

August 1997

Community Life in Rural Nebraska: Results from the 1997 Annual Nebraska Rural Poll

John C. Allen

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, jallen1@unl.edu

Sam Cordes

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, scordes1@unl.edu

Rebecca Filkins

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, rvogt2@unl.edu

Amy M. Smith

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Eric Jarecki

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/caripubs>

 Part of the [Rural Sociology Commons](#)

Allen, John C.; Cordes, Sam; Filkins, Rebecca; Smith, Amy M.; and Jarecki, Eric, "Community Life in Rural Nebraska: Results from the 1997 Annual Nebraska Rural Poll" (1997). *Publications from the Center for Applied Rural Innovation (CARI)*. 35.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/caripubs/35>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the CARI: Center for Applied Rural Innovation at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications from the Center for Applied Rural Innovation (CARI) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



THE CENTER FOR RURAL COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A Working Paper*

**Community Life in Rural Nebraska: Results
from the 1997 Annual Nebraska Rural Poll****

John C. Allen
Sam Cordes
Rebecca Filkins
Amy M. Smith
Eric Jarecki



University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources



Center Working Paper 97-2, August 1997.

*Working Papers are used to present preliminary policy and programmatic ideas and research findings to a limited audience in a timely manner. Working Papers have not necessarily been peer reviewed and the content is the sole responsibility of the author(s). Any questions, suggestions, or concerns should be sent directly to the author(s).

**Funding for this project was provided by the Partnership for Rural Nebraska, the Cooperative Extension Division of the Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Center for Rural Community Revitalization and Development. Additionally, considerable in-kind support and contributions were provided by a number of individuals and organizations associated with the Partnership for Rural Nebraska. A special note of appreciation is extended to the staff and student workers in the Center for Rural Community Revitalization and Development for data entry and administrative and staff support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY AND RESPONDENT PROFILE.....	1
1997 RURAL POLL FINDINGS	3
My community has changed for the... (Figure 1).....	3
Dissatisfaction with Services and Amenities, 1997 (Figure 2).....	6
Regions of Nebraska (Figure 3).....	7
Is the supply of housing sufficient in your community? (Figure 4).....	8
Has lack of affordable housing hurt population and economic growth? (Figure 5).....	9
How would the following affect the quality of life in your community?	
Consolidation of... (Figure 6)	11
How would the following affect the quality of life in your community?	
Growth in community population by adding... (Figure 7).....	12
COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE 1996 AND 1997 RURAL POLLS.....	14
Community Change, 1996 and 1997 (Figure 8).....	14
Table 1 Demographic Profile of 1996 and 1997 Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 1990 Census....	16
Table 2 Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997	17
Table 3 Level of Satisfaction with Services and Amenities, 1997	19
Table 4 Measures of Satisfaction with Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Structure, Region, and Individual Attributes, 1997	20
Table 5 Community Housing Supply Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997	22
Table 6 Issues Affecting Community Quality of Life by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997	24
Table 7 Growth in Community Population Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.....	26
Table 8 Measures of Community Attributes, 1996 and 1997.....	28

Executive Summary

This working paper presents findings from the second annual Nebraska Rural Poll. The study is based on 3,264 responses from households in the 87 non-metropolitan counties in the state. The objectives of this paper are to answer the following questions:

1. How do rural Nebraskans perceive changes occurring in their community?
2. How do rural Nebraskans describe their communities: friendly or unfriendly, trusting or distrusting, supportive or hostile?
3. How satisfied are rural Nebraskans with various services and amenities; and how does satisfaction vary by community size, region, household income, age, gender, education and marital status?
4. Do rural Nebraskans believe there is a shortage of affordable housing in their community; and how do they feel this shortage has affected the community's population and economic growth?
5. How do rural Nebraskans believe the consolidation of public schools, health care and local government would affect the quality of life in their community; and how do these perceptions vary by community size, region, and various individual attributes?
6. How do rural Nebraskans feel that population growth by adding different demographic segments (e.g., elderly residents, young families, members of minority groups) would affect the quality of life in their community?

