



NEBRASKA RURAL POLL

A Research Report

Community Satisfaction and Marketing in Nonmetropolitan Nebraska

2016 Nebraska Rural Poll Results

Rebecca Vogt
Cheryl Burkhart-Kriesel
Randolph Cantrell
Bradley Lubben
L.J. McElravy

Nebraska Rural Poll Research Report 16-4 October 2016.

© 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 research reports detailing Nebraska Rural Poll results are located on its webpage 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 Department of Agricultural Economics. Additionally, in-kind support was provided by the University of Nebraska Rural Futures Institute.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2016)	2
<i>Figure 1. Community Change, 1996 - 2016</i>	2
<i>Figure 2. Expected Community Change Ten Years from Now: 2011 – 2016</i>	3
<i>Figure 3. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2016</i>	4
<i>Table 1. Proportions of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2016</i>	6
The Community and Its Attributes in 2016	5
<i>Figure 4. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size</i>	7
<i>Figure 5. Expected Community Change in Ten Years by Community Size</i>	7
<i>Figure 6. Satisfaction with Cost of Housing by Community Size</i>	11
<i>Figure 7. Satisfaction with Internet Service by Community Size</i>	12
<i>Figure 8. Feelings of Community Powerlessness by Community Size</i>	12
Plans to Leave the Community	13
<i>Figure 9. Difficulty or Ease of Leaving Community</i>	13
<i>Figure 10. Ease or Difficulty of Leaving Community by Community Size</i>	14
<i>Figure 11. Size of Community Planning to Move to</i>	15
<i>Figure 12. Size of Community Planning to Move to by Age</i>	15
Assessment of Community to Newcomers	16
<i>Table 2. Assessment of Community Characteristics to a Newcomer</i>	17
<i>Figure 13. Community Characteristics Rated Higher to Newcomer by Residents of Smaller Communities</i>	18
<i>Figure 14. Community Characteristics Rated Higher to Newcomer by Residents of Larger Communities</i>	18
Individual and Community Political Views	19
<i>Figure 15. Individual and Community Political Views</i>	20
<i>Figure 16. Community Political Views on Economic Issues by Community Size</i>	21
Conclusion	21

List of Appendix Tables and Figures

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska	23
Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2010 - 2014 American Community Survey 5 Year Average for Nebraska	24
Appendix Table 2. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	25
Appendix Table 3. Expectations of Future Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	27
Appendix Table 4. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	29
Appendix Table 5. Level of Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities	31
Appendix Table 6. Measures of Satisfaction with Ten Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	32
Appendix Table 7. Feelings of Community Powerlessness by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	35
Appendix Table 8. Opinions about Leaving Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	36
Appendix Table 9. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	37
Appendix Table 10. Size of Community Planning to Move to by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	38
Appendix Table 11. Assessment of Community Characteristics to a Newcomer by Community Size, Region and Age	39
Appendix Table 12. Individual and Community Political Views by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes	42

Executive Summary

Recent Census estimates reveal more Nebraska counties saw population growth during the past five years compared to the previous decade. However, many rural counties continue to experience population loss. This loss leads to many issues faced by rural communities such as funding public services and recruiting new residents as well as many others. Given these challenges, how do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided by their community? Are they planning to move from their community in the next year? Have these views changed over the past 21 years? How would rural Nebraskans rate items in their community to a person looking to move there? What are the political views held by rural Nebraskans and their community? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 1,746 responses to the 2016 Nebraska Rural Poll, the 21st annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community. Trends for some of the questions are examined by comparing data from the 20 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:

- ***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 (74%), trusting (62%) and supportive (65%).
 - ✓ *Over one-half of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community.* Fifty-two 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 16 percent gave a neutral response.
 - ✓ *Most rural Nebraskans disagree that their community is powerless to control its future.* Six in ten rural Nebraskans (60%) strongly disagree or disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future.
 - ✓ *Rural Nebraskans' views about the change in their community have generally been positive.* The proportion believing their community has changed for the better during the past year has usually been greater than the proportion believing it has changed for the worse, especially during the past five years when the gap between the two has widened.
 - ✓ *Rural Nebraskans' optimism about the expected change in their community ten years from now has increased during the past six years.* The proportion believing their community will be a better place to live ten years from now has steadily increased during the past six years, from 20 percent in 2011 to 27 percent this year. The proportion believing their community will be a worse place to live has declined from 24 percent in 2011 to 20 percent this year.
- ***Residents of larger communities are more likely than residents of smaller communities to say their community has changed for the better during the past year, will be a better place to live ten years from now and disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future.***
 - ✓ *Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say their community has changed for the better during the past year.* Forty-one percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or

more say their community has changed for the better during the past year, compared to 20 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.

- ✓ *Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say their community will be a better place to live ten years from now.* Just over three in ten persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more (31%) believe their community will be a better place to live ten years from now, compared to 13 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people.
 - ✓ *Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future.* Just over six in ten persons living in or near communities with populations of 1,000 or more (63%) disagree with that statement, compared to 50 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500. Just over one in five persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500 (21%) agree that their community is powerless to control its own future.
- ***Residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of larger communities to say it would be difficult to leave their community.*** Sixty percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 500 believe it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 49 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities.
 - ***Except for some services that are largely unavailable in rural communities, rural Nebraskans are generally satisfied with basic community services and amenities.*** At least two-thirds of rural Nebraskans are satisfied with the following services or amenities: fire protection (87%), parks and recreation (78%), library services (71%), religious organizations (69%), law enforcement (69%), and education (K-12) (68%). 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, quality of housing, cost of housing, and public transportation services in their community.
 - ✓ *The proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with many social services and entertainment services has decreased across all 20 years of the study.* Declines in satisfaction levels across all 20 years are seen with nursing home care, medical care services, senior centers, mental health services, entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants.
 - ✓ *Satisfaction with law enforcement increased this year compared to last year.* Satisfaction with law enforcement increased from 64 percent last year to 69 percent this year (the highest proportion of all 20 years).
 - ***Only six percent indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year.*** Eleven percent are uncertain and 83 percent have no plans to move. Of those who are planning to move, just under one-half (49%) plan to leave Nebraska. Approximately one-half plan to remain in the state, with 22 percent planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha area and 28 percent plan to move to another part of the state.
 - ✓ *Most expected movers are planning to move to a larger community.* Over seven in ten (71%) expected movers are planning to move to a community larger than their current one. Just over one in ten expected movers (12%) are planning to move to a community smaller than their current one and 17 percent are planning to move to a community of similar size to their current one.
 - ***Most rural Nebraskans would rate the safety, the environment for raising children and the natural/outdoor environment of their community as excellent to a newcomer.*** And, at least four in

ten rural Nebraskans would rate the church/religious community and friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors as excellent. Over two in ten (21%) rural Nebraskans would rate their local taxes as poor to a person looking to move to their community.

- ✓ *Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to rate the following characteristics as excellent to a newcomer: environment for raising children, the natural/outdoor environment, sense of community among residents, and cost of living.*
 - ✓ *Other items are more likely to be rated as excellent by persons living in or near larger communities: church/religious community; available outdoor recreational opportunities; civic and nonprofit organizations; arts, entertainment and cultural activities; and available child care services.*
- ***Most rural Nebraskans rate themselves as having conservative political views on both economic and social issues. They also rate their community's political views on both economic and social views as conservative.*** In fact, they view their community's political views on social issues as more conservative than their own. Fifty-two percent of rural Nebraskans have conservative views on social issues and 56 percent rate their community's political views on social issues as conservative.
 - ✓ *Persons living in or near mid-sized communities are more likely than persons living in or near both the smallest and largest communities to rate their community's political views on both economic and social issues as conservative. As an example, just over six in ten persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 4,999 rate their community's political views on economic issues as conservative. In comparison, one-half (50%) of persons living in or near the smallest communities rate their community's political views on economic issues as conservative.*

Introduction

Recent Census estimates reveal more Nebraska counties saw population growth during the past five years compared to the previous decade. However, many rural counties continue to experience population loss. This loss leads to many issues faced by rural communities such as funding public services and recruiting new residents as well as many others. Given these challenges, how do rural Nebraskans feel about their community? Are they satisfied with the services provided by their community? Are they planning to move from their community in the next year? Have these views changed over the past 21 years? How would rural Nebraskans rate items in their community to a person looking to move there? What are the political views held by rural Nebraskans and their community? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 1,746 responses to the 2016 Nebraska Rural Poll, the 21st annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about their community.

Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 1,746 responses from Nebraskans living in 86 counties in the state.¹ A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in April to 6,115 randomly selected households. Metropolitan counties not included in the sample were Cass, Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward and Washington. The 14-page questionnaire included questions

¹ In the spring of 2013, the Grand Island area (Hall, Hamilton, Howard and Merrick Counties) was designated a metropolitan area. To facilitate comparisons from previous years, these four counties are still included in our sample. In addition, the Sioux City area metropolitan counties of Dixon and Dakota were added in 2014 because of a joint

pertaining to well-being, community, internet services, education, and housing. This paper reports only results from the community section.

A 29% 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 ten days later.
3. A reminder postcard was sent to the entire sample approximately ten days after the questionnaire had been sent.
4. Those who had not yet responded within approximately 20 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 2010 - 2014 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

Metro Poll being conducted by the University of Nebraska at Omaha to ensure all counties in the state were sampled. Although classified as metro, Dixon County is rural in nature. Dakota County is similar in many respects to other "micropolitan" counties the Rural Poll surveys.

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. Sixty-nine 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 42 years and have lived in their current community 27 years. Fifty-nine percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety-seven percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Thirty-three percent of the respondents report their 2015 approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, as below \$40,000. Fifty-six percent report incomes over \$50,000.

Seventy-six percent were employed in 2015 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Seventeen percent are retired. Thirty-three percent of those employed reported working in a management, professional, or education occupation. Twelve percent indicated they were employed in agriculture.

Trends in Community Ratings (1996 - 2016)

Comparisons are made between the community data collected this year to the twenty 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 21 years. Starting in 1998, the phrase "this past year" was added to the question; no time frame was given to the respondents in the first two studies. Also, in 2007 the middle response "same" was replaced with "no change."

Rural Nebraskans' views about the change in their community have generally been positive. The proportion believing their community has changed for the better has usually been greater than the proportion believing it has changed for

Figure 1. Community Change 1996 - 2016



the worse, especially during the past five years when the gap between the two has widened (Figure 1).

The proportion saying their community has changed for the better has averaged approximately 30 percent. Following a seven-year period of general decline, the proportion saying their community has changed for the better increased from 23 percent in 2003 to 33 percent in 2007. It then declined to 23 percent in 2009 (the lowest proportion of all 21 years, also occurring in 2003). However, the proportion viewing positive change in their community has since increased to 35 percent this year.

The proportion saying their community has stayed the same first increased from 1996 to 1998. It then remained fairly steady during the following eight years but declined in both 2006 and 2007. Then it steadily increased to 53 percent in 2011. However, the proportion dropped to 46 percent in 2012, then increased to 51 percent in 2013 before declining to 47 percent this year.

