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## Executive Summary

Population loss in rural Nebraska communities has been a concern, but many communities across the state have experienced population gains during the past decade. Are rural Nebraskans aware of new residents living in their community? How do they feel about their community's new residents? What do they think will happen to their community's population during the next ten years?

This report details 2,482 responses to the 2006 Nebraska Rural Poll, the eleventh annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans’ perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about new residents in their community and their expectations regarding population growth in their community during the next decade. For all questions, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, that is, comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- Almost two-thirds of rural Nebraskans are aware of new residents living in their community. Sixty-four percent are aware of new residents (persons who have moved to their community within the past five years) in their community. Twenty percent are not aware of new residents and 16 percent don't know. No variations are found by community size or region of the state for this question.
- Rural Nebraskans have mixed opinions on the impact new residents have had on their community. Less than one-third (31\%) agree with the statement that new residents who move into their community improve the quality of life. One quarter disagree with the statement and 44 percent neither agree nor disagree. Eighteen percent agree with the statement that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community. Just under one-half (46\%) disagree and 37 percent neither agree nor disagree.
- Just under one-half (49\%) of rural Nebraskans say more people should be encouraged to relocate to their community. Sixteen percent disagree and 35 percent neither agree nor disagree.
- Many rural Nebraskans believe new residents are made to feel welcome in their community. Fifty-six percent agree with the statement that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome. Thirty-six percent agree with the statement that their community does a lot to include new residents in the community. One quarter (25\%) disagree with that statement. Nineteen percent agree with the statement that new residents are often discriminated against while 45 percent disagree.
- Many rural Nebraskans believe new residents tend to become home owners, join a church and attend community events. Over one-half of rural Nebraskans agree with the statements that new residents in their community become members of a church (52\%) and become home owners (59\%). Almost one-half (47\%) agree that new residents attend community events.
- $\quad$ Residents of the Panhandle are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that new residents improve the quality of life in their community. Thirtynine percent of Panhandle residents agree with this statement, compared to 26 percent of residents in the Northeast region.
- $\quad$ Newcomers to the community are less likely than longer term residents to agree that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome and that the community does a lot to include new residents. Forty-seven percent of persons living in their community for five years or less agree with the statement that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome, compared to 57 percent of persons living in the community for more than five years. Similarly, 27 percent of newcomers agree with the statement that the community does a lot to include new residents, compared to 37 percent of long term residents.
- Persons living in the Northeast region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community. Twenty-four percent of Northeast region residents agree with this statement, compared to 11 percent of North Central region residents.
- Over one-half of rural Nebraskans expect the population of retired persons and immigrants in their community to increase over the next ten years. Sixty-eight percent expect the population of retired persons to increase and 55 percent believe the number of immigrants will grow during the next decade. Almost one-half (49\%) expect the total population of their community to increase over the next ten years. Over one-third (36\%) expect the population of young families to decrease during the next decade.
- Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to think the population of each of the groups will increase over the next ten years. Seventy percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more say their total community population will increase during the next ten years, compared to 30 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people. Over one-third (35\%) of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 expect their community's population to decrease over the next decade.


## Introduction

Population loss has been a concern for many rural Nebraska communities over the past few decades. However, when examining recent community level Census data, a more optimistic picture emerges. Over one-half of incorporated communities had population gains between 1990 and 2000. Growth occurred in $68 \%$ of communities with populations exceeding 1,000 and $50 \%$ of the communities with less than 1,000 people showed population gains (Rural depopulation: A closer look at Nebraska's counties and communities, 2005). ${ }^{1}$ Given that, how many rural Nebraskans are aware of new residents in their community? How do they feel about their community's new residents? What do they think will happen to their community's population during the next ten years? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

The 2006 Nebraska Rural Poll is the eleventh annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about new residents in their community and their expectations regarding population growth in their community during the next decade.

## Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 2,482 responses from Nebraskans living in the 84 nonmetropolitan counties in the state. A selfadministered questionnaire was mailed in February and March to approximately 6,200 randomly selected households. Metropolitan counties not included in the sample were Cass, Dakota, Dixon, Douglas,
${ }^{1}$ Paper available online at http://ruralinitiative.nebraska.edu/externalpubs/964

Lancaster, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward and Washington. The 14-page questionnaire included questions pertaining to well-being, community, work, new residents, immigration, and making a living. This paper reports only results from the new residents portion of the survey.

A 40\% response rate was achieved using the total design method (Dillman, 1978). The sequence of steps used follow:

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

Appendix Table 1 shows demographic data from this year's study and previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire non-metropolitan population of Nebraska (using 2000 U.S. Census data). As can be seen from the table, there are some marked differences between some of the demographic variables in our sample compared to the Census data. Certainly some variance from 2000 Census data is to be expected as a result of changes that have occurred in the intervening six years. Nonetheless, we suggest the reader use caution in generalizing our data to all rural Nebraska. However, given the random sampling frame used for this survey, the acceptable percentage of responses, and the large number of respondents, we feel the data provide useful insights into opinions of rural Nebraskans on the various issues
presented in this report.
The average age of respondents is 56 years. Sixty-nine percent are married (Appendix Table 1 ) and 71 percent live within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 48 years and have lived in their current community 32 years. Fifty-two percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety-two percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Forty-nine percent of the respondents report their 2005 approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, as below $\$ 40,000$. Thirty-six percent report incomes over $\$ 50,000$.

Seventy-two percent were employed in 2005 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Twenty-five percent are retired. Thirty-five percent of those employed reported working in a professional, technical or administrative occupation. Fourteen percent indicated they were farmers or ranchers. The employed respondents who do not work in their home or their nearest community reported having to drive an average of 31 miles, one way, to their primary job.

## New Residents in Community

Almost two-thirds (64\%) of rural Nebraskans are aware of new residents living in their community (Figure 1). New residents are defined as persons who have moved to their community within the past five years. Twenty percent aren't aware of new residents living in their community and 16 percent don't know.

Answers to this question are analyzed by community size, region and various

Figure 1. Aware of New Residents in Community

individual attributes (Appendix Table 2). No variations are found by community size which seems to indicate that communities of all sizes are attracting new residents. Similarly, no differences are found by region of the state. Some differences are found by individual attributes of the respondents, however.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to be aware of new residents in their community. Seventy-two percent of persons with household incomes of $\$ 60,000$ or more are aware of new residents in their community, compared to 57 percent of persons with incomes under $\$ 20,000$. Respondents with the lowest incomes are more likely than persons with the highest incomes to say they don't know if there are new residents living in their community (25 percent compared to 10 percent).

Other groups most likely to be aware of new residents in their community include: persons over the age of 30 , males, married persons, persons with the highest education levels and farmers/ranchers.

Respondents were next given a series of
statements about new residents. They were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each. Respondents were given the option to check a box to denote "doesn't apply." The proportions for this response ranged from four percent to eight percent for each of the items. Those responses have been excluded from the following proportions.

