



CENTER FOR APPLIED RURAL INNOVATION

A Research Report

Quality of Life in Nonmetropolitan Nebraska: Perceptions of Well-Being and Church Life

2012 Nebraska Rural Poll Results

Rebecca Vogt
Cheryl Burkhart-Kriesel
Randolph Cantrell
Bradley Lubben
Philip Schwadel

Center Research Report 12-1, July 2012.

© 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

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

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

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Trends in Well-Being (1996 - 2012)	2
<i>Figure 1. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago: 1996 - 2012</i>	2
<i>Figure 2. Well-Being Compared to Parents: 1996 - 2012</i>	3
<i>Figure 3. Well-Being Ten Years from Now: 1996 - 2012</i>	3
<i>Figure 4. "People are Powerless to Control their Own Lives":1996 - 2012</i>	4
<i>Table 1. Proportions of Respondents Satisfied with Each Factor, 1996 - 2012</i>	5
General Well-Being by Subgroups	5
<i>Figure 5. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago by Occupation</i>	7
<i>Figure 6. Belief that People are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives by Education Level</i>	8
Specific Aspects of Well-Being by Subgroups	8
<i>Figure 7. Satisfaction with Job Opportunities by Household Income</i>	9
Church Membership and Attendance	10
<i>Figure 8. Church Membership by Age</i>	11
<i>Figure 9. Frequency of Church Attendance</i>	11
Perceptions of the Church	12
<i>Figure 10. Average Church Attendance by Community Size</i>	12
<i>Table 2. Perceptions of their Church</i>	13
<i>Figure 11. Concern that Church May Need to Close or Consolidate by Community Size</i>	14
Conclusion	16

List of Appendix Tables and Figures

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska	17
Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2010 Census and 2009 American Community Survey	18
Appendix Table 2. Measures of Individual Well-Being in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	19
Appendix Table 3. Life Has Changed So Much in Our Modern World that Most People Are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives	22
Appendix Table 4. Satisfaction with Items Affecting Well-Being, 2012.....	23
Appendix Table 5. Satisfaction with Items by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	24
Appendix Table 6. Church Membership by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes...27	
Appendix Table 7. Frequency of Church Attendance by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes	28
Appendix Table 8. Average Church Attendance by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes	29
Appendix Table 9. Opinions about the Church by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes	30
Appendix Table 10. What Would Do if Church Closed or Consolidated by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes	35
Appendix Table 11. How Many Friends and Relatives Attend Same Church by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes	36

Executive Summary

Nebraska's unemployment rate has been one of the lowest in the nation in recent years. The agricultural economy has also been strong with record levels of farm income in 2011. Given the challenges and uncertainties of recent years, how do rural Nebraskans believe they are doing and how do they view their future? Have these views changed over the past seventeen years? How satisfied are they with various items that influence their well-being? Most rural Nebraskans have also reported high satisfaction levels with their religion/spirituality in previous polls. How often do they attend church? How do they view their church? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 2,323 responses to the 2012 Nebraska Rural Poll, the seventeenth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their individual well-being. Trends for some of the questions are examined by comparing data from the sixteen previous polls to this year's results. In addition, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, that is, comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- **Most rural Nebraskans believe they are better off than they were five years ago.** Over one-half (51%) of rural Nebraskans believe they are better off than they were five years ago. This represents the third highest proportion of persons believing they are better off compared to five years ago in the study's history (behind 53% occurring in 2008 and 52% last year). There was a slight increase in the proportion of rural Nebraskans who believe they are worse off than they were five years ago, from 18 percent last year to 21 percent this year.
- **Rural Nebraskans continue to be generally positive about their future.** The proportion stating they will be better off ten years from now has generally remained about 42 percent. This year, that proportion is 45 percent. The proportion of respondents stating they will be worse off ten years from now is 20 percent this year, the same as last year.
- **Most rural Nebraskans disagree that people are powerless to control their own lives.** The proportion that either strongly disagree or disagree that people are powerless to control their own lives increased from 51 percent last year to 56 percent this year. The proportion that strongly agree or agree with the statement declined from 29 percent last year to 25 percent this year.
- **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.** Satisfaction with job opportunities, however, increased from 38 percent last year to 46 percent this year. Yet, other items saw declines in their level of satisfaction compared to last year - general quality of life, general standard of living, health and community.
- **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, 65 percent of

respondents with household incomes of \$60,000 or more think they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. However, only 29 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 believe they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. And, 58 percent of persons with household incomes over \$60,000 think they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to 31 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000.

- ***Persons with lower education levels are more likely than persons with more education to believe that people are powerless to control their own lives.*** Thirty-five percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education agree that people are powerless to control their own lives. However, only 17 percent of persons with at least a four-year college degree share this opinion.
- ***Most rural Nebraskans are members of a church and attend church at least once a month.*** Seventy-five percent of rural Nebraskans are members of a church. Thirty-nine percent attend church services weekly or more often and 17 percent attend one or more times a month.
- ***Rural Nebraskans who attend church generally are positive about the future of their church.*** Three-quarters (75%) believe their church is financially stable, most (77%) believe that it serves as a resource to the entire community, and just under three-quarters (72%) agree that the level of pastoral services in their church is adequate for the needs of the congregation. And, two-thirds (66%) disagree that they are concerned that their church may need to close or consolidate and over one-half (52%) disagree that their church will decline over the next several years. Persons living in or near smaller communities and persons with occupations in agriculture are the groups most likely to express concern for the future of their church.

Introduction

Nebraska's unemployment rate has been one of the lowest in the nation in recent years. The agricultural economy has also been strong with record levels of farm income in 2011. Given the challenges and uncertainties of recent years, how do rural Nebraskans believe they are doing and how do they view their future? Have these views changed over the past seventeen years? How satisfied are they with various items that influence their well-being? Most rural Nebraskans have also reported high satisfaction levels with their religion/spirituality in previous polls. How often do they attend church? How do they view their church? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 2,323 responses to the 2012 Nebraska Rural Poll, the seventeenth annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their well-being. Trends for these questions will be examined by comparing the data from the sixteen previous polls to this year's results. They were also asked some questions about church membership and attendance and their perceptions about their church.

Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 2,323 responses from Nebraskans living in the 84 non-metropolitan counties in the state. A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in March and April to approximately 6,350 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, church, resources, and businesses in the community. This paper reports only results from the well-being and church portions of the survey.

A 37% response rate was achieved using the total design method (Dillman, 1978). The sequence of steps used follow:

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

Appendix Table 1 shows demographic data from this year's study and previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire nonmetropolitan population of Nebraska (using the latest available data from the 2010 U.S. Census and the 2009 American Community Survey). 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. Thus, we suggest the reader use caution in generalizing our data to all rural Nebraska. However, given the random sampling frame used for this survey, the acceptable percentage of responses, and the large number of respondents, we feel the data provide useful insights into opinions of rural Nebraskans on the various issues presented in this report. The margin of error for this study is plus or minus two percent.

Since younger residents have typically been under-represented by survey respondents and older residents have been over-represented, weights were used to adjust the sample to match the age distribution in the nonmetropolitan counties in Nebraska (using U.S. Census figures from 2010).

The average age of respondents is 51 years. Seventy percent are married (Appendix Table 1) and 68 percent live within the city limits of a

town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 44 years and have lived in their current community 27 years. Fifty-four percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety-six percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Thirty-six percent of the respondents report their 2011 approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, as below \$40,000. Fifty-two percent report incomes over \$50,000.

Seventy-three percent were employed in 2011 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Nineteen percent are retired. Thirty-two percent of those employed reported working in a management, professional, or education occupation. Fourteen percent indicated they were employed in agriculture.

Trends in Well-Being (1996 - 2012)

Comparisons are made between the well-being data collected this year to the sixteen 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?"
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."

The responses to the first three questions were expanded in 2009 to a five-point scale, where responses included much worse off, worse off, about the same, better off, and much better off. To compare the data to prior years, the much worse off and worse off categories are combined as well as the better off and much better off categories.

When examining the trends over the past seventeen years, rural Nebraskans have generally given positive reviews about their current situation (Figure 1). 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.

This year, rural Nebraskans' opinions about their current situation remain about the same

Figure 1. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago: 1996 - 2012



as last year. Just over one-half (51%) of rural Nebraskans believe they are better off than they were five years ago, compared to 52 percent last year. This represents the third highest proportion of persons believing they are better off compared to five years ago in the study's history (behind 53% occurring in 2008 and 52% last year). The proportion of rural Nebraskans who believe they are worse off than they were five years ago increased slightly from 18 percent last year to 21 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 2). The proportion stating they are better off has averaged approximately 59 percent over the seventeen year period. Similarly, the proportion feeling they are worse off than their parents has remained steady at approximately 17 percent during this period.

When looking to the future, respondents' views have also been generally positive (Figure 3). The

Figure 2. Well-Being Compared to Parents: 1996 - 2012





Figure 3. Well-Being Ten Years from Now: 1996 - 2012



proportion saying 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.

Rural Nebraskans' outlook on their future is virtually unchanged compared to last year. The proportion stating they will be better off ten years from now has generally remained about 42 percent. This year, that proportion is 45 percent, the same as last year.