The proportion saying their community has changed for the worse has remained fairly steady across all 21 years, averaging 20 percent. It increased from 22 percent in 2008 to 26 percent in 2009 (the highest proportion in all years of this study). Since then, however, it has generally decreased to 18 percent this year.

Starting in 2011, respondents were also asked to predict the expected change in their community ten years from now. The exact question wording was, “Based on what you see of the situation today, do you think that, ten years from now, your community will be a worse place to live, a better place or about the same?”


The proportion believing their community will be a better place to live ten years from now has steadily increased during the past six years, from 20 percent in 2011 to 27 percent this year (Figure 2). The proportion believing their community will be a worse place to live has declined from 24 percent in 2011 to 20 percent this year.

The proportion thinking their community will be about the same ten years from now has remained relatively stable, with the exception of 2014 when it declined to 50 percent.

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

Figure 2. Expected Community Change Ten Years from Now: 2011 - 2016



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 21-year period, ranging from 69 to 77 percent. The proportion of respondents who view their community as trusting has also remained fairly steady, ranging from 59 to 66 percent.

A similar pattern emerged when examining the proportion of respondents who rated their community as supportive. The proportions rating their community as supportive have ranged from 60 percent to 69 percent over the 21-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 19 years, ranging from 3 percent to 7 percent.

The expected destination for the persons planning to move has changed over time (Figure 3). Following an increase during the previous two years, the proportion of expected movers planning to leave the state decreased from 53 percent last year to 49 percent this year. The proportion expecting to leave the state has averaged approximately 45 percent over the 19-year period.

The proportion of expected movers planning to move to either the Omaha or Lincoln area had generally declined between 2006 and 2012, from 21 percent to 11 percent. However, it increased sharply to 20 percent in 2013, then decreased to 13 percent last year before increasing again to 22 percent this year (the highest proportion in all 19 years). The

Figure 3. Expected Destination of Those Planning to Move: 1998 - 2016



proportion of expected movers planning to move to the Omaha or Lincoln area has averaged approximately 16 percent.

And, the proportion of expected movers planning to move to other areas of rural Nebraska had generally increased from 28 percent in 2011 to 39 in 2014, but then declined to 28 percent this year. The average proportion expecting to move to other areas of rural Nebraska has been 39 percent.

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 21 studies; however, in 1996 they were also asked about the availability of these

services. Therefore, comparisons will only be made between the last 20 studies, when the question wording was identical. The respondents were asked how satisfied they were with a list of 26 services and amenities, taking into consideration availability, cost, and quality.

Table 1 shows the proportions very or somewhat satisfied with the service each year. The rank ordering of these items has remained relatively stable over the 20 years. However, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with many social services has declined across all 20 years of the study. As an example, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with nursing home care has dropped from 63 percent in 1997 to 43 percent this year. Similar declines are seen with medical care services, senior centers, and mental health services. In addition, satisfaction with entertainment services (entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants) have also generally declined over the past 20 years. Satisfaction with retail shopping has declined from 53 percent in 1997 to 34 percent this year.

On the other hand, satisfaction with cellular phone service and Internet service has generally increased over time. The proportion satisfied with cellular phone services has increased from 49 percent in 2006 (the first year it was included in the survey) to 63 percent this year. And, satisfaction with Internet services has increased from 50 percent in 2006 (the first year it was included in the survey) to 56 percent this year. The largest increase in satisfaction with Internet service occurred between 2007 and 2008. Since 2008, the satisfaction levels have been fairly steady.

One service saw an increase in satisfaction levels this year as compared to last year. Satisfaction with law enforcement increased

from 64 percent last year to 69 percent this year (the highest proportion of all 20 years).

Some items saw declines from last year: nursing home care, streets and roads, retail shopping and arts/cultural activities. As an example, satisfaction with streets and roads declined from 47 percent last year to 43 percent this year. And, satisfaction with arts/cultural activities declined from 26 percent to 22 percent.

The Community and Its Attributes in 2016

In this section, the 2016 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 larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say that their community has changed for the better during the past year. Forty-one 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 20 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people (Figure 4).


Persons living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say their community has changed

Table 1. Proportion of Respondents Very or Somewhat Satisfied with Each Service, 1997 - 2016

Service/Amenity	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Fire protection	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	86	85	86	87	85	86	85	86	86	87	87
Parks/recreation	77	77	75	77	73	74	76	75	74	75	74	75	74	74	75	76	76	71	76	78
Library services	78	78	72	79	71	74	74	74	72	73	74	75	74	73	73	72	73	72	73	71
Religious org.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72	72	73	71	71	70	72	71	70	72	69
Law enforcement	66	64	63	64	61	63	65	63	63	64	63	62	64	65	63	65	64	62	64	69
Education (K-12)	71	74	72	73	69	69	69	68	68	68	68	70	68	68	68	68	68	68	69	68
Medical care svcs	73	73	70	72	71	69	71	71	71	71	63	66	67	67	67	68	66	62	62	64
Sewage/waste disp*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	66	66	67	66	65	65	64	67	64	65	64
Sewage disposal	68	63	63	63	61	66	64	67	63	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Water disposal	66	61	60	61	60	64	62	65	62	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Solid waste disp.	61	59	60	60	60	64	63	65	63	64	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Cell phone services	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	49	54	58	61	60	64	63	65	60	64	63
Internet service	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	51	57	58	56	60	59	59	56	58	56
Comm recycling	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	48	52	54	54	54	58	53	55	52
Senior centers	66	65	62	59	58	62	61	58	59	55	48	47	47	47	48	47	48	47	49	47
Cost of housing	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	45	45
Quality of housing	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	44	45	45
Housing	61	63	62	56	57	62	60	61	60	61	59	59	61	59	59	57	52	*	*	*
Nursing home care	63	62	59	56	55	57	57	55	55	53	46	47	45	46	46	45	43	47	47	43
Streets and roads*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	55	49	51	47	48	49	53	44	47	43
Streets	*	59	62	59	51	61	62	59	60	60	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Highway/bridges	*	66	68	68	65	69	70	69	70	69	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Restaurants	59	57	56	55	53	51	54	56	54	54	50	45	47	47	48	48	46	40	46	43
Head start progms	44	41	37	40	39	38	40	41	39	37	29	26	28	29	27	27	27	39	39	39
Local government*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	41	40	38	41	40	41	42	40	37	40	37
County govt.	48	53	53	49	49	47	51	48	47	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
City/village govt.	46	50	51	45	46	45	48	45	46	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Retail shopping	53	48	49	47	47	45	45	49	47	45	41	39	40	41	37	39	38	33	38	34
Child day care svcs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32	34	35	35	32	34	34	33
Day care services	51	50	45	46	43	44	45	47	45	42	31	28	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Entertainment	38	35	34	33	33	32	33	36	32	34	30	26	29	32	30	30	31	26	29	26
Arts/cultural activities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26	25	24	27	27	27	26	24	26	22
Mental health svcs	34	32	29	30	29	30	30	31	30	27	23	23	24	23	24	25	23	21	23	22
Adult day care svcs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	22	21	22	21	21	*	*	*
Airport	*	*	*	30	29	32	32	32	31	26	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pub transp svcs*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	17	17	19	18	19	19	20	17	19	18
Airline service	*	*	*	15	15	16	17	18	15	15	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Taxi service	11	9	8	9	10	10	11	12	12	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Rail service	14	11	11	10	10	11	11	13	11	9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bus service	13	11	10	9	10	9	10	11	7	7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

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

Figure 4. Perceptions of Community Change by Community Size



for the better during the past year (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region). Forty-four percent of the South Central residents say their community changed for the better during the past year, compared to 23 percent of persons living in the Panhandle region. One-quarter (25%) of Panhandle residents say their community has changed for the worse during the past year.


Other groups most likely to say their community has changed for the better during the past year include: persons with higher household incomes, married persons, widowed persons, persons with higher education levels, newcomers to the community (persons living in their community for five years or less) and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

In addition, respondents were asked to predict the expected change in their community ten years from now. The exact question wording was, “Based on what you see of the situation

today, do you think that, ten years from now, your community will be a worse place to live, a better place or about the same?” Just over one-quarter (27%) of rural Nebraskans expect their community will be a better place to live ten years from now. Over one-half (54%) expect it to be about the same and one in five (20%) think their community will be a worse place to live ten years from now.

Respondents’ perceptions differ by the size of their community, the region in which they live and some individual attributes (Appendix Table 3). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say their community will be a better place to live ten years from now (Figure 5). Over three in ten (31%) of persons living in or near communities with populations greater than 10,000 believe their community will be a better place to live ten years from now. In comparison, 13 percent of persons

Figure 5. Expected Community Change in Ten Years by Community Size



living in or near communities with less than 500 people think their community will improve in ten years.

Persons living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say their community will be a better place to live ten years from now. Just over one-third (34%) of persons living in the South Central region believe their community will be a better place to live ten years from now, compared to 16 percent of Panhandle residents. Similar to their perceptions of current community change, one-quarter (25%) of Panhandle residents think their community will be a worse place to live ten years from now.

Newcomers are more likely than long-term residents to say their community will be a better place to live ten years from now. Just over one-third (34%) of persons who have lived in their community for five years or less believe their community will be a better place to live ten years from now, compared to 26 percent of persons who have lived in the community for more than five years.

Other groups most likely to have an optimistic view about their community's future include: persons with higher household incomes; younger persons; persons with higher education levels; persons with management, professional or education occupations; and persons with sales or office support occupations.

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 (74%), trusting (62%) and supportive (65%).

Respondents' ratings of their community on these dimensions differ by some of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 4). 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 trusting and supportive. Just over two-thirds (68%) of persons living in or near communities with populations under 500 say their community is trusting, compared to 54 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999. And, 73 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities rate their community as supportive, compared to 61 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities.

Males are more likely than females to rate their community as supportive. When comparing responses by marital status, married persons and widowed persons are most likely to rate their community as both trusting and supportive. And, divorced or separated persons are the marital group *least* likely to rate their community as friendly.

Persons with the highest education levels are more likely than persons with less education to rate their community as friendly and supportive. As an example, 71 percent of persons with at least a four-year college degree rate their community as supportive, compared to 59 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education.

Persons with occupations in agriculture and persons with occupations classified as other are the occupation groups most likely to rate their community as friendly. Persons with occupations in agriculture and persons with

healthcare support or public safety occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to view their community as trusting.

Newcomers to the community are more likely than long-term residents to rate their community as trusting. Just under seven in ten (69%) of persons living in their community for five years or less rate their community as trusting, compared to 60 percent of persons living in their community for more than five years.