Many rural Nebraskans believe new residents tend to become home owners, join a church and attend community events. They also believe their community in turn welcomes new residents. Over one-half of rural Nebraskans strongly agree or agree with the statements that new residents in their community become home owners (59\%) and members of a church (52\%) (Table 1). Fifty-six percent of rural Nebraskans believe that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome. Forty-seven percent agree with the statement that new residents attend community events and the same proportion agree with the statement that new residents are invited to join local organizations.

When asked about the future, many rural Nebraskans would welcome more new residents to their community. Just under one-half (49\%) agree with the statement that more people should be encouraged to relocate to their community.

While many rural Nebraskans think new residents are made to feel welcome, a lower proportion believe their community does a lot to include new residents in the community. Thirty-six percent agree with the statement that their community does a lot to include new residents in the community. One quarter (25\%) disagree and 39 percent neither agree nor disagree.

Rural Nebraskans have mixed opinions on the impact new residents have on their community. Less than one-third (31\%) agree with the statement that new residents who move into their community improve the quality of life. One-quarter (25\%) disagree with that statement. Forty-four percent neither agree nor disagree.

Less than one in five rural Nebraskans think new residents have been detrimental to their community. Eighteen percent agree with the statement that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community. However, just under one-half (46\%) disagree with the statement and 37 percent neither agree nor disagree.

Many rural Nebraskans think new residents don't face discrimination. Less than one in five (19\%) rural Nebraskans believe new residents are often discriminated against. But, 45 percent disagree with the statement.

Opinions are mixed on the efforts of new residents to serve the community in official or volunteer roles, or with financial contributions. One quarter (25\%) agree with the statement that new residents do not make an effort to get involved in their community. Approximately one-third (34\%) disagree with this statement and 41 percent neither agree nor disagree. Eighteen percent of rural Nebraskans agree with the statement that new residents seek public office or other similar activities and 25 percent agree with the statement that new residents volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations.

The responses to these questions are analyzed by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix
Table 3). Many differences of opinion are

Table 1. Opinions About New Residents

|  | Strongly Disagree or Disagree | Neither | Strongly Agree or Agree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New residents who move into my community improve the quality of life. | 25\% | 44\% | 31\% |
| New residents do not make an effort to get involved in my community. | 34 | 41 | 25 |
| New residents to my community are made to feel welcome. | 14 | 30 | 56 |
| My community does a lot to include new residents in the community. | 25 | 39 | 36 |
| New residents in my community volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations. | 24 | 52 | 25 |
| New residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities. | 32 | 50 | 18 |
| New residents in my community attend community events. | 16 | 37 | 47 |
| New residents in my community become home owners. | 15 | 26 | 59 |
| New residents in my community become members of a church. | 12 | 37 | 52 |
| New people moving into my community has been bad for the community. | 46 | 37 | 18 |
| More people should be encouraged to relocate to my community. | 16 | 35 | 49 |
| New residents are often discriminated against. | 45 | 36 | 19 |
| New residents are often invited to join local organizations. | 13 | 40 | 47 |

detected.

Residents living in or near smaller
communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to agree that new residents to their community are
made to feel welcome and are invited to join local organizations. As an example, approximately 55 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 1,000 agree with the statement that new residents are often invited to join local organizations, compared to 39 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more.

In addition, persons living in or near the larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to think that new residents are often discriminated against. Twenty-three percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more agree with this statement (Figure 2). In comparison, 13 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations less than 500 agree.

However, residents living in or near smaller communities are less likely than residents of larger communities to think that new residents are getting involved in their community. Persons living in or near

communities with populations less than 500 are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to disagree with the following statements: new residents in my community volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations, new residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities, new residents in my community attend community events, new residents in my community become home owners, and new residents in my community become members of a church.

In addition, 36 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people agree that new residents do not make an effort to get involved in their community, compared to approximately 21 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 1,000 or more.

Residents living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to agree that new residents improve the quality of life in their community. But, persons living in or near both the smallest and largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near mid-size communities to agree that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community.

Persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999 are more likely than persons living in communities of different sizes to agree that more people should be encouraged to relocate to their community. Sixty percent of persons living in or near communities with populations between 500 and 999 agree with this statement, compared to 42 percent of persons living in or near communities
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with populations of 10,000 or more.
Many regional differences are also detected in the responses to these questions. Regions across the state have had different histories with newcomers. Census data show that the Panhandle area has a higher proportion of new arrivals in its population than can be found in other regions of the state.

Persons living in the Northeast region of the state are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to have negative attitudes toward new residents. Persons living in the Northeast region are the regional group least likely to agree that new residents improve the quality of life in their community. Twenty-six percent of Northeast region residents agree with this statement, compared to 39 percent of Panhandle residents (see Appendix Figure 1 for the counties included in each region).

And, persons living in the Northeast region are the regional group most likely to agree that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community. Twenty-four percent of Northeast region residents agree with this statement, compared to 11 percent of residents of the North Central region (Figure 3).

Residents of both the Northeast and Southeast regions are more likely than persons living in other parts of the state to agree that new residents do not make an effort to get involved in their community. Approximately 29 percent of residents of these two regions agree with this statement, compared to 18 percent of persons living in either the Panhandle or North Central regions.

An interesting finding is that residents of the


Northeast region are the regional group most likely to agree that new residents are often discriminated against yet are also the group most likely to agree that their community does a lot to include new residents in the community.

Residents of the Panhandle are more likely than residents of other parts of the state to say that new residents in their community are getting involved in the community.
They are the regional group most likely to agree that new residents in their community do the following items: seek public office or other similar activities, attend community events, and become home owners. As an example, 71 percent of Panhandle residents agree with the statement that new residents in their community become home owners, compared to 53 percent of residents of the Northeast region.

Residents of the South Central region are the regional group most likely to agree with the statement that new residents in their community become members of a church.

When given the statement that more people should be encouraged to relocate to their community, persons living in both the Panhandle and North Central regions are the groups most likely to agree. Approximately 54 percent of residents in these regions agree with this statement, compared to 44 percent of persons living in the Northeast region of the state.

Looking at the responses by length of residence in the community show that newcomers to the community have different opinions about how new residents are viewed by the community as compared to opinions of longer term residents.
Newcomers to the community are less likely than longer term residents to agree that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome and that the community does a lot to include new residents. Forty-seven percent of persons living in their community for five years or less agree with the statement that new residents to their community are made to feel welcome, compared to 57 percent of persons living in the community for more than five years. Similarly, 27 percent of newcomers agree with the statement that the community does a lot to include new residents, compared to 37 percent of long term residents (Figure 4).

However, long term residents are more likely than newcomers to agree that new residents do not make an effort to get involved in their community. Twenty-seven percent of long-term residents agree with this statement, compared to 19 percent of newcomers in the community.

Newcomers to the community are more likely than long term residents to agree that new residents are often discriminated against. One quarter (25\%) of persons

Figure 4. Community Includes New Residents by Length of Residence in Community

living in their communities for five years or less agree that new residents are often discriminated against, compared to 18 percent of persons living in their communities for more than five years.

Long term residents are more likely than newcomers to the community to agree that new residents are often invited to join local organizations. Forty-eight percent of longterm residents agree with this statement, compared to 33 percent of newcomers.

