions will be examined by comparing the data from the eleven previous polls to this year's results.

### *Methodology and Respondent Profile*

This study is based on 2,680 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 6,400 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, retirement issues, work, and immigration. This paper reports only results from the community and well-being portions of the survey.

A 40% 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.

In addition to the standard random sample of rural households, this year's questionnaire was also distributed both randomly and non-randomly to Latinos in three communities (Grand Island, Lexington and Crete) in order to increase responses received from Latinos. Out of the returned surveys in these communities, 151 self-identified themselves as Spanish, Hispanic or Latino. The Latino respondents were combined with the respondents from the random rural sample for this report in order that the total proportion of Latino respondents would mirror the proportion of Latinos living in rural Nebraska.

Appendix Table 1 shows demographic data from this year's study and previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire non-metropolitan population of Nebraska (using 2000 U.S. Census data). As can be seen from the table, there are



some marked differences between some of the demographic variables in our sample compared to the Census data. Certainly some variance from 2000 Census data is to be expected as a result of changes that have occurred in the intervening seven years. Nonetheless, we suggest the reader use caution in generalizing our data to all rural Nebraska. However, given the random sampling frame used for this survey, the acceptable percentage of responses, and the large number of respondents, we feel the data provide useful insights into opinions of rural Nebraskans on the various issues presented in this report. The margin of error for this study is plus or minus two percent.

Since younger residents have typically been under-represented by survey respondents and older residents have been over-represented, weights were used to adjust the sample to match the age distribution in the non-metropolitan counties in Nebraska (using U.S. Census figures). Even though this is the first year that such weighting has been utilized in the data analysis, data from the previous polls were weighted in a similar fashion for the trend comparisons included in this report.

The average age of respondents is 50 years. Seventy percent are married (Appendix Table 1) and 70 percent live within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 41 years and have lived in their current community 27 years. Forty-nine percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Forty-eight percent of the respondents report their 2006 approximate household income

from all sources, before taxes, as below \$40,000. Thirty-nine percent report incomes over \$50,000.

Seventy-four percent were employed in 2006 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Nineteen percent are retired. Forty-one percent of those employed reported working in a professional, technical or administrative occupation. Ten percent indicated they were farmers or ranchers.

### *Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2007)*


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

#### *Community Change*

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

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

During the past four years, the proportion of rural Nebraskans that have viewed positive



change in their communities has increased (Figure 1). Following a seven year period of general decline, the proportion saying their community has changed for the better increased from 23 percent in 2003 (the lowest point over the twelve year period) to 33 percent this year. This pattern seems to follow the economic conditions that existed in the state during this time period.

The proportion saying their community has stayed the same first increased from 1996 to 1998. It then remained fairly steady during the following eight years but has since declined the past two years. The proportion saying their community has changed for the worse has remained fairly steady across all twelve 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 has remained fairly steady over the twelve year period, ranging from 69 to 75 percent. The proportion of respondents who view their community as trusting have also remained fairly steady, ranging from 59 to 66 percent. A similar pattern emerged when examining the proportion of respondents who rated their community as supportive. The proportions rating their community as supportive have ranged from 60 percent to 67 percent over the twelve year period.

### Plans to Leave the Community

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

The expected destination for the persons planning to move has changed over time (Figure 2). During the past three years of this study, the proportion of expected movers planning to move to either the Omaha or Lincoln area has increased from 8 percent in 2004 to 22 percent this year (the highest proportion during the ten year period). During this same three year time period, the proportion planning to leave Nebraska has generally decreased. In 2004, 54 percent of expected movers planned to leave the state. This proportion steadily

**Figure 2. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2007**



decreased to 36 percent last year and then increased slightly to 39 percent this year.

### *Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities*

Respondents were also asked how satisfied they are with various community services and amenities each year. They were asked this in all twelve studies; however, in 1996 they were also asked about the availability of these services. Therefore, comparisons will only be made between the last eleven studies, when the question wording was identical. The respondents were asked how satisfied they were with a list of 24 services and amenities, taking into consideration availability, cost, and quality.

Table 1 shows the proportions very or somewhat satisfied with the service each year. The rank ordering of these items has remained relatively stable over the eleven years. However, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with many social services has declined across all eleven years of the study. In addition, a few services had significant declines this year. Medical care services, senior centers, nursing home care, day care services, and Head Start programs all had significant declines in the proportions satisfied with each service this year. As an example, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with day care services in their community has steadily declined across all eleven years, from 51 percent in 1997 to 31 percent this year.

### *Trends in Well-Being (1996 - 2007)*

Comparisons are made between the well-being data collected this year to the eleven previous studies. These comparisons show a clearer picture of the trends in the well-being of rural Nebraskans.

### *General Well-Being*

To examine perceptions of general well-being, respondents were asked four questions.

1. "All things considered, do you think you are better or worse off than you were five years ago?" (Answer categories were worse off, about the same, or better off).
2. "All things considered, do you think you are better or worse off than your parents when they were your age?"
3. "All things considered, do you think you will be better or worse off ten years from now than you are today?"

**Table 1. Proportion of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2007**

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

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



4. “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Life has changed so much in our modern world that most people are powerless to control their own lives.”


When examining the trends over the past twelve years, rural Nebraskans have generally given positive reviews about their current situation (Figure 3). Each year the proportion of rural Nebraskans that say they are better off than they were five years ago has been greater than the proportion saying they are worse off than they were five years ago. And, during the past four years, the proportion of rural Nebraskans saying they are worse off than they were five years ago has declined from 28 percent in 2003 to 15 percent this year. The proportion believing

they are better off than they were five years ago has generally increased during this same four-year time period. The proportion saying they are better off first increased from 32 percent in 2003 to 45 percent in 2005. The proportion then dipped to 39 percent last year before increasing again to 44 percent this year.

When asked to compare themselves to their parents when they were their age, the responses have been very stable over time (Figure 4). The proportion stating they are better off has averaged 59 percent over the twelve year period. Similarly, the proportion feeling they are worse off than their parents has remained steady at approximately 16 percent during this period.

When looking to the future, respondents’





views have also been generally positive (Figure 5). The proportion that say they will be better off ten years from now has always been greater than the proportion saying they will be worse off ten years from now. The gap between the two proportions was widest in 1998 and 2005. The gap narrowed somewhat in 2003.


The proportion stating they will be better off ten years from now has generally remained about 41 percent. In 2003, the proportion fell to 37 percent, the lowest of all 12 years. The proportion of respondents stating they will be worse off ten years from now has been approximately 19 percent each year. In 1996 the proportion saying they would be worse off ten years from now was 28 percent, the highest of all 12 years. The proportion has declined to 18 percent this

year.

In addition to asking about general well-being, rural Nebraskans were asked about the amount of control they feel they have over their lives. To measure this, respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statement:

*“Life has changed so much in our modern world that most people are powerless to control their own lives.”*

Responses to this question remained fairly consistent over the first ten years (Figure 6). The proportion who either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement has declined since 2002, from 58 percent to 44 percent this year, the lowest of the 12-year period. The proportion that either strongly agree or



agree with the statement has remained fairly consistent each year, averaging around 33 percent. However, the proportion has increased during the past three years, from 30 percent in 2005 to 38 percent this year. This is the highest proportion in all 12 years of the study. The proportion of those who were undecided each year has gradually increased over time, from 10 percent in 1996 to 18 percent this year.

### *Satisfaction with Specific Aspects of Life*

Each year, respondents were also given a list of items that can affect their well-being and were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with each using a five-point scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 5 = very satisfied). They were also given the option of checking a box to denote “does not apply.”

This same question was asked in the eleven previous polls, but the list of items was not identical each year. Table 2 shows the proportions very or somewhat satisfied with each item for each study period.

The rank ordering of the items has remained relatively stable over the years. In addition, the proportion of respondents stating they were very or somewhat satisfied with each item also has been fairly consistent over the years. However, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with both clean air and clean water dropped this year. During the past seven years, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with clean air has averaged approximately 80 percent. This proportion dropped to 74 percent this year. Similarly, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with clean water has averaged approximately 74 percent during the past seven years, but declined to 68

percent this year.

Items generally fall into three levels of satisfaction ratings. Family, friends, the outdoors, spirituality, their health and education continue to be items given high satisfaction ratings by respondents. Items in the middle category include job satisfaction, job security, their spare time and their community. On the other hand, respondents continue to be less satisfied with job opportunities, their current income level, and financial security during retirement.

### *The Community and Its Attributes in 2007*

In this section, the 2007 data on respondents' evaluations of their communities and its attributes are examined in terms of any significant differences that may exist depending upon the size of the respondent's community, the region in which they live, or various individual attributes such as household income or age.

#### *Community Change*

The perceptions of the change occurring in their community by various demographic subgroups are examined (Appendix Table 2). Residents living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to say that their community has changed for the better. Thirty-eight percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe their community has changed for the better, compared to 19 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people (Figure 7). Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger

**Table 2. Proportions of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Factor, 1996 - 2007.\***

Item	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Your marriage	90	94	92	94	92	93	92	93	92	91	NA	NA
Your family	88	91	89	90	90	90	89	93	89	92	93	90
Your friends	82	84	83	86	85	85	86	87	84	87	85	84
Greenery and open space	80	85	83	80	82	87	86	86	87	90	NA	NA
Your religion/spirituality	78	75	75	78	78	79	79	83	78	81	79	79
Your education	74	74	71	72	74	74	72	76	74	74	73	73
Your health	74	73	71	73	75	74	74	77	75	78	81	78
Clean air	74	80	79	78	79	82	81	80	NA	NA	NA	NA
Your housing	73	76	78	77	79	78	78	80	80	81	75	NA
Clean water	68	74	73	73	75	76	75	73	NA	NA	NA	NA
Your spare time**	68	68	65	66	67	67	66	71	65	71	NA	54
Your job satisfaction	68	69	72	72	68	70	69	70	66	69	69	68
Your job security	64	66	65	66	62	65	66	68	59	63	64	63
Your community	62	62	66	64	62	63	67	70	68	70	64	65
Your current income level	50	50	48	49	47	48	48	51	46	53	58	54
Job opportunities	40	43	39	34	35	37	38	36	37	38	41	39
Financial security during retirement	39	39	38	34	30	38	37	43	38	43	47	43

Note: The list of items was not identical in each study. "NA" means that item was not asked that particular year.


\* The proportions were calculated out of those answering the question. The respondents checking "does not apply" were not included in the calculations.

\*\* Worded as "time to relax during the week" in 1996 study.

communities to say their community did not change during the past year.

The other groups most likely to say their community has changed for the better include: persons between the ages of 30 and





39, respondents with the highest household incomes, persons with the highest education levels and Latinos. When comparing responses by region, persons living in both the Panhandle and Southeast regions of the state were the groups *least* likely to say their community has changed for the better during the past year (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region).