Satisfaction with Community Services and Amenities

Next, rural residents were asked to rate how satisfied they are with 27 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 seven 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 (87%), parks and recreation (78%), library services (71%), religious organizations (69%), law enforcement (69%), and education (K-12) (68%) (Appendix Table 5). At least one-third of the respondents are either “very dissatisfied” or “somewhat dissatisfied” with entertainment (55%), retail shopping (53%), streets and roads (50%), restaurants (47%), arts/cultural activities (41%), quality of housing (38%), cost of housing (37%), 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 6). Many differences emerge.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to be dissatisfied with the entertainment in their community. Sixty-four percent of persons age 19 to 29 are dissatisfied with the entertainment in their community, compared to 40 percent of persons age 65 and older. Persons age 30 to 39 are the age group most likely to express dissatisfaction with the retail shopping and restaurants in their community.

Persons living in or near mid-sized communities are more likely than persons living in or near both smaller and larger communities to express dissatisfaction with their entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants. For example, 72 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 are dissatisfied with their retail shopping, compared to 46 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

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.

Residents of the South Central region are the regional group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with their community’s entertainment and retail shopping. Almost six in ten residents of the other four regions are dissatisfied with the entertainment in their community, compared to 50 percent of the residents of the South Central region. Residents of the Southeast region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to

express dissatisfaction with the restaurants in their community. Over one-half (54%) of Southeast region residents are dissatisfied with restaurants, compared to 42 percent of the residents of the South Central region.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to say they are dissatisfied with their community's retail shopping. And, persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations are the occupation group most likely to be dissatisfied with the entertainment and restaurants in their community.

Residents of the Northeast region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to be dissatisfied with their streets and roads. Over six in ten residents of the Northeast region (63%) express dissatisfaction with their streets and roads, compared to 42 percent of residents of the South Central region.

Other groups most likely to express dissatisfaction with their streets and roads include: persons with lower household incomes, older persons, persons with lower education levels, and persons with occupations classified as other.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near the largest communities to be dissatisfied with their arts/cultural activities. Over one-half (54%) of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are dissatisfied with their arts/cultural activities, compared to 31 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their arts/cultural activities include younger persons and persons with food service or

personal care occupations. When comparing responses by region, Panhandle residents are the group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with their arts/cultural activities.


Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to be dissatisfied with the quality of housing in their community. Almost one-half (47%) of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are dissatisfied with the quality of housing, compared to 34 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999.

Residents of the North Central region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to express dissatisfaction with the quality of housing in their community. Just over one-half of the North Central region residents (51%) are dissatisfied with the quality of housing, compared to 31 percent of persons living in the Southeast region.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with the quality of housing in their community include: persons with higher household incomes, persons under the age of 50, persons with higher education levels and persons with occupations classified as other.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to express dissatisfaction with the cost of housing in their community. One-half (50%) of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more are dissatisfied with their community's cost of housing, compared to 28 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500 (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Satisfaction with Cost of Housing by Community Size



Panhandle residents are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to say they are dissatisfied with the cost of housing in their community. Almost one-half (46%) of Panhandle residents are dissatisfied with their cost of housing, compared to 23 percent of the residents of the Southeast region.

Other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with their community’s cost of housing include: younger persons, persons with higher education levels and persons with occupations classified as other.

Middle-aged persons are more likely than persons both older and younger to express dissatisfaction with the public transportation services in their community. At least one-third of persons age 30 to 64 are dissatisfied with their public transportation services, compared to 28 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Person with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to be

dissatisfied with the public transportation services. And, persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 9,999 are the community size group *least* likely to express dissatisfaction with their public transportation services.

Middle-aged persons are more likely than both younger and older persons to be dissatisfied with their local government. Almost four in ten (38%) of persons age 40 to 64 are dissatisfied with their local government, compared to 13 percent of persons age 19 to 29.


Persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations are the occupation group most likely to be dissatisfied with their local government. Over one-half (52%) of persons with these types of occupations are dissatisfied with their local government, compared to 25 percent of persons with occupations classified as other.

Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to express dissatisfaction with the Internet service in their community. Over four in ten (44%) of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500 are dissatisfied with the Internet service, compared to 25 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities (Figure 7).

Persons age 30 to 39 are the age group most likely to be dissatisfied with their Internet service. Forty-one percent of persons age 30 to 39 are dissatisfied with their Internet service, compared to 18 percent of persons age 65 and older.

The other groups most likely to be dissatisfied with the Internet service in their community

Figure 7. Satisfaction with Internet Services by Community Size



include: persons with higher household incomes, persons with higher education levels, and persons with occupations classified as other.

Community Powerlessness

Respondents were next asked a question to determine if they view their community as powerless. They were asked, “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? My community is powerless to control its own future.” They were given a five-point scale that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.


Most rural Nebraskans disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future. Six in ten rural Nebraskans (60%) strongly disagree or disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future. Just under one in five rural Nebraskans (17%) believe their community is powerless to control its future and just under one-quarter (22%) are undecided.

The feelings of community powerlessness are examined by community size, region and individual attributes (Appendix Table 7). Many differences emerge.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future (Figure 8). Just under two-thirds (63%) of persons living in or near communities with populations of 1,000 or more disagree with that statement, compared to 50 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500. Just over one in five (21%) of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500 agree that their community is powerless to control its own future.

Residents of the South Central region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future.

Figure 8. Feelings of Community Powerlessness by Community Size



Approximately two-thirds (66%) of South Central region residents disagree with this statement, compared to 52 percent of Panhandle residents.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future. Just over seven in ten (71%) of persons with at least a four-year college degree disagree with this statement, compared to 41 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education.


Other groups most likely to disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future include: persons with higher household incomes; younger persons; married persons; persons with management, professional or education occupations; and newcomers to the community.

Plans to Leave the Community

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. Just over one-half (52%) of rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community¹

¹ The responses on the 7-point scale are converted to percentages as follows: values of 1, 2, and 3 are categorized as easy; values of 5, 6, and 7

Figure 9. Difficulty or Ease of Leaving Community



(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 8). Many differences emerge.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Six in ten (60%) of persons living in or near communities with populations under 500 believe it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 49 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more (Figure 10).

Persons with occupations in agriculture are more likely than persons with different occupations to say it would be difficult to leave their community. Sixty-eight percent of persons with agriculture occupations say it would be difficult to leave their community, compared to 43 percent of persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations.

are categorized as difficult; and a value of 4 is categorized as neutral.

Figure 10. Ease or Difficulty of Leaving Community by Community Size



Other groups most likely to say it would be difficult to leave their community include: persons living in the South Central region, persons with some college education but less than a four-year degree, and long-term residents.

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, to the Lincoln/Omaha metro areas; yes, to someplace in Nebraska outside the Lincoln/Omaha metro areas; yes, to some place other than Nebraska; no; and uncertain.

Only six percent indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year, 11 percent are uncertain and 83 percent have no plans to move. Of those who are planning to move, just under one-half (49%) plan to leave Nebraska. Approximately one-half plan to remain in the state, with 22 percent planning to move to either the Lincoln or Omaha area and 28 percent plan to move to another part of the state.

Intentions to move from their community differ by many of the characteristics examined (Appendix Table 9). Only three percent of the persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are planning to move from their community next year, compared to approximately seven percent of persons living or near communities of different sizes.

Panhandle residents are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to be both planning to move from their community or be uncertain about their plans. Nine percent of Panhandle residents are planning to move from their community in the next year and an additional 23 percent are uncertain if they will move.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to be planning to move from their community in the next year. Ten percent of persons age 19 to 29 are planning to move next year, compared to only five percent of persons age 65 and older. Persons age 30 to 49 are the age group most likely to be uncertain if they plan to move.

Persons who have never married are the marital group most likely to be planning to move from their community. Fourteen percent of persons who have never married are planning to move in the next year, compared to three percent of the widowed respondents.


Fifteen percent of the persons with occupations classified as other are planning to move from their community in the next year. In comparison, only four percent of both persons with occupations in agriculture and persons with food service or personal care occupations are planning to move.

A follow-up question (asked only of those who indicated they were planning to move) asked to what size of community they were planning to move. The answer categories for this question were: in or near a community larger than your current one, in or near a community smaller than your current one, and in or near a community of the same size as your current one.

Most expected movers are planning to move to a larger community. Over seven in ten (71%) expected movers are planning to move to a community larger than their current one (Figure 11). Just over one in ten expected movers (12%) are planning to move to a community smaller than their current one and 17 percent are planning to move to a community of similar size to their current one.

The expected destinations of those planning to move are examined by community size, region and individual attributes (Appendix Table 10). The younger potential movers are more likely than the older potential movers to be planning to move to a larger community. All of the

Figure 11. Size of Community Planning to Move to




potential movers age 19 to 29 (100%) are planning to move to a community larger than their current one (Figure 12). In comparison, only 48 percent of potential movers age 50 to 64 are planning to move to a larger community.

The potential movers with higher education levels are more likely than the potential movers with less education to be planning to move to a larger community. Just over three-quarters of the potential movers with at least some college education are planning to move to a larger community, compared to 44 percent of the potential movers with a high school diploma or less education.

Almost two-thirds of the potential movers who are planning to leave the state (65%) expect to move to a larger community. Similarly, most of the potential movers planning to move to nonmetropolitan Nebraska (59%) expect to move to a larger community.

Figure 12. Size of Community Planning to Move to by Age



Assessment of Community to Newcomers

Current community residents can be an important source of information for people looking to move there. To determine how rural Nebraskans might market their communities, respondents were asked to rate various items in their communities for newcomers. The specific question wording was, “Imagine you’ve been approached by a person looking to move to your community and are giving them an honest assessment of your community. How would you rate the following items in your community for that person?” The response options for each item were: poor, fair, good, excellent and don’t know.

Most rural Nebraskans would rate the safety, the environment for raising children and the natural/outdoor environment of their community as excellent to a newcomer (Table 2). And, at least four in ten rural Nebraskans would rate the church/religious community and friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors as excellent. Over two in ten (21%) rural Nebraskans would rate their local taxes as poor to a person looking to move to their community.

The assessments of these community characteristics for a newcomer to their community are viewed by community size, region and age (Appendix Table 11). Many differences emerge.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to rate the following characteristics as excellent to a newcomer: environment for raising children, the natural/outdoor environment, sense of

community among residents, and cost of living (Figure 13). As an example, over one-half of persons living in or near communities with populations under 5,000 would rate the natural/outdoor environment as excellent to a person looking to move there. In comparison, only 44 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more would rate their natural/outdoor environment as excellent to a newcomer. And, 36 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities would rate a sense of community among residents as excellent, compared to 25 percent of persons living in or the largest communities.


Other items are more likely to be rated as excellent by persons living in or near larger communities: church/religious community; available outdoor recreational opportunities; civic and nonprofit organizations; arts, entertainment and cultural activities; and available child care services. As an example, 23 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities would rate their civic and nonprofit organizations as excellent, compared to 12 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities (Figure 14).