Persons with higher household incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to agree with the following statements: new residents who move into my community improve the quality of life, new residents in my community become home owners, and new residents in my community become members of a church.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree with the following statements: new residents who move into my community improve the quality of life,
new residents to my community are made to feel welcome, my community does a lot to include new residents in the community, new residents in my community volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations, new residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities, new residents in my community become members of a church, new people moving into my community has been bad for the community, more people should be encouraged to relocate to my community, and new residents are often invited to join local organizations.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to agree with the following statements: new residents who move into my community improve the quality of life, new residents in my community attend community events, new residents in my community become members of a church, and more people should be encouraged to relocate to my community. Persons with less education are more likely than persons with more education to agree with the statement that their community does a lot to include new residents in the community.

Widowed respondents are more likely than the other marital groups to agree with the following statements: new residents to my community are made to feel welcome, my community does a lot to include new residents in the community, new residents in my community volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations, new residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities, new residents in my community become home owners, new residents in my community become members of a church, more people should be encouraged to relocate to my
community, and new residents are often invited to join local organizations. Persons who have never married are the marital group most likely to agree with the statement that new residents are often discriminated against.

Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group most likely to agree with the following statements: new residents do not make an effort to get involved in my community, new residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities, and new residents are often invited to join local organizations. They are the occupation group least likely to agree with the statement that new residents are often discriminated against. Persons with professional occupations are the group most likely to agree with the statements that new residents in my community become members of a church and more people should be encouraged to relocate to my community. Laborers are the group most likely to agree with the statement that new people moving into my community has been bad for the community.

## Expected Changes in Community Population Over Next Ten Years

Next, respondents were asked about changes they expect to see in the population of various groups in their community over the next ten years. Over one-half of rural Nebraskans expect to see an increase in retired persons (68\%) and immigrants (55\%) in their community over the next ten years (Figure 5). Almost one-half (49\%) expect the total population of their community to increase over the next ten years. Over onethird (36\%) of rural Nebraskans expect the population of young families in their community to decrease over the next ten

Figure 5. Expected Change in Population in Community Over Next Ten Years

years.

The responses to this question are analyzed by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 4). Many differences emerge.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to think the population of each of the groups will increase over the next ten years. Seventy percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more say their total community population will increase during the next ten years, compared to 30 percent of persons living in or near communities with less than 500 people (Figure 6). Over one-third (35\%) of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 expect their community's population to decrease over the next decade.

Figure 6. Expected Change in Total Community Population by Community Size


And, 73 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations of 10,000 or more think the number of immigrants will increase, compared to approximately 33 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000 .

Regional differences are detected for each items listed, with the exception of retired persons. Persons living in the South Central region are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to say that the population of young families, immigrants, single adults and total community population will increase over the next ten years. Sixty-five percent of persons living in the South Central region believe the number of immigrants will increase, compared to 41 percent of persons living in the North Central region. And, 59 percent of persons living in the South Central region believe their community's population will grow over the next ten years. Only 38 percent of persons living in the Southeast region share this opinion.

Persons with higher incomes are more likely than persons with lower incomes to believe the populations of young families, retired persons, immigrants and the total community population will increase over the next ten years. Younger persons are more likely than older persons to say that the number of young families, retired persons, immigrants, and the total community population will increase over the next decade.

Persons with higher education levels are more likely than persons with less education to think the number of retired persons, immigrants, and the total community population will grow over the next ten years. Persons with professional occupations are
the occupation group most likely to think the number of immigrants will increase. Farmers and ranchers are the occupation group least likely to think the number of young families, single adults and the total community population will grow during the next ten years.

Persons living in their community for more than five years are more likely than persons living in their community for five years or less to say the number of single adults will stay the same over the next decade.

## Conclusion

Almost two-thirds of rural Nebraskans are aware of new residents living in their community. No statistical differences for this question are detected by community size or region of the state. Thus, communities of all sizes across the state have experienced new people moving into them.

Many rural Nebraskans have no opinion about the impact new residents have had on their community. Less than one-third agree that new residents improve the quality of life in their community. One quarter disagree with this statement. Just under one-half disagree that new people moving into the community has been bad for the community. Almost one half agree that more people should be encouraged to relocate to their community. While over one-half think that new residents are made to feel welcome, just over one-third say their community does a lot to include new residents in the community.

The opinions about the impact new residents have had differs by many of the characteristics examined. Residents of the

Northeast region appear to have more of a negative attitude toward new residents as compared to residents of other regions. Almost one-quarter of residents of the Northeast region believe that new people moving into their community has been bad for the community.

Also, newcomers to the community (those living in the community for five years or less) are less likely than long-term residents to believe that new residents are made to feel welcome and the community does a lot to include new residents. In addition, one quarter of the newcomers say that new residents are often discriminated against. Thus, it would appear that some communities need to do a better job of welcoming and including new residents.

Over one-half of rural Nebraskans say new residents become members of a church and become home owners. Almost one-half say new residents attend community events. So, it appears new residents are doing their part to become assimilated into the community.

When asked about the future of their community, most rural Nebraskans expect to see population increases of retired persons and immigrants. Almost one half expect their community's total population to increase over the next decade. However, over one-third expect to see a decline in young families in their community.

Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to expect to see population increases of the various groups over the next ten years. In fact, when asked about the total community population, 70 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities expect the population to increase. However, only 30 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities expect to see their community's population grow.
Furthermore, over one-third of the residents
of the smallest communities expect to see a decline in their community's population. These small community residents see a continuing consolidation of population into the largest communities in the state.

## Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska


$\square$ Metropolitan counties (not surveyed)

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

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2003 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2002 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2001 \\ \text { Poll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age : ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-39 | 16\% | 15\% | 18\% | 18\% | 16\% | 17\% | 33\% |
| 40-64 | 52\% | 51\% | 49\% | 51\% | 51\% | 49\% | 42\% |
| 65 and over | 32\% | 34\% | 32\% | 32\% | 32\% | 33\% | 24\% |
| Gender: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 31\% | 32\% | 32\% | 51\% | 36\% | 37\% | 51\% |
| Male | 70\% | 69\% | 68\% | 49\% | 64\% | 63\% | 49\% |
| Education: ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than $9^{\text {th }}$ grade | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 7\% |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }}$ grade (no diploma) | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | 10\% |
| High school diploma (or equivalent) | 32\% | 33\% | 34\% | 34\% | 32\% | 35\% | 35\% |
| Some college, no degree | 25\% | 24\% | 24\% | 23\% | 25\% | 26\% | 25\% |
| Associate degree | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% | 11\% | 10\% | 8\% | 7\% |
| Bachelors degree | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 13\% | 11\% |
| Graduate or professional degree | 9\% | 10\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 8\% | 4\% |
| Household income: ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000 | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% |
| \$10,000-\$19,999 | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% |
| \$20,000-\$29,999 | 14\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 20\% | 17\% |
| \$30,000-\$39,999 | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 16\% | 15\% |
| \$40,000-\$49,999 | 15\% | 14\% | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 12\% |
| \$50,000-\$59,999 | 11\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 9\% | 10\% |
| \$60,000-\$74,999 | 11\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% |
| \$75,000 or more | 14\% | 13\% | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% | 8\% | 11\% |
| Marital Status: ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 69\% | 71\% | 69\% | 73\% | 73\% | 70\% | 61\% |
| Never married | 8\% | 7\% | 9\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | 22\% |
| Divorced/separated | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 9\% |
| Widowed/widower | 13\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 8\% |

${ }^{1} 2000$ Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.
${ }^{2} 2000$ Census universe is total non-metro population.
${ }^{3} 2000$ Census universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.
${ }^{4} 2000$ Census universe is all non-metro households.
${ }^{5} 2000$ Census universe is non-metro population 15 years of age and over.