### 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 (72%), trusting (59%) and supportive (65%).

Respondents' ratings of their community on these dimensions differ by some of the

characteristics examined (Appendix Table 3). Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the largest communities to rate their community as both friendly and trusting. Approximately 65 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 say their community is trusting, compared to 55 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more.

When comparing responses by age, persons age 65 and older are more likely than younger respondents to view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. Widowed respondents are the marital group most likely to view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. As an example, 69 percent of widowed respondents say their community is trusting, compared to 47 percent of persons who are either divorced/ separated or who have never married.

Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group most likely to view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. Eighty-one percent of farmers and ranchers rate their community as friendly, compared to 55 percent of persons with occupations classified as "other."

Non-Latinos are more likely than Latinos to view their community as trusting. Sixty percent of non-Latinos rate their community as trusting, compared to 50 percent of Latinos.

### Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

Next, rural residents were asked to rate how

satisfied they are with 24 different services and amenities, taking into consideration cost, availability, and quality. Residents report high levels of satisfaction with some services, but other services and amenities have higher levels of dissatisfaction. Only four services listed have a higher proportion of dissatisfied responses than satisfied responses and those services are largely unavailable in rural communities.

The services or amenities respondents are most satisfied with (based on the combined percentage of “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” responses) include: fire protection (85%), library services (74%), parks and recreation (74%), religious organizations (72%), education (K-12) (68%) and sewage/waste disposal (66%) (Appendix Table 4). At least one-third of the respondents are either “very dissatisfied” or “somewhat dissatisfied” with entertainment (50%), retail shopping (47%), restaurants (41%), streets and roads (39%), arts/cultural activities (37%), local government (35%) and public transportation services (33%).

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

Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to be dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants in their community. As an example, 60 percent of persons between the ages of 19 and 39 are dissatisfied with entertainment, compared to only 28 percent of persons age 65 and older.

When comparing responses by household

income, persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to be dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants in their community.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to be dissatisfied with the entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants in their community. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with occupations classified as “other” and persons with professional occupations are the groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants.

Non-Latinos are more likely than Latinos to say they are dissatisfied with their community’s retail shopping and restaurants. As an example, 49 percent of non-Latinos are dissatisfied with the retail shopping in their community, compared to 31 percent of Latinos.

Persons living in the Panhandle region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with the retail shopping in their community.

The persons who have never married are more likely than the other marital groups to express dissatisfaction with the entertainment in their community. Married persons are the marital group most likely to be dissatisfied with the retail shopping in their community. The widowed respondents are the marital group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with the restaurants in their community.

Persons living in the both the North Central and Panhandle regions are more likely than

persons living in other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with their streets and roads. Approximately 46 percent of persons living in these two regions are dissatisfied with their streets and roads, compared to 34 percent of residents of the Southeast region.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their streets and roads include: persons age 19 to 64, non-Latinos, persons who are divorced/separated, persons who have never married, and persons with some college education.

The groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their arts/cultural activities include: persons with the highest household incomes, persons under the age of 65, respondents who have never married, persons with the highest education levels and persons with occupations classified as “other.”

Persons age 40 to 64 are the age group most likely to express dissatisfaction with their local government. Forty-two percent of persons age 40 to 64 are dissatisfied with their local government, compared to 29 percent of persons under the age of 40 or over the age of 65. The divorced/separated respondents are more likely than persons with a different marital status to be dissatisfied with their local government.

Non-Latinos are more likely than Latinos to be dissatisfied with their local government (36 percent compared to 24 percent). Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to have no opinion on their local government. Almost one-half (46%) of Latinos have no opinion about their local government.

Persons living in the Panhandle are more likely than persons living in different regions

of the state to be dissatisfied with public transportation services in their community. Forty-three percent of persons living in the Panhandle are dissatisfied with their public transportation services, compared to 26 percent of persons living in the North Central region.

Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to express dissatisfaction with the public transportation services in their community. Almost one-half (49%) of Latinos are dissatisfied with the public transportation services, compared to 31 percent of non-Latinos.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their public transportation services include: persons living in or near the largest communities, both respondents who have never married or are divorced/separated, and persons with occupations classified as “other.”

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express dissatisfaction with the cellular phone service in their community. Forty-three percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people are dissatisfied with their community’s cellular phone service, compared to 21 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more.

Persons living in the Panhandle, North Central and Southeast regions are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with their cellular phone service. Approximately 34 percent of residents of these three regions are dissatisfied with their cellular phone service,

compared to 22 percent of persons living in the South Central region.

The age and marital groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with the cellular phone service in their community are the persons under the age of 65 and both married persons and respondents who are divorced/separated.

Persons with the highest education levels are more likely than persons with lower educational levels to be dissatisfied with their community recycling. Thirty percent of persons with at least a four-year college degree are dissatisfied with their community recycling, compared to 20 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education.

Persons under the age of 65 are more likely than persons over the age of 65 to be dissatisfied with their community recycling. The widowed respondents are the marital group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with their community recycling.


Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the larger communities to

express dissatisfaction with their law enforcement. Thirty-five percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people are dissatisfied with their law enforcement. However, only 21 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more are dissatisfied with this service.

Persons under the age of 65 are the age group most likely to express dissatisfaction with their law enforcement. The widowed respondents are the marital group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with their community's law enforcement.

### Feelings About Community

The respondents were next given some statements about their community and were asked the extent to which they agree or disagree with each. Approximately two-thirds (67%) agree with the statement that "my community is very special to me." (Figure 8) And 62 percent agree with the statement that "I feel I can really be myself in my community."



Responses to this question differ by many of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 6). Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community. Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to agree with three of these statements about their community. As an example, 53 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree with the statement that my community is my favorite place to be. In comparison, approximately 40 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more agree with this statement.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree with each statement listed. For example, 63 percent of persons age 65 and older agree with the statement that I really miss my community when I am away too long, compared to 38 percent of persons under the age of 30.

Long term residents are more likely than newcomers to the community to express positive sentiments about their community. As an example, 50 percent of persons living in their community for more than five years agree with the statement I really miss my community when I am away too long, compared to 32 percent of persons living in the community for five years or less.

Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group most likely to express positive sentiments about their community. Eighty-one percent of farmers and ranchers agree with the statement that my community is very special to me, compared to 30 percent of

persons with occupations classified as “other.”

When comparing responses by marital status and education, widowed respondents and persons with a high school diploma or less education are the groups most likely to agree with each statement.


Persons with the lowest household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to agree with the statements that no other place can compare to my community and my community is my favorite place to be.

Next, respondents were asked a question about how easy or difficult it would be to leave their community. The exact question wording was “Assume you were to have a discussion in your household about leaving your community for a reasonably good opportunity elsewhere. Some people might be happy to live in a new place and meet new people. Others might be very sorry to leave. How easy or difficult would it be for your household to leave your community?” They were given a seven point scale where 1 indicated very easy and 7 denoted very difficult. One-half (50%) of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community<sup>1</sup> (Figure 9). Approximately one-third (32%) indicate it would be easy for their household to leave their community.

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

---

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




Older persons are more likely than younger persons to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Sixty-two percent of persons age 65 or older think it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 38 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Similarly, widowed persons are the marital group most likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Sixty percent of widowed respondents believe it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 41 percent of persons who have never married.

Long term residents of the community are more likely than newcomers to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Fifty-three percent of persons who have lived in their community for more than five years say it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 37 percent of persons living in the community for five years or less (Figure 10).

Other groups most likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community include persons with the lowest education levels and farmers and ranchers. When comparing



responses by region, persons living in the Panhandle are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say it would be *easy* to leave their community. Forty-two percent of persons living in the Panhandle said it would be easy to leave their community, compared to 29 percent of persons living in the Northeast region of the state.

### ***Plans to Leave the Community***

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

Only six percent indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year, 12 percent are uncertain and 83 percent have

no plans to move. Of those who are planning to move, 61 percent plan to remain in the state, with 22 percent planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha area and 39 percent plan to move to another part of the state. Thirty-nine percent are planning to leave Nebraska.

Intentions to move from their community differed by many of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 8). Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to be planning to move from their community in the next year. Thirteen percent of persons between the ages of 19 and 29 are planning to move next year, compared to only three percent of persons age 65 and older. An additional 20 percent of the younger respondents indicate they are uncertain if they plan to move.

Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to be planning to move from their community in the next year. Sixteen percent of Latinos are planning to move in the next year, compared to four percent of non-Latinos. Another twenty percent of Latinos are uncertain if they plan to move from their community next year.

Persons who have never married are the marital group most likely to be planning to move from their community in the next year. Sixteen percent of persons who have never married are planning to move and an additional 20 percent are uncertain if they plan to move.

Potential movers from the largest communities are more likely than potential movers from smaller communities to be planning to move to either the Lincoln/Omaha metropolitan areas or out of

Nebraska.

Respondents with the lowest household incomes who are planning to move from their community in the next year are more likely than potential movers with higher household incomes to plan to move out of Nebraska.

### ***General Well-Being by Subgroups***

In this section, 2007 data on the four general measures of well-being are analyzed and reported for the region in which the respondent lives, by the size of their community, and for various individual characteristics (Appendix Table 9).

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to believe they are better off compared to five years ago and will be better off ten years from now. Seventy-three percent of persons age 19 to 29 feel they will be better off ten years from now. However, only nine percent of persons age 65 and older share this opinion. Both the oldest respondents and the youngest respondents are the groups most likely to believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age.

Persons with the highest household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to feel they are better off compared to five years ago, are better off compared to their parents when they were their age, and will be better off ten years from now. For example, 62 percent of respondents with household incomes of \$60,000 or more think they are better off than they were five years ago. However, only 29 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 believe they are better off than they were five years ago.

Persons with higher educational levels are more likely than persons with less education to think they are better off compared to five years ago, are better off compared to their parents when they were their age, and will be better off ten years from now. Fifty-seven percent of respondents with at least a four-year college degree believe they are better off than they were five years ago. Only 33 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education share this optimism.

When comparing the marital groups, respondents who have never married are the group most likely to believe they will be better off ten years from now. The married respondents join them as the groups most likely to believe they are better off than they were five years ago. The divorced/separated respondents are the marital group *least* likely to believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age.


Farmers and ranchers and persons with professional occupations are the occupation groups most likely to believe they are better off compared to five years ago.

Approximately 58 percent of persons with professional occupations and farmers and ranchers believe they are better off than they were five years ago, compared to only 36 percent of manual laborers (Figure 11). Persons with occupations classified as “other” are the group most likely to believe they will be better off ten years from now.

Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to think they will be better off ten years from now. Seventy percent of Latinos say they will be better off ten years from now, compared to only 38 percent of non-Latinos.

Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to believe they will be better off ten years from now. Approximately 45 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more believe they will be better off ten years from now, compared to 35 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 persons.