The following items are most likely to be rated as excellent to newcomers by persons living in or near mid-sized communities: local school system (K – 12), pace of life, health care services, acceptance of newcomers, high-speed Internet services, leadership opportunities, infrastructure, and responsive government/community leadership. As an example, 35 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 1,000 to 4,999 would rate their health care services as excellent to newcomers, compared to 18 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500.

Table 2. Assessment of Community Characteristics to a Newcomer

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't Know
Safety	1%	7%	36%	52%	4%
Environment for raising children	1	8	34	51	6
The natural/outdoor environment	1	8	37	50	4
Church/religious community	2	9	35	43	11
Friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors	5	14	38	40	4
Local school system (K – 12)	4	13	36	38	11
Pace of life	2	12	46	36	3
Available outdoor recreational opportunities	6	18	38	34	5
A sense of community among residents	6	20	39	31	4
Health care services	10	22	36	29	4
Acceptance of newcomers	9	23	39	23	6
High-speed Internet services	14	25	31	22	8
Cost of living	8	28	44	19	2
Civic and nonprofit organizations	5	19	38	19	19
Leadership opportunities	10	24	36	16	15
Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, water)	15	31	37	15	2
Available quality housing	16	32	30	13	9
Responsive govt./community leadership	13	28	36	13	10
Arts, entertainment and cultural activities	19	34	27	11	10
Available child care services	12	22	30	11	25
Cost of available housing	16	30	33	10	12
Openness to discussing political issues rationally	12	24	35	10	18
Available jobs/economic opportunities	19	34	29	10	8
Affordable child care services	9	21	30	9	32
Local taxes	21	37	32	7	5
Pay rates	18	36	30	6	10

Figure 13. Community Characteristics Rated Higher to Newcomer by Residents of Smaller Communities




Many differences also exist by region. For some of the items, residents of the Panhandle are the group *least* likely to rate them as excellent to newcomers: safety, environment for raising children, and health care services. As an example, 37 percent of Panhandle residents rate the safety of their community as excellent, compared to over one-half of residents from the other four regions. However, they are the regional group most likely to rate friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors, pace of life, and acceptance of newcomers as excellent to a

newcomer. As an example, 41 percent of Panhandle residents would rate their pace of life as excellent to a person looking to move to their community. Only 30 percent of residents of both the North Central and Southeast regions would rate this as excellent to a newcomer.

Residents of the North Central region are more likely than residents of other regions to rate the natural/outdoor environment as excellent to newcomers. Sixty percent of North Central region residents rate the natural/outdoor

Figure 14. Community Characteristics Rated Higher to Newcomer by Residents of Larger Communities



environment as excellent to a newcomer, compared to 44 percent of residents of the Southeast region. Residents of the South Central region join residents of the North Central region as the groups most likely to rate civic and nonprofit organizations as excellent. Residents of the North Central region are the group *least* likely to rate cost of living and available quality housing as excellent to a person looking to move to their community. They, along with the Panhandle residents, are also the groups *least* likely to rate affordable child care services as excellent.

Residents of the Southeast region are the group *least* likely to rate their church/religious community as excellent to a person looking to move to their community. But, they are the group most likely to rate their local school system and local taxes as excellent. Forty-four percent of Southeast region residents would rate their local school system as excellent to a person looking to move to their community, compared to 27 percent of Panhandle residents. Residents of the Northeast region join the Southeast region residents as the groups most likely to rate costs of available housing as excellent.

Residents of the South Central region are the group most likely to rate the following as excellent: leadership opportunities; infrastructure; and arts, entertainment and cultural activities. As an example, 20 percent of the South Central region residents would rate their infrastructure as excellent to a newcomer, compared to 11 percent of Panhandle residents.

The ratings of many of these community characteristics also differ by age. The youngest persons are more likely than older persons to rate the following items as excellent to a person looking to move to their community: safety,

environment for raising children, the natural/outdoor environment, pace of life, high-speed Internet services, cost of living, available jobs/economic opportunities, local taxes and pay rates. As an example, 21 percent of persons age 19 to 29 would rate available jobs/economic opportunities as excellent to a potential newcomer. In comparison, approximately six percent of persons age 30 to 64 would rate this item as excellent.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to rate the following items as excellent to a person looking to move to their community: friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors; local school system (K – 12); sense of community among residents; health care services; civic and nonprofit organizations; and arts, entertainment and cultural activities. As an example, 45 percent of persons age 65 and older would rate their local school system as excellent to a potential newcomer, compared to 30 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Both the youngest and oldest persons are the groups most likely to rate the following items as excellent: available outdoor recreational opportunities, acceptance of newcomers, leadership opportunities, and available quality housing.

Individual and Community Political Views

Finally, respondents were asked to rate the political views they hold as well as the views of their community on social and economic issues. The specific question wording was, “Where would you place yourself and your community on the following scale of political views that people might hold?” They were given an eight-point scale ranging from extremely liberal to extremely conservative along with a don’t know option.

Most rural Nebraskans rate themselves as conservative on both economic and social issues. They also rate their community's political views on both economic and social issues as conservative. In fact, they view their community's political views on social issues as more conservative than their own. Fifty-two percent of rural Nebraskans have conservative views on social issues and 56 percent rate their community's political views on social issues as conservative (Figure 15).

The respondents' political views and their perceptions of the political views of their community are examined by community size, region and individual attributes (Appendix Table 12). Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to say they have conservative political views on economic issues. Approximately two-thirds (66%) of persons with at least a four-year degree have conservative views on economic issues, compared to 41 percent of persons with a high school diploma or less education.


Other groups most likely to rate their views on economic issues as conservative include:

persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999, males, married persons, persons with occupations in agriculture, and long-term residents of the community.

Residents of both the Panhandle and North Central region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to say they have conservative political views on social issues. Almost six in ten (58%) of the residents of these two regions have conservative views on social issues, compared to approximately 48 percent of residents of both the South Central and Northeast regions.

Other groups most likely to have conservative views on social issues include: persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999, persons with higher household incomes, males, married persons, persons with higher education levels, and persons with occupations in agriculture.

Persons living in or near mid-sized communities are more likely than persons living in or near both the smallest and largest communities to



rate their community's political views on both economic and social issues as conservative. As an example, just over six in ten persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 4,999 rate their community's political views on economic issues as conservative (Figure 16). In comparison, one-half (50%) of persons living in or near the smallest communities rate their community's political views on economic issues as conservative.

Residents of both the Panhandle and North Central regions are the regional groups most likely to rate their community's political views on both economic and social issues as conservative. Just over six in ten (61%) of the residents of these two regions rate their community's views on social issues as conservative, compared to 51 percent of residents of the Northeast region.

Other groups most likely to rate their community's political views on both economic

and social issues as conservative include: persons with higher household incomes, persons age 30 to 39, males, married persons, persons with the highest education levels, and persons with occupations in agriculture.


Newcomers to the community are more likely than long-term residents to say they don't know their community's political views.

Conclusion

By many different measures, rural Nebraskans are positive about their community. Many rural Nebraskans rate their community favorably on its social dimensions: as friendly, trusting and supportive. Most rural Nebraskans say it would be difficult to leave their community. And, most rural Nebraskans disagree that their community is powerless to control its future.

Across all years of this study, rural Nebraskans' views about the change in their community have generally been positive. The proportion believing their community has changed for the better during the past year has usually been greater than the proportion believing it has changed for the worse, especially during the past five years when the gap between the two has widened. In addition, rural Nebraskans' optimism about the expected change in their community ten years from now has increased during the past six years.

Some differences in residents' evaluations of their community exist by community size. Residents of larger communities are more likely than residents of smaller communities to say their community has changed for the better during the past year, will be a better place to live ten years from now and disagree that their community is powerless to control its own future. However, residents of smaller communities are more likely than residents of



larger communities to say it would be difficult to leave their community.

Except for some services that are largely unavailable in rural communities, rural Nebraskans are generally satisfied with basic community services and amenities. However, the proportion of rural Nebraskans satisfied with many social services and entertainment services has decreased across all 20 years of the study. Declines in satisfaction levels across all 20 years are seen with nursing home care, medical care services, senior centers, mental health services, entertainment, retail shopping and restaurants.

Only six percent of rural Nebraskans indicate they are planning to move from their community in the next year. Of those who are planning to move, just under one-half plan to leave Nebraska.

When asked to rate their community to a potential newcomer, most rural Nebraskans would rate the safety, the environment for raising children and the natural/outdoor environment of their community as excellent. And, at least four in ten rural Nebraskans would rate the church/religious community and


friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors as excellent. Over two in ten rural Nebraskans would rate their local taxes as poor to a person looking to move to their community.

Persons living in or near smaller communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to rate the following characteristics as excellent to a newcomer: environment for raising children, the natural/outdoor environment, sense of community among residents, and cost of living. Other items are more likely to be rated as excellent by persons living in or near larger communities: church/religious community; available outdoor recreational opportunities; civic and nonprofit organizations; arts, entertainment and cultural activities; and available child care services.

Most rural Nebraskans rate themselves as having conservative political views on both economic and social issues. They also rate their community's political views on both economic and social views as conservative. In fact, they view their community's political views on social issues as more conservative than their own.

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska

Nebraska Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties (2013 Definitions)



Source: 2013 Metropolitan and Micropolitan Definitions, Office of Management and Budget, released 2-28-13
 Prepared by: David Drozd, Center for Public Affairs Research, University of Nebraska at Omaha - August 11, 2014

Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents¹ Compared to 2010 – 2014 American Community Survey 5 Year Average for Nebraska*

	2016 Poll	2015 Poll	2014 Poll	2013 Poll	2012 Poll	2011 Poll	2010 - 2014 ACS
Age : ²							
20 - 39	31%	31%	32%	31%	31%	31%	31%
40 - 64	45%	45%	46%	44%	44%	44%	45%
65 and over	24%	24%	23%	24%	24%	24%	24%
Gender: ³							
Female	59%	58%	57%	51%	61%	60%	51%
Male	41%	42%	43%	49%	39%	40%	49%
Education: ⁴							
Less than 9 th grade	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	5%
9 th to 12 th grade (no diploma)	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	7%
High school diploma (or equiv.)	21%	22%	18%	23%	22%	26%	33%
Some college, no degree	21%	23%	23%	25%	25%	23%	26%
Associate degree	19%	15%	16%	15%	15%	16%	11%
Bachelors degree	23%	24%	24%	22%	24%	19%	13%
Graduate or professional degree	14%	13%	16%	12%	11%	12%	5%
Household Income: ⁵							
Less than \$10,000	3%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	8%	7%	7%	7%	10%	10%	12%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	11%	9%	8%	13%	11%	13%	12%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	11%	9%	14%	10%	10%	14%	11%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	11%	12%	12%	15%	12%	11%	10%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	11%	11%	13%	10%	13%	12%	10%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	14%	15%	13%	11%	14%	12%	11%
\$75,000 or more	32%	32%	29%	29%	25%	22%	27%
Marital Status: ⁶							
Married	69%	68%	68%	70%	70%	66%	62%
Never married	11%	13%	12%	12%	10%	14%	17%
Divorced/separated	10%	10%	12%	9%	11%	11%	12%
Widowed/widower	9%	8%	8%	9%	10%	10%	8%

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

² 2010-2014 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

³ 2010-2014 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

⁴ 2010-2014 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

⁵ 2010-2014 American Community Survey universe is all non-metro households.