Appendix Table 2. Awareness of New Residents in Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

|  | Are you aware of new residents (i.e., newcomers) living in your community? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No | Don't know | Chi-square (sig.) |
|  | Percentages |  |  |  |
| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2228$ ) |  |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 68 | 17 | 15 |  |
| 500-999 | 64 | 21 | 16 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 65 | 19 | 16 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 64 | 22 | 14 | $\chi^{2}=3.55$ |
| 10,000 and up | 65 | 21 | 15 | (.895) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2322$ ) |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 61 | 24 | 15 |  |
| North Central | 66 | 19 | 15 |  |
| South Central | 66 | 21 | 13 |  |
| Northeast | 65 | 18 | 17 | $\chi^{2}=11.68$ |
| Southeast | 61 | 20 | 19 | (.166) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=2084$ ) |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 57 | 19 | 25 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 61 | 21 | 18 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 68 | 21 | 11 | $\chi^{2}=56.56$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 72 | 19 | 10 | (.000) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2286$ ) |  |  |  |
| 19-29 | 54 | 27 | 19 |  |
| 30-39 | 62 | 23 | 14 |  |
| 40-49 | 65 | 23 | 13 |  |
| 50-64 | 69 | 19 | 11 | $\chi^{2}=46.89$ |
| 65 and older | 62 | 17 | 22 | (.000) |
| Gender | ( $\mathrm{n}=2264$ ) |  |  |  |
| Male | 67 | 20 | 14 | $\chi^{2}=12.48$ |
| Female | 60 | 21 | 19 | (.002) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2275$ ) |  |  |  |
| Married | 67 | 20 | 14 |  |
| Never married | 58 | 23 | 19 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 64 | 21 | 15 | $\chi^{2}=21.13$ |
| Widowed | 58 | 19 | 23 | (.002) |

Appendix Table 2 continued.
\(\left.\begin{array}{rcccc}\hline \hline \& Are you aware of new residents (i.e., newcomers) living in your <br>

community?\end{array}\right]\)| Don't know |
| :---: | Chi-square (sig.)


| New residents who move into my community improve the quality of life. | New residents do not make an effort to get involved in my community. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Disagree Neither Agree Sig. | Disagree Neither Arree Sig. |

## Percentages

| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2112$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2100$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 500 | 30 | 47 | 23 |  | 29 | 35 | 36 |  |
| 500-999 | 22 | 43 | 35 |  | 34 | 38 | 29 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 23 | 44 | 34 |  | 36 | 42 | 23 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 21 | 48 | 31 | $\chi^{2}=18.54$ | 34 | 45 | 21 | $\chi^{2}=28.09$ |
| 10,000 and up | 28 | 42 | 31 | (.018) | 34 | 42 | 23 | (.000) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2197$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2183$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 15 | 46 | 39 |  | 38 | 44 | 18 |  |
| North Central | 18 | 47 | 35 |  | 35 | 47 | 18 |  |
| South Central | 25 | 43 | 32 |  | 35 | 39 | 26 |  |
| Northeast | 32 | 42 | 26 | $\chi^{2}=43.52$ | 33 | 37 | 30 | $\chi^{2}=32.26$ |
| Southeast | 28 | 45 | 28 | (.000) | 27 | 44 | 29 | (.000) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=1983$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1969$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 26 | 47 | 27 |  | 30 | 46 | 24 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 25 | 46 | 29 |  | 29 | 43 | 28 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 25 | 45 | 30 | $\chi^{2}=19.73$ | 35 | 37 | 28 | $\chi^{2}=23.99$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 22 |  | 39 | (.003) | 40 | 39 | 21 | (.001) |
| Age | $(\mathrm{n}=2320)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2309$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 17 | 50 | 33 |  | 34 | 45 | 22 |  |
| 40-64 | 27 | 42 | 31 | $\chi^{2}=19.10$ | 34 | 41 | 25 | $\chi^{2}=7.71$ |
| 65 and older | 25 |  | 33 | (.001) | 31 | 40 | 29 | (.103) |
| Gender | $(\mathrm{n}=2142)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2127$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 26 | 44 | 30 | $\chi^{2}=2.12$ | 34 | 40 | 27 | $\chi^{2}=6.54$ |
| Female | 23 |  | 33 | (.346) | 34 | 44 | 22 | (.038) |
| Education | $(\mathrm{n}=2137)$ |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=2120)$ |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 28 | 47 | 25 |  | 29 | 42 | 29 |  |
| Some college | 27 | 43 | 30 | $\chi^{2}=48.58$ | 33 | 43 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=26.33$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 17 | 41 | 42 | (.000) | 42 | 37 | 21 | (.000) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2153$ ) |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=2138)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 25 | 44 | 32 |  | 34 | 40 | 26 |  |
| Never married | 23 | 51 | 27 |  | 35 | 39 | 26 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 29 | 44 | 27 | $\chi^{2}=7.28$ | 33 | 46 | 21 | $\chi^{2}=6.63$ |
| Widowed | 23 | 43 | 34 | (.296) | 31 | 46 | 23 | (.357) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1627$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1623$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 21 | 41 | 38 |  | 38 | 38 | 25 |  |
| Laborer | 26 | 47 | 27 |  | 29 | 45 | 26 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 25 | 49 | 26 | $\chi^{2}=17.82$ | 29 | 43 | 29 | $\chi^{2}=15.18$ |
| Other | 21 | 45 | 34 | (.007) | 34 | 45 | 21 | (.019) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2077$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2063$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 19 | 48 | 34 | $\chi^{2}=6.66$ | 30 | 51 | 19 | $\chi^{2}=13.61$ |
| More than five years | 26 | 44 | 30 | (.036) | 34 | 39 | 27 | (.001) |

New residents to my community are
made to feel welcome.
Disagree Neither Agree Sig.

My community does a lot to include new residents in the community. Disagree Neither Agree Sig.