The respondents were also asked if they





believe people are powerless to control their own lives. When analyzing the responses by region, community size, and various individual attributes, many differences emerge (Appendix Table 10). Persons with lower educational levels are more likely than persons with more education to believe that people are powerless to control their own lives. Forty-nine percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education agree that people are powerless to control their own lives (Figure 12). However, only 26 percent of persons with a four-year college degree share this opinion.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to agree with the statement. Forty-nine percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 believe people are powerless to control their own lives, compared to 28 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.



Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to believe people are powerless to control their own lives. Over one-half (51%) of Latinos agree with the statement that people are powerless to control their own lives. Only 36 percent of non-Latinos agree with this statement.

The marital status groups most likely to believe people are powerless are both widowed respondents and respondents who are divorced/separated. When comparing responses by occupation, manual laborers are the group most likely to agree with this statement.

### *Specific Aspects of Well-Being by Subgroups*

The respondents were given a list of items that may influence their well-being and were asked to rate their satisfaction with each. The complete ratings for each item are listed in Appendix Table 11. At least one-third of respondents are very satisfied with their family (52%), their marriage (47%), their religion/ spirituality (44%), their friends (41%), and greenery and open space (39%). Items receiving the highest proportion of very dissatisfied responses include: financial security during retirement (19%), current income level (14%), and job opportunities for you (12%).

The top ten items people are dissatisfied with (determined by the largest proportions of “very dissatisfied” and “dissatisfied” responses) will now be examined in more detail by looking at how the different demographic subgroups view each item. These comparisons are shown in Appendix Table 12.

Respondents' satisfaction level with both their financial security during retirement and their current income level differ by most of the individual characteristics examined.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to be dissatisfied with both of these items. Fifty-five percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 report being dissatisfied with their current income level, compared to 18 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.

Respondents who are divorced or separated are the marital group most likely to be dissatisfied with both their financial security during retirement and their current income level. Sixty-five percent of divorced/separated respondents are dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement, compared to 33 percent of widowed respondents.

When comparing responses by education level, persons with some college education are the group most likely to report being dissatisfied with these two items.

When comparing the age groups, persons between the ages of 40 and 49 are the group most likely to be dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement. The youngest persons (age 19 to 29) are the group most likely to express dissatisfaction with their current income level.

Females are more likely than males to express dissatisfaction with their financial security during retirement. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with service occupations are the group most likely to be dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement. But, persons with

occupations classified as "other" are most likely to be dissatisfied with their current income level.

Non-Latinos are more likely than Latinos to report dissatisfaction with their financial security during retirement. Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to have no opinion about this item.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to be dissatisfied with their job, their job security and their job opportunities. Fifty-three percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 are dissatisfied with their job opportunities, compared to 32 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.

Persons who are either divorced/separated or never married are the marital groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with these three job-related items (job satisfaction, job security and job opportunities). When comparing responses by age, persons under the age of 64 the groups most likely to be dissatisfied with these three job-related items.

When comparing responses by occupation, manual laborers and skilled laborers are the groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their job and their job security.

Females are more likely than males to report dissatisfaction with their job opportunities. Forty-seven percent of females are dissatisfied with the job opportunities for them, compared to 35 percent of males.

Latinos are more likely than non-Latinos to be dissatisfied with their job security. Thirty percent of Latinos are dissatisfied with their

job security, compared to 19 percent of non-Latinos.

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 are more likely than persons living in communities of different sizes to express dissatisfaction with clean water. Twenty-nine percent of persons living in or near communities of this size are dissatisfied with clean water. Only 14 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people share this opinion.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with clean water include: persons with lower household incomes, younger persons and Latinos. Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group *least* likely to report being dissatisfied with clean water.

The groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their spare time include: persons under the age of 50 and persons with higher education levels. The widowed respondents are the marital group *least* likely to report being dissatisfied with their spare time.

The groups most likely to report being dissatisfied with their community include: persons under the age of 65, persons who are either divorced or separated or who have never married, and persons with occupations classified as “other.”

The groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their health include: persons with the lowest household incomes, respondents who are divorced/separated and both persons with occupations classified as “other” and persons with service occupations.

The groups most likely to be dissatisfied with

their housing are: persons with lower household incomes, younger respondents, and persons who have never married. Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group *least* likely to be dissatisfied with their housing.

### ***Conclusion***

Rural Nebraskans are generally positive about their communities. The majority believe their community has either stayed the same or changed for the better during the past year. In addition, most characterize their communities as friendly, trusting and supportive. Many also say their community is very special to them and that they can be themselves in their community. One-half indicate it would be difficult for their household to move from their community. Furthermore, most rural Nebraskans are planning to stay in their community next year. Only six percent are planning to move and twelve percent are uncertain.

Many differences are detected by community size. Residents of larger communities are more likely than residents of smaller communities to think their community has changed for the better during the past year. However, residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to express positive sentiments about their community. The smaller community residents rate their communities higher on their social dimensions (as being friendly and trusting) and are more likely to have higher levels of attachment to their community. Thus, smaller communities have positive attributes that can be marketed to potential new residents.

Rural Nebraskans have generally positive


views about their current and future situation. Over one-third (41%) of rural Nebraskans think they are better off than they were five years ago and will be better off ten years from now.

Certain groups remain pessimistic about their situation. Persons with lower household incomes, older persons, persons with lower educational levels and persons who are divorced or separated are the groups most likely to be more pessimistic about the present and the future.

When asked if they believe people are powerless to control their own lives, 38 percent of this year's respondents agreed. Widowed persons, persons who are divorced/separated, persons with lower educational levels, older persons, persons with lower household incomes, manual laborers and Latinos are the groups most likely to agree that people are powerless to control their own lives.

Rural Nebraskans continue to be most satisfied with family, spirituality, friends, and the outdoors. On the other hand, they continue to be less satisfied with job opportunities, their current income level, and financial security during retirement.

# Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska



Metropolitan counties (not surveyed)

*Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents<sup>1</sup> Compared to 2000 Census*

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2000</b>
	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Poll</b>	<b>Census</b>
<b>Age : <sup>2</sup></b>							
20 - 39	31%	33%	34%	34%	33%	34%	33%
40 - 64	44%	43%	42%	42%	43%	42%	42%
65 and over	25%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%
<b>Gender: <sup>3</sup></b>							
Female	59%	30%	32%	33%	51%	36%	51%
Male	41%	70%	68%	67%	49%	64%	49%
<b>Education: <sup>4</sup></b>							
Less than 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	7%
9 <sup>th</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup> grade (no diploma)	6%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	10%
High school diploma (or equivalent)	26%	28%	28%	31%	31%	30%	35%
Some college, no degree	23%	25%	24%	24%	24%	25%	25%
Associate degree	14%	13%	15%	14%	13%	13%	7%
Bachelors degree	18%	18%	17%	16%	18%	18%	11%
Graduate or professional degree	10%	10%	10%	8%	9%	9%	4%
<b>Household income: <sup>5</sup></b>							
Less than \$10,000	7%	6%	7%	9%	7%	7%	10%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	13%	12%	12%	14%	13%	13%	16%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	15%	14%	15%	16%	17%	16%	17%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	14%	15%	16%	16%	16%	17%	15%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	13%	16%	15%	13%	14%	15%	12%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	13%	10%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	11%	12%	10%	11%	11%	10%	9%
\$75,000 or more	16%	13%	14%	10%	11%	9%	11%
<b>Marital Status: <sup>6</sup></b>							
Married	70%	70%	72%	69%	73%	74%	61%
Never married	10%	11%	10%	11%	9%	9%	22%
Divorced/separated	10%	9%	10%	10%	9%	9%	9%
Widowed/widower	10%	10%	8%	9%	9%	9%	8%

<sup>1</sup> Data from the Rural Polls have been weighted by age.

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

<sup>3</sup> 2000 Census universe is total non-metro population.

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

<sup>5</sup> 2000 Census universe is all non-metro households.

<sup>6</sup> 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**

<b>Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say...</b>				
<b>My community has changed for the</b>				
	<u>Worse</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Better</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<i>Percentages</i>				
<b><u>Community Size</u></b>		(n = 2393)		
Less than 500	22	59	19	
500 - 999	22	45	33	
1,000 - 4,999	23	44	32	$\chi^2 = 51.43^*$ (.000)
5,000 - 9,999	26	42	32	
10,000 and up	21	41	38	
<b><u>Region</u></b>		(n = 2335)		
Panhandle	28	47	25	
North Central	19	47	34	
South Central	21	44	35	$\chi^2 = 24.38^*$ (.002)
Northeast	23	44	33	
Southeast	28	47	25	
<b><u>Income Level</u></b>		(n = 2267)		
Under \$20,000	23	47	31	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	23	44	33	$\chi^2 = 22.67^*$ (.001)
\$40,000 - \$59,999	22	48	30	
\$60,000 and over	20	39	41	
<b><u>Age</u></b>		(n = 2517)		
19 - 29	14	54	32	
30 - 39	17	43	41	
40 - 49	26	39	35	$\chi^2 = 56.99^*$ (.000)
50 - 64	29	42	30	
65 and older	22	48	30	
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		(n = 2481)		
Male	21	45	34	$\chi^2 = 2.83$ (.242)
Female	24	44	32	
<b><u>Marital Status</u></b>		(n = 2472)		
Married	22	45	33	
Never married	21	44	36	
Divorced/separated	26	43	31	$\chi^2 = 3.44$ (.752)
Widowed	23	46	31	
<b><u>Education</u></b>		(n = 2468)		
H.S. diploma or less	23	47	31	
Some college	26	45	29	$\chi^2 = 34.24^*$ (.000)
Bachelors or grad degree	18	41	41	

Appendix Table 2 continued.