The proportion of respondents stating they will be worse off ten years from now has been approximately 20 percent each year. In 1996 the proportion saying they would be worse off ten years from now was 28 percent, the highest of all 17 years. The proportion this year is 20 percent, the same as it was last year. The proportion stating they will be about the same ten years from now had remained fairly steady

around 40 percent over the first 12 years of the study, declined to 33 percent in 2008, and has remained around 36 percent the past three years.

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 4). The proportion that either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement generally declined between 2002 and 2010, from 58 percent to 43 percent (the lowest in the 17 year period). However, the proportion has since sharply increased to 56 percent this year. The proportion that either strongly agree or agree with the statement has remained fairly consistent each year, averaging around 32 percent. That proportion declined from 35 percent in 2010 to 25 percent this year. The proportion of those who were undecided each year has gradually increased over time, from 10 percent in 1996 to 19 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.”

The rank ordering of the items has remained relatively stable over the years (Table 1). In addition, the proportion of respondents stating they were very or somewhat satisfied with each

Figure 4. “...People are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives”: 1996 - 2012



item also has been fairly consistent over the years.

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.

One of the items in the latter category had an increase in the levels of satisfaction this year as

Table 1. Proportions of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Factor, 1996 - 2012. *

Item	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Your marriage	NA	NA	91	92	93	92	93	92	94	92	94	90	92	92	90	90	90
Your family	90	93	92	89	93	89	90	90	90	89	91	88	91	85	89	89	87
Greenery and open space	NA	NA	90	87	86	86	87	82	80	83	85	80	82	80	81	82	84
Your general quality of life	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82	84	86	81
Your friends	84	85	87	84	87	86	85	85	86	83	84	82	85	82	84	84	81
Your general standard of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	77	79	83	79
Clean air	NA	NA	NA	NA	80	81	82	79	78	79	80	74	80	75	79	82	79
Your religion/spirituality	79	79	81	78	83	79	79	78	78	75	75	78	79	75	77	76	78
Clean water	NA	NA	NA	NA	73	75	76	75	73	73	74	68	76	72	77	78	76
Your housing	NA	75	81	80	80	78	78	79	77	78	76	73	77	73	76	77	74
Your education	73	73	74	74	76	72	74	74	72	71	74	74	77	67	74	77	74
Your job satisfaction	68	69	69	66	70	69	70	68	72	72	69	68	76	71	70	72	71
Your health	78	81	78	75	77	74	74	75	73	71	73	74	77	66	73	75	70
Your spare time**	54	NA	71	65	71	66	67	67	66	65	68	68	71	66	67	72	70
Your job security	63	64	63	59	68	66	65	62	66	65	66	64	73	59	66	67	67
Your community	65	64	70	68	70	67	63	62	64	66	62	62	66	63	64	65	59
Your current income level	54	58	53	46	51	48	48	47	49	48	50	50	53	47	50	55	53
Job opportunities	39	41	38	37	36	38	37	35	34	39	43	40	48	32	42	38	46
Financial security during retirement	43	47	43	38	43	37	38	30	34	38	39	39	38	24	32	38	35

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.

compared to last year. Forty-six percent of rural Nebraskans are satisfied with their job opportunities this year, compared to 38 percent last year. However, some other items declined in their satisfaction levels this year. Satisfaction with general quality of life decreased from 86 percent last year to 81 percent this year. Similarly, satisfaction with general standard of living declined from 83 percent last year to 79 percent this year. Satisfaction with the respondent's health and community also declined. Satisfaction with their health declined from 75 percent last year to 70 percent this

year. And, satisfaction with their community declined from 65 percent to 59 percent.

General Well-Being by Subgroups

In this section, 2012 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 2).

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. Three-quarters (75%) of persons age 19 to 29 feel they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. However, just over one-quarter (29%) of persons age 65 and older share this opinion. Similarly, 75 percent of persons age 19 to 29 believe they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to only 12 percent of persons age 65 and older.

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, 65 percent of respondents with household incomes of \$60,000 or more think they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. However, only 29 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 believe they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. And, 58 percent of persons with household incomes over \$60,000 think they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to 31 percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000.

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-eight percent of respondents with at least a four-year college degree believe they will be much better off or better off ten years from now than they are today. Only 28 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education share this optimism.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age. Sixty-two percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more believe they are much better off or better off compared to their parents when they were their age, while approximately 50 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 1,000 share this opinion.

Respondents living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to believe they are better off than they were five years ago and are better off compared to their parents when they were their age (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region). As an example, 55 percent of the South Central region residents think they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago, compared to 45 percent of the residents of the North Central region. Panhandle residents, however, are the regional group most likely to believe they will be better off ten years from now. One-half (50%) of the Panhandle residents believe they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to 39 percent of the residents of the Southeast region.

Females are more likely than males to believe they will be better off ten years from now. Just under one-half (49%) of females say they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to 40 percent of males. When comparing the marital groups, married respondents are the group most likely to believe they are better off than they were five years ago and will be better off ten years from now. As an example, 50 percent of married persons believe they will be much better off or better off ten years from now, compared to 12 percent of widowed respondents. The widowed respondents join the married respondents as

the marital groups most likely to believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age.

Persons with agriculture occupations and persons with management, professional or education occupations are the occupation groups most likely to believe they are better off compared to five years ago (Figure 5). Sixty-two percent of both of these occupation groups believe they are much better off or better off than they were five years ago. In comparison, only 46 percent of persons with production, transportation and warehousing occupations think they are better off than they were five years ago. Persons with management, professional or education occupations are the group most likely to believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age. Sixty-four percent of persons with these types of occupations believe they are better off compared to their parents when they were their age. In comparison, only 40 percent of persons with food service or personal care occupations share the same opinion. Persons with management, professional or education occupations, persons with food service or personal care occupations and the persons with

sales or office support occupations are the groups most likely to believe they will be better off ten years from now than they are today. Approximately 56 percent of persons with these types of occupations think they will be better off ten years from now, compared to 40 percent of persons with occupations classified as other.

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 3). Persons with lower educational levels are more likely than persons with more education to believe that people are powerless to control their own lives. Thirty-five percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education agree that people are powerless to control their own lives (Figure 6). However, only 17 percent of persons with at least 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. Thirty-four percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 believe people are powerless to control their

Figure 5. Well-Being Compared to Five Years Ago by Occupation





Figure 6. Belief that People are Powerless to Control Their Own Lives by Education Level



own lives, compared to 18 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree that people are powerless to control their own lives. Thirty-four percent of persons age 65 and older agree with the statement, compared to 16 percent of persons under the age of 30.

Persons living in both the Northeast and North Central regions are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to think people are powerless to control their own lives. Approximately 28 percent of the residents of these two regions agree with this statement, compared to 20 percent of persons living in the South Central region.

Males are more likely than females to think people are powerless. The widowed respondents are the marital status group most likely to believe people are powerless. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with production, transportation or warehousing occupations are the group most likely to agree with this statement. Approximately one-third

(32%) of persons with these types of occupations agree that people are powerless to control their own lives.

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 4. At least four out of ten respondents are very satisfied with their family (50%), their marriage (47%), and greenery and open space (46%). Items receiving the highest proportion of very dissatisfied responses include: financial security during retirement (23%), current income level (13%), and job opportunities for you (10%).

The top five 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 5.

Respondents’ satisfaction level with their financial security during retirement differs by all of the individual characteristics examined. Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to be dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement. Sixty-three percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 report being dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement, compared to 39 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.

Persons between the ages of 30 and 49 are the age groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement. Approximately 57 percent of persons age 30 to

49 are dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement, compared to 30 percent of persons age 65 and older.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their financial security during retirement include: females, persons with some college education (but less than a four year degree), divorced or separated respondents, persons who have never married, and persons with food service or personal care occupations.


Persons with food service or personal care occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to be dissatisfied with their job opportunities. Just over one-half (52%) of persons with these types of occupations are dissatisfied with their job opportunities, compared to 18 percent of persons with occupations in agriculture.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher household incomes to report being dissatisfied with their job opportunities (Figure 7). Fifty-two percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 are dissatisfied with their job opportunities, compared to 28 percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to report dissatisfaction with their job opportunities. Over one-third (at least 35%) of persons under the age of 65 are dissatisfied with their job opportunities. In comparison, only 21 percent of persons age 65 and older are dissatisfied with their job opportunities.

Females are more likely than males to be dissatisfied with their job opportunities. Thirty-nine percent of females are dissatisfied with their job opportunities, compared to 30 percent of males.

Figure 7. Satisfaction with Job Opportunities by Household Income



Persons living in the North Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to report being dissatisfied with their job opportunities. Just under one-half (48%) of North Central region residents are dissatisfied with their job opportunities, compared to 30 percent of residents of the South Central region.

Other groups most likely to say they are dissatisfied with their job opportunities include: persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999, persons with some college education (but less than a four year degree), persons who have never married, and divorced/separated respondents.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher household incomes to be dissatisfied with their current income level. Over one-half (58%) 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.

Persons with food service or personal care occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to express dissatisfaction with their current income level. Sixty-two percent of persons with these types of occupations are dissatisfied with their current income level, compared to 20 percent of persons with occupations in agriculture.