Percentages

| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2132$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2112$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 500 | 13 | 26 | 61 |  | 28 | 37 | 36 |  |
| 500-999 | 10 | 28 | 62 |  | 23 | 37 | 41 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 20 | 27 | 54 |  | 29 | 37 | 34 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 16 | 27 | 57 | $\chi^{2}=34.82$ | 26 | 41 | 34 | $\chi^{2}=13.33$ |
| 10,000 and up | 12 | 35 | 53 | (.000) | 22 | 43 | 35 | (.101) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2217$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2194$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 15 | 28 | 57 |  | 27 | 41 | 33 |  |
| North Central | 13 | 27 | 60 |  | 26 | 40 | 34 |  |
| South Central | 15 | 29 | 56 |  | 26 | 37 | 37 |  |
| Northeast | 12 | 33 | 55 | $\chi^{2}=11.30$ | 19 | 41 | 41 | $\chi^{2}=21.87$ |
| Southeast | 18 |  | 55 | (.185) | 30 | 40 | 30 | (.005) |
| Income Level | $(\mathrm{n}=1998)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1979$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 15 | 29 | 56 |  | 25 | 35 | 40 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 13 | 31 | 56 |  | 25 | 38 | 37 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 18 | 29 | 54 | $\chi^{2}=6.14$ | 29 | 40 | 31 | $\chi^{2}=14.62$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 13 |  | 56 | (.408) | 22 | 42 | 36 | (.023) |
| Age | $(\mathrm{n}=2344)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2319$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 20 | 29 | 52 |  | 34 | 41 | 26 |  |
| 40-64 | 15 | 33 | 52 | $\chi^{2}=43.72$ | 25 | 41 | 34 | $\chi^{2}=53.55$ |
| 65 and older | 10 |  | 66 | (.000) | 20 | 35 | 45 | (.000) |
| Gender | $(\mathrm{n}=2160)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2137$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 14 | 30 | 56 | $\chi^{2}=2.76$ | 24 | 40 | 36 | $\chi^{2}=4.22$ |
| Female | 16 | 29 | 54 | (.252) | 28 | 37 | 35 | (.121) |
| Education | ( $\mathrm{n}=2157$ ) |  |  | (.252) $\quad(\mathrm{n}=2133)$ |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 12 | 30 | 59 |  | 21 | 38 | 41 |  |
| Some college | 17 | 31 | 53 | $\chi^{2}=10.94$ | 28 | 40 | 33 | $\chi^{2}=16.14$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 16 | 28 | 56 | (.027) | 27 | 40 | 33 | (.003) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2171$ ) |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=2148)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 14 | 30 | 56 |  | 25 | 40 | 36 |  |
| Never married | 16 | 33 | 51 |  | 34 | 36 | 30 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 19 | 32 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=13.29$ | 27 | 39 | 34 | $\chi^{2}=15.81$ |
| Widowed | 11 | 26 | 63 | (.039) | 20 | 37 | 44 | (.015) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1630$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1628$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 18 | 30 | 53 |  | 28 | 42 | 30 |  |
| Laborer | 14 | 31 | 55 |  | 24 | 44 | 32 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 13 | 28 | 60 | $\chi^{2}=7.69$ | 26 | 43 | 31 | $\chi^{2}=4.79$ |
| Other | 14 | 33 | 53 | (.262) | 26 | 39 | 35 | (.570) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | $14 \quad(\mathrm{n}=2099)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2082$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 24 | 29 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=19.51$ | 33 | 40 | 27 | $\chi^{2}=13.39$ |
| More than five years | 14 | 30 | 57 | (.000) | 24 | 39 | 37 | (.001) |


|  | New residents in my community volunteer or donate money to local faith or community organizations. |  |  |  | New residents in my community seek public office or other similar activities. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Sig. | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Sig. |
|  | Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Size |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2036$ ) |  |  |  | = 2042) |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 32 | 44 | 24 |  | 39 | 44 | 17 |  |
| 500-999 | 27 | 46 | 28 |  | 30 | 54 | 16 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 20 | 51 | 29 |  | 30 | 45 | 25 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 21 | 55 | 25 | $\chi^{2}=37.00$ | 26 | 55 | 19 | $\chi^{2}=47.54$ |
| 10,000 and up | 23 | 57 | 20 | (.000) | 33 | 54 | 13 | (.000) |
| Region |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2110$ ) |  |  |  | = 2118) |  |  |
| Panhandle | 17 | 55 | 29 |  | 26 | 49 | 26 |  |
| North Central | 19 | 53 | 28 |  | 28 | 53 | 20 |  |
| South Central | 22 | 52 | 26 |  | 32 | 51 | 18 |  |
| Northeast | 29 | 49 | 22 | $\chi^{2}=25.10$ | 37 | 47 | 16 | $\chi^{2}=22.69$ |
| Southeast | 27 | 52 | 21 | (.001) | 33 | 53 | 15 | (.004) |
| Income Level |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1907$ ) |  |  |  | = 1918) |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 23 | 50 | 27 |  | 27 | 53 | 21 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 24 | 51 | 24 |  | 30 | 51 | 19 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 24 | 53 | 23 | $\chi^{2}=2.01$ | 36 | 48 | 16 | $\chi^{2}=11.23$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 23 | 53 | 25 | (.919) | 35 | 50 | 16 | (.081) |
| Age |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2227$ ) |  |  |  | = 2237) |  |  |
| 19-39 | 18 | 58 | 24 |  | 33 | 55 | 12 |  |
| 40-64 | 25 | 54 | 22 | $\chi^{2}=30.95$ | 33 | 50 | 17 | $\chi^{2}=27.87$ |
| 65 and older | 25 | 45 | 31 | (.000) | 27 | 49 | 24 | (.000) |
| Gender |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2055$ ) |  |  |  | = 2062) |  |  |
| Male | 25 | 52 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=2.85$ | 33 | 50 | 17 | $\chi^{2}=2.73$ |
| Female | 21 | 53 | 26 | (.240) | 30 | 50 | 20 | (.256) |
| Education |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2052$ ) |  |  |  | = 2060) |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 24 | 53 | 23 |  | 26 | 54 | 20 |  |
| Some college | 26 | 51 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=6.36$ | 36 | 48 | 17 | $\chi^{2}=18.96$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 21 | 52 | 28 | (.174) | 35 | 48 | 17 | (.001) |
| Marital Status |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2066$ ) |  |  |  | = 2073) |  |  |
| Married | 25 | 51 | 24 |  | 33 | 50 | 17 |  |
| Never married | 20 | 54 | 26 |  | 35 | 48 | 16 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 23 | 58 | 19 | $\chi^{2}=17.44$ | 28 | 52 | 20 | $\chi^{2}=21.35$ |
| Widowed | 18 | 49 | 34 | (.008) | 22 | 52 | 27 | (.002) |
| Occupation |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1581$ ) |  |  |  | = 1600) |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 24 | 54 | 22 |  | 38 | 48 | 14 |  |
| Laborer | 25 | 56 | 19 |  | 29 | 55 | 16 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 23 | 52 | 26 | $\chi^{2}=7.43$ | 24 | 54 | 22 | $\chi^{2}=18.87$ |
| Other | 20 | 56 | 25 | (.283) | 31 | 51 | 18 | (.004) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2000$ ) |  |  |  | = 2009) |  |  |
| Five years or less | 19 | 58 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=3.89$ | 28 | 60 | 12 | $\chi^{2}=9.06$ |
| More than five years | 24 | 51 | 25 | (.143) | 33 | 49 | 18 | (.011) |

Appendix Table 3 continued.