⁶ 2010-2014 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

*Comparison numbers are estimates taken from the American Community Survey five-year sample and may reflect significant margins of error for areas with relatively small populations.

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

<i>Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about this past year, would you say... My community has changed for the</i>				
	<i>Worse</i>	<i>No Change</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Total	18	47	35	
<i>Percentages</i>				
Community Size		(n = 1491)		
Less than 500	22	58	20	
500 - 999	16	48	36	
1,000 - 4,999	18	45	37	$\chi^2 = 37.45^*$
5,000 - 9,999	22	42	35	(.000)
10,000 and up	16	44	41	
Region		(n = 1572)		
Panhandle	25	52	23	
North Central	15	51	34	
South Central	15	41	44	$\chi^2 = 37.17^*$
Northeast	19	50	31	(.000)
Southeast	19	50	32	
Income Level		(n = 1415)		
Under \$20,000	26	45	29	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	15	53	32	$\chi^2 = 25.74^*$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	23	47	30	(.000)
\$60,000 and over	16	43	41	
Age		(n = 1583)		
19 - 29	6	58	37	
30 - 39	15	45	40	
40 - 49	23	43	34	$\chi^2 = 48.70^*$
50 - 64	23	48	29	(.000)
65 and older	19	43	38	
Gender		(n = 1580)		
Male	18	48	34	$\chi^2 = 0.31$
Female	18	47	35	(.856)
Marital Status		(n = 1559)		
Married	18	45	38	
Never married	18	58	25	
Divorced/separated	21	52	27	$\chi^2 = 18.75^*$
Widowed	15	47	38	(.005)
Education		(n = 1517)		
H.S. diploma or less	19	53	28	
Some college	18	48	34	$\chi^2 = 18.47^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	16	43	41	(.001)

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>				
	<u>Worse</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Better</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<u>Occupation</u>		(n = 1195)		
Mgt, prof or education	16	42	43	
Sales or office support	19	41	40	
Constrn, inst or maint	25	53	22	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	18	47	35	
Agriculture	21	58	21	
Food serv/pers. care	27	52	21	
Hlthcare supp/safety	13	60	27	$\chi^2 = 51.79^*$
Other	25	39	36	(.000)
<u>Yrs Lived in Community</u>		(n = 1396)		
Five years or less	9	50	41	$\chi^2 = 14.31^*$
More than five years	19	46	34	(.001)

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

Appendix Table 3. Expectations of Future Community Change by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Based on what you see of the situation today, do you think that, ten years from now, your community will be a worse place to live, a better place or about the same?</i>				
	<i>Worse Place</i>	<i>About the same</i>	<i>Better Place</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Total	20	54	27	
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Size		(n = 1496)		
Less than 500	24	63	13	
500 - 999	19	58	23	
1,000 - 4,999	18	51	31	$\chi^2 = 36.67^*$
5,000 - 9,999	21	53	26	(.000)
10,000 and up	18	51	31	
Region		(n = 1578)		
Panhandle	25	59	16	
North Central	18	56	26	
South Central	19	46	34	$\chi^2 = 33.81^*$
Northeast	19	56	25	(.000)
Southeast	18	59	23	
Income Level		(n = 1421)		
Under \$20,000	20	60	21	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	20	52	28	$\chi^2 = 18.78^*$
\$40,000 - \$59,999	25	54	21	(.005)
\$60,000 and over	17	52	31	
Age		(n = 1588)		
19 - 29	14	56	31	
30 - 39	18	48	34	
40 - 49	27	49	24	$\chi^2 = 28.67^*$
50 - 64	22	55	22	(.000)
65 and older	17	57	26	
Gender		(n = 1583)		
Male	21	52	27	$\chi^2 = 2.93$
Female	18	56	26	(.231)
Marital Status		(n = 1565)		
Married	20	53	27	
Never married	17	60	22	
Divorced/separated	26	48	26	$\chi^2 = 11.45$
Widowed	13	58	30	(.075)
Education		(n = 1521)		
H.S. diploma or less	22	55	23	
Some college	21	56	23	$\chi^2 = 21.58^*$
Bachelors or grad degree	16	51	34	(.000)

Appendix Table 3 continued.

<i>Based on what you see of the situation today, do you think that, ten years from now, your community will be a worse place to live, a better place or about the same?</i>				
	<u>Worse Place</u>	<u>About the same</u>	<u>Better Place</u>	<u>Significance</u>
<u>Occupation</u>		(n = 1198)		
Mgt, prof or education	18	50	32	
Sales or office support	20	48	32	
Constrn, inst or maint	25	60	15	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	22	51	27	
Agriculture	28	53	19	
Food serv/pers. care	33	45	22	
Hlthcare supp/safety	19	55	27	$\chi^2 = 27.66^*$
Other	14	60	26	(.016)
<u>Yrs Lived in Community</u>		(n = 1398)		
Five years or less	14	52	34	$\chi^2 = 9.12^*$
More than five years	20	54	26	(.010)

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

Appendix Table 4. 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>opinion</i>	<i>Trusting</i>		<i>Hostile</i>	<i>opinion</i>	
Total	11	15	74		17	22	62		15	20	65
	<i>Percentages</i>										
Community Size	(n = 1483)				(n = 1462)				(n = 1462)		
Less than 500	8	16	76		16	16	68		13	14	73
500 - 999	15	12	73		19	17	64		18	17	65
1,000 - 4,999	10	17	73	$\chi^2 =$	13	27	61	$\chi^2 =$	15	21	64
5,000 - 9,999	18	12	71	14.19	17	29	54	25.59*	15	19	66
10,000 and up	11	14	75	(.077)	20	22	59	(.001)	16	24	61
	(n = 1561)				(n = 1536)				(n = 1538)		
Region	(n = 1561)				(n = 1536)				(n = 1538)		
Panhandle	9	15	76		16	26	59		18	20	62
North Central	10	13	77		12	20	68		9	21	70
South Central	13	12	75	$\chi^2 =$	18	21	61	$\chi^2 =$	14	19	68
Northeast	11	20	69	13.76	18	23	59	8.09	16	20	64
Southeast	12	13	75	(.088)	16	20	64	(.425)	19	19	62
	(n = 1403)				(n = 1388)				(n = 1390)		
Individual Attributes	(n = 1403)				(n = 1388)				(n = 1390)		
<i>Income Level</i>	(n = 1403)				(n = 1388)				(n = 1390)		
Under \$20,000	13	19	68		22	23	56		21	23	56
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	15	73	$\chi^2 =$	17	22	61	$\chi^2 =$	14	21	65
\$40,000 - \$59,999	14	14	72	7.03	21	24	56	9.98	18	22	60
\$60,000 and over	10	14	76	(.318)	15	20	65	(.125)	14	18	68
	(n = 1570)				(n = 1546)				(n = 1549)		
Age	(n = 1570)				(n = 1546)				(n = 1549)		
19 - 29	10	12	79		17	19	64		19	17	64
30 - 39	12	14	75		17	25	58		12	24	64
40 - 49	13	17	70	$\chi^2 =$	20	20	59	$\chi^2 =$	18	20	62
50 - 64	12	15	73	6.23	16	22	62	7.67	14	19	67
65 and older	11	15	74	(.622)	14	23	64	(.467)	14	18	67
	(n = 1566)				(n = 1544)				(n = 1546)		
Gender	(n = 1566)				(n = 1544)				(n = 1546)		
Male	10	15	76	$\chi^2 =$	15	23	63	$\chi^2 =$	12	20	68
Female	13	15	73	(.170)	18	21	61	(.159)	18	19	63

Appendix Table 4 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 = 1550)				(n = 1527)				(n = 1530)			
Married	12	14	75		16	20	64		16	19	66	
Never married	5	17	78	$\chi^2 =$	14	31	55	$\chi^2 =$	6	19	74	$\chi^2 =$
Divorced/separated	16	19	65	14.88*	22	27	51	20.41*	21	26	54	22.10*
Widowed	11	15	74	(.021)	14	24	62	(.002)	18	17	65	(.001)
<i>Education</i>	(n = 1509)				(n = 1489)				(n = 1490)			
H.S. diploma or less	14	20	66	$\chi^2 =$	18	23	59	$\chi^2 =$	18	23	59	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	10	15	76	18.82*	16	24	61	4.83	17	19	64	17.59*
Bachelors degree	10	12	78	(.001)	17	19	64	(.306)	11	18	71	(.001)
<i>Occupation</i>	(n = 1195)				(n = 1188)				(n = 1184)			
Mgt, prof or education	13	15	73		18	21	62		13	17	69	
Sales or office support	13	11	76		19	23	58		17	28	55	
Constrn, inst or maint	9	25	66		15	31	54		10	31	58	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	11	13	76		18	19	64		12	23	65	
Agriculture	5	16	79	$\chi^2 =$	8	22	70	$\chi^2 =$	13	17	70	$\chi^2 =$
Food serv/pers. care	18	8	74	24.84*	17	32	51	31.18*	13	26	62	23.49
Hlthcare supp/safety	12	12	76	(.036)	17	14	69	(.005)	13	23	64	(.053)
Other	3	17	81		17	34	49		13	13	74	
<i>Yrs Lived in Comm.</i>	(n = 1387)				(n = 1373)				(n = 1375)			
Five years or less	11	11	77	$\chi^2 =$	16	16	69	$\chi^2 =$	17	14	69	$\chi^2 =$
More than five years	11	16	73	2.86	17	23	60	7.72*	15	21	64	5.14
				(.240)				(.021)				(.076)

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

Appendix Table 5. 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	55	19	26
Retail shopping	53	13	34
Streets and roads	50	7	43
Restaurants	47	10	43
Arts/cultural activities	41	37	22
Quality of housing	38	16	45
Cost of housing	37	18	45
Public transportation services	33	49	18
Local government	31	32	37
Internet service	31	14	56
Community recycling	27	21	52
Cellular phone service	26	11	63
Mental health services	26	52	22
Medical care services	23	13	64
Nursing home care	20	37	43
Child day care services	19	49	33
Law enforcement	17	14	69
Access to higher education (college, technical, etc.)	16	23	62
Education (K - 12)	15	17	68
Senior centers	12	41	47
Sewage/waste disposal	12	24	64
Parks and recreation	11	11	78
Head Start or early childhood education programs	11	51	39
Civic/nonprofit organizations	10	46	45
Library services	8	21	71
Religious organizations	7	24	69
Fire protection	4	9	87