Other groups most likely to report being dissatisfied with their current income level include: residents of both the Panhandle and Northeast regions, females, persons with lower education levels, and persons who are divorced or separated.

Panhandle residents are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with their community. Just over one-quarter (29%) of Panhandle residents are dissatisfied with their community, compared to 17 percent of persons living in the South Central region of the state.

Persons with food service or personal care occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to express dissatisfaction with their community. Over one-third (36%) of persons with these types of occupations are dissatisfied with their community, compared to 15 percent of persons with occupations classified as other.

Other groups most likely to report dissatisfaction with their community include: persons with lower household incomes, persons under the age of 65, and persons who have never married.

Persons with lower household incomes are more likely than persons with higher incomes to be dissatisfied with their job security. Thirty percent of persons with household incomes under \$20,000 report being dissatisfied with their job security. In comparison, only 13

percent of persons with household incomes of \$60,000 or more are dissatisfied with their job security.

Over one-third (37%) of persons with food service or personal care occupations are dissatisfied with their job security. However, only 11 percent of persons with occupations in agriculture and persons with occupations classified as other are dissatisfied with their job security. Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their job security include: residents of the North Central region, residents of the Southeast region, younger persons, persons with lower education levels, persons who have divorced or separated, and persons who have never married.

Church Membership and Attendance

In past studies, most rural Nebraskans have reported high satisfaction levels with their religion/ spirituality. In addition, many churches serve as an anchor institution in rural communities. To further explore the role of the church in the lives of rural Nebraskans and their communities, some questions were added to this year's survey. While we recognize that a small number of respondents may be representing non-Christian groups, we are using "church" generically.

First, respondents were asked about church membership. Three-quarters (75%) of rural Nebraskans are members of a church. Church membership depends on the region the respondent lives in as well as other individual attributes (Appendix Table 6).

Rural Nebraskans living in either the Northeast or Southeast regions are more likely than rural Nebraskans living in other regions of the state to be a member of a church. Approximately 78 percent of the residents of these two regions

are members of a church, compared to 65 percent of Panhandle residents.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to be members of a church (Figure 8). Eighty-six percent of persons age 65 and older are church members, compared to 64 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Persons with occupations in agriculture are more likely than persons with different types of occupations to be a member of a church. Eighty-three percent of persons with agriculture occupations are members of a church, compared to 56 percent of persons with occupations in production, transportation or warehousing.

Other groups that are most likely to be members of a church include: persons with higher household incomes, persons with higher education levels and widowed respondents.

Next, respondents were asked how often they attend church services whether or not they are a member. Many rural Nebraskans (39%) attend church services weekly or more often (Figure 9). An additional 17 percent attend services one or more times a month. Sixteen percent attend services several times a year and 12 percent attend only on special religious holidays. Sixteen percent do not ever attend church

Figure 8. Church Membership by Age





Figure 9. Frequency of Church Attendance



services.

Church attendance differs by community size and all the individual attributes examined (Appendix Table 7). Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are more likely than persons living in or near communities of different sizes to attend church services weekly or more often. Forty-five percent of persons living in or near communities of this size attend church at least weekly, compared to 35 percent of persons who live in or near communities with less than 500 persons.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to attend church at least weekly. Over one-half (59%) of persons age 65 and older attend church weekly or more often, compared to 23 percent of persons age 19 to 29.


Other groups most likely to attend church at least weekly include: persons with the highest household incomes, females, widowed respondents, persons with the highest education levels, and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

Perceptions of the Church

Respondents who attend church were asked further questions about their church. Persons who never attend church skipped this next series of questions. They were first asked, “When you attend church, how many people do you see there on average?” Two-thirds (67%) of churchgoers see over 50 people in church on average (Figure 10). Just under one-third (31%) see more than 100 people in church on average and over one-third (36%) see between 51 and 100 people in church. Just over one-quarter (27%) see between 20 and 50 people in church on average and six percent see less than 20 people there.

The perceptions of average church attendance differ by community size, region and most of the individual attributes examined (Appendix Table 8). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to see more than 100 persons on average in church when they attend (Figure 10). One-half (50%) of

Figure 10. Average Church Attendance by Community Size



persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more see more than 100 persons in church on average, compared to 14 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 persons.

Persons living in the Northeast region of the state are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to see more than 100 persons on average in church when they attend. Over one-third (37%) of Northeast region residents see more than 100 persons in church on average, compared to 23 percent of persons living in the North Central region.

Other groups most likely to see at least 100 persons in church on average when they attend include: persons with higher household incomes, married persons, persons with higher education levels and persons with management, professional or education occupations. When comparing responses by age, the youngest persons are *least* likely to see more than 100 persons in church when they attend. Eighteen percent of persons age 19 to 29 see at least 100 persons in church on average when they attend. In comparison, at least one-third of respondents age 30 or older see more than 100 persons in church.

Respondents were next given a series of statements about their perceptions of their church. They were asked the extent to which they agree or disagree with each. Most rural Nebraskan churchgoers think their church will survive into the future. Two-thirds (67%) of rural Nebraskan churchgoers agree that their church is financially stable (Table 2). Over three-quarters (77%) of churchgoers agree that their church serves as a resource to the entire community. Two-thirds (66%) *disagree* that they are concerned that their church may need to close or consolidate. And, over one-half (52%) disagree that their church will decline

Table 2. Perceptions of their Church

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>
My church is financially stable.	13%	8%	67%	12%
My church serves as a resource to the entire community.	6	9	77	8
I am concerned that my church may need to close or consolidate.	66	13	14	8
My church will decline over the next several years.	52	16	24	8
The level of pastoral services in my church is adequate for the needs of the congregation.	13	7	72	8

over the next several years. Almost three-quarters (72%) agree that the level of pastoral services in their church is adequate for the needs of the congregation.

Perceptions about their church are examined by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 9). Many differences emerge.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that their church is financially stable. Seventy-one percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more agree with that statement, compared to 61 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.

Persons living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that their church is financially stable. Just under three-quarters (73%) of residents of this region agree with the statement, compared to 62 percent of persons living in either the Panhandle or North Central regions.

Other groups most likely to agree that their church is financially stable include: persons with

higher household incomes; married persons; widowed respondents; persons with higher education levels; persons with management, professional or education occupations; and persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations.

Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that their church serves as a resource to the entire community. Eighty percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more agree with this statement, compared to 70 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.

Residents of the Northeast region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that their church serves as a resource to the entire community. Eighty-one percent of persons living in the Northeast region agree with the statement, compared to 73 percent of persons living in the North Central region.

Other groups most likely to agree that their church serves as a resource to the entire community include: persons with higher household incomes, persons over the age of 30, married persons, widowed respondents,

persons with higher education levels and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to agree that they are concerned that their church may need to close or consolidate (Figure 11). Approximately 20 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree with this statement, compared to eight percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree that they are concerned their church may need to close or consolidate. Seventeen percent of persons age 50 or older agree with this statement, compared to eight percent of persons age 30 to 39.

Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the largest communities to agree that their church will decline over the next several years. At least one-third of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 1,000 agree with that statement, compared to

15 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Residents of the Southeast region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that their church will decline over the next several years. Over one-third (35%) of residents of this region agree with this statement, compared to 19 percent of residents of the South Central region.


Other groups most likely to agree that their church will decline over the next several years include: persons over the age of 40, males, and persons with agriculture occupations.

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 1,000 to 4,999 are more likely than persons living in or near communities of different sizes to agree that the level of pastoral services in their church is adequate for the needs of the congregation. Over three-quarters (77%) of persons living in or near communities of this size agree with this statement, compared to 65 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999.

Other groups most likely to agree that the level of pastoral services in their church is adequate for the needs of the congregation include: widowed respondents, persons with less education, and persons with construction, installation or warehousing occupations.

Next, respondents were asked, "If your church closed or consolidated, which of the following would you be most likely to do?" The majority (78%) of respondents would join another (or the consolidated) church of the same denomination. Eight percent would join another church of a different denomination, seven percent would stop going to church and seven percent gave another response.

Figure 11. Concern that Church May Need to Close or Consolidate by Community Size



The responses to this question are analyzed by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 10). Persons living in the Northeast region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say they would join another church of the same denomination if their church closed or consolidated. Eighty-two percent of residents of this region say they would join another church of the same denomination, compared to 72 percent of residents of the North Central region.

Other groups most likely to say they would join another church of the same denomination if their church closed or consolidated include: persons with higher household incomes, persons age 30 to 39, and persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations.

Finally, respondents were asked how many of their closest friends and relatives who live in or near their community attend the same church they do.

One-third (33%) of rural Nebraskan churchgoers say at least half of their closest friends attend the same church they do. Four percent say all of their closest friends attend the same church they do, 16 percent say most of their closest friends attend the same church and 14 percent say about half attend the same church. Forty-two percent say some of their closest friends attend the same church and just under one-quarter (24%) say none of their closest friends attend the same church.

A few more of their relatives who live in or near their community attend the same church they do. Eleven percent of churchgoers say all of their nearby relatives attend their same church. Other responses include: most (19%), about half (8%), some (26%) and none (36%).