|  | New residents in my community attend community events. |  |  |  | New residents in my community become home owners. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Sig. | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Sig. |
|  | Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2082$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2105$ ) |  |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 23 | 32 | 45 |  | 24 | 26 | 50 |  |
| 500-999 | 19 | 35 | 46 |  | 13 | 31 | 56 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 13 | 35 | 53 |  | 12 | 28 | 61 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 12 | 39 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=30.25$ | 9 | 22 | 70 | $\chi^{2}=43.89$ |
| 10,000 and up | 16 | 41 | 44 | (.000) | 15 | 26 | 59 | (.000) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2161$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2188$ ) |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 10 | 36 | 54 |  | 9 | 21 | 71 |  |
| North Central | 12 | 38 | 50 |  | 11 | 32 | 58 |  |
| South Central | 14 | 35 | 51 |  | 14 | 23 | 63 |  |
| Northeast | 21 | 39 | 41 | $\chi^{2}=35.89$ | 20 | 27 | 53 | $\chi^{2}=45.48$ |
| Southeast | 20 | $39$ | 41 | (.000) | 15 | 30 | 55 | (.000) |
| Income Level | $(\mathrm{n}=1949)$ |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1979$ ) |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 17 | 37 | 46 |  | 15 | 29 | 56 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 16 | 40 | 44 |  | 15 | 29 | 57 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 17 | 36 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=5.79$ | 16 | 28 | 56 | $\chi^{2}=13.29$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 14 | 35 | 51 | (.447) | 13 | 22 | 65 | (.039) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2281$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2314$ ) |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 13 | 39 | 48 |  | 10 | 28 | 62 |  |
| 40-64 | 16 | 39 | 45 | $\chi^{2}=9.74$ | 16 | 27 | 57 | $\chi^{2}=14.87$ |
| 65 and older | 17 | 33 | 50 | (.045) | 14 | 23 | 63 | (.005) |
| Gender | ( $\mathrm{n}=2105$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2132$ ) |  |  |  |
| Male | 16 | 38 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=0.21$ | 16 | 26 | 59 | $\chi^{2}=7.77$ |
| Female | 16 | 36 | 47 | (.900) | 11 |  | 61 | (.021) |
| Education |  | $\mathrm{n}=2102)$ |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=2130)$ |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 17 | 38 | 45 |  | 16 | 27 | 56 |  |
| Some college | 17 | 38 | 45 | $\chi^{2}=12.61$ | 15 | 27 | 59 | $\chi^{2}=9.83$ |
| Bach./grad degree | $12 \quad \begin{gathered}35 \\ (\mathrm{n}=2115\end{gathered}$ |  |  | (.013) | 12 | 24 | 64 | (.043) |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2143$ ) |  |  |  |
| Married | 16 | 37 | 47 |  | 15 | 26 | 60 |  |
| Never married | 15 | 38 | 47 |  | 14 | 32 | 55 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 16 | 41 | 43 | $\chi^{2}=4.75$ | 14 | 32 | 54 | $\chi^{2}=13.84$ |
| Widowed | 14 | 34 | 52 | (.576) | 12 | 21 | 67 | (.031) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1610$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1630$ ) |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 14 | 38 | 48 |  | 14 | 24 | 62 |  |
| Laborer | 15 | 40 | 45 |  | 15 | 27 | 58 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 16 | 32 | 52 | $\chi^{2}=6.88$ | 15 | 26 | 59 | $\chi^{2}=6.30$ |
| Other | 15 | 41 | 43 | (.332) | 13 | 30 | 57 | (.391) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2049$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2076$ ) |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 13 | 45 | 42 | $\chi^{2}=5.94$ | 8 | 29 | 62 | $\chi^{2}=8.87$ |
| More than five years | 16 | 37 | 47 | (.051) | 16 | 26 | 59 | (.012) |

Disagree represents the combined responses of "strongly disagree" and "disagree". Similarly, agree is the combined responses of "strongly agree" and "agree." Respondents were also given the option of checking "doesn't apply," those responses were excluded from this analysis.

## New residents in my community become New people moving into my community has members of a church. been bad for the community.

Disagree Neither Agree Sig. Disagree Neither Agree Sig.

| Community Size | Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2068$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2099$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 24 | 41 | 36 |  | 42 | 37 | 20 |  |
| 500-999 | 17 | 41 | 43 |  | 47 | 40 | 14 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 10 | 33 | 57 |  | 50 | 37 | 14 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 9 | 36 | 55 | $\chi^{2}=79.79$ | 46 | 39 | 14 | $\chi^{2}=22.20$ |
| 10,000 and up | 9 | 37 | 55 | (.000) | 43 | 35 | 22 | (.005) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2153$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2182$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 11 | 40 | 49 |  | 55 | 33 | 13 |  |
| North Central | 9 | 38 | 53 |  | 51 | 38 | 11 |  |
| South Central | 10 | 34 | 56 |  | 47 | 35 | 18 |  |
| Northeast | 14 | 34 | 52 | $\chi^{2}=21.17$ | 40 | 36 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=42.36$ |
| Southeast | 14 | 42 | 44 | (.007) | 40 | 43 | 18 | (.000) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=1941$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1969$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 15 | 38 | 47 |  | 39 | 41 | 20 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 13 | 38 | 50 |  | 41 | 41 | 18 |  |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | 12 | 39 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=15.72$ | 49 | 34 | 17 | $\chi^{2}=24.95$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 9 |  | 58 | (.015) | 53 | 31 | 16 | (.000) |
| Age | $(\mathrm{n}=2276)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2306$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 9 | 41 | 50 |  | 48 | 41 | 12 |  |
| 40-64 | 12 | 39 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=17.94$ | 44 | 37 | 19 | $\chi^{2}=15.96$ |
| 65 and older | 12 |  | 57 | (.001) | 48 | 34 | 19 | (.003) |
| Gender | $(\mathrm{n}=2096)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2126$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 11 | 37 | 52 | $\chi^{2}=2.50$ | 46 | 36 | 18 | $\chi^{2}=0.53$ |
| Female | 14 |  | 51 | (.286) | 45 | 38 | 17 | (.769) |
| Education | $(\mathrm{n}=2094)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2124$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 14 | 38 | 48 |  | 39 | 41 | 20 |  |
| Some college | 12 | 36 | 52 | $\chi^{2}=10.36$ | 44 | 38 | 18 | $\chi^{2}=40.62$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 9 | 36 | 55 | (.035) | 57 | 29 | 14 | (.000) |
| Marital Status | $(\mathrm{n}=2107)$ |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=2137)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 11 | 36 | 53 |  | 46 | 36 | 17 |  |
| Never married | 10 | 44 | 45 |  | 45 | 40 | 16 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 10 | 46 | 44 | $\chi^{2}=20.33$ | 39 | 37 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=8.36$ |
| Widowed | 16 | 29 | 55 | (.002) | 46 | 37 | 17 | (.213) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1604$ ) |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=1613)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 9 | 35 | 55 |  | 52 | 33 | 15 |  |
| Laborer | 12 | 39 | 48 |  | 37 | 43 | 21 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 15 | 38 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=12.97$ | 48 | 41 | 12 | $\chi^{2}=27.08$ |
| Other | 10 | $42$ | 48 | (.043) | 44 | 40 | 16 | (.000) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2039$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2068$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 9 | 39 | 53 | $\chi^{2}=2.53$ | 46 | 41 | 13 | $\chi^{2}=5.12$ |
| More than five years | 12 | 36 | 51 | (.282) | 45 | 36 | 19 | (.077) |

Disagree represents the combined responses of "strongly disagree" and "disagree". Similarly, agree is the combined responses of "strongly agree" and "agree." Respondents were also given the option of checking "doesn’t apply," those responses were excluded from this analysis.