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

Appendix Table 6. 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>Streets and roads</i>			<i>Restaurants</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>											
Community Size	(n = 1507)			(n = 1515)			(n = 1505)			(n = 1514)		
Less than 500	52	28	21	56	22	22	48	10	42	42	16	43
500 - 999	66	18	16	54	17	29	52	7	41	53	12	35
1,000 - 4,999	60	20	20	54	12	34	50	8	42	51	10	39
5,000 - 9,999	58	16	26	72	6	22	54	7	39	56	7	37
10,000 and over	49	15	37	46	9	44	49	6	45	41	8	51
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 63.07^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 76.67^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 5.05 (.752)$			$\chi^2 = 37.60^* (.000)$		
Region	(n = 1587)			(n = 1594)			(n = 1584)			(n = 1596)		
Panhandle	58	19	24	58	14	28	56	4	40	49	7	44
North Central	56	22	23	52	13	35	45	9	46	47	11	42
South Central	50	15	35	45	11	44	42	7	52	42	7	52
Northeast	59	18	24	56	13	31	63	8	29	49	12	39
Southeast	57	26	17	59	16	26	47	7	46	54	14	33
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 42.33^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 33.70^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 56.14^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 35.80^* (.000)$		
Income Level	(n = 1429)			(n = 1433)			(n = 1425)			(n = 1437)		
Under \$20,000	50	23	27	41	22	37	61	6	33	40	14	47
\$20,000 - \$39,999	50	23	27	47	14	38	51	8	41	44	11	46
\$40,000 - \$59,999	54	20	26	53	13	33	56	5	39	50	11	40
\$60,000 and over	60	15	25	59	10	31	47	8	46	50	9	42
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 16.61^* (.011)$			$\chi^2 = 30.74^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 15.10^* (.019)$			$\chi^2 = 9.97 (.126)$		
Age	(n = 1599)			(n = 1606)			(n = 1594)			(n = 1607)		
19 - 29	64	15	21	54	16	31	43	13	43	42	4	54
30 - 39	56	16	28	63	9	28	52	5	44	54	9	37
40 - 49	59	18	23	51	14	36	51	8	40	50	9	40
50 - 64	59	16	26	52	14	34	54	5	41	49	13	39
65 and over	40	29	31	47	13	41	49	7	44	41	13	46
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 52.64^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 20.56^* (.008)$			$\chi^2 = 23.13^* (.003)$			$\chi^2 = 34.79^* (.000)$		
Education	(n = 1532)			(n = 1542)			(n = 1531)			(n = 1541)		
H.S. diploma or less	54	21	25	47	18	36	57	6	37	45	14	42
Some college	55	18	26	56	11	33	51	9	40	49	10	41
College grad	57	18	26	54	13	34	44	7	49	47	8	45
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 2.23 (.694)$			$\chi^2 = 13.41^* (.009)$			$\chi^2 = 17.80^* (.001)$			$\chi^2 = 8.15 (.086)$		
Occupation	(n = 1209)			(n = 1214)			(n = 1206)			(n = 1214)		
Mgt, prof, education	59	18	23	54	14	32	45	6	50	50	8	42
Sales/office support	62	12	26	58	8	35	56	9	34	43	7	50
Const, inst or maint	48	30	22	40	20	40	63	6	31	51	14	34
Prodn/trans/warehs	51	15	34	44	11	45	47	8	45	43	12	46
Agriculture	51	21	28	52	17	31	50	12	38	43	14	43
Food serv/pers. care	56	16	28	52	18	30	67	2	31	31	14	55
Hlthcare supp/safety	64	15	22	56	10	34	42	9	49	54	9	37
Other	57	15	29	58	14	28	71	3	26	50	5	45
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 23.82^* (.048)$			$\chi^2 = 23.04 (.060)$			$\chi^2 = 48.00^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 24.48^* (.040)$		

* 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 continued.

	<i>Arts/cultural activities</i>			<i>Quality of housing</i>			<i>Cost of housing</i>			<i>Public transportation services</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>			<i>Percentages</i>			<i>Percentages</i>			<i>Percentages</i>		
Community Size	(n = 1516)			(n = 1514)			(n = 1512)			(n = 1513)		
Less than 500	43	44	13	39	21	40	28	21	51	33	55	12
500 - 999	54	32	15	47	12	40	26	20	55	37	51	12
1,000 - 4,999	48	35	17	40	15	46	33	20	47	32	50	19
5,000 - 9,999	40	33	27	34	15	51	42	14	44	23	48	29
10,000 and over	31	38	30	36	17	47	50	14	36	35	46	19
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 66.72^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 17.86^* (.022)$			$\chi^2 = 62.77^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 31.41^* (.000)$		
Region	(n = 1595)			(n = 1594)			(n = 1594)			(n = 1588)		
Panhandle	37	40	24	42	15	43	46	11	44	30	46	23
North Central	43	39	18	51	18	31	41	20	40	30	52	18
South Central	40	33	27	35	16	49	42	16	42	35	45	20
Northeast	45	35	20	39	17	44	34	20	46	33	53	14
Southeast	41	44	15	31	17	52	23	23	55	30	53	18
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 22.56^* (.004)$			$\chi^2 = 30.11^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 42.38^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 13.59 (.093)$		
Income Level	(n = 1439)			(n = 1435)			(n = 1434)			(n = 1435)		
Under \$20,000	39	35	26	33	21	46	40	22	38	34	39	27
\$20,000 - \$39,999	40	39	21	34	21	46	34	21	45	28	47	25
\$40,000 - \$59,999	42	38	19	37	18	45	36	18	46	38	50	12
\$60,000 and over	45	34	22	45	11	44	39	14	47	33	51	16
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 6.51 (.369)$			$\chi^2 = 28.21^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 13.85^* (.031)$			$\chi^2 = 31.07^* (.000)$		
Age	(n = 1605)			(n = 1605)			(n = 1603)			(n = 1599)		
19 - 29	49	40	11	43	11	45	42	9	49	28	57	15
30 - 39	46	33	21	42	15	43	48	13	39	36	51	13
40 - 49	46	37	18	48	13	39	44	15	41	33	53	14
50 - 64	42	35	23	39	20	42	35	20	45	36	47	16
65 and over	29	41	30	25	20	56	25	27	48	29	43	29
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 50.29^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 51.61^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 64.39^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 43.42^* (.000)$		
Education	(n = 1540)			(n = 1540)			(n = 1538)			(n = 1540)		
H.S. diploma or less	42	41	17	33	23	44	33	22	45	31	46	23
Some college	41	39	21	41	18	41	41	17	42	31	50	19
College grad	43	32	26	39	10	51	37	14	49	35	51	14
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 14.36^* (.006)$			$\chi^2 = 39.49^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 14.81^* (.005)$			$\chi^2 = 13.14^* (.011)$		
Occupation	(n = 1217)			(n = 1216)			(n = 1219)			(n = 1211)		
Mgt, prof, education	46	30	24	44	10	46	38	16	47	37	50	13
Sales/office support	53	29	18	42	14	43	47	14	39	35	45	20
Const, inst or maint	28	49	24	35	30	35	38	21	41	28	60	13
Prodn/trans/warehs	33	45	22	28	19	54	29	14	58	33	49	18
Agriculture	39	44	17	43	18	40	33	26	41	32	54	14
Food serv/pers. care	60	28	12	33	23	44	37	16	47	27	47	27
Hlthcare supp/safety	41	39	20	43	17	40	42	13	45	29	59	12
Other	39	47	14	47	16	38	51	21	28	25	64	12
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>	$\chi^2 = 40.25^* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 31.50^* (.005)$			$\chi^2 = 32.94^* (.003)$			$\chi^2 = 23.12 (.058)$		

* 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 continued.

	<i>Local government</i>			<i>Internet service</i>		
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>					
Community Size		(n = 1519)			(n = 1513)	
Less than 500	32	36	32	44	15	41
500 - 999	35	30	35	32	10	58
1,000 - 4,999	28	33	39	31	12	57
5,000 - 9,999	34	34	32	27	13	61
10,000 and over	31	30	40	25	16	59
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 9.13 (.332)$			$\chi^2 = 38.37* (.000)$	
Region		(n = 1597)			(n = 1592)	
Panhandle	34	33	33	31	12	57
North Central	31	34	35	35	15	50
South Central	29	27	44	29	11	60
Northeast	33	32	35	33	14	53
Southeast	30	36	34	28	18	54
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 14.93 (.061)$			$\chi^2 = 14.33 (.073)$	
Income Level		(n = 1440)			(n = 1435)	
Under \$20,000	29	33	39	21	25	54
\$20,000 - \$39,999	31	35	34	30	17	53
\$40,000 - \$59,999	35	32	33	31	14	55
\$60,000 and over	29	31	40	34	8	58
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 7.89 (.247)$			$\chi^2 = 40.05* (.000)$	
Age		(n = 1608)			(n = 1602)	
19 - 29	13	58	28	32	6	62
30 - 39	31	37	32	41	9	51
40 - 49	38	29	33	35	12	53
50 - 64	39	23	38	33	13	54
65 and over	29	21	50	18	25	58
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 147.92* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 86.47* (.000)$	
Education		(n = 1546)			(n = 1539)	
H.S. diploma or less	35	32	33	27	21	53
Some college	31	33	36	32	15	53
College grad	28	31	41	32	8	60
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 8.95 (.062)$			$\chi^2 = 32.29* (.000)$	
Occupation		(n = 1222)			(n = 1214)	
Mgt. prof, education	28	30	42	36	8	56
Sales/office support	31	30	39	32	6	63
Const, inst or maint	52	14	34	29	21	50
Prodn/trans/warehs	35	33	33	29	14	57
Agriculture	28	34	38	32	15	53
Food serv/pers. care	30	48	22	30	16	54
Hlthcare supp/safety	31	41	28	36	12	52
Other	25	41	34	39	10	51
<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>		$\chi^2 = 41.68* (.000)$			$\chi^2 = 26.38* (.023)$	

* 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 7. Feelings of Community Powerlessness by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? My community is powerless to control its own future.

	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
<i>Percentages</i>				
Total	60	22	17	
Community Size		(n = 1488)		
Less than 500	50	28	21	
500 - 999	59	23	18	
1,000 - 4,999	64	20	16	
5,000 - 9,999	65	24	11	$\chi^2 = 18.37^*$
10,000 and up	63	21	16	(.019)
Region		(n = 1568)		
Panhandle	52	33	15	
North Central	55	30	16	
South Central	66	17	17	
Northeast	60	20	21	$\chi^2 = 32.35^*$
Southeast	60	23	17	(.000)
Income Level		(n = 1412)		
Under \$20,000	52	29	20	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	53	27	20	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	54	28	18	$\chi^2 = 45.81^*$
\$60,000 and over	70	15	15	(.000)
Age		(n = 1581)		
19 - 29	67	21	12	
30 - 39	67	27	6	
40 - 49	58	20	22	
50 - 64	58	19	23	$\chi^2 = 46.41^*$
65 and older	56	26	18	(.000)
Gender		(n = 1575)		
Male	61	20	19	$\chi^2 = 6.69^*$
Female	60	24	16	(.035)
Marital Status		(n = 1557)		
Married	64	21	16	
Never married	57	23	20	
Divorced/separated	57	20	23	$\chi^2 = 20.54^*$
Widowed	49	34	17	(.002)
Education		(n = 1514)		
H.S. diploma or less	41	33	26	
Some college	63	21	16	$\chi^2 = 82.98^*$
Bachelors degree	71	17	12	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1193)		
Mgt, prof, education	73	14	13	
Sales/office support	65	18	16	
Const, inst or maint	52	21	28	
Prodn/trans/warehs	49	25	25	
Agriculture	55	27	18	
Food serv/pers. care	39	29	33	
Hlthcare supp/safety	63	21	16	$\chi^2 = 51.71^*$
Other	60	26	14	(.000)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1391)		
Five years or less	66	25	9	$\chi^2 = 9.63^*$
More than five years	61	22	18	(.008)

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

Appendix Table 8. 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?