Responses to these questions are examined by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 11). Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are more likely than persons living in communities of different sizes to say that at least half of their closest friends attend the same church they do. Forty-two percent of persons living in communities of this size say at least half of their closest friends attend their same church. In comparison, 30 percent of persons living in or near either the largest communities or the smallest communities have at least half of their closest friends attend their same church.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to say that most or all of their closest friends attend their same church. Twenty-nine percent of persons age 65 and older say most or all of their closest friends attend their same church, compared to 13 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Other groups most likely to say that all or most of their closest friends attend their same church include females and widowed respondents. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with food service or personal care occupations are *less* likely than persons with different occupations to have most or all of their closest friends attend their same church.

Persons living in or near the smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near the largest communities to have all or most of their nearby relatives attend the same church they do. Forty-three percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 have all or most of their nearby relatives attend their same church. In comparison, 26 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more have all or most of their nearby relatives attend their same church.

Residents of the Northeast region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to have all or most of their nearby relatives attend their same church. Thirty-six percent of Northeast region residents have all or most of their nearby relatives attend the same church, compared to 23 percent of persons living in the South Central region of the state.

Other groups that are most likely to have all or most of their nearby relatives attend their same church include: persons with higher household incomes, younger persons, and persons with health care support or public safety occupations.

Conclusion

Most rural Nebraskans are positive about their current situation. And, they continue to be generally positive about their future situation. Over one-half (51%) of rural Nebraskans think they are better off than they were five years ago and just under one-half (45%) think they will be better off ten years from now. Certain groups remain pessimistic about their situation. Persons with lower household incomes, older persons, and persons with lower educational levels are the groups most likely to be pessimistic about the present and the future.


When asked if they believe people are powerless to control their own lives, most rural Nebraskans disagree. The proportion that either strongly disagree or disagree with this statement sharply increased from last year.

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. Satisfaction with job opportunities increased this year compared to last year. However, satisfaction with general quality of life, general standard of living, their health and their community all saw declines this year.

Most rural Nebraskans are members of a church and over one-half attend church services at least once a month. Older persons, persons with higher incomes, and persons with higher education levels are the groups most likely to be members of a church and to attend church services at least once a month.

Rural Nebraskans who attend church generally are positive about the future of their church. Most believe their church is financially stable, that it serves as a resource to the entire community, and that the level of pastoral services in their church is adequate for the needs of the congregation. And, most are not concerned that their church may need to close or consolidate nor do they believe their church will decline over the next several years. Persons living in or near smaller communities and persons with occupations in agriculture are the groups most likely to express concern for the future of their church.

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska



■ Metropolitan counties (not surveyed)

Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents¹ Compared to 2010 Census and 2009 American Community Survey

	2012 Poll	2011 Poll	2010 Poll	2009 Poll	2008 Poll	2007 Poll	2009 ACS
Age : ²							
20 - 39	31%	31%	32%	32%	32%	31%	31%
40 - 64	44%	44%	44%	44%	44%	44%	46%
65 and over	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	25%	24%
Gender: ³							
Female	61%	60%	59%	57%	56%	59%	50%
Male	39%	40%	41%	43%	44%	41%	50%
Education: ⁴							
Less than 9 th grade	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%	5%
9 th to 12 th grade (no diploma)	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%	8%
High school diploma (or equiv.)	22%	26%	25%	26%	26%	26%	34%
Some college, no degree	25%	23%	25%	25%	25%	23%	26%
Associate degree	15%	16%	14%	15%	12%	14%	10%
Bachelors degree	24%	19%	20%	20%	21%	18%	13%
Graduate or professional degree	11%	12%	11%	10%	10%	10%	5%
Household Income: ⁵							
Less than \$10,000	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	10%	10%	10%	9%	10%	13%	14%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	11%	13%	13%	13%	14%	15%	14%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	10%	14%	12%	13%	14%	14%	13%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	12%	11%	13%	12%	13%	13%	11%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	13%	12%	11%	13%	11%	12%	9%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	14%	12%	13%	14%	13%	11%	11%
\$75,000 or more	25%	22%	23%	21%	18%	16%	21%
Marital Status: ⁶							
Married	70%	66%	71%	68%	70%	70%	58%
Never married	10%	14%	9%	10%	10%	10%	24%
Divorced/separated	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	10%	11%
Widowed/widower	10%	10%	9%	11%	9%	10%	8%

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

² 2010 Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

³ 2010 Census universe is total non-metro population.

⁴ 2009 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

⁵ 2009 American Community Survey universe is all non-metro households.

⁶ 2009 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 15 years of age and over.

Appendix Table 2. Measures of Individual Well-Being in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Compared to Five Years Ago</i>						Chi-square (sig.)
<i>Much Worse Off</i>	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>About the Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Much Better Off</i>	<i>Percentages</i>	
Total	5	16	29	39	12	
Community Size			(n = 2119)			
Less than 500	6	15	32	39	8	
500 - 999	5	19	34	28	15	
1,000 - 4,999	5	14	29	40	14	
5,000 - 9,999	4	16	29	37	13	$\chi^2 = 25.60$
10,000 and up	5	15	28	42	11	(.060)
Region			(n = 2214)			
Panhandle	7	22	28	33	11	
North Central	6	17	32	41	4	
South Central	3	16	26	40	15	
Northeast	4	14	31	39	12	$\chi^2 = 44.72^*$
Southeast	5	13	32	39	12	(.000)
Income Level			(n = 2005)			
Under \$20,000	11	27	34	23	6	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	7	18	34	34	8	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	14	27	43	13	$\chi^2 = 167.65^*$
\$60,000 and over	2	11	23	48	17	(.000)
Age			(n = 2223)			
19 - 29	1	11	13	55	20	
30 - 39	2	9	23	48	19	
40 - 49	7	14	26	41	12	
50 - 64	6	20	30	36	8	$\chi^2 = 268.83^*$
65 and older	5	19	47	24	5	(.000)
Gender			(n = 2177)			
Male	4	17	29	38	12	$\chi^2 = 2.49$
Female	5	14	29	39	12	(.647)
Marital Status			(n = 2182)			
Married	4	13	25	44	13	
Never married	7	22	31	31	8	
Divorced/separated	8	19	31	32	10	$\chi^2 = 140.57^*$
Widowed	7	19	54	16	4	(.000)
Education			(n = 2164)			
H.S. diploma or less	7	18	39	29	7	
Some college	5	16	29	39	12	$\chi^2 = 90.72^*$
Bachelors degree	3	13	23	47	15	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1508)			
Mgt, prof or education	2	16	20	48	14	
Sales or office support	4	11	27	49	10	
Constrn, inst or maint	3	23	19	42	14	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	3	17	33	28	18	
Agriculture	3	8	26	44	18	
Food serv/pers. care	4	22	24	42	9	
Hlthcare supp/safety	7	13	30	41	10	$\chi^2 = 63.78^*$
Other	6	18	27	36	13	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 2 continued

<i>Compared to Parents When They Were Your Age</i>						
	<i>Much Worse Off</i>	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>About the Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Much Better Off</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	4	16	23	42	15	
Community Size			(n = 2111)			
Less than 500	6	17	27	39	11	
500 - 999	3	25	22	35	16	
1,000 - 4,999	4	13	24	44	16	
5,000 - 9,999	2	16	23	41	18	$\chi^2 = 39.06^*$
10,000 and up	4	14	21	46	16	(.001)
Region			(n = 2203)			
Panhandle	5	18	21	42	14	
North Central	5	19	25	42	9	
South Central	3	12	23	46	15	
Northeast	4	15	22	40	18	$\chi^2 = 31.71^*$
Southeast	3	18	25	39	15	(.011)
Income Level			(n = 2002)			
Under \$20,000	8	24	26	33	8	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	7	19	26	38	11	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	16	23	43	14	$\chi^2 = 121.05^*$
\$60,000 and over	1	11	18	47	23	(.000)
Age			(n = 2212)			
19 - 29	3	16	15	44	23	
30 - 39	5	13	22	41	18	
40 - 49	4	19	27	41	10	
50 - 64	5	20	24	40	11	$\chi^2 = 78.59^*$
65 and older	3	10	26	46	15	(.000)
Gender			(n = 2169)			
Male	4	15	23	43	16	$\chi^2 = 1.67$
Female	4	16	23	42	15	(.796)
Marital Status			(n = 2173)			
Married	3	13	22	45	16	
Never married	7	30	19	29	15	
Divorced/separated	7	23	29	29	10	$\chi^2 = 94.99^*$
Widowed	3	10	26	47	14	(.000)
Education			(n = 2156)			
H.S. diploma or less	5	16	24	43	13	
Some college	4	20	23	41	13	$\chi^2 = 36.86^*$
Bachelors degree	4	11	22	43	20	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1507)			
Mgt, prof or education	3	13	20	47	17	
Sales or office support	4	19	21	38	18	
Constrn, inst or maint	4	17	27	39	14	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	3	18	23	39	17	
Agriculture	1	16	28	43	12	
Food serv/pers. care	9	26	26	28	12	
Hlthcare supp/safety	5	13	26	46	11	$\chi^2 = 51.02^*$
Other	3	22	15	49	12	(.005)