Key findings include the following:

- Eighty-one percent of rural Nebraskans believe their community has either changed for the better or remained the same and nineteen percent think it has changed for the worse. The proportion of respondents who believe their community has changed for the worse decreased slightly between 1996 and 1997.
- Certain groups were more likely than others to think their community has changed for the better. These groups include: respondents in larger communities, those with higher educational levels, older respondents and respondents with higher household incomes.
- Overall, rural Nebraskans view their community as friendly, trusting and supportive. These proportions remained relatively stable between 1996 and 1997. Respondents from smaller communities, older respondents and the widowed were more likely to believe their communities possessed these attributes.
- Over one-third of rural Nebraskans expressed dissatisfaction with the following services and amenities: entertainment, retail shopping, city/village government and streets/highways.
- Respondents' satisfaction levels with individual services and amenities varied by certain characteristics (community size, region, income, age, education and marital status). However, no systematic pattern existed across all of the services/amenities.
- Over one-half of rural Nebraskans feel there is not an adequate supply of affordable housing in their community. Furthermore, seventy-seven percent of

those respondents feel this shortage of housing has hurt their community's population and economic growth.

- Many rural Nebraskans believe the consolidation of public schools, health care and local government would reduce the quality of life in their community. The greatest concern was expressed about the consolidation of schools. However, certain groups were more likely to think the consolidation of these services would improve the quality of life in their community: respondents in larger communities, persons in the Panhandle region and respondents with higher educational levels.
- Most rural Nebraskans think population growth by adding young families to their community would improve the quality of life of their community. On the other hand, almost one-half believe adding members of minority groups would decrease the quality of life in their community.

Introduction

Rural Nebraskans have faced many challenges in their communities. In many regions of the state, community population peaked between 1920 and 1930, and in some cases even earlier. In other regions, rapid expansion of population has occurred. During the past decades, a global economy has developed and the agricultural and food industry, as well as other sectors of the economy have changed dramatically. All of these changes have had an impact on communities and community life. As a consequence, rural Nebraskans were polled about a variety of specific issues related to their community.

Methodology and Respondent Profile

This study is based on 3,264 responses from Nebraskans living in non-metropolitan counties in the state. A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in April 1997 to 6,400 randomly selected households. Metropolitan counties not included in the sample were the six Nebraska counties that are part of the Omaha, Lincoln, and Sioux City metropolitan areas. All of the other 87 counties in the state were sampled. The 14 page questionnaire included questions pertaining to well-being, community, government policy, and work. This paper will report only on the community portion of the survey.

A 51% response rate was achieved using the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978). The sequence of steps in the survey process were:

1. A “pre-notification” letter was sent first. This letter requested participation in the study and was signed by the project director.
2. The questionnaire was mailed with an informational letter, signed by the project director, about seven days after the “pre-notification” letter was sent.

3. A reminder postcard was sent to the entire sample approximately seven days after the questionnaire (step #2) had been sent.
4. Those who had not responded within approximately 14 days of the original mailing were then sent a replacement questionnaire.

1997 Respondent Profile

The average respondent was 53 years of age. Seventy-three percent were married (Table 1*) and seventy-two percent lived in a town or village. On average, respondents had lived in their current town or village 31 years. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were living in towns or villages smaller than 5,000 people.

Sixty percent of the respondents reported their approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, for 1996 was below \$39,999. Twenty-five percent reported incomes over \$50,000. Ninety percent had attained at least a high school diploma.

Fifty-two percent reported that their spouse or partner worked full-time, and an additional twenty percent said their spouse or partner was working part-time. Twenty-five percent reported that their spouse or partner was retired.

* Table 1 also includes demographic data from the 1996 Rural Poll, as well as similar data based on the entire non-metro population of Nebraska (using 1990 Census data).

1997 Rural Poll Findings

A large amount of data were generated from the 1997 Rural Poll but only the community portion is reflected in the subsequent tables and figures. Only selected comments will be made on the data presented. The reader is encouraged to study the tables and figures to draw additional conclusions and insights.