<i>Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say...</i>				
<i>My community has changed for the</i>				
	<i>Worse</i>	<i>No Change</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>
<b><u>Occupation</u></b>		(n = 1730)		
Sales	25	40	35	
Manual laborer	22	49	29	
Professional/tech/admin	24	39	37	
Service	23	46	31	
Farming/ranching	22	49	29	
Skilled laborer	24	49	26	$\chi^2 = 20.69$
Administrative support	25	48	27	(.110)
Other	35	30	35	
<b><u>Yrs Lived in Community</u></b>		(n = 2429)		
Five years or less	10	52	37	$\chi^2 = 44.26^*$
More than five years	25	43	32	(.000)
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b>		(n = 2487)		
Non-Latinos	23	45	31	$\chi^2 = 25.28^*$
Latinos	15	39	46	(.000)

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



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

	<i>My community is...</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>My community is...</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>My community is...</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Friendly</i>		<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Trusting</i>		<i>Hostile</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2369)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2263)		
Less than 500	10	14	76		14	21	65		13	17	70	
500 - 999	8	14	78		15	18	67		12	20	68	
1,000 - 4,999	13	17	69	$\chi^2 =$	19	23	58	$\chi^2 =$	12	21	67	$\chi^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	9	20	71	17.92*	17	28	55	27.51*	17	23	60	14.18
10,000 and up	13	18	69	(.022)	22	23	55	(.001)	15	23	62	(.077)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2331)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2236)		
Panhandle	11	17	72		16	27	58		12	25	63	
North Central	10	16	74		21	17	62		14	17	69	
South Central	11	17	72	$\chi^2 =$	17	23	60	$\chi^2 =$	14	21	65	$\chi^2 =$
Northeast	10	16	74	6.76	17	22	61	11.50	12	21	67	8.97
Southeast	14	19	68	(.563)	20	24	56	(.175)	16	23	61	(.345)
<b>Individual Attributes</b>	(n = 2254)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2162)		
<b>Income Level</b>	(n = 2254)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2162)		
Under \$20,000	15	18	67		21	24	56		17	17	66	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	19	69	$\chi^2 =$	19	25	57	$\chi^2 =$	14	26	60	$\chi^2 =$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	10	16	74	14.84*	16	22	62	7.18	13	20	68	16.91*
\$60,000 and over	10	15	75	(.022)	18	21	61	(.305)	15	20	66	(.010)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 2486)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2373)		
19 - 29	13	19	69		24	23	53		16	22	62	
30 - 39	11	18	72		22	22	57		13	23	64	
40 - 49	13	18	69	$\chi^2 =$	18	26	57	$\chi^2 =$	16	23	61	$\chi^2 =$
50 - 64	13	16	71	16.16*	20	24	56	39.17*	14	22	64	16.65*
65 and older	8	15	77	(.040)	12	20	69	(.000)	11	17	72	(.034)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 2454)			<i>Percentages</i>						(n = 2345)		
Male	10	15	75	$\chi^2 =$	16	21	64	$\chi^2 =$	11	23	66	$\chi^2 =$
Female	12	18	70	8.16*	20	25	55	17.25*	16	21	64	10.49*

Appendix Table 3 continued

	<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>			
	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Friendly</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2445)				(n = 2337)				(n = 2336)			
Married	10	17	73		17	22	61		13	21	66	
Never married	17	19	65	$\chi^2 =$	31	22	47	$\chi^2 =$	16	24	60	$\chi^2 =$
Divorced/separated	17	19	64	27.17*	22	31	47	50.54*	21	25	54	21.12*
Widowed	7	15	78	(.000)	11	20	69	(.000)	11	18	71	(.002)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2441)				(n = 2337)				(n = 2337)			
H.S. diploma or less	12	17	71	$\chi^2 =$	18	24	58	$\chi^2 =$	13	23	64	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	12	18	70	8.11	20	24	56	8.98	14	23	63	7.94
Bachelors degree	9	15	76	(.088)	17	20	63	(.062)	15	18	68	(.094)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1735)				(n = 1703)				(n = 1697)			
Sales	19	18	63		26	17	57		21	22	57	
Manual laborer	12	25	63		19	34	47		12	29	59	
Prof/tech/admin	9	17	74		19	23	58		14	20	65	
Service	12	15	73		19	21	59		12	21	66	
Farming/ranching	8	11	81	$\chi^2 =$	11	21	69	$\chi^2 =$	11	18	71	$\chi^2 =$
Skilled laborer	12	20	68	40.69*	20	26	54	34.26*	10	34	56	31.77*
Admin support	14	18	68	(.000)	25	17	58	(.002)	18	17	65	(.004)
Other	32	14	55		28	17	56		17	22	61	
<i>Yrs Lived in Comm.</i>	(n = 2413)				(n = 2315)				(n = 2310)			
Five years or less	11	17	72	$\chi^2 =$	18	24	58	$\chi^2 =$	16	22	62	$\chi^2 =$
More than five years	11	17	72	0.25	19	23	59	0.33	13	21	65	2.20
				(.883)				(.849)				(.334)
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	(n = 2461)				(n = 2351)				(n = 2348)			
Non-Latinos	11	17	73	$\chi^2 =$	18	23	60	$\chi^2 =$	14	21	65	$\chi^2 =$
Latinos	16	20	64	9.08*	27	24	50	12.64*	17	25	59	3.85
				(.011)				(.002)				(.146)

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

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

<i>Service/Amenity</i>	<i>Dissatisfied*</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied*</i>
		<i>Percentages</i>	
Entertainment	50	20	30
Retail shopping	47	12	41
Restaurants	41	9	50
Streets and roads	39	6	55
Arts/cultural activities	37	35	27
Local government	35	26	40
Public transportation services	33	50	17
Cellular phone service	28	18	54
Community recycling	26	24	50
Law enforcement	24	14	63
Housing	24	16	59
Medical care services	23	14	63
Internet service	21	28	51
Mental health services	20	56	23
Education (K - 12)	15	17	68
Nursing home care	15	39	46
Day care services	14	55	31
Parks and recreation	13	13	74
Sewage/waste disposal	12	22	66
Senior centers	9	44	48
Head start programs	9	62	29
Library services	8	18	74
Religious organizations	7	21	72
Fire protection	5	10	85

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

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

	<i>Entertainment</i>			<i>Retail shopping</i>			<i>Restaurants</i>			<i>Streets and roads</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>											
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2440)			(n = 2445)			(n = 2464)			(n = 2455)		
Less than 500	46	28	27	45	20	35	38	13	49	41	7	52
500 - 4,999	53	22	25	51	13	36	46	8	46	38	6	56
5,000 and over	51	17	33	47	9	45	41	8	51	39	6	55
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 32.09^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 47.46^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 14.99^* (.005)$			$\chi^2 = 2.28 (.685)$		
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2376)			(n = 2388)			(n = 2406)			(n = 2391)		
Panhandle	50	21	29	59	8	34	51	8	41	47	4	49
North Central	52	20	28	50	12	38	41	10	49	46	7	47
South Central	50	18	33	43	12	46	42	9	50	38	6	55
Northeast	51	23	26	52	11	38	38	9	53	39	4	57
Southeast	48	22	30	48	13	39	46	8	47	34	7	59
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 11.51 (.174)$			$\chi^2 = 26.11^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 14.61 (.067)$			$\chi^2 = 21.60^* (.006)$		
<b>Income Level</b>	(n = 2316)			(n = 2323)			(n = 2333)			(n = 2326)		
Under \$20,000	45	25	30	40	16	44	35	10	55	39	8	53
\$20,000 - \$39,999	47	22	31	44	14	42	36	10	54	40	6	54
\$40,000 - \$59,999	55	18	27	51	10	40	48	6	46	40	5	56
\$60,000 and over	55	14	32	55	9	37	48	8	44	39	5	56
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 33.10^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 33.56^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 37.90^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 6.82 (.338)$		
<b>Age</b>	(n = 2560)			(n = 2565)			(n = 2589)			(n = 2576)		
19 - 39	60	12	28	49	15	36	45	8	47	43	6	51
40 - 64	54	18	28	52	10	38	46	9	45	41	6	53
65 and over	28	36	36	36	12	52	27	11	62	28	6	66
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 184.95^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 58.38^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 66.81^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 43.48^* (.000)$		
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	(n = 2530)			(n = 2534)			(n = 2558)			(n = 2544)		
Non-Latinos	50	21	29	49	11	40	43	9	49	40	6	54
Latinos	52	16	32	31	22	48	30	12	58	26	10	65
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 4.20 (.122)$			$\chi^2 = 44.74^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 16.65^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 24.12^* (.000)$		
<b>Marital Status</b>	(n = 2515)			(n = 2522)			(n = 2542)			(n = 2533)		
Married	51	20	29	49	11	41	43	8	49	39	5	56
Never married	60	13	28	46	19	35	43	11	46	44	6	50
Divorced/separated	48	20	32	46	16	38	41	12	47	45	11	45
Widowed	32	33	35	39	12	49	27	11	62	28	7	65
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 49.39^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 27.22^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 30.85^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 32.69^* (.000)$		
<b>Education</b>	(n = 2512)			(n = 2517)			(n = 2540)			(n = 2526)		
High school or less	43	26	30	38	15	48	34	11	55	35	7	59
Some college	56	19	26	54	11	35	44	9	47	45	6	49
College grad	52	14	34	51	10	39	48	7	46	35	5	60
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 53.75^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 51.11^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 39.10^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 28.69^* (.000)$		
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1776)			(n = 1777)			(n = 1782)			(n = 1778)		
Prof/tech/admin.	57	14	28	56	9	36	48	8	44	39	5	56
Farming/ranching	46	26	28	42	19	39	43	9	49	41	6	53
Laborer	51	22	27	43	17	40	40	11	49	42	9	49
Other	62	12	26	56	8	36	48	5	46	44	5	52
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 32.91^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 39.43^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 16.42^* (.012)$			$\chi^2 = 13.23^* (.039)$		

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

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

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	<i>Arts/cultural activities</i>			<i>Local government</i>			<i>Public transportation</i>			<i>Cellular phone service</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>											
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2437)			(n = 2453)			(n = 2421)			(n = 2433)		
Less than 500	38	46	17	31	31	38	33	59	8	43	14	42
500 - 4,999	40	38	22	37	24	39	27	57	16	35	18	48
5,000 and over	37	31	33	35	25	40	37	44	19	21	19	60
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 57.72^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 7.18 (.127)$			$\chi^2 = 59.66^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 88.02^* (.000)$		
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2373)			(n = 2390)			(n = 2362)			(n = 2370)		
Panhandle	38	33	29	44	21	36	43	45	12	34	21	44
North Central	42	38	20	37	22	40	26	59	15	35	15	50
South Central	34	34	32	35	24	41	33	48	20	22	18	60
Northeast	38	39	24	33	26	41	30	54	16	28	20	52
Southeast	39	35	27	32	24	44	29	52	19	35	17	48
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 23.76^* (.003)$			$\chi^2 = 12.95 (.113)$			$\chi^2 = 33.28^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 41.83^* (.000)$		
<b>Income Level</b>	(n = 2317)			(n = 2327)			(n = 2299)			(n = 2309)		
Under \$20,000	30	43	27	33	26	41	38	40	22	25	28	47
\$20,000 - \$39,999	33	40	27	32	32	35	32	50	18	28	17	54
\$40,000 - \$59,999	40	34	27	34	24	42	32	53	15	28	13	59
\$60,000 and over	46	24	29	39	20	41	34	54	12	33	12	55
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 58.61^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 28.61^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 34.96^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 59.27^* (.000)$		
<b>Age</b>	(n = 2557)			(n = 2570)			(n = 2540)			(n = 2553)		
19 - 39	41	37	23	29	38	33	36	51	13	33	13	54
40 - 64	44	29	27	42	21	37	35	50	15	31	14	55
65 and over	20	46	34	29	18	53	27	47	26	18	32	50
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 116.87^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 133.24^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 50.04^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 118.53^* (.000)$		
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	(n = 2531)			(n = 2539)			(n = 2513)			(n = 2523)		
Non-Latinos	37	36	27	36	24	41	31	52	17	30	18	53
Latinos	39	31	30	24	46	31	49	34	17	21	19	60
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 2.67 (.264)$			$\chi^2 = 64.17^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 37.44^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 8.64^* (.013)$		
<b>Marital Status</b>	(n = 2515)			(n = 2523)			(n = 2494)			(n = 2507)		
Married	39	34	28	36	24	41	32	52	16	31	14	55
Never married	42	36	23	32	37	31	38	49	13	24	18	58
Divorced/separated	35	40	25	40	30	30	39	44	18	30	24	45
Widowed	23	45	32	25	26	49	29	41	31	15	36	50
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 31.01^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 42.60^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 45.35^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 88.42^* (.000)$		
<b>Education</b>	(n = 2510)			(n = 2521)			(n = 2493)			(n = 2504)		
High school or less	31	44	25	32	30	38	30	48	22	24	23	53
Some college	39	37	24	40	26	35	37	49	15	32	15	53
College grad	43	23	34	31	21	48	33	54	13	31	14	55
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 78.23^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 41.79^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 29.71^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 34.50^* (.000)$		
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1773)			(n = 1786)			(n = 1761)			(n = 1773)		
Prof/tech/admin.	44	26	30	34	24	42	36	52	12	32	13	55
Farming/ranching	31	50	19	37	23	39	22	65	13	39	11	50
Laborer	36	41	23	38	32	30	29	52	19	30	22	49
Other	47	29	24	39	28	33	39	48	13	31	11	58
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 61.12^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 22.91^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 29.85^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 26.84^* (.000)$		