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

Appendix Table 2 continued

	<i>Ten Years From Now</i>					<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Much Worse Off</i>	<i>Worse Off</i>	<i>About the Same</i>	<i>Better Off</i>	<i>Much Better Off</i>	
Total	4	16	36	36	9	
Community Size			(n = 2092)			
Less than 500	3	16	41	32	8	
500 - 999	2	20	37	35	7	
1,000 - 4,999	3	15	35	37	10	
5,000 - 9,999	5	16	32	40	7	$\chi^2 = 18.40$
10,000 and up	4	14	35	38	9	(.301)
Region			(n = 2185)			
Panhandle	4	20	27	40	10	
North Central	5	19	36	37	3	
South Central	3	13	36	37	11	
Northeast	3	15	36	36	10	$\chi^2 = 41.33^*$
Southeast	4	16	40	33	6	(.000)
Income Level			(n = 1992)			
Under \$20,000	11	21	38	26	5	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	4	22	41	25	8	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	2	13	36	39	11	$\chi^2 = 170.57^*$
\$60,000 and over	1	9	31	47	11	(.000)
Age			(n = 2196)			
19 - 29	1	5	19	56	19	
30 - 39	2	5	25	50	19	
40 - 49	2	10	31	50	7	
50 - 64	5	23	41	29	4	$\chi^2 = 549.47^*$
65 and older	6	27	54	10	2	(.000)
Gender			(n = 2154)			
Male	4	19	37	32	8	$\chi^2 = 22.09^*$
Female	3	13	35	39	10	(.000)
Marital Status			(n = 2155)			
Married	2	14	34	40	10	
Never married	7	16	33	33	11	
Divorced/separated	5	19	33	38	4	$\chi^2 = 127.75^*$
Widowed	7	25	57	10	2	(.000)
Education			(n = 2141)			
H.S. diploma or less	6	20	46	23	5	
Some college	4	17	34	36	9	$\chi^2 = 121.06^*$
Bachelors degree	2	10	30	47	11	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1506)			
Mgt, prof or education	1	11	30	46	12	
Sales or office support	2	13	28	49	8	
Constrn, inst or maint	7	18	28	34	13	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	4	19	33	36	9	
Agriculture	1	15	38	39	7	
Food serv/pers. care	4	16	25	51	5	
Hlthcare supp/safety	3	11	33	45	8	$\chi^2 = 72.07^*$
Other	2	9	49	21	19	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 3. 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>
Total	56	19	25	
Community Size		(n = 2115)		
Less than 500	51	18	32	
500 - 999	55	17	28	
1,000 - 4,999	56	24	20	
5,000 - 9,999	65	11	25	$\chi^2 = 36.42^*$
10,000 and up	58	17	24	(.000)
Region		(n = 2209)		
Panhandle	59	17	23	
North Central	54	18	28	
South Central	63	17	20	
Northeast	51	19	30	$\chi^2 = 26.89^*$
Southeast	54	21	25	(.001)
Household Income		(n = 2007)		
Under \$20,000	40	26	34	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	51	20	30	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	56	19	25	$\chi^2 = 91.32^*$
\$60,000 and over	69	13	18	(.000)
Age		(n = 2220)		
19 - 29	68	16	16	
30 - 39	64	16	20	
40 - 49	61	17	22	
50 - 64	56	18	27	$\chi^2 = 89.35^*$
65 and older	41	25	34	(.000)
Gender		(n = 2176)		
Male	54	16	29	$\chi^2 = 16.17^*$
Female	58	20	22	(.000)
Education		(n = 2163)		
H.S. diploma or less	38	28	35	
Some college	58	17	25	$\chi^2 = 133.69^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	70	13	17	(.000)
Marital Status		(n = 2180)		
Married	60	17	23	
Never married	57	19	24	
Divorced/separated	51	21	29	$\chi^2 = 43.21^*$
Widowed	38	29	34	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1507)		
Mgt, prof or education	68	15	18	
Sales or office support	66	17	16	
Constrn, inst or maint	56	15	29	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	53	15	32	
Agriculture	55	20	25	
Food serv/pers. care	49	23	28	
Hlthcare supp/safety	71	9	20	$\chi^2 = 48.82^*$
Other	56	28	16	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 4. Satisfaction with Items Affecting Well-Being, 2012

Item	<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	1%	1%	3%	8%	37%	50%
Your marriage	28	1	3	4	17	47
Greenery and open space	0*	1	4	11	38	46
Your friends	1	1	4	13	42	39
Your religion/spirituality	3	1	5	16	36	39
Clean air	0*	3	5	13	40	39
Clean water	0*	5	9	11	39	37
Your general quality of life	0	2	6	11	45	36
Your housing	0*	4	9	13	42	32
Your general standard of living	0	2	8	11	47	32
Your education	0*	2	9	15	43	30
Your spare time	2	3	13	14	41	28
Your health	0	6	11	13	46	24
Your job security	26	4	8	12	28	22
Your job satisfaction	25	4	7	11	32	21
Your community	0	5	16	20	44	16
Job opportunities for you	22	10	17	15	22	14
Current income level	0	13	20	14	41	12
Financial security during retirement	1	23	26	16	26	9

0* = Less than 1 percent.

Appendix Table 5. Satisfaction with Items By Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes.**

	<i>Financial security during retirement</i>				<i>Your job opportunities</i>			
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
Total	49	16	35		35	19	46	
Community Size	(n = 1990)				(n = 1660)			
Less than 500	48	17	35		35	25	40	
500 - 999	51	20	30		41	18	41	
1,000 - 4,999	46	18	36		31	19	50	
5,000 - 9,999	51	18	31	$\chi^2 = 11.49$	32	14	53	$\chi^2 = 19.27^*$
10,000 and up	50	13	37	(.176)	36	20	44	(.014)
Region	(n = 2075)				(n = 1721)			
Panhandle	56	12	33		32	22	46	
North Central	48	16	36		48	14	37	
South Central	49	15	36		30	18	52	
Northeast	50	18	32	$\chi^2 = 12.77$	36	21	43	$\chi^2 = 29.92^*$
Southeast	44	17	39	(.120)	34	22	44	(.000)
Individual Attributes:								
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 1897)				(n = 1615)			
Under \$20,000	63	18	20		52	24	24	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	60	15	25		39	20	41	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	53	17	31	$\chi^2 = 115.24^*$	38	17	45	$\chi^2 = 62.50^*$
\$60,000 and over	39	12	49	(.000)	28	18	54	(.000)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2082)				(n = 1727)			
19 - 29	54	29	17		38	10	53	
30 - 39	57	11	32		37	18	46	
40 - 49	58	9	33		35	18	47	
50 - 64	52	15	34	$\chi^2 = 182.66^*$	36	23	41	$\chi^2 = 60.46^*$
65 and older	30	18	53	(.000)	21	37	42	(.000)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 2044)				(n = 1702)			
Male	46	16	38	$\chi^2 = 7.86^*$	30	21	49	$\chi^2 = 14.41^*$
Female	52	16	33	(.020)	39	18	43	(.001)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2034)				(n = 1694)			
High school diploma or less	45	21	34		32	29	40	
Some college	57	13	30	$\chi^2 = 46.22^*$	39	17	44	$\chi^2 = 29.31^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	43	16	42	(.000)	33	17	51	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2046)				(n = 1699)			
Married	47	16	37		34	19	48	
Never married	64	17	19		44	18	38	
Divorced/separated	65	13	22	$\chi^2 = 81.63^*$	42	21	38	$\chi^2 = 24.51^*$
Widowed	30	21	50	(.000)	19	33	47	(.000)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1433)				(n = 1455)			
Mgt, prof or education	46	11	43		31	16	53	
Sales or office support	55	17	28		39	23	39	
Constrn, inst or maint	67	14	19		32	24	44	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	60	9	31		40	25	35	
Agriculture	37	26	37		18	23	59	
Food serv/pers. care	82	4	14		52	11	38	
Hlthcare supp/safety	64	10	25	$\chi^2 = 132.85^*$	43	11	46	$\chi^2 = 76.34^*$
Other	39	35	26	(.000)	27	30	43	(.000)