Community Change and Attributes


Rural communities have faced many challenges over the years. Each community adapts and reacts to these changes differently. Rural Nebraskans were asked the following question to determine how their community is responding to change:

Communities across the nation are undergoing change. When you think about where you live, would you say...

My community has changed for the... (Answer categories were better, same or worse.)

Thirty-seven percent responded that their community had changed for the better, forty-four percent said their community was the same and nineteen percent replied that it had changed for

Figure 1. My community has changed for the...



the worse (Figure 1).

Community population, income, age and education were related to how respondents viewed the change in their community (Table 2). Respondents in larger communities were more likely to say their community had changed for the better than those living in smaller towns. For example, over forty percent of people living in towns with 5,000 population or more said their community had changed for the better, while only twenty-one percent of respondents living in towns with less than 100 people said their community had improved¹. Also, respondents with higher educational levels, older respondents and those with higher household incomes were more likely to say their community had changed for the better. For example, less than one-third of respondents with household incomes less than \$20,000 felt their community has improved, compared to nearly forty-five percent of respondents with incomes over \$50,000.

Respondents were also asked if they would describe their communities as friendly or unfriendly, trusting or distrusting, and supportive or hostile. For each of these three dimensions, respondents were asked to “rate” their community using a seven-point scale between each pair of contrasting views. Overall, rural Nebraskans see their communities as friendly (72%), trusting (63%) and supportive (63%).*

Community population, age and marital status appear to influence rural Nebraskans’ perceptions of their communities (Table 2). Respondents from smaller towns were more likely to say their community was friendly, trusting and supportive than those from larger communities. For example, seventy-two percent of the people living in towns with populations less than 100

¹ According to July 1, 1994 U.S. Census Estimates, there are 82 towns in non-metro Nebraska that have populations less than 100. A total of 4,689 people live in these towns.

* The responses on the seven-point scale were converted to percentages as follows: values of 1, 2, and 3 were categorized as friendly, trusting, and supportive; values of 5, 6, and 7 were categorized as unfriendly, distrusting, and hostile; and a value of 4 was categorized as no opinion.

said their community was supportive; but only fifty-eight percent of respondents from communities with populations greater than 10,000 shared this view. Older respondents were also more likely to think their community was friendly, trusting and supportive. Seventy-four percent of respondents age 65 or older said their community was trusting, compared to less than sixty percent of persons less than 50 years of age. When comparing marital groups, the respondents who are widowed were the most likely to think their community possessed these three positive attributes. Seventy-three percent of widowed respondents said their community was trusting; only fifty-three percent of divorced or separated respondents shared this opinion about their community.


Dissatisfaction with Services and Amenities

People in rural areas often feel they are disadvantaged relative to their urban counterparts when it comes to services and amenities. This study attempts to discover how satisfied rural Nebraskans are with various services and amenities. A list of twenty-four services was included on the survey and respondents were asked how satisfied they were with each, taking into consideration availability, cost and quality.

The ten services/amenities with the highest combined percentage of “very dissatisfied” or “somewhat dissatisfied” are shown in Figure 2. Respondents were most dissatisfied with entertainment (43%), followed by retail shopping (37%), city/village government (34%) and streets and highways (33%). The four services/amenities in which respondents were least dissatisfied were senior centers (7%), library services (8%), head start programs (8%)*, and sewage disposal (9%). (Table 3)


* Care must be taken in interpreting this statistic, given that 48% of the respondents had “no opinion” about the head start program.