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

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

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	<i>Community recycling</i>			<i>Law enforcement</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>					
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 2447)			(n = 2461)	
Less than 500	25	34	41	35	15	50
500 - 4,999	27	20	53	24	15	61
5,000 and over	25	25	50	21	13	67
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 28.19^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 37.87^* (.000)$	
<b>Region</b>		(n = 2383)			(n = 2403)	
Panhandle	26	28	46	31	13	56
North Central	24	22	54	23	14	63
South Central	23	25	52	23	12	66
Northeast	30	25	45	24	13	63
Southeast	26	20	54	24	14	62
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 21.43^* (.006)$			$\chi^2 = 11.00 (.202)$	
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 2320)			(n = 2332)	
Under \$20,000	22	27	51	25	15	59
\$20,000 - \$39,999	24	25	52	24	14	62
\$40,000 - \$59,999	27	23	50	24	13	63
\$60,000 and over	31	22	47	23	13	64
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 15.66^* (.016)$			$\chi^2 = 3.15 (.789)$	
<b>Age</b>		(n = 2571)			(n = 2587)	
19 - 39	27	30	43	25	18	57
40 - 64	29	21	50	27	12	62
65 and over	18	22	60	16	13	71
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 57.81^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 48.00^* (.000)$	
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>		(n = 2541)			(n = 2556)	
Non-Latinos	26	24	51	24	13	63
Latinos	24	31	46	20	22	59
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 7.31^* (.026)$			$\chi^2 = 16.59^* (.000)$	
<b>Marital Status</b>		(n = 2524)			(n = 2541)	
Married	26	23	51	24	12	64
Never married	28	28	44	26	19	55
Divorced/separated	28	25	47	27	19	54
Widowed	17	26	58	17	12	71
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 16.42^* (.012)$			$\chi^2 = 28.97^* (.000)$	
<b>Education</b>		(n = 2521)			(n = 2538)	
High school or less	20	24	56	22	15	64
Some college	27	26	47	27	14	59
College grad	30	22	48	21	12	67
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 27.97^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 14.86^* (.005)$	
<b>Occupation</b>		(n = 1773)			(n = 1779)	
Prof/tech/admin.	31	23	46	23	12	65
Farming/ranching	27	24	49	28	11	61
Laborer	25	26	50	23	16	61
Other	28	25	47	25	18	57
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 5.26 (.510)$			$\chi^2 = 12.58 (.050)$	

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

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

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

	<i>My community is very special to me.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>No other place can compare to my community.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>		<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 2513)				(n = 2497)		
Less than 500	10	17	73		28	32	40	
500 - 999	9	19	72		30	27	43	
1,000 - 4,999	12	22	67		37	27	36	
5,000 - 9,999	12	20	68	$\chi^2 = 23.5^*$	34	29	36	$\chi^2 = 38.0^*$
10,000 and up	10	27	63	(.003)	39	33	28	(.000)
<b>Region</b>		(n = 2395)				(n = 2378)		
Panhandle	10	23	67		44	27	30	
North Central	11	19	70		31	30	39	
South Central	10	22	68		36	31	33	
Northeast	9	25	66	$\chi^2 = 7.74$	34	32	34	$\chi^2 = 12.6$
Southeast	12	23	66	(.459)	36	31	33	(.126)
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 2331)				(n = 2319)		
Under \$20,000	13	22	66		29	31	41	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	9	21	70		34	33	34	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	11	24	66	$\chi^2 = 6.02$	38	30	32	$\chi^2 = 24.02^*$
\$60,000 and over	11	23	66	(.421)	41	28	31	(.001)
<b>Age</b>		(n = 2580)				(n = 2565)		
19 - 29	10	26	64		38	34	28	
30 - 39	13	22	65		42	25	33	
40 - 49	13	24	63		38	30	32	
50 - 64	11	24	65	$\chi^2 = 49.1^*$	38	32	30	$\chi^2 = 79.22^*$
65 and older	5	17	78	(.000)	22	31	47	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>		(n = 2546)				(n = 2530)		
Male	11	22	68	$\chi^2 = 0.73$	34	30	36	$\chi^2 = 1.65$
Female	10	23	67	(.694)	36	30	34	(.437)
<b>Marital Status</b>		(n = 2539)				(n = 2524)		
Married	10	22	68		36	29	35	
Never married	16	27	57		39	31	31	
Divorced/separated	14	27	58	$\chi^2 = 44.7^*$	36	35	29	$\chi^2 = 26.6^*$
Widowed	4	16	80	(.000)	23	31	46	(.000)
<b>Education</b>		(n = 2536)				(n = 2520)		
H.S. diploma or less	9	20	71		30	29	41	
Some college	12	23	65	$\chi^2 = 10.3^*$	34	34	32	$\chi^2 = 46.93^*$
Bachelors degree	10	24	67	(.035)	43	27	29	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>		(n = 1780)				(n = 1771)		
Sales	15	27	58		46	29	25	
Manual laborer	11	27	62		29	35	36	
Prof/tech/admin	10	25	66		41	29	30	
Service	15	21	64		39	30	31	
Farming/ranching	9	10	81		27	30	44	
Skilled laborer	15	31	54		46	34	21	
Admin support	8	25	67	$\chi^2 = 55.9^*$	40	31	29	$\chi^2 = 40.79^*$
Other	17	52	30	(.000)	55	27	18	(.000)
<b>Yrs Lived in Comm.</b>		(n = 2581)				(n = 2566)		
Five years or less	14	28	58	$\chi^2 = 20.6^*$	44	30	26	$\chi^2 = 22.4^*$
More than five years	10	21	69	(.000)	33	31	36	(.000)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>		(n = 2554)				(n = 2537)		
Non-Latinos	10	23	67	$\chi^2 = 2.88$	36	31	34	$\chi^2 = 6.19^*$
Latinos	10	19	71	(.237)	30	29	41	(.045)

Appendix Table 6 continued.

	<i>I feel I can really be myself in my community.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	<i>My community is my favorite place to be.</i>			<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>		<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b><u>Community Size</u></b>	(n = 2460)				(n = 2468)			
Less than 500	16	16	68		18	29	53	
500 - 999	20	17	64		23	29	48	
1,000 - 4,999	19	21	60		28	28	43	
5,000 - 9,999	20	18	62	$\chi^2 = 12.0$	29	31	41	$\chi^2 = 29.4^*$
10,000 and up	18	22	60	(.152)	28	33	40	(.000)
<b><u>Region</u></b>	(n = 2341)				(n = 2350)			
Panhandle	21	18	61		29	34	38	
North Central	16	22	63		22	26	52	
South Central	18	18	64		27	32	41	
Northeast	17	23	60	$\chi^2 = 9.40$	26	31	44	$\chi^2 = 18.1^*$
Southeast	20	19	61	(.309)	28	27	45	(.020)
<b><u>Income Level</u></b>	(n = 2280)				(n = 2293)			
Under \$20,000	22	17	61		23	27	50	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	20	20	60		26	28	46	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	18	19	63	$\chi^2 = 6.00$	26	34	40	$\chi^2 = 25.68^*$
\$60,000 and over	17	21	62	(.423)	30	33	37	(.000)
<b><u>Age</u></b>	(n = 2521)				(n = 2534)			
19 - 29	25	18	57		29	36	34	
30 - 39	22	19	59		30	34	36	
40 - 49	22	21	58		31	31	38	
50 - 64	18	23	59	$\chi^2 = 67.5^*$	29	30	40	$\chi^2 = 159.1^*$
65 and older	9	17	74	(.000)	12	23	65	(.000)
<b><u>Gender</u></b>	(n = 2489)				(n = 2502)			
Male	17	18	65	$\chi^2 = 6.81^*$	23	29	47	$\chi^2 = 11.54^*$
Female	20	20	60	(.033)	28	31	41	(.003)
<b><u>Marital Status</u></b>	(n = 2481)				(n = 2492)			
Married	17	20	63		26	31	43	
Never married	27	20	53		32	34	34	
Divorced/separated	26	19	55	$\chi^2 = 37.3^*$	33	29	39	$\chi^2 = 64.9^*$
Widowed	11	16	73	(.000)	11	25	65	(.000)
<b><u>Education</u></b>	(n = 2478)				(n = 2491)			
H.S. diploma or less	16	19	66		20	27	53	
Some college	21	21	58	$\chi^2 = 12.9^*$	28	33	40	$\chi^2 = 53.8^*$
Bachelors degree	18	19	63	(.012)	31	33	37	(.000)
<b><u>Occupation</u></b>	(n = 1747)				(n = 1755)			
Sales	20	18	62		32	32	36	
Manual laborer	19	25	57		20	37	43	
Prof/tech/admin	19	22	59		32	33	35	
Service	24	23	54		31	31	39	
Farming/ranching	15	10	75		16	26	57	
Skilled laborer	23	25	51		31	35	35	
Admin support	26	18	56	$\chi^2 = 40.2^*$	35	27	38	$\chi^2 = 49.6^*$
Other	44	17	39	(.000)	48	29	24	(.000)
<b><u>Yrs Lived in Comm.</u></b>	(n = 2523)				(n = 2535)			
Five years or less	22	21	57	$\chi^2 = 6.6^*$	34	34	33	$\chi^2 = 30.6^*$
More than five years	18	19	63	(.038)	24	30	46	(.000)
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b>	(n = 2495)				(n = 2507)			
Non-Latinos	18	20	62	$\chi^2 = 4.88$	26	30	44	$\chi^2 = 0.70$
Latinos	22	15	63	(.087)	24	32	45	(.704)



Appendix Table 6 continued.