Appendix Table 3 continued.

## More people should be encouraged to New residents are often discriminated relocate to my community. <br> against.

Disagree Neither Agree Sig.
Percentages

| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2113$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2111$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 500 | 18 | 33 | 49 |  | 50 | 37 | 13 |  |
| 500-999 | 7 | 33 | 60 |  | 54 | 32 | 14 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 17 | 30 | 54 |  | 48 | 34 | 19 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 14 | 39 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=39.79$ | 44 | 38 | 18 | $\chi^{2}=28.28$ |
| 10,000 and up | 19 | 39 | 42 | (.000) | 40 | 38 | 23 | (.000) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2198$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2195$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 15 | 31 | 55 |  | 48 | 36 | 16 |  |
| North Central | 12 | 34 | 54 |  | 49 | 35 | 16 |  |
| South Central | 18 | 32 | 50 |  | 46 | 36 | 17 |  |
| Northeast | 16 | 40 | 44 | $\chi^{2}=20.23$ | 40 | 36 | 24 | $\chi^{2}=19.47$ |
| Southeast | 18 | 36 | 46 | (.010) | 47 | 37 | 16 | (.013) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=1984$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1981$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 17 | 37 | 47 |  | 40 | 37 | 23 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 14 | 38 | 47 |  | 43 | 40 | 18 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 17 | 36 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=10.47$ | 47 | 33 | 20 | $\chi^{2}=14.75$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 16 | 30 | 54 | (.106) | 49 | 35 | 16 | (.022) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2319$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2321$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 15 | 42 | 43 |  | 42 | 35 | 23 |  |
| 40-64 | 16 | 35 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=13.67$ | 45 | 36 | 19 | $\chi^{2}=2.87$ |
| 65 and older | 16 |  | 53 | (.008) | 44 | 36 | 20 | (.580) |
| Gender | $(\mathrm{n}=2140)$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2140$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 17 | 34 | 49 | $\chi^{2}=4.54$ | 46 | 36 | 18 | $\chi^{2}=3.90$ |
| Female | 14 | 38 | 48 | (.103) | 42 | 37 | 21 | (.142) |
| Education | ( $\mathrm{n}=2136$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2137$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 17 | 40 | 43 |  | 44 | 38 | 18 |  |
| Some college | 18 | 34 | 48 | $\chi^{2}=37.42$ | 44 | 36 | 21 | $\chi^{2}=5.50$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 12 | 29 | 59 | (.000) | 48 | 34 | 18 | (.239) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2151$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2151$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 16 | 34 | 50 |  | 47 | 35 | 18 |  |
| Never married | 11 | 47 | 43 |  | 36 | 37 | 27 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 18 | 37 | 44 | $\chi^{2}=16.64$ | 38 | 41 | 21 | $\chi^{2}=16.57$ |
| Widowed | 16 | 30 | 54 | (.011) | 44 | 38 | 18 | (.011) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1629$ ) |  |  | $(\mathrm{n}=1626)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 14 | 31 | 56 |  | 44 | 36 | 21 |  |
| Laborer | 19 | 45 | 36 |  | 39 | 39 | 22 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 14 | 35 | 51 | $\chi^{2}=37.15$ | 52 | 36 | 12 | $\chi^{2}=13.12$ |
| Other | 16 | 38 | 47 | (.000) | 43 | 37 | 20 | (.041) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2083$ ) |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2084$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 18 | 35 | 47 | $\chi^{2}=0.53$ | 41 | 33 | 25 | $\chi^{2}=8.14$ |
| More than five years | 16 | 35 | 49 | (.766) | 46 | 37 | 18 | (.017) |

Disagree represents the combined responses of "strongly disagree" and "disagree". Similarly, agree is the combined responses of "strongly agree" and "agree." Respondents were also given the option of checking "doesn’t apply," those responses were excluded from this analysis.

Appendix Table 3 continued.

|  | New residents are often invited to join local organizations. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Sig. |
| Community Size | Percentages |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2106$ ) |
| Less than 500 | 13 | 33 | 55 |  |
| 500-999 | 11 | 31 | 58 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 14 | 35 | 51 |  |
| 5,000-9,999 | 15 | 46 | 39 | $\chi^{2}=49.99$ |
| 10,000 and up | 13 | 47 | 39 | (.000) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2191$ ) |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 13 | 37 | 49 |  |
| North Central | 12 | 34 | 54 |  |
| South Central | 14 | 40 | 46 |  |
| Northeast | 13 | 43 | 44 | $\chi^{2}=10.95$ |
| Southeast | 14 | 42 | 44 | (.205) |
| Income Level | $(\mathrm{n}=1978)$ |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 16 | 37 | 47 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 12 | 45 | 44 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 15 | 40 | 45 | $\chi^{2}=8.75$ |
| \$60,000 and over | 13 | 40 | 48 | (.188) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2316$ ) |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 16 | 44 | 40 |  |
| 40-64 | 14 | 43 | 43 | $\chi^{2}=32.85$ |
| 65 and older | 12 | 34 | 55 | (.000) |
| Gender | ( $\mathrm{n}=2134$ ) |  |  |  |
| Male | 14 | 40 | 46 | $\chi^{2}=0.21$ |
| Female | 13 | 40 | 47 | (.900) |
| Education | $(\mathrm{n}=2131)$ |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 12 | 41 | 47 |  |
| Some college | 15 | 42 | 43 | $\chi^{2}=5.60$ |
| Bach./grad degree | 13 | 38 | 49 | (.231) |
| Marital Status | $(\mathrm{n}=2145)$ |  |  |  |
| Married | 14 | 39 | 47 |  |
| Never married | 13 | 47 | 41 |  |
| Divorced/separated | 15 | 46 | 40 | $\chi^{2}=13.83$ |
| Widowed | 10 | 37 | 53 | (.032) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1619$ ) |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 15 | 42 | 44 |  |
| Laborer | 14 | 48 | 38 |  |
| Farming/ranching | 12 | 34 | 54 | $\chi^{2}=14.98$ |
| Other | 14 | 44 | 42 | (.020) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2075$ ) |  |  |  |
| Five years or less | 25 | 43 | 33 | $\chi^{2}=38.12$ |
| More than five years | 12 | 40 | 48 | (.000) |

Disagree represents the combined responses of "strongly disagree" and "disagree". Similarly, agree is the combined responses of "strongly agree" and "agree." Respondents were also given the option of checking "doesn’t apply," those responses were excluded from this analysis.