Figure 2. Dissatisfaction with Services and Amenities, 1997 (Top 10)



The ten services in which the greatest amount of dissatisfaction were shown were then analyzed by community population, region and various individual attributes (Table 4). Satisfaction with services varied by most of these characteristics, however no systematic pattern exists. For example, people in smaller towns, in comparison to those living in larger towns, were more dissatisfied with law enforcement; but those in larger towns were more dissatisfied with air service, bus service, rail service, and city/village government. Regional differences also exist. Respondents from the Panhandle region were most likely to be dissatisfied with air service, bus service and rail service (see Figure 3 for the counties included in each region). However, respondents from the North Central region were most likely to be dissatisfied with

Figure 3. Regions of Nebraska



*Shaded counties represent the metropolitan counties of the state (unsurveyed).

retail shopping; and dissatisfaction with entertainment and restaurants was most likely to be expressed by respondents in the Southeast region. Older respondents and the respondents who were widowed generally expressed less dissatisfaction with services and amenities than did respondents who were younger and who had a different marital status. However, two exceptions to this general pattern were in the case of bus and rail service in which the elderly and widowed respondents were the ones who were most likely to be dissatisfied.

Affordable Housing Supplies


Many programs have been established to address the issue of affordable housing supplies available in Nebraska communities. Two questions were included in this study to determine the extent to which the supply of affordable housing is a problem in rural Nebraska communities.

The first question asks:

“In your opinion, is the supply of affordable housing sufficient in your community?”

Thirty-five percent of respondents felt the supply of affordable housing was sufficient, fifty-four percent believed that the supply was insufficient, and eleven percent had no opinion (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Is the supply of affordable housing sufficient in your community?



Respondents' perceptions of the affordable housing supply are related to community size, region, income, age, gender, education and marital status (Table 5). Respondents in larger towns were more likely to think that their community had an insufficient supply of affordable housing. Fifty-seven percent of respondents living in towns with a population of at least 5,000 said the affordable housing supply in their community was insufficient, compared to thirty-six percent of respondents living in towns with less than 100 people. Respondents living in the Panhandle region were more likely to think there was an insufficient supply of affordable housing in their community in comparison to respondents from other regions of the state. Sixty percent of respondents from the Panhandle region said the supply of affordable housing was not sufficient, compared to forty-eight percent of respondents living in the Southeast region. Younger respondents were also more likely to feel the supply was insufficient. Sixty-four percent of persons age 19-29 said the affordable housing supply was not sufficient in their community,

compared to thirty-nine percent of the persons 65 and older. Another noticeable difference exists within the marital groups. The respondents who are divorced/separated were most likely to think the supply of affordable housing was not sufficient.


The respondents who indicated that the supply of affordable housing was not sufficient in their community were then asked if they felt that the lack of supply was hurting their community's growth. The specific question asked was:

“Do you feel that the lack of affordable housing has hurt population and economic growth in your community?”

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents who felt the affordable housing supply in their community was deficient felt the problem was serious enough to hurt population and economic growth (Figure 5).

This question was analyzed by community size, region and individual attributes (Table 5). Respondents living in towns with populations between 100 and 9,999 were more likely to

Figure 5. Has lack of affordable housing hurt population and economic growth?



feel their community growth has been hurt by the lack of housing. Approximately eighty percent of respondents living in towns of this size felt the lack of affordable housing has hurt population and economic growth in their community, while only sixty-six percent of respondents living in towns with less than 100 people felt their community has been hurt. As mentioned above, the Panhandle region was more likely to feel that affordable housing was deficient in their community. They were also more likely to feel that this lack of housing has hurt growth in their community (87%). Persons age 30–64, in comparison to other age groups, were also more likely to think their community has been hurt by the lack of affordable housing. Around eighty percent of persons in this age group felt their community’s growth has been hurt, while only sixty-eight percent of persons age 19-29 shared this same belief.


Community Quality of Life

In recent years, many towns in rural Nebraska have been forced to either consolidate or consider consolidating many of their services. Respondents were asked how the consolidation of public schools, health care and local government would affect the quality of life in their community. Consolidation of public schools was viewed as having a greater negative impact than the consolidation of health care or local government.

Forty percent of rural Nebraskans stated that consolidation of public schools would reduce the quality of life in their community, forty percent believe it would have no effect, and twenty percent felt it would improve their community’s quality of life (Figure 6). When considering the consolidation of health care, thirty-four percent felt it would reduce their community’s quality of life, forty-one percent believed it would have no effect and twenty-six percent stated it would improve the quality of life. Opinions were split on the effect of

consolidating local government, with thirty-one percent believing it would improve the quality of life and thirty-one percent stating it would reduce the quality of life. Thirty-eight percent stated it would have no effect.