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

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

Appendix Table 5 continued

	<i>Your current income level</i>			<i>Significance</i>	<i>Your community</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>							
Total	33	14	53		21	20	59	
Community Size	(n = 2066)				(n = 2083)			
Less than 500	27	20	53		19	29	53	
500 - 999	36	15	49		23	21	56	
1,000 - 4,999	30	15	56		19	18	63	
5,000 - 9,999	38	11	51	$\chi^2 = 21.76^*$	23	21	57	$\chi^2 = 27.30^*$
10,000 and up	34	12	54	(.005)	22	17	62	(.001)
Region	(n = 2151)				(n = 2172)			
Panhandle	37	8	56		29	17	55	
North Central	34	15	51		22	18	61	
South Central	30	14	56		17	19	64	
Northeast	36	15	49	$\chi^2 = 19.02^*$	22	22	57	$\chi^2 = 23.65^*$
Southeast	28	16	57	(.015)	21	23	56	(.003)
Individual Attributes:								
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 1966)				(n = 1983)			
Under \$20,000	58	22	20		31	21	48	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	46	19	35		23	26	52	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	33	13	54	$\chi^2 = 344.68^*$	19	22	60	$\chi^2 = 63.73^*$
\$60,000 and over	18	6	76	(.000)	18	14	68	(.000)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 2159)				(n = 2182)			
19 - 29	36	13	51		24	22	54	
30 - 39	38	8	54		23	15	62	
40 - 49	29	12	59		21	22	57	
50 - 64	35	13	52	$\chi^2 = 54.10^*$	23	20	58	$\chi^2 = 23.69^*$
65 and older	26	23	51	(.000)	15	20	65	(.003)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 2122)				(n = 2142)			
Male	28	16	56	$\chi^2 = 15.79^*$	21	22	57	$\chi^2 = 3.95$
Female	36	13	51	(.000)	21	19	61	(.139)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 2107)				(n = 2130)			
High school diploma or less	34	24	42		20	28	53	
Some college	37	15	49	$\chi^2 = 108.71^*$	22	22	56	$\chi^2 = 49.39^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	27	7	66	(.000)	20	13	67	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 2121)				(n = 2140)			
Married	29	12	59		19	20	61	
Never married	45	19	36		36	17	48	
Divorced/separated	51	14	35	$\chi^2 = 106.19^*$	25	21	54	$\chi^2 = 41.33^*$
Widowed	26	27	47	(.000)	14	22	65	(.000)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1500)				(n = 1506)			
Mgt, prof or education	30	4	67		16	17	66	
Sales or office support	38	15	48		24	16	60	
Constrn, inst or maint	24	23	53		20	24	56	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	35	15	50		21	30	50	
Agriculture	20	16	64		19	18	64	
Food serv/pers. care	62	10	29		36	18	46	
Hlthcare supp/safety	31	7	62	$\chi^2 = 131.06^*$	22	17	61	$\chi^2 = 46.57^*$
Other	27	21	52	(.000)	15	33	52	(.000)

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

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

Appendix Table 5 continued.

	<i>Your job security</i>			<i>Significance</i>
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Total	17	16	67	
Community Size	(n = 1574)			
Less than 500	20	19	61	
500 - 999	16	17	67	
1,000 - 4,999	16	15	69	
5,000 - 9,999	14	12	75	$\chi^2 = 9.09$
10,000 and up	17	16	67	(.335)
Region	(n = 1623)			
Panhandle	17	18	66	
North Central	21	12	67	
South Central	15	14	71	
Northeast	15	22	63	$\chi^2 = 22.68^*$
Southeast	20	13	68	(.004)
Individual Attributes:				
<i>Household Income Level</i>	(n = 1526)			
Under \$20,000	30	26	45	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	22	22	57	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	17	17	66	$\chi^2 = 83.38^*$
\$60,000 and over	13	10	77	(.000)
<i>Age</i>	(n = 1628)			
19 - 29	15	12	73	
30 - 39	17	15	69	
40 - 49	18	17	65	
50 - 64	19	15	66	$\chi^2 = 41.94^*$
65 and older	9	33	59	(.000)
<i>Gender</i>	(n = 1603)			
Male	14	16	70	$\chi^2 = 4.98$
Female	18	16	65	(.083)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 1597)			
High school diploma or less	23	27	51	
Some college	19	16	65	$\chi^2 = 70.66^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	12	11	77	(.000)
<i>Marital Status</i>	(n = 1603)			
Married	16	15	70	
Never married	23	18	59	
Divorced/separated	22	17	61	$\chi^2 = 27.88^*$
Widowed	6	34	60	(.000)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1451)			
Mgt, prof or education	13	12	75	
Sales or office support	15	16	68	
Constn, inst or maint	14	14	72	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	24	26	50	
Agriculture	11	12	78	
Food serv/pers. care	37	16	47	
Hlthcare supp/safety	16	11	73	$\chi^2 = 97.34^*$
Other	11	37	52	(.000)

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

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

Appendix Table 6. Church Membership by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes

	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Total	75	<i>Percentages</i>	25	
<u>Community Size</u>		(n = 2043)		
Less than 500	75		25	
500 - 999	83		18	
1,000 - 4,999	75		25	
5,000 - 9,999	76		24	$\chi^2 = 8.40$
10,000 and up	73		27	(.078)
<u>Region</u>		(n = 2133)		
Panhandle	65		35	
North Central	73		27	
South Central	73		27	
Northeast	80		20	$\chi^2 = 22.83^*$
Southeast	78		22	(.000)
<u>Household Income</u>		(n = 1939)		
Under \$20,000	64		36	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	68		32	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	75		25	$\chi^2 = 37.49^*$
\$60,000 and over	80		20	(.000)
<u>Age</u>		(n = 2141)		
19 - 29	64		36	
30 - 39	71		29	
40 - 49	74		26	
50 - 64	75		25	$\chi^2 = 59.31^*$
65 and older	86		14	(.000)
<u>Gender</u>		(n = 2103)		
Male	74		26	$\chi^2 = 0.38$
Female	75		25	(.536)
<u>Education</u>		(n = 2089)		
H.S. diploma or less	74		26	
Some college	70		30	$\chi^2 = 21.65^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	81		20	(.000)
<u>Marital Status</u>		(n = 2105)		
Married	79		21	
Never married	51		50	
Divorced/separated	61		39	$\chi^2 = 120.06^*$
Widowed	88		13	(.000)
<u>Occupation</u>		(n = 1458)		
Mgt, prof or education	75		25	
Sales or office support	74		26	
Constrn, inst or maint	80		20	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	56		44	
Agriculture	83		18	
Food serv/pers. care	66		34	
Hlthcare supp/safety	72		28	$\chi^2 = 33.52^*$
Other	72		28	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 7. Frequency of Church Attendance by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes

Whether or not you are a member, how often do you attend church services?

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Only on special religious holidays</i>	<i>Several times a year</i>	<i>One or more times a month</i>	<i>Weekly or more often</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	16	12	16	17	39	
	<i>Percentages</i>					
Community Size			(n = 2046)			
Less than 500	14	16	13	22	35	
500 - 999	15	11	14	15	45	
1,000 - 4,999	16	9	16	20	39	
5,000 - 9,999	11	9	24	19	37	$\chi^2 = 47.89^*$
10,000 and up	18	13	15	14	41	(.000)
Region			(n = 2138)			
Panhandle	22	13	14	17	35	
North Central	17	14	17	17	36	
South Central	16	13	15	18	39	
Northeast	13	11	16	17	44	$\chi^2 = 21.71$
Southeast	17	9	17	19	39	(.153)
Income Level			(n = 1943)			
Under \$20,000	27	14	15	8	37	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	21	20	14	14	31	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	16	9	20	22	33	$\chi^2 = 118.1^*$
\$60,000 and over	11	10	14	20	45	(.000)
Age			(n = 2146)			
19 - 29	20	16	23	18	23	
30 - 39	21	8	16	26	30	
40 - 49	13	16	14	19	38	
50 - 64	17	12	15	17	38	$\chi^2 = 173.4^*$
65 and older	11	7	12	12	59	(.000)
Gender			(n = 2106)			
Male	17	14	16	15	38	$\chi^2 = 11.69^*$
Female	15	10	15	18	41	(.020)
Marital Status			(n = 2108)			
Married	13	10	15	19	42	
Never married	30	25	13	12	20	
Divorced/separated	27	14	22	16	21	$\chi^2 = 169.1^*$
Widowed	9	6	15	11	59	(.000)
Education			(n = 2095)			
H.S. diploma or less	19	16	13	11	41	
Some college	20	13	19	16	33	$\chi^2 = 99.32^*$
Bachelors degree	10	8	14	23	46	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1463)			
Mgt, prof or education	15	8	16	20	42	
Sales or office support	17	15	15	14	39	
Constrn, inst or maint	15	15	18	22	29	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	35	19	12	14	20	
Agriculture	9	15	21	18	37	
Food serv/pers. care	11	23	20	24	22	
Hlthcare supp/safety	12	12	20	25	31	$\chi^2 = 105.3^*$
Other	19	9	25	7	40	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 8. Average Church Attendance by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>When you attend church, how many people do you see there on average?</i>					
	<i>Less than 20</i>	<i>20 - 50</i>	<i>51 - 100</i>	<i>More than 100</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<u>Total</u>	6	27	36	31	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
<u>Community Size</u>			(n = 1738)		
Less than 500	15	48	24	14	
500 - 999	6	41	35	18	
1,000 - 4,999	5	30	41	24	
5,000 - 9,999	5	20	45	30	$\chi^2 = 299.0^*$
10,000 and up	2	12	36	50	(.000)
<u>Region</u>			(n = 1810)		
Panhandle	10	31	32	27	
North Central	7	33	38	23	
South Central	4	23	39	33	
Northeast	5	22	36	37	$\chi^2 = 43.98^*$
Southeast	6	34	34	27	(.000)
<u>Income Level</u>			(n = 1635)		
Under \$20,000	14	32	35	19	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	7	34	34	25	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	30	40	27	$\chi^2 = 96.54^*$
\$60,000 and over	3	20	36	41	(.000)
<u>Age</u>			(n = 1815)		
19 - 29	7	28	48	18	
30 - 39	5	22	35	37	
40 - 49	4	28	35	34	
50 - 64	5	26	35	33	$\chi^2 = 40.79^*$
65 and older	7	28	32	34	(.000)
<u>Gender</u>			(n = 1780)		
Male	6	25	38	31	$\chi^2 = 2.41$
Female	6	28	35	32	(.491)
<u>Marital Status</u>			(n = 1784)		
Married	5	26	36	33	
Never married	9	25	47	19	
Divorced/separated	8	31	34	28	$\chi^2 = 23.76^*$
Widowed	3	32	37	29	(.005)
<u>Education</u>			(n = 1768)		
H.S. diploma or less	7	33	35	26	
Some college	6	27	36	31	$\chi^2 = 21.43^*$
Bachelors degree	4	23	37	36	(.002)
<u>Occupation</u>			(n = 1247)		
Mgt, prof or education	2	23	37	38	
Sales or office support	13	22	33	33	
Constrn, inst or maint	4	19	52	26	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	8	19	46	27	
Agriculture	2	46	29	23	
Food serv/pers. care	12	25	36	27	
Hlthcare supp/safety	3	24	43	31	$\chi^2 = 111.4^*$
Other	6	15	48	31	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 9. Opinions about the Church by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes

My church is financially stable.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	13	8	67	12	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size			(n = 1727)		
Less than 500	12	10	61	17	
500 - 999	14	9	64	13	
1,000 - 4,999	17	8	68	8	
5,000 - 9,999	9	10	67	15	$\chi^2 = 32.04^*$
10,000 and up	12	6	71	11	(.001)
Region			(n = 1797)		
Panhandle	16	8	62	14	
North Central	14	7	62	17	
South Central	10	5	73	12	
Northeast	15	8	68	9	$\chi^2 = 31.05^*$
Southeast	16	10	63	10	(.002)
Income Level			(n = 1635)		
Under \$20,000	12	8	61	19	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	9	12	63	15	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	18	6	65	12	$\chi^2 = 51.20^*$
\$60,000 and over	13	7	73	7	(.000)
Age			(n = 1802)		
19 - 29	15	7	66	13	
30 - 39	9	7	73	11	
40 - 49	14	10	66	10	
50 - 64	16	7	65	12	$\chi^2 = 13.02$
65 and older	12	7	69	12	(.368)
Gender			(n = 1772)		
Male	13	10	66	11	$\chi^2 = 8.78^*$
Female	14	6	68	12	(.032)
Marital Status			(n = 1779)		
Married	15	7	69	9	
Never married	10	15	54	21	
Divorced/separated	11	7	61	21	$\chi^2 = 51.57^*$
Widowed	11	6	69	15	(.000)
Education			(n = 1762)		
H.S. diploma or less	11	8	67	14	
Some college	13	11	63	14	$\chi^2 = 40.16^*$
Bachelors degree	15	4	72	9	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1249)		
Mgt, prof or education	15	4	73	9	
Sales or office support	12	8	66	14	
Constrn, inst or maint	9	7	73	11	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	13	10	71	5	
Agriculture	13	12	60	15	
Food serv/pers. care	11	12	68	10	
Hlthcare supp/safety	18	7	62	12	$\chi^2 = 40.56^*$
Other	6	10	64	20	(.006)

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

My church serves as a resource to the entire community.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	6	9	77	8	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size			(n = 1720)		
Less than 500	8	13	70	9	
500 - 999	8	5	78	9	
1,000 - 4,999	5	12	79	4	
5,000 - 9,999	5	9	75	12	$\chi^2 = 38.26^*$
10,000 and up	5	6	80	8	(.000)
Region			(n = 1789)		
Panhandle	6	9	76	10	
North Central	8	9	73	10	
South Central	3	8	79	10	
Northeast	7	9	81	4	$\chi^2 = 37.02^*$
Southeast	9	11	74	7	(.000)
Income Level			(n = 1626)		
Under \$20,000	5	9	73	13	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	5	9	79	7	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	7	8	76	9	$\chi^2 = 18.54^*$
\$60,000 and over	7	10	79	5	(.029)
Age			(n = 1795)		
19 - 29	3	13	72	12	
30 - 39	5	8	80	8	
40 - 49	9	11	76	5	
50 - 64	7	8	77	8	$\chi^2 = 34.44^*$
65 and older	5	6	81	8	(.001)
Gender			(n = 1763)		
Male	7	11	74	8	$\chi^2 = 7.63$
Female	6	8	79	8	(.054)
Marital Status			(n = 1770)		
Married	7	10	78	6	
Never married	6	10	72	12	
Divorced/separated	3	8	75	14	$\chi^2 = 24.40^*$
Widowed	5	5	79	11	(.004)
Education			(n = 1753)		
H.S. diploma or less	4	10	77	9	
Some college	8	12	70	10	$\chi^2 = 40.84^*$
Bachelors degree	5	6	84	5	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1242)		
Mgt, prof or education	5	6	83	6	
Sales or office support	6	5	79	10	
Constrn, inst or maint	14	17	59	9	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	4	31	61	4	
Agriculture	8	12	72	8	
Food serv/pers. care	4	10	82	4	
Hlthcare supp/safety	6	11	76	7	$\chi^2 = 86.20^*$
Other	6	6	70	18	(.000)

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

I am concerned that my church may need to close or consolidate.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	66	13	14	8	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size			(n = 1715)		
Less than 500	53	17	21	10	
500 - 999	59	14	20	7	
1,000 - 4,999	63	15	17	5	
5,000 - 9,999	74	9	9	9	$\chi^2 = 74.28^*$
10,000 and up	74	9	8	8	(.000)
Region			(n = 1785)		
Panhandle	58	14	16	11	
North Central	60	13	15	12	
South Central	70	11	11	8	
Northeast	68	12	15	5	$\chi^2 = 27.05^*$
Southeast	66	14	15	6	(.008)
Income Level			(n = 1621)		
Under \$20,000	58	14	16	13	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	67	11	13	9	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	62	15	15	8	$\chi^2 = 33.45^*$
\$60,000 and over	73	10	12	5	(.000)
Age			(n = 1788)		
19 - 29	68	13	12	7	
30 - 39	74	10	8	8	
40 - 49	68	15	11	6	
50 - 64	63	12	17	8	$\chi^2 = 25.83^*$
65 and older	62	12	17	9	(.011)
Gender			(n = 1758)		
Male	67	12	15	6	$\chi^2 = 9.81^*$
Female	65	13	13	9	(.020)
Marital Status			(n = 1763)		
Married	68	12	14	6	
Never married	61	13	15	11	
Divorced/separated	64	11	12	14	$\chi^2 = 26.49^*$
Widowed	58	15	13	13	(.002)
Education			(n = 1750)		
H.S. diploma or less	62	13	15	9	
Some college	62	15	14	9	$\chi^2 = 25.15^*$
Bachelors degree	73	9	13	5	(.000)
Occupation			(n = 1240)		
Mgt, prof or education	68	11	14	7	
Sales or office support	68	8	15	10	
Constrn, inst or maint	71	16	8	5	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	74	9	13	4	
Agriculture	59	16	18	7	
Food serv/pers. care	70	12	10	9	
Hlthcare supp/safety	68	12	10	10	$\chi^2 = 26.68$
Other	78	8	6	8	(.182)

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

My church will decline over the next several years.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	52	16	24	8	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size			(n = 1710)		
Less than 500	42	17	34	8	
500 - 999	36	18	36	11	
1,000 - 4,999	50	20	26	5	
5,000 - 9,999	50	17	23	9	$\chi^2 = 96.71^*$
10,000 and up	65	11	15	9	(.000)
Region			(n = 1779)		
Panhandle	43	19	28	9	
North Central	46	13	30	12	
South Central	57	16	19	9	
Northeast	57	17	20	6	$\chi^2 = 49.57^*$
Southeast	44	14	35	7	(.000)
Income Level			(n = 1613)		
Under \$20,000	45	20	22	13	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	53	13	24	10	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	47	17	27	9	$\chi^2 = 33.07^*$
\$60,000 and over	57	15	23	5	(.000)
Age			(n = 1783)		
19 - 29	59	19	17	5	
30 - 39	60	11	19	10	
40 - 49	49	18	26	7	
50 - 64	46	16	29	8	$\chi^2 = 38.10^*$
65 and older	50	14	26	10	(.000)
Gender			(n = 1751)		
Male	48	18	28	7	$\chi^2 = 17.39^*$
Female	55	14	22	9	(.001)
Marital Status			(n = 1755)		
Married	53	16	25	7	
Never married	48	15	26	12	
Divorced/separated	52	13	25	11	$\chi^2 = 19.84^*$
Widowed	50	15	21	15	(.019)
Education			(n = 1740)		
H.S. diploma or less	50	16	23	11	
Some college	49	18	25	9	$\chi^2 = 22.84^*$
Bachelors degree	57	13	25	5	(.001)
Occupation			(n = 1232)		
Mgt, prof or education	57	13	26	4	
Sales or office support	52	19	19	10	
Constrn, inst or maint	49	9	31	11	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	62	16	18	4	
Agriculture	37	18	37	9	
Food serv/pers. care	54	21	15	10	
Hlthcare supp/safety	55	13	24	9	$\chi^2 = 54.43^*$
Other	57	20	16	8	(.000)