Appendix Table 4. Expected Changes in Community Population Over the Next Ten Years by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

|  | Young families |  |  |  |  | Retired persons |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Decrease | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stay } \\ \text { Same } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Increase | Don't know | Sig. | Decrease | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stay } \\ \text { Same } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Increase | Don't <br> know | Sig. |
|  | Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2254$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2258$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 46 | 25 | 23 | 5 |  | 11 | 26 | 59 | 4 |  |
| 500-999 | 42 | 27 | 24 | 7 |  | 7 | 20 | 67 | 6 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 48 | 21 | 25 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 7 | 17 | 72 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| 5,000-9,999 | 29 | 32 | 34 | 5 | 150.5 | 9 | 19 | 69 | 4 | 26.65 |
| 10,000 and up | 23 | 27 | 45 | 5 | (.000) | 8 | 17 | 72 | 3 | (.009) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2333$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2338$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 38 | 25 | 32 | 5 |  | 7 | 20 | 70 | 3 |  |
| North Central | 44 | 23 | 26 | 7 |  | 9 | 16 | 69 | 5 |  |
| South Central | 31 | 23 | 40 | 5 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 7 | 17 | 72 | 3 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Northeast | 33 | 29 | 32 | 6 | 47.3 | 9 | 22 | 65 | 4 | 16.7 |
| Southeast | 39 | 29 | 26 | 6 | (.000) | 9 | 19 | 67 | 5 | (.162) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=2098$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2098$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 32 | 24 | 34 | 10 |  | 10 | 20 | 63 | 7 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 39 | 25 | 31 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 9 | 19 | 68 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 39 | 27 | 30 | 4 | 40.7 | 8 | 19 | 71 | 2 | 28.1 |
| \$60,000 and over | 31 | 28 | 38 | 3 | (.000) | 8 | 16 | 74 | 2 | (.001) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2300$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2305$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 27 | 25 | 44 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 8 | 18 | 71 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| 40-64 | 40 | 26 | 30 | 4 | 66.7 | 9 | 18 | 71 | 3 | 26.5 |
| 65 and older | 34 | 27 | 30 | 10 | (.000) | 8 | 23 | 63 | 6 | (.000) |
| Gender | ( $\mathrm{n}=2278$ ) |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}=$ | ( $\mathrm{n}=2283$ ) |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Male | 37 | 26 | 32 | 5 | 19.7 | 8 | 19 | 70 | 4 | 6.5 |
| Female | 33 | 25 | 34 | 9 | (.000) | 9 | 19 | 66 | 6 | (.088) |
| Education | ( $\mathrm{n}=2270$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2275$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 34 | 27 | 31 | 9 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 11 | 22 | 61 | 7 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Some college | 39 | 24 | 32 | 5 | 27.7 | 9 | 18 | 70 | 3 | 74.4 |
| Bach./grad degree | 34 | 28 | 36 | 3 | (.000) | 4 | 15 | 79 | 2 | (.000) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2289$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2294$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 37 | 26 | 33 | 5 |  | 8 | 19 | 69 | 3 |  |
| Never married | 29 | 30 | 35 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 5 | 18 | 73 | 5 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Divorced/separated | 37 | 27 | 29 | 7 | 23.2 | 9 | 19 | 65 | 6 | 16.2 |
| Widowed | 37 | 21 | 32 | 11 | (.006) | 9 | 19 | 65 | 7 | (.064) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1552$ ) |  |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=1555$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 37 | 23 | 38 | 3 |  | 8 | 16 | 75 | 2 |  |
| Laborer | 33 | 29 | 34 | 5 | $\chi^{2}=$ | 9 | 20 | 67 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Farming/ranching | 56 | 21 | 16 | 6 | 58.5 | 11 | 20 | 66 | 4 | 13.2 |
| Other | 33 | 28 | 36 | 4 | (.000) | 8 | 16 | 74 | 3 | (.154) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2203$ ) |  |  | $\chi^{2}=$ |  |  | ( $\mathrm{n}=2207$ ) |  |  | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Five years or less | 32 | 22 | 39 | 7 | 7.8 | 6 | 18 | 68 | 7 | 9.8 |
| More than five years | 36 | 26 | 32 | 6 | (.050) | 9 | 19 | 69 | 3 | (.020) |

Appendix Table 4 continued.


Appendix Table 4 continued.

|  | Total population |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Decrease | Stay Same | Increase | Don't know | Sig. |
|  | Percentages |  |  |  |  |
| Community Size | ( $\mathrm{n}=2252$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 500 | 35 | 26 | 30 | 9 |  |
| 500-999 | 35 | 25 | 32 | 7 |  |
| 1,000-4,999 | 31 | 26 | 36 | 7 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| 5,000-9,999 | 14 | 28 | 50 | 8 | 305.7 |
| 10,000 and up | 8 | 17 | 70 | 6 | (.000) |
| Region | ( $\mathrm{n}=2332$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Panhandle | 20 | 25 | 48 | 7 |  |
| North Central | 32 | 20 | 39 | 9 |  |
| South Central | 17 | 18 | 59 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Northeast | 19 | 25 | 49 | 7 | 81.1 |
| Southeast | 25 | 29 | 38 | 9 | (.000) |
| Income Level | ( $\mathrm{n}=2094$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Under \$20,000 | 23 | 20 | 44 | 13 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 23 | 23 | 47 | 7 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 22 | 24 | 50 | 4 | 56.5 |
| \$60,000 and over | 19 | 21 | 57 | 3 | (.000) |
| Age | ( $\mathrm{n}=2298$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 19-39 | 20 | 20 | 56 | 4 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| 40-64 | 23 | 22 | 50 | 5 | 64.7 |
| 65 and older | 20 | 25 | 43 | 13 | (.000) |
| Gender | $(\mathrm{n}=2276) \quad \chi^{2}=$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 22 | 23 | 50 | 6 | 19.3 |
| Female | 21 | 22 | 46 | 11 | (.000) |
| Education | ( $\mathrm{n}=2268$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| H.S. diploma or less | 19 | 23 | 46 | 11 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Some college | 24 | 23 | 48 | 5 | 43.4 |
| Bach./grad degree | 21 | 21 | 54 | 4 | (.000) |
| Marital Status | ( $\mathrm{n}=2287$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 22 | 23 | 50 | 5 |  |
| Never married | 24 | 18 | 51 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Divorced/separated | 20 | 19 | 52 | 9 | 68.0 |
| Widowed | 17 | 26 | 38 | 18 | (.000) |
| Occupation | ( $\mathrm{n}=1551$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Prof./technical/admin | 22 | 19 | 56 | 3 |  |
| Laborer | 18 | 25 | 52 | 6 | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Farming/ranching | 40 | 23 | 32 | 6 | 59.6 |
| Other | 19 | 22 | 53 | 5 | (.000) |
| Yrs Lived in Comm. | ( $\mathrm{n}=2202$ ) |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}=$ |
| Five years or less | 19 | 19 | 54 | 8 | 5.0 |
| More than five years | 22 | 23 | 48 | 7 | (.173) |
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