<i>I really miss my community when I am away too long.</i>				<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Percentages</i>	
<b><u>Community Size</u></b> (n = 2497)				
Less than 500	20	29	51	
500 - 999	22	29	49	
1,000 - 4,999	27	27	46	
5,000 - 9,999	27	28	46	$\chi^2 = 10.9$
10,000 and up	25	30	45	(.207)
<b><u>Region</u></b> (n = 2380)				
Panhandle	28	28	45	
North Central	22	27	51	
South Central	25	28	47	
Northeast	23	32	45	$\chi^2 = 8.52$
Southeast	27	27	47	(.384)
<b><u>Income Level</u></b> (n = 2318)				
Under \$20,000	24	29	48	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	23	27	50	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	25	29	46	$\chi^2 = 10.11$
\$60,000 and over	29	30	42	(.120)
<b><u>Age</u></b> (n = 2564)				
19 - 29	30	31	38	
30 - 39	28	30	42	
40 - 49	28	27	46	
50 - 64	28	32	40	$\chi^2 = 104.61^*$
65 and older	12	25	63	(.000)
<b><u>Gender</u></b> (n = 2528)				
Male	24	28	48	$\chi^2 = 2.13$
Female	25	29	46	(.344)
<b><u>Marital Status</u></b> (n = 2519)				
Married	25	29	46	
Never married	31	31	38	
Divorced/separated	28	28	44	$\chi^2 = 43.89^*$
Widowed	11	26	63	(.000)
<b><u>Education</u></b> (n = 2519)				
H.S. diploma or less	20	27	53	
Some college	27	31	42	$\chi^2 = 26.11^*$
Bachelors degree	27	29	45	(.000)
<b><u>Occupation</u></b> (n = 1773)				
Sales	32	30	38	
Manual laborer	20	39	41	
Prof/tech/admin	27	31	43	
Service	31	24	46	
Farming/ranching	20	25	56	
Skilled laborer	35	27	38	
Admin support	34	26	39	$\chi^2 = 41.35^*$
Other	46	36	18	(.000)
<b><u>Yrs Lived in Comm.</u></b> (n = 2564)				
Five years or less	35	33	32	$\chi^2 = 53.2^*$
More than five years	22	28	50	(.000)
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b> (n = 2534)				
Non-Latinos	25	29	47	$\chi^2 = 0.14$
Latinos	24	28	48	(.931)

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

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

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

	Easy	Neutral	Difficult	Chi-square (sig.)
	<i>Percentages</i>			
<b><u>Community Size</u></b>		(n = 2515)		
Less than 500	30	20	50	
500 - 999	30	16	54	
1,000 - 4,999	32	16	51	
5,000 - 9,999	32	17	51	$\chi^2 = 6.37$
10,000 and up	34	19	48	(.606)
<b><u>Region</u></b>		(n = 2391)		
Panhandle	42	16	41	
North Central	32	15	53	
South Central	33	20	48	
Northeast	29	16	55	$\chi^2 = 22.97^*$
Southeast	31	19	50	(.003)
<b><u>Income Level</u></b>		(n = 2326)		
Under \$20,000	28	20	52	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	29	20	51	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	36	17	48	$\chi^2 = 17.06^*$
\$60,000 and over	37	14	49	(.009)
<b><u>Age</u></b>		(n = 2580)		
19 - 29	37	25	38	
30 - 39	31	17	52	
40 - 49	36	16	48	
50 - 64	37	15	48	$\chi^2 = 78.01^*$
65 and older	21	18	62	(.000)
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		(n = 2546)		
Male	31	17	52	$\chi^2 = 3.11$
Female	32	19	49	(.212)
<b><u>Marital Status</u></b>		(n = 2537)		
Married	31	17	52	
Never married	38	22	41	
Divorced/separated	40	17	43	$\chi^2 = 31.99^*$
Widowed	22	18	60	(.000)
<b><u>Education</u></b>		(n = 2536)		
H.S. diploma or less	25	18	56	
Some college	35	20	45	$\chi^2 = 35.30^*$
Bachelors degree	36	15	50	(.000)
<b><u>Occupation</u></b>		(n = 1780)		
Sales	46	12	41	
Manual laborer	35	18	48	
Prof/tech/admin	35	15	49	
Service	34	22	44	
Farming/ranching	22	14	63	
Skilled laborer	42	21	38	
Admin support	39	21	40	$\chi^2 = 44.59^*$
Other	48	17	35	(.000)
<b><u>Yrs Lived in Comm.</u></b>		(n = 2580)		
Five years or less	44	19	37	$\chi^2 = 44.15^*$
More than five years	29	18	53	(.000)
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b>		(n = 2553)		
Non-Latinos	33	17	50	$\chi^2 = 8.99^*$
Latinos	25	22	53	(.011)

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

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

	Do you plan to leave your community in the next year?			Chi-square (sig.)	If yes, where do you plan to move?			Chi-square (sig.)
	Yes	No	Uncertain		Lincoln/Omaha metro areas	Some other place in NE	Some place other than Nebraska	
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 2510)			Percentages			(n = 130)
Less than 500	5	84	11		7	80	13	
500 - 999	6	87	7		8	83	8	
1,000 - 4,999	6	85	9		19	31	50	
5,000 - 9,999	4	84	13	$\chi^2 = 22.37^*$	23	39	39	$\chi^2 = 26.43^*$
10,000 and up	7	79	15	(.004)	29	26	45	(.001)
<b>Region</b>		(n = 2392)						(n = 108)
Panhandle	4	83	13		10	20	70	
North Central	4	87	10		9	36	55	
South Central	4	83	13		31	39	31	
Northeast	6	85	9	$\chi^2 = 16.42^*$	13	41	46	$\chi^2 = 10.09$
Southeast	6	85	9	(.037)	14	55	32	(.259)
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 2325)						(n = 115)
Under \$20,000	7	77	16		3	40	57	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	6	82	13		36	21	42	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	6	85	9	$\chi^2 = 22.56^*$	21	45	35	$\chi^2 = 18.26^*$
\$60,000 and over	4	86	10	(.001)	26	57	17	(.006)
<b>Age</b>		(n = 2575)						(n = 132)
19 - 29	13	68	20		24	51	24	
30 - 39	7	80	12		23	36	42	
40 - 49	4	83	12		14	41	46	
50 - 64	4	85	11	$\chi^2 = 96.91^*$	25	20	55	$\chi^2 = 8.72$
65 and older	3	90	7	(.000)	21	36	43	(.367)
<b>Gender</b>		(n = 2539)						(n = 132)
Male	5	83	12	$\chi^2 = 0.69$	22	30	48	$\chi^2 = 2.51$
Female	6	82	12	(.707)	22	43	35	(.286)
<b>Marital Status</b>		(n = 2532)						(n = 126)
Married	4	85	11		19	46	35	
Never married	16	64	20		32	34	34	
Divorced/separated	7	81	13	$\chi^2 = 90.67^*$	0	29	71	$\chi^2 = 14.55^*$
Widowed	3	86	11	(.000)	38**	50**	13**	(.024)
<b>Education</b>		(n = 2530)						(n = 130)
H.S. diploma or less	6	81	13		12	48	41	
Some college	5	83	12	$\chi^2 = 3.76$	28	32	40	$\chi^2 = 4.60$
Bachelors degree	6	84	10	(.439)	27	37	37	(.331)

Appendix Table 8 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>	
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1776)				(n = 98)			
Sales	9	77	14		14	43	43	
Manual laborer	9	74	18		0	42	58	
Prof/tech/admin	5	84	11		14	56	31	
Service	11	81	8		13	52	35	
Farming/ranching	2	93	6		100**	0**	0**	
Skilled laborer	3	80	17		25**	0**	75**	
Admin support	6	84	10	$\chi^2 = 47.47^*$	67**	0**	33**	$\chi^2 = 31.56^*$
Other	5	77	18	(.000)	0**	0**	100**	(.005)
<b>Yrs Lived in Comm.</b>	(n = 2576)				(n = 133)			
Five years or less	11	70	20	$\chi^2 = 61.03^*$	18	41	41	$\chi^2 = 0.48$
More than five years	5	85	10	(.000)	23	38	38	(.786)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	(n = 2545)				(n = 131)			
Non-Latinos	4	85	11	$\chi^2 = 87.70^*$	17	44	39	$\chi^2 = 5.72$
Latinos	16	64	20	(.000)	34	26	40	(.057)

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

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

**Appendix Table 9. Measures of Individual Well-Being in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes.**

	<i>Compared to Five Years Ago</i>				<i>Compared to Parents</i>				<i>Ten Years from Now</i>			
	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Significance</i>
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2487)				<i>Percentages</i> (n = 2479)				(n = 2455)			
Less than 500	16	46	39		16	29	55		19	47	35	
500 - 999	16	37	47		16	30	55		20	43	37	
1,000 - 4,999	16	40	43		15	30	55		18	43	39	
5,000 - 9,999	11	41	48	$\chi^2 = 14.66$	11	26	64	$\chi^2 = 9.48$	15	39	46	$\chi^2 = 19.17^*$
10,000 and up	16	38	46	(.066)	14	29	58	(.304)	17	38	45	(.014)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2431)				(n = 2425)				(n = 2391)			
Panhandle	13	40	47		16	28	56		21	40	39	
North Central	16	42	43		17	31	52		20	44	36	
South Central	15	41	45		14	28	58		15	44	41	
Northeast	15	41	45	$\chi^2 = 5.60$	14	28	58	$\chi^2 = 6.39$	18	43	38	$\chi^2 = 10.92$
Southeast	17	43	39	(.692)	13	29	58	(.603)	20	41	39	(.207)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>												
<i>Household Income</i>	(n = 2356)				(n = 2351)				(n = 2333)			
Under \$20,000	27	44	29		19	33	48		25	39	36	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	19	43	38		17	31	52		19	41	39	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	13	37	51	$\chi^2 = 180.24^*$	13	28	60	$\chi^2 = 69.39^*$	12	42	46	$\chi^2 = 58.58^*$
\$60,000 and over	6	32	62	(.000)	9	21	70	(.000)	12	38	51	(.000)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2611)				(n = 2606)				(n = 2572)			
19 - 29	9	30	61		7	29	65		6	21	73	
30 - 39	8	26	66		13	26	61		6	27	67	
40 - 49	16	37	47		20	29	51		12	37	51	
50 - 64	21	42	37	$\chi^2 = 276.65^*$	20	29	51	$\chi^2 = 70.53^*$	24	51	25	$\chi^2 = 641.85^*$
65 and older	18	60	23	(.000)	9	29	62	(.000)	32	59	9	(.000)

Appendix Table 9 Continued.