	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Total	32	16	52	
Community Size		(n = 1514)		
Less than 500	24	16	60	
500 - 999	33	14	53	
1,000 - 4,999	30	17	53	
5,000 - 9,999	40	13	47	$\chi^2 = 18.31^*$
10,000 and up	36	16	49	(.019)
Region		(n = 1591)		
Panhandle	44	14	42	
North Central	32	16	52	
South Central	26	17	57	
Northeast	35	15	51	$\chi^2 = 22.15^*$
Southeast	31	16	54	(.005)
Income Level		(n = 1437)		
Under \$20,000	28	18	54	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	33	16	51	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	28	13	58	$\chi^2 = 8.71$
\$60,000 and over	35	15	50	(.190)
Age		(n = 1601)		
19 - 29	34	15	51	
30 - 39	35	12	53	
40 - 49	30	19	52	
50 - 64	34	16	50	$\chi^2 = 10.83$
65 and older	28	15	57	(.211)
Gender		(n = 1596)		
Male	35	13	52	$\chi^2 = 6.53^*$
Female	30	17	52	(.038)
Marital Status		(n = 1577)		
Married	32	14	54	
Never married	34	18	49	
Divorced/separated	37	19	44	$\chi^2 = 9.05$
Widowed	28	17	55	(.171)
Education		(n = 1537)		
H.S. diploma or less	30	19	51	
Some college	30	15	56	$\chi^2 = 9.80^*$
Bachelors degree	36	14	50	(.044)
Occupation		(n = 1210)		
Mgt, prof, education	35	16	50	
Sales/office support	33	17	49	
Const, inst or maint	36	20	44	
Prodn/trans/warehs	35	13	53	
Agriculture	23	9	68	
Food serv/pers. care	20	24	56	
Hlthcare supp/safety	39	17	43	$\chi^2 = 34.98^*$
Other	27	10	63	(.001)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1413)		
Five years or less	39	15	47	$\chi^2 = 6.64^*$
More than five years	30	17	53	(.036)

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

Appendix Table 9. Plans to Leave Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

Do you plan to move from your community in the next year?

	<i>Yes, to the Lincoln/Omaha metro areas</i>	<i>Yes, to someplace in Nebraska outside metro areas</i>	<i>Yes, to someplace other than Nebraska</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	1	2	3	83	11	
Community Size		(n = 1512)				
Less than 500	2	4	2	83	9	
500 - 999	1	1	1	83	14	
1,000 - 4,999	3	2	2	83	11	
5,000 - 9,999	1	1	5	78	15	$\chi^2 = 33.64^*$
10,000 and up	1	1	5	84	10	(.006)
Region		(n = 1590)				
Panhandle	0	3	6	69	23	
North Central	1	1	3	87	9	
South Central	1	2	2	84	11	
Northeast	3	1	3	84	9	$\chi^2 = 53.88^*$
Southeast	1	2	3	87	7	(.000)
Income Level		(n = 1435)				
Under \$20,000	0	3	4	80	13	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	1	0.3	4	86	9	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	4	2	4	79	11	$\chi^2 = 28.74^*$
\$60,000 and over	1	2	3	84	10	(.004)
Age		(n = 1598)				
19 - 29	4	2	4	81	10	
30 - 39	2	2	2	82	14	
40 - 49	0.4	2	2	81	14	
50 - 64	1	2	4	85	9	$\chi^2 = 31.10^*$
65 and older	1	1	3	85	10	(.013)
Gender		(n = 1597)				
Male	2	1	4	83	11	$\chi^2 = 4.36$
Female	1	2	3	83	11	(.359)
Marital Status		(n = 1582)				
Married	1	2	2	85	10	
Never married	7	2	5	75	12	
Divorced/separated	1	3	6	76	14	$\chi^2 = 59.08^*$
Widowed	1	1	1	85	12	(.000)
Education		(n = 1536)				
H.S. diploma or less	1	1	3	83	12	
Some college	1	2	3	85	9	$\chi^2 = 8.48$
Bachelors degree	2	2	4	81	11	(.388)
Occupation		(n = 1212)				
Mgt, prof, education	2	2	3	83	11	
Sales/office support	0	2	4	85	9	
Const, inst or maint	2	0	6	81	12	
Prodn/trans/warehs	0	1	5	82	13	
Agriculture	1	1	2	90	6	
Food serv/pers. care	2	2	0	82	14	
Hlthcare supp/safety	1	3	2	84	10	$\chi^2 = 41.65^*$
Other	6	1	8	76	9	(.047)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1413)				
Five years or less	2	1	3	85	9	$\chi^2 = 3.85$
More than five years	1	2	3	83	11	(.427)

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

Appendix Table 10. Size of Community Planning to Move to by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>If yes, to what size of community do you plan to move?</i>				
	<i>In or near a community larger than your current one</i>	<i>In or near a community smaller than your current one</i>	<i>In or near a community of the same size as your current one</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	71	12	17	
Community Size		Percentages		
		(n = 95)		
Less than 500	84	11	5	
500 - 999	57**	29**	14**	
1,000 - 4,999	78	4	19	
5,000 - 9,999	89**	0**	11**	$\chi^2 = 10.50$
10,000 and up	58	21	21	(.232)
Region		(n = 97)		
Panhandle	81	6	13	
North Central	90	0	10	
South Central	57	21	21	
Northeast	69	10	21	$\chi^2 = 6.93$
Southeast	79	7	14	(.544)
Income Level		(n = 94)		
Under \$20,000	36	27	36	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	57	14	29	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	77	7	17	$\chi^2 = 11.62$
\$60,000 and over	82	10	8	(.071)
Age		(n = 98)		
19 - 29	100	0	0	
30 - 39	83	8	8	
40 - 49	77	0	23	
50 - 64	48	29	23	$\chi^2 = 24.38^*$
65 and older	61	11	28	(.002)
Gender		(n = 98)		
Male	63	15	23	$\chi^2 = 2.05$
Female	76	10	14	(.358)
Education		(n = 96)		
H.S. diploma or less	44	13	44	
Some college	76	14	11	$\chi^2 = 10.51^*$
Bachelors degree	77	12	12	(.033)
Occupation		(n = 79)		
Mgt, prof, education	83	13	4	
Sales/office support	73	18	9	
Const, inst or maint	50**	33**	17**	
Prodn/trans/warehs	60**	40**	0**	
Agriculture	67**	17**	17**	
Food serv/pers. care	50**	0**	50**	
Hlthcare supp/safety	62	8	31	$\chi^2 = 19.30$
Other	100	0	0	(.154)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 89)		
Five years or less	93	7	0	$\chi^2 = 3.69$
More than five years	69	13	17	(.158)
Where Plan to Move		(n = 98)		
Lincoln/Omaha area	100	0	0	
Someplace else in NE	59	19	22	$\chi^2 = 11.73^*$
Someplace outside NE	65	14	20	(.020)

* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level ** Row percentages are calculated using row total with less than 10 respondents.

Appendix Table 11. Assessment of Community Characteristics to a Newcomer by Community Size, Region and Age

	<i>Community Size</i>					Total
	Less than 500	500 - 999	1,000 - 4,999	5,000 - 9,999	10,000 & over	
	<i>Percent Rating Each "Excellent"</i>					
Safety	55	54	54	44	50	52
Environment for raising children*	55	54	55	42	47	51
The natural/outdoor environment*	52	52	54	51	44	50
Church/religious community*	33	47	47	42	45	43
Friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors	45	40	42	44	34	40
Local school system (K – 12)*	41	38	44	33	29	38
Pace of life*	33	40	36	39	35	36
Available outdoor recreational opportunities*	28	39	29	38	36	34
A sense of community among residents*	36	30	35	31	25	31
Health care services*	18	22	35	32	31	29
Acceptance of newcomers*	25	24	24	30	20	23
High-speed Internet services*	14	22	24	27	23	22
Cost of living*	21	22	19	21	15	19
Civic and nonprofit organizations*	12	18	20	19	23	19
Leadership opportunities*	13	19	12	17	17	16
Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, water)*	12	20	12	18	17	15
Available quality housing	7	11	12	14	17	13
Responsive govt./community leadership*	14	10	13	16	13	13
Arts, entertainment and cultural activities*	8	3	6	14	18	11
Available child care services*	5	13	11	12	13	11
Cost of available housing*	10	10	9	8	9	10
Openness to discussing political issues rationally	10	7	10	10	12	10
Available jobs/economic opportunities*	9	9	9	8	11	10
Affordable child care services*	6	10	9	9	8	9
Local taxes*	9	7	4	10	5	7
Pay rates	2	7	7	5	6	6

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

Appendix Table 11 continued.

	<i>Region</i>					Total
	Panhandle	North Central	South Central	Northeast	Southeast	
	<i>Percent Rating Each "Excellent"</i>					
Safety*	37	58	53	56	51	52
Environment for raising children*	39	53	53	56	48	51
The natural/outdoor environment*	52	60	51	46	44	50
Church/religious community*	46	42	44	48	36	43
Friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors*	45	39	38	40	38	40
Local school system (K – 12)	27	34	38	41	44	38
Pace of life*	41	30	38	37	30	36
Available outdoor recreational opportunities	33	42	36	33	26	34
A sense of community among residents	34	32	32	30	32	31
Health care services*	18	28	31	33	28	29
Acceptance of newcomers*	30	26	25	20	20	23
High-speed Internet services	25	22	25	18	20	22
Cost of living*	20	12	18	19	23	19
Civic and nonprofit organizations*	16	24	24	16	14	19
Leadership opportunities*	16	15	18	14	15	16
Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, water)*	11	16	20	12	14	15
Available quality housing*	15	8	13	14	13	13
Responsive govt./community leadership	13	13	15	13	13	13
Arts, entertainment and cultural activities*	10	10	14	10	6	11
Available child care services	12	8	15	10	8	11
Cost of available housing*	9	8	8	12	13	10
Openness to discussing political issues rationally*	9	11	12	9	8	10
Available jobs/economic opportunities*	10	10	10	10	8	10
Affordable child care services*	5	5	11	10	9	9
Local taxes*	6	6	4	8	11	7
Pay rates	9	4	6	7	5	6

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

Appendix Table 11 continued.