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

The level of pastoral services in my church is adequate for the needs of the congregation.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Unable to Comment</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	13	7	72	8	
	<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size			(n = 1716)		
Less than 500	11	10	69	9	
500 - 999	20	6	65	9	
1,000 - 4,999	13	6	77	4	
5,000 - 9,999	11	7	70	12	$\chi^2 = 31.39^*$
10,000 and up	12	6	72	10	(.002)
Region			(n = 1789)		
Panhandle	14	9	67	9	
North Central	15	6	68	11	
South Central	11	7	73	10	
Northeast	13	8	73	6	$\chi^2 = 14.63$
Southeast	14	7	72	6	(.262)
Income Level			(n = 1623)		
Under \$20,000	8	8	72	12	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	14	6	71	9	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	11	10	71	8	$\chi^2 = 15.07$
\$60,000 and over	14	7	72	8	(.089)
Age			(n = 1792)		
19 - 29	12	10	68	10	
30 - 39	11	7	73	9	
40 - 49	17	9	67	8	
50 - 64	12	8	71	9	$\chi^2 = 18.99$
65 and older	12	5	77	7	(.089)
Gender			(n = 1760)		
Male	12	7	74	7	$\chi^2 = 3.82$
Female	13	8	70	9	(.281)
Marital Status			(n = 1766)		
Married	13	8	72	7	
Never married	20	6	61	12	
Divorced/separated	12	7	66	15	$\chi^2 = 31.65^*$
Widowed	10	3	79	8	(.000)
Education			(n = 1750)		
H.S. diploma or less	7	9	75	9	
Some college	14	7	69	10	$\chi^2 = 20.89^*$
Bachelors degree	15	7	71	7	(.002)
Occupation			(n = 1236)		
Mgt, prof or education	15	9	70	7	
Sales or office support	14	3	73	10	
Constrn, inst or maint	6	7	83	5	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	14	13	67	6	
Agriculture	13	5	76	6	
Food serv/pers. care	7	12	73	9	
Hlthcare supp/safety	18	10	60	13	$\chi^2 = 43.20^*$
Other	12	6	63	18	(.003)

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

Appendix Table 10. What Would Do if Church Closed or Consolidated by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes

<i>If your church closed or consolidated, which of the following would you be most likely to do?</i>					
	<i>Join another (or the consolidated) church of the same denomination</i>	<i>Join another church of a different denomination</i>	<i>Stop going to church</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	78	8	7	7	
		<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Size		(n = 1674)			
Less than 500	76	7	9	8	
500 - 999	80	8	6	6	
1,000 - 4,999	75	9	8	9	
5,000 - 9,999	79	10	8	4	$\chi^2 = 20.09$
10,000 and up	83	8	4	5	(.065)
Region		(n = 1744)			
Panhandle	76	5	9	11	
North Central	72	10	9	10	
South Central	80	8	8	5	
Northeast	82	8	5	6	$\chi^2 = 29.35^*$
Southeast	76	11	8	5	(.003)
Income Level		(n = 1584)			
Under \$20,000	74	7	11	8	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	72	11	7	10	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	74	7	11	8	$\chi^2 = 45.61^*$
\$60,000 and over	84	8	5	3	(.000)
Age		(n = 1749)			
19 - 29	78	5	10	7	
30 - 39	85	4	6	5	
40 - 49	78	8	8	6	
50 - 64	75	11	7	7	$\chi^2 = 24.76^*$
65 and older	78	10	5	7	(.016)
Gender		(n = 1716)			
Male	79	9	7	5	$\chi^2 = 2.98$
Female	78	8	7	7	(.396)
Marital Status		(n = 1722)			
Married	79	8	7	6	
Never married	73	6	11	9	
Divorced/separated	78	6	8	8	$\chi^2 = 11.79$
Widowed	75	11	6	8	(.226)
Education		(n = 1710)			
H.S. diploma or less	76	7	9	8	
Some college	78	8	8	7	$\chi^2 = 9.45$
Bachelors degree	80	9	6	5	(.150)
Occupation		(n = 1202)			
Mgt, prof or education	80	9	5	6	
Sales or office support	85	5	3	7	
Constrn, inst or maint	90	4	4	2	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	73	8	11	8	
Agriculture	74	11	9	7	
Food serv/pers. care	70	8	19	3	
Hlthcare supp/safety	84	8	6	3	$\chi^2 = 69.19^*$
Other	66	4	8	22	(.000)

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

Appendix Table 11. How Many Friends and Relatives Attend Same Church by Community Size, Region and Various Individual Attributes

<i>How many of your closest friends attend the same church that you do?</i>						
	<i>All</i>	<i>Most</i>	<i>About half</i>	<i>Some</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	4	16	14	42	24	
	<i>Percentages</i>					
Community Size			(n = 1740)			
Less than 500	4	14	12	44	27	
500 - 999	5	23	14	36	22	
1,000 - 4,999	3	16	17	42	23	
5,000 - 9,999	6	16	13	49	17	$\chi^2 = 30.97^*$
10,000 and up	4	14	12	42	28	(.014)
Region			(n = 1808)			
Panhandle	8	12	16	43	22	
North Central	4	18	14	38	26	
South Central	4	13	12	46	25	
Northeast	3	18	16	38	25	$\chi^2 = 30.56^*$
Southeast	3	19	13	44	21	(.015)
Income Level			(n = 1632)			
Under \$20,000	7	13	12	41	28	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	4	15	13	39	29	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	6	15	16	36	27	$\chi^2 = 37.50^*$
\$60,000 and over	2	17	14	46	22	(.000)
Age			(n = 1812)			
19 - 29	3	10	10	42	34	
30 - 39	2	12	14	40	32	
40 - 49	5	12	12	45	27	
50 - 64	2	18	14	43	23	$\chi^2 = 90.90^*$
65 and older	6	23	17	40	13	(.000)
Gender			(n = 1777)			
Male	2	15	15	46	22	$\chi^2 = 14.37^*$
Female	5	16	13	40	26	(.006)
Marital Status			(n = 1782)			
Married	4	17	14	43	23	
Never married	2	10	11	36	41	
Divorced/separated	4	9	11	40	36	$\chi^2 = 62.54^*$
Widowed	8	23	16	39	15	(.000)
Education			(n = 1765)			
H.S. diploma or less	7	17	12	43	22	
Some college	3	15	14	42	27	$\chi^2 = 15.24$
Bachelors degree	3	16	15	42	24	(.055)
Occupation			(n = 1249)			
Mgt, prof or education	2	17	16	36	29	
Sales or office support	3	11	15	51	20	
Constrn, inst or maint	2	14	9	41	34	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	1	16	9	46	29	
Agriculture	3	14	11	56	15	
Food serv/pers. care	1	8	12	46	33	
Hlthcare supp/safety	1	18	12	45	24	$\chi^2 = 66.93^*$
Other	11	9	6	46	29	(.000)

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

How many of your relatives who live in or near your community attend the same church that you do?

	<i>All</i>	<i>Most</i>	<i>About half</i>	<i>Some</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	11	19	8	26	36	
	<i>Percentages</i>					
Community Size			(n = 1710)			
Less than 500	11	23	7	26	34	
500 - 999	12	31	9	22	26	
1,000 - 4,999	12	17	9	28	35	
5,000 - 9,999	14	16	7	21	42	$\chi^2 = 40.40^*$
10,000 and up	10	16	9	27	39	(.001)
Region			(n = 1774)			
Panhandle	12	16	10	18	45	
North Central	13	18	10	28	31	
South Central	7	16	8	27	42	
Northeast	14	22	7	28	29	$\chi^2 = 43.45^*$
Southeast	11	20	8	27	34	(.000)
Income Level			(n = 1602)			
Under \$20,000	9	14	8	28	41	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	13	14	8	33	32	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	10	21	10	25	34	$\chi^2 = 22.98^*$
\$60,000 and over	12	20	7	23	38	(.028)
Age			(n = 1776)			
19 - 29	12	26	9	24	29	
30 - 39	10	16	8	28	39	
40 - 49	12	15	6	24	43	
50 - 64	9	20	8	27	36	$\chi^2 = 30.27^*$
65 and older	12	18	11	27	33	(.017)
Gender			(n = 1740)			
Male	11	18	8	25	39	$\chi^2 = 3.38$
Female	11	19	9	27	35	(.496)
Marital Status			(n = 1746)			
Married	10	20	8	26	36	
Never married	18	15	11	23	34	
Divorced/separated	10	14	5	25	46	$\chi^2 = 20.18$
Widowed	11	17	8	31	32	(.064)
Education			(n = 1730)			
H.S. diploma or less	10	20	8	29	34	
Some college	12	19	8	29	31	$\chi^2 = 24.97^*$
Bachelors degree	11	17	8	21	43	(.002)
Occupation			(n = 1223)			
Mgt, prof or education	9	15	7	26	42	
Sales or office support	8	23	14	23	33	
Constrn, inst or maint	12	15	6	29	38	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	14	20	5	34	27	
Agriculture	10	26	7	27	30	
Food serv/pers. care	7	14	6	44	30	
Hlthcare supp/safety	13	24	9	13	40	$\chi^2 = 69.03^*$
Other	7	15	6	22	51	(.000)

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

CARI Research Report 12-1, July 2012

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.