		<i>Compared to Five Years Ago</i>				<i>Compared to Parents</i>				<i>Ten Years from Now</i>						
		<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>			
		<i>Off</i>		<i>Off</i>		<i>Off</i>		<i>Off</i>		<i>Off</i>		<i>Off</i>				
<i>Gender</i>		(n = 2573)				(n = 2569)				(n = 2537)						
	Male	15	40	46	$\chi^2 = 0.87$	14	28	58	$\chi^2 = 0.82$	19	42	40	$\chi^2 = 2.61$			
	Female	16	41	44	(.646)	14	29	57	(.663)	17	41	43	(.271)			
<i>Education</i>		(n = 2563)				(n = 2560)				(n = 2528)						
	H. S. diploma or less	19	49	33	$\chi^2 = 112.34^*$	13	30	57	$\chi^2 = 15.12^*$	21	46	33	$\chi^2 = 48.88^*$			
	Some college	17	36	47		17	29	55		18	38	44				
	Bachelors or graduate degree	8	35	57		(.000)	12	26		62	(.004)	12		39	49	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>		(n = 2565)				(n = 2562)				(n = 2529)						
	Married	12	40	48	$\chi^2 = 125.18^*$	13	27	60	$\chi^2 = 57.41^*$	16	42	43	$\chi^2 = 126.36^*$			
	Never married	18	34	48		14	30	57		14	30	57				
	Divorced/separated	30	31	39		28	31	41		19	37	44				
	Widowed	21	59	20		(.000)	10	32		59	(.000)	33		56	11	(.000)
<i>Occupation</i>		(n = 1789)				(n = 1789)				(n = 1789)						
	Sales	19	31	51	$\chi^2 = 62.46^*$	15	26	59	$\chi^2 = 21.06$	12	33	55	$\chi^2 = 28.03^*$			
	Manual laborer	21	43	36		17	36	47		17	42	42				
	Prof/tech/admin	9	33	58		13	26	61		13	36	51				
	Service	13	41	46		13	29	58		16	40	45				
	Farming/ranching	10	31	59		17	26	57		10	46	44				
	Skilled laborer	19	36	44		16	35	50		21	34	45				
	Admin. support	17	41	42		18	23	59		18	43	40				
	Other	5	46	50		(.000)	17	17		65	(.100)	5		32	64	(.014)
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b>		(n = 2577)				(n = 2574)				(n = 2542)						
	Non-Latinos	15	40	44	$\chi^2 = 1.73$	15	28	57	$\chi^2 = 10.85^*$	19	43	38	$\chi^2 = 100.57^*$			
	Latinos	13	39	48	(.421)	8	29	64	(.004)	7	23	70	(.000)			

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

**Appendix Table 10. Life Has Changed So Much in Our Modern World that Most People Are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives.**

	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<i>Percentages</i>				
(n = 2483)				
<b><u>Community Size</u></b>				
Less than 500	43	18	39	
500 - 999	46	19	35	
1,000 - 4,999	41	19	40	
5,000 - 9,999	46	20	34	$\chi^2 = 10.54$
10,000 and up	48	16	37	(.229)
<b><u>Region</u></b>				
(n = 2421)				
Panhandle	47	15	37	
North Central	47	17	36	
South Central	48	18	34	
Northeast	42	18	40	$\chi^2 = 9.92$
Southeast	44	21	35	(.271)
<b><u>Individual Attributes:</u></b>				
<i>Household Income Level</i>				
(n = 2352)				
Under \$20,000	28	23	49	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	40	18	42	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	54	16	30	$\chi^2 = 118.35^*$
\$60,000 and over	58	15	28	(.000)
<i>Age</i>				
(n = 2602)				
19 - 29	44	16	40	
30 - 39	52	18	30	
40 - 49	50	15	35	
50 - 64	46	17	37	$\chi^2 = 57.52^*$
65 and older	32	23	44	(.000)
<i>Gender</i>				
(n = 2568)				
Male	44	17	39	$\chi^2 = 2.04$
Female	45	19	36	(.361)
<i>Education</i>				
(n = 2555)				
H.S. diploma or less	28	23	49	
Some college	48	17	36	$\chi^2 = 178.97^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	61	13	26	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>				
(n = 2558)				
Married	47	17	36	
Never married	45	19	36	
Divorced/separated	39	17	44	$\chi^2 = 43.36^*$
Widowed	27	26	46	(.000)

Appendix Table 10 Continued.

	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<i>Occupation</i>		(n = 1790)		
Sales	55	10	34	
Manual laborer	25	23	52	
Prof/technical/admin.	58	14	27	
Service	46	19	34	
Farming/ranching	47	21	32	
Skilled laborer	39	12	49	
Admin. support	50	14	36	$\chi^2 = 99.16^*$
Other	46	32	23	(.000)
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>		(n = 2573)		
Non-Latinos	46	18	36	$\chi^2 = 28.82^*$
Latinos	30	19	51	(.000)

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



*Appendix Table 11. Satisfaction with Items Affecting Well-Being, 2007.*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Does Not Apply</i>	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Somewhat Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Somewhat Satisfied</i>	<i>Very Satisfied</i>
Your family	2%	2%	3%	7%	34%	52%
Your marriage	31	1	2	4	15	47
Your religion/spirituality	2	2	4	17	33	44
Your friends	1	2	4	12	40	41
Greenery and open space	0	2	7	11	41	39
Clean air	0	4	10	12	42	32
Your housing	0	4	10	13	42	31
Your education	0	3	9	14	44	30
Clean water	0	7	14	11	39	29
Your spare time	3	5	14	12	37	29
Your health	0	5	11	11	48	25
Your job satisfaction	24	4	10	11	33	19
Your job security	24	6	10	12	30	19
Your community	0	4	15	19	45	17
Current income level	0	14	24	13	37	13
Job opportunities for you	23	12	20	15	20	11
Financial security during retirement	0	19	27	15	30	9

**Appendix Table 12. Satisfaction with Items By Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes.\*\***

	<i>Financial security during retirement</i>			<i>Significance</i>	<i>Job opportunities for you</i>			<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>		<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2279)				(n = 1951)			
Less than 500	43	17	41		39	25	36	
500 - 999	50	15	35		43	15	42	
1,000 - 4,999	49	10	40		42	22	37	
5,000 - 9,999	39	19	42	$\chi^2 = 21.92^*$	41	17	43	$\chi^2 = 15.91^*$
10,000 and up	47	14	39	(.005)	42	17	41	(.044)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2228)				(n = 1860)			
Panhandle	43	13	43		40	14	46	
North Central	49	12	38		45	21	35	
South Central	49	12	39		41	19	40	
Northeast	44	15	42	$\chi^2 = 6.94$	41	19	40	$\chi^2 = 8.23$
Southeast	47	12	42	(.544)	42	21	37	(.411)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<b>Household Income Level</b>	(n = 2180)				(n = 1890)			
Under \$20,000	57	21	23		53	20	28	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	54	15	31		45	20	35	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	49	13	39	$\chi^2 = 178.15^*$	41	20	39	$\chi^2 = 69.02^*$
\$60,000 and over	31	9	60	(.000)	32	15	53	(.000)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 2384)				(n = 2027)			
19 - 29	52	25	23		46	20	34	
30 - 39	48	16	37		41	16	44	
40 - 49	55	10	35		43	15	43	
50 - 64	48	12	40	$\chi^2 = 136.70^*$	42	21	38	$\chi^2 = 39.65^*$
65 and older	30	17	54	(.000)	28	33	39	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 2353)				(n = 2007)			
Male	40	15	45	$\chi^2 = 24.94^*$	35	21	44	$\chi^2 = 28.76^*$
Female	50	15	35	(.000)	47	17	36	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 2343)				(n = 2004)			
High school diploma or less	45	21	34		42	24	34	
Some college	51	13	36	$\chi^2 = 78.97^*$	44	18	38	$\chi^2 = 31.47^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	41	9	51	(.000)	38	15	47	(.000)
<b>Marital Status</b>	(n = 2345)				(n = 2000)			
Married	45	14	42		40	20	40	
Never married	49	30	22		46	17	37	
Divorced/separated	65	9	26	$\chi^2 = 106.77^*$	49	14	36	$\chi^2 = 14.24^*$
Widowed	33	15	52	(.000)	29	24	47	(.027)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1678)				(n = 1706)			
Sales	56	15	29		46	25	29	
Manual laborer	55	23	22		48	19	33	
Prof./technical/admin	45	10	46		37	15	48	
Service	66	13	21		50	18	33	
Farming/ranching	40	15	45		25	30	45	
Skilled laborer	50	16	35		49	14	37	
Admin. support	59	9	33	$\chi^2 = 99.49^*$	50	16	33	$\chi^2 = 71.97^*$
Other	47	37	16	(.000)	35	30	35	(.000)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	(n = 2360)				(n = 2011)			
Non-Latinos	47	13	40	$\chi^2 = 85.63^*$	42	19	40	$\chi^2 = 0.57$
Latinos	37	35	28	(.000)	40	21	39	(.754)

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

\*\* Only the ten items with the highest combined proportion of very and somewhat dissatisfied responses are included.

Appendix Table 12 Continued.

	<i>Current income level</i>				<i>Clean water</i>			
	<i>No</i>		<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>No</i>		<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>			<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>		
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2347)				(n = 2433)			
Less than 500	37	13	51		14	13	73	
500 - 999	42	11	47		21	5	74	
1,000 - 4,999	39	13	49		18	10	72	
5,000 - 9,999	32	14	54	$\chi^2 = 8.94$	29	14	57	$\chi^2 = 46.51^*$
10,000 and up	39	11	50	(.348)	22	11	66	(.000)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2291)				(n = 2372)			
Panhandle	34	12	54		23	10	67	
North Central	42	12	46		14	9	78	
South Central	39	12	49		23	10	66	
Northeast	36	11	53	$\chi^2 = 6.67$	19	12	69	$\chi^2 = 22.44^*$
Southeast	37	11	52	(.573)	18	13	69	(.004)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 2243)				(n = 2322)			
Under \$20,000	55	20	25		28	15	57	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	47	15	38		23	12	65	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	39	8	54	$\chi^2 = 317.76^*$	20	9	72	$\chi^2 = 49.37^*$
\$60,000 and over	18	6	76	(.000)	16	9	75	(.000)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2454)				(n = 2553)			
19 - 29	45	16	39		27	17	56	
30 - 39	37	11	53		24	10	66	
40 - 49	42	6	52		22	11	67	
50 - 64	41	10	49	$\chi^2 = 95.41^*$	21	9	70	$\chi^2 = 49.13^*$
65 and older	25	22	53	(.000)	14	11	75	(.000)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 2426)				(n = 2522)			
Male	35	13	53	$\chi^2 = 7.56^*$	18	10	72	$\chi^2 = 11.71^*$
Female	40	13	47	(.023)	23	12	65	(.003)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2415)				(n = 2510)			
High school diploma or less	39	19	42		24	15	61	
Some college	42	11	48	$\chi^2 = 98.40^*$	20	11	69	$\chi^2 = 33.50^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	31	7	62	(.000)	18	8	74	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2418)				(n = 2513)			
Married	37	11	53		20	10	71	
Never married	43	19	38		27	15	59	
Divorced/separated	52	10	38	$\chi^2 = 69.57^*$	27	14	59	$\chi^2 = 34.29^*$
Widowed	25	22	54	(.000)	17	17	67	(.000)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1771)				(n = 1786)			
Sales	46	7	46		23	10	67	
Manual laborer	47	13	39		26	14	60	
Prof./technical/admin	33	6	61		20	9	71	
Service	50	13	37		21	8	71	
Farming/ranching	32	14	55		9	4	87	
Skilled laborer	48	9	43		30	13	57	
Admin. support	42	9	49	$\chi^2 = 74.00^*$	31	8	61	$\chi^2 = 74.49^*$
Other	55	14	32	(.000)	17	35	48	(.000)
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	(n = 2429)				(n = 2524)			
Non-Latinos	38	11	51	$\chi^2 = 48.97^*$	20	10	70	$\chi^2 = 53.65^*$
Latinos	38	26	37	(.000)	34	18	48	(.000)

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

\*\* Only the ten items with the highest combined proportion of very and somewhat dissatisfied responses are included.