	<i>Age categories</i>					Total
	19 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 64	65 and older	
	<i>Percent Rating Each "Excellent"</i>					
Safety*	62	56	46	50	49	52
Environment for raising children*	57	52	50	49	51	51
The natural/outdoor environment*	58	50	48	48	47	50
Church/religious community	49	40	41	42	45	43
Friendliness or supportiveness of neighbors*	40	39	37	37	44	40
Local school system (K – 12)*	30	37	33	39	45	38
Pace of life*	41	43	36	32	31	36
Available outdoor recreational opportunities*	36	37	29	32	35	34
A sense of community among residents*	30	32	31	29	35	31
Health care services*	25	29	28	25	36	29
Acceptance of newcomers*	26	23	19	21	28	23
High-speed Internet services*	34	18	18	21	22	22
Cost of living*	25	22	17	17	16	19
Civic and nonprofit organizations*	15	19	18	19	24	19
Leadership opportunities*	17	18	14	14	17	16
Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, water)*	15	20	15	12	16	15
Available quality housing*	15	15	11	10	16	13
Responsive govt./community leadership*	11	12	15	13	16	13
Arts, entertainment and cultural activities*	9	8	10	10	15	11
Available child care services*	13	11	11	10	12	11
Cost of available housing*	9	14	8	8	12	10
Openness to discussing political issues rationally	7	12	9	11	11	10
Available jobs/economic opportunities*	21	6	7	7	10	10
Affordable child care services*	8	11	10	8	8	9
Local taxes*	13	6	3	5	6	7
Pay rates*	9	7	6	4	5	6

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

Appendix Table 12. Individual and Community Political Views by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Where would you place yourself and your community on the following scale of political views that people might hold?</i>					
<i>Your political views on economic issues</i>					
	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Moderate, middle of road</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	11	21	56	12	
Community Size		(n = 1504)			
Less than 500	8	23	53	16	
500 - 999	3	21	63	14	
1,000 - 4,999	13	20	56	11	
5,000 - 9,999	17	16	56	11	$\chi^2 = 33.82^*$
10,000 and up	12	23	54	10	(.001)
Region		(n = 1515)			
Panhandle	12	20	61	8	
North Central	8	17	63	11	
South Central	14	21	54	11	
Northeast	10	22	54	14	$\chi^2 = 17.92$
Southeast	9	24	53	14	(.118)
Income Level		(n = 1437)			
Under \$20,000	12	23	43	21	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	14	24	47	15	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	9	21	56	14	$\chi^2 = 43.45^*$
\$60,000 and over	11	18	63	8	(.000)
Age		(n = 1524)			
19 - 29	12	21	54	14	
30 - 39	12	14	55	18	
40 - 49	10	23	58	10	
50 - 64	11	22	58	9	$\chi^2 = 19.19$
65 and older	12	22	54	12	(.084)
Gender		(n = 1520)			
Male	11	18	62	8	$\chi^2 = 20.83^*$
Female	11	23	52	14	(.000)
Marital Status		(n = 1505)			
Married	10	19	59	12	
Never married	15	23	52	10	
Divorced/separated	12	28	49	12	$\chi^2 = 18.98^*$
Widowed	13	28	46	13	(.025)
Education		(n = 1510)			
H.S. diploma or less	14	27	41	18	
Some college	7	22	56	15	$\chi^2 = 97.77^*$
Bachelors degree	15	16	66	5	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1165)			
Mgt, prof, education	12	17	62	8	
Sales/office support	9	20	62	9	
Const, inst or maint	6	19	61	14	
Prodn/trans/warehs	15	11	58	16	
Agriculture	6	18	64	12	
Food serv/pers. care	16	37	33	14	
Hlthcare supp/safety	9	20	58	13	$\chi^2 = 47.64^*$
Other	5	33	49	13	(.001)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1404)			
Five years or less	14	18	51	17	$\chi^2 = 9.27^*$
More than five years	11	21	57	11	(.026)

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

Where would you place yourself and your community on the following scale of political views that people might hold?

Your political views on social issues

	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Moderate, middle of road</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	15	22	52	11	
Community Size		(n = 1505)			
Less than 500	12	23	50	16	
500 - 999	8	20	61	11	
1,000 - 4,999	13	25	52	10	
5,000 - 9,999	21	17	51	11	$\chi^2 = 33.45^*$
10,000 and up	18	24	49	10	(.001)
Region		(n = 1513)			
Panhandle	13	25	58	4	
North Central	14	16	58	12	
South Central	16	24	49	11	
Northeast	15	24	48	14	$\chi^2 = 25.63^*$
Southeast	13	20	53	14	(.012)
Income Level		(n = 1439)			
Under \$20,000	17	31	34	18	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	16	23	46	15	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	12	23	50	15	$\chi^2 = 52.47^*$
\$60,000 and over	15	20	58	7	(.000)
Age		(n = 1523)			
19 - 29	17	27	48	8	
30 - 39	17	16	50	18	
40 - 49	13	23	53	11	
50 - 64	13	23	54	10	$\chi^2 = 25.03^*$
65 and older	15	23	51	12	(.015)
Gender		(n = 1519)			
Male	15	18	59	9	$\chi^2 = 26.00^*$
Female	15	26	47	13	(.000)
Marital Status		(n = 1502)			
Married	14	21	55	11	
Never married	21	27	43	10	
Divorced/separated	15	26	46	12	$\chi^2 = 20.25^*$
Widowed	14	30	44	12	(.016)
Education		(n = 1510)			
H.S. diploma or less	15	30	37	19	
Some college	8	25	53	14	$\chi^2 = 131.58^*$
Bachelors degree	22	15	59	3	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1161)			
Mgt, prof, education	18	17	57	8	
Sales/office support	15	27	50	9	
Const, inst or maint	5	24	56	16	
Prodn/trans/warehs	14	13	55	19	
Agriculture	8	13	68	10	
Food serv/pers. care	17	38	33	13	
Hlthcare supp/safety	11	25	57	7	$\chi^2 = 61.37^*$
Other	13	29	43	15	(.000)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1402)			
Five years or less	19	22	47	13	$\chi^2 = 5.35$
More than five years	14	22	53	11	(.148)

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

*Where would you place yourself and your community on the following scale of political views
that people might hold?*

Your community's political views on economic issues

	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Moderate, middle of road</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	6	19	57	18	
Community Size		(n = 1500)			
Less than 500	2	23	50	24	
500 - 999	3	14	62	21	
1,000 - 4,999	4	17	61	17	
5,000 - 9,999	15	17	52	15	$\chi^2 = 57.42^*$
10,000 and up	8	21	56	15	(.000)
Region		(n = 1511)			
Panhandle	11	17	60	12	
North Central	4	14	63	19	
South Central	7	20	57	16	
Northeast	6	20	52	21	$\chi^2 = 26.13^*$
Southeast	4	21	55	20	(.010)
Income Level		(n = 1438)			
Under \$20,000	9	21	39	31	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	10	22	47	21	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	6	19	52	23	$\chi^2 = 78.00^*$
\$60,000 and over	4	17	67	12	(.000)
Age		(n = 1521)			
19 - 29	8	17	56	19	
30 - 39	3	11	64	23	
40 - 49	4	23	58	16	
50 - 64	8	21	56	15	$\chi^2 = 31.48^*$
65 and older	8	20	53	19	(.002)
Gender		(n = 1519)			
Male	8	18	63	12	$\chi^2 = 28.59^*$
Female	6	20	53	22	(.000)
Marital Status		(n = 1500)			
Married	6	17	60	17	
Never married	3	21	56	20	
Divorced/separated	7	23	51	19	$\chi^2 = 21.30^*$
Widowed	8	28	43	21	(.011)
Education		(n = 1508)			
H.S. diploma or less	10	25	38	28	
Some college	4	21	55	20	$\chi^2 = 109.74^*$
Bachelors degree	7	13	71	10	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1163)			
Mgt, prof, education	5	15	67	13	
Sales/office support	9	15	60	16	
Const, inst or maint	6	19	55	20	
Prodn/trans/warehs	14	18	45	23	
Agriculture	3	13	73	12	
Food serv/pers. care	6	43	33	18	
Hlthcare supp/safety	3	20	57	20	$\chi^2 = 72.93^*$
Other	4	27	47	23	(.000)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1400)			
Five years or less	7	11	58	24	$\chi^2 = 14.79^*$
More than five years	6	20	57	17	(.002)

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

Where would you place yourself and your community on the following scale of political views that people might hold?

Your community's political views on social issues

	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Moderate, middle of road</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Chi-square (sig.)</i>
Total	7	19	56	18	
Community Size		(n = 1504)			
Less than 500	6	24	48	23	
500 - 999	4	16	61	20	
1,000 - 4,999	4	18	61	18	
5,000 - 9,999	15	17	53	15	$\chi^2 = 47.09^*$
10,000 and up	10	21	55	14	(.000)
Region		(n = 1513)			
Panhandle	11	17	61	11	
North Central	5	16	61	19	
South Central	8	20	56	16	
Northeast	8	21	51	21	$\chi^2 = 21.12^*$
Southeast	6	19	55	20	(.049)
Income Level		(n = 1439)			
Under \$20,000	9	23	37	31	
\$20,000 - \$39,999	12	21	46	21	
\$40,000 - \$59,999	7	19	51	23	$\chi^2 = 82.67^*$
\$60,000 and over	5	17	67	12	(.000)
Age		(n = 1522)			
19 - 29	8	17	58	17	
30 - 39	3	11	64	22	
40 - 49	5	24	55	16	
50 - 64	10	20	55	16	$\chi^2 = 34.50^*$
65 and older	9	22	50	20	(.001)
Gender		(n = 1519)			
Male	9	18	62	12	$\chi^2 = 32.43^*$
Female	6	20	52	22	(.000)
Marital Status		(n = 1501)			
Married	7	17	59	17	
Never married	3	21	55	21	
Divorced/separated	10	24	46	20	$\chi^2 = 28.95^*$
Widowed	11	27	41	21	(.001)
Education		(n = 1510)			
H.S. diploma or less	10	27	35	27	
Some college	5	21	53	20	$\chi^2 = 128.41^*$
Bachelors degree	8	12	71	9	(.000)
Occupation		(n = 1163)			
Mgt, prof, education	6	15	67	13	
Sales/office support	9	17	56	18	
Const, inst or maint	5	22	53	20	
Prodn/trans/warehs	15	15	47	23	
Agriculture	4	13	71	13	
Food serv/pers. care	6	45	31	18	
Hlthcare supp/safety	5	18	60	18	$\chi^2 = 71.15^*$
Other	4	27	47	23	(.000)
Yrs Lived in Comm.		(n = 1402)			
Five years or less	8	11	56	25	$\chi^2 = 15.48^*$
More than five years	7	20	56	17	(.001)

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

Rural Poll Research Report 16-4, October 2016

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.