Appendix Table 12 Continued.

	<i>Your spare time</i>				<i>Your job security</i>			
	<i>No</i>		<i>Significance</i>	<i>No</i>		<i>Significance</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>		<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>		<i>opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2396)				(n = 1913)			
Less than 500	15	16	70	18	17	64		
500 - 999	22	11	67	17	18	65		
1,000 - 4,999	21	13	65	19	16	65		
5,000 - 9,999	18	13	69	$\chi^2 = 12.47$	16	17	$\chi^2 = 13.22$	
10,000 and up	21	12	67	(.131)	23	13	(.104)	
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2325)				(n = 1830)			
Panhandle	20	13	66		19	15	65	
North Central	18	9	73		15	20	65	
South Central	18	13	69		21	14	66	
Northeast	21	13	67	$\chi^2 = 8.99$	20	14	$\chi^2 = 9.92$	
Southeast	23	12	66	(.343)	19	13	(.271)	
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 2288)				(n = 1861)			
Under \$20,000	19	19	62		36	22	42	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	17	13	70		21	19	61	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	24	11	66	$\chi^2 = 34.88^*$	19	11	$\chi^2 = 114.14^*$	
\$60,000 and over	22	9	70	(.000)	12	12	(.000)	
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2508)				(n = 1989)			
19 - 29	28	15	57		24	18	58	
30 - 39	24	11	66		18	15	67	
40 - 49	28	11	60		21	10	68	
50 - 64	17	13	70	$\chi^2 = 125.26^*$	21	16	$\chi^2 = 38.42^*$	
65 and older	5	13	82	(.000)	12	28	(.000)	
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 2479)				(n = 1969)			
Male	19	13	68	$\chi^2 = 1.35$	20	15	$\chi^2 = 0.12$	
Female	21	12	67	(.511)	20	16	(.941)	
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2470)				(n = 1964)			
High school diploma or less	15	16	69		22	20	58	
Some college	21	12	67	$\chi^2 = 31.52^*$	22	14	$\chi^2 = 30.24^*$	
Bachelors or grad degree	24	9	67	(.000)	15	13	(.000)	
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2470)				(n = 1963)			
Married	20	10	70		18	15	67	
Never married	24	17	58		27	20	53	
Divorced/separated	25	19	56	$\chi^2 = 59.43^*$	29	12	$\chi^2 = 30.97^*$	
Widowed	8	20	72	(.000)	18	18	(.000)	
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1771)				(n = 1714)			
Sales	26	16	59		22	19	59	
Manual laborer	17	22	62		32	20	48	
Prof./technical/admin	26	9	65		13	10	76	
Service	26	13	61		26	15	59	
Farming/ranching	20	12	68		15	17	67	
Skilled laborer	23	12	66		30	12	58	
Admin. support	27	12	61	$\chi^2 = 36.84^*$	25	13	$\chi^2 = 91.40^*$	
Other	5	24	71	(.001)	5	30	(.000)	
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	(n = 2484)				(n = 1974)			
Non-Latinos	20	12	68	$\chi^2 = 8.58^*$	19	15	$\chi^2 = 35.46^*$	
Latinos	21	18	61	(.014)	30	23	(.000)	

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

\*\* Only the ten items with the highest combined proportion of very and somewhat dissatisfied responses are included.

Appendix Table 12 Continued.

	<i>Your community</i>				<i>Your job</i>			
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2423)				(n = 1927)			
Less than 500	15	16	68		19	14	67	
500 - 999	15	11	74		14	12	74	
1,000 - 4,999	23	19	59		17	15	68	
5,000 - 9,999	21	20	58	$\chi^2 = 34.05^*$	14	13	73	$\chi^2 = 10.71$
10,000 and up	21	21	58	(.000)	20	14	65	(.219)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2369)				(n = 1840)			
Panhandle	20	15	65		13	12	75	
North Central	19	17	64		14	14	72	
South Central	20	19	61		19	14	67	
Northeast	18	18	64	$\chi^2 = 6.88$	16	15	69	$\chi^2 = 11.11$
Southeast	20	21	59	(.549)	21	12	67	(.195)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<b>Household Income Level</b>	(n = 2313)				(n = 1872)			
Under \$20,000	21	20	59		28	17	56	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	20	18	62		22	16	62	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	22	17	61	$\chi^2 = 4.64$	18	12	70	$\chi^2 = 68.38^*$
\$60,000 and over	18	17	65	(.590)	10	11	79	(.000)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 2539)				(n = 2003)			
19 - 29	21	23	57		21	18	61	
30 - 39	19	17	64		17	12	71	
40 - 49	24	20	56		20	10	70	
50 - 64	23	16	61	$\chi^2 = 41.79^*$	18	13	69	$\chi^2 = 35.03^*$
65 and older	12	17	71	(.000)	10	24	66	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 2513)				(n = 1983)			
Male	18	19	63	$\chi^2 = 4.35$	16	14	70	$\chi^2 = 3.51$
Female	21	18	61	(.113)	19	14	66	(.173)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 2501)				(n = 1979)			
High school diploma or less	20	20	61		22	16	62	
Some college	21	21	59	$\chi^2 = 16.48^*$	18	14	68	$\chi^2 = 18.72^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	17	15	68	(.002)	14	12	74	(.001)
<b>Marital Status</b>	(n = 2503)				(n = 1975)			
Married	19	18	64		16	14	70	
Never married	23	23	55		23	13	64	
Divorced/separated	26	23	52	$\chi^2 = 26.98^*$	26	14	60	$\chi^2 = 18.19^*$
Widowed	13	18	70	(.000)	14	15	71	(.006)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1772)				(n = 1718)			
Sales	24	18	58		20	16	64	
Manual laborer	15	23	62		30	14	56	
Prof./technical/admin	21	14	65		13	9	79	
Service	25	17	58		24	17	60	
Farming/ranching	18	17	65		7	10	82	
Skilled laborer	24	26	50		28	19	53	
Admin. support	24	16	61	$\chi^2 = 32.27^*$	19	10	71	$\chi^2 = 103.60^*$
Other	36	14	50	(.004)	18	27	55	(.000)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	(n = 2516)				(n = 1988)			
Non-Latinos	19	18	62	$\chi^2 = 1.56$	17	13	70	$\chi^2 = 19.40^*$
Latinos	21	21	59	(.459)	24	20	56	(.000)

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

\*\* Only the ten items with the highest combined proportion of very and somewhat dissatisfied responses are included.

Appendix Table 12 Continued.

	<i>Your health</i>				<i>Your housing</i>			
	<i>No</i>		<i>Significance</i>	<i>No</i>		<i>Significance</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>opinion</i>		<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>		<i>opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 2421)				(n = 2381)			
Less than 500	14	11	75	14	16	70		
500 - 999	14	12	74	13	8	79		
1,000 - 4,999	16	12	73	15	11	74		
5,000 - 9,999	16	8	77	$\chi^2 = 8.40$	15	15	$\chi^2 = 12.46$	
10,000 and up	17	9	73	(.396)	13	14	(.132)	
<b>Region</b>	(n = 2362)				(n = 2321)			
Panhandle	15	6	80		9	10	81	
North Central	16	9	75		16	10	74	
South Central	15	11	75		14	12	74	
Northeast	16	13	71	$\chi^2 = 11.52$	13	16	$\chi^2 = 16.47^*$	
Southeast	17	10	73	(.174)	12	13	(.036)	
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 2310)				(n = 2275)			
Under \$20,000	24	14	62		22	16	62	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	19	11	69		14	14	72	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	13	10	77	$\chi^2 = 75.21^*$	13	13	$\chi^2 = 61.94^*$	
\$60,000 and over	10	6	84	(.000)	9	8	(.000)	
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2538)				(n = 2494)			
19 - 29	12	8	80		21	19	61	
30 - 39	13	11	76		19	9	72	
40 - 49	16	10	75		15	11	74	
50 - 64	20	11	68	$\chi^2 = 23.14^*$	12	14	$\chi^2 = 71.00^*$	
65 and older	16	12	72	(.003)	6	12	(.000)	
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 2508)				(n = 2463)			
Male	16	11	74	$\chi^2 = 0.13$	12	13	$\chi^2 = 5.35$	
Female	16	10	74	(.938)	15	13	(.069)	
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2497)				(n = 2453)			
High school diploma or less	18	15	67		14	15	71	
Some college	16	9	75	$\chi^2 = 48.48^*$	15	15	$\chi^2 = 23.15^*$	
Bachelors or grad degree	12	7	81	(.000)	13	8	(.000)	
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2498)				(n = 2454)			
Married	14	10	75		12	12	76	
Never married	19	10	72		26	14	61	
Divorced/separated	22	12	66	$\chi^2 = 15.89^*$	21	16	$\chi^2 = 59.80^*$	
Widowed	17	13	70	(.014)	7	16	(.000)	
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1772)				(n = 1772)			
Sales	17	11	72		17	9	74	
Manual laborer	13	18	69		18	16	67	
Prof./technical/admin	12	5	83		14	9	77	
Service	21	9	70		18	14	68	
Farming/ranching	11	10	79		9	11	80	
Skilled laborer	14	15	70		15	21	64	
Admin. support	15	11	75	$\chi^2 = 58.08^*$	18	16	$\chi^2 = 47.21^*$	
Other	22	22	57	(.000)	14	36	(.000)	
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	(n = 2513)				(n = 2464)			
Non-Latinos	16	10	75	$\chi^2 = 11.24^*$	13	13	$\chi^2 = 10.64^*$	
Latinos	16	16	68	(.004)	20	14	(.005)	

CARI Research Report 07-1, August 2007

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.