Figure 6. How would the following affect the quality of life in your community? Consolidation of...




Respondents’ opinions on these issues were related to community size, region, income, age, gender, education and marital status (Table 6). Rural Nebraskans living in smaller towns were more likely to think that the consolidation of these services would reduce the quality of life in their community. For example, over fifty percent of persons living in communities with populations less than 500 believed consolidation of public schools would reduce their communities’ quality of life, but only twenty-nine percent of those living in towns of 5,000 – 9,999 population held similar views. Regional differences also exist. Almost half (49%) of the respondents from the North Central region felt that consolidation of public schools would reduce the quality of life in their community. They were also more likely to think the consolidation of

local government would hurt their community (37%). Respondents from the Panhandle region were more likely to think that consolidation of these three services would improve the quality of life in their community. Persons with a college degree were also more likely than respondents in other educational groups to see consolidation of services leading to an improvement in quality of life.

Respondents were also asked how growth in their community’s population by adding various groups would affect the quality of life in their town. The specific groups that respondents were asked about include: out of state residents, Nebraskans from other areas of the state, members of minority groups, elderly residents, young families and single parent households.

Figure 7. How would the following affect the quality of life in your community? Growth in community population by adding...



Seventy-four percent of rural Nebraskans believed the addition of young families to their communities would improve the quality of life there (Figure 7). In contrast, only seventeen percent felt the addition of minorities would improve the community's quality of life and almost one-half (48%) felt it would reduce the quality of life.

Community size, region, income, age and education played a role in the respondents' perceptions and answers (Table 7). Respondents in larger communities were most likely to feel that adding members of minority groups and single parent households would reduce the quality of life in their community. Specifically, fifty-five percent of respondents in communities with 10,000 population or more felt that adding minorities would reduce the quality of life. Respondents in the Northeast region were more likely to think that adding out of state residents, minorities, and single parent households would hurt their community than respondents in other regions of the state. Thirty-five percent of respondents in the Northeast believe adding out of state residents would reduce the quality of life in their community. Only twenty-five percent of respondents in the Southeast region held similar views. Similarly, fifty-seven percent of respondents in the Northeast region felt adding minorities to their community would reduce the quality of life; but only thirty-eight percent of the respondents in the Panhandle shared this opinion. Respondents with a college degree were more likely than respondents with less education to think that the quality of life in their community would improve with the addition of any of these six groups.


Comparisons Between the 1996 and 1997 Rural Polls

This section will make comparisons between the data collected this year to the data from the 1996 Rural Poll. In considering these comparisons it is important to recognize that different people were surveyed each year (although both years involved a random sample).

Community Change and Attributes

Fewer respondents in 1997 than in 1996 said their community had changed for the worse (Figure 8). In 1996, twenty-three percent stated that their community had changed for the worse, compared to nineteen percent of the 1997 respondents. The percent stating that their community had changed for the better remained relatively stable between 1996 and 1997.

Figure 8. Community Change, 1996 and 1997.



The changes from 1996 to 1997 were also analyzed by community size, region and individual attributes (Table 8). Respondents living in towns with populations ranging from 500-999 were less likely to think their community had changed for the worse in 1997 than in 1996. In 1996, twenty-six percent of respondents living in towns of this size said their community has changed for the worse. In 1997, the proportion decreased to seventeen percent. Another interesting change from 1996 to 1997 occurred among low income households, i.e., those with household incomes below \$10,000. In 1996, thirty-four percent of this group stated that their community had changed for the worse. Only twenty-two percent of the respondents with low incomes felt this way in 1997.

When respondents were asked about various attributes of their community (i.e., if it was friendly or unfriendly), there was relatively no change from 1996 to 1997. Approximately seventy-two percent of respondents in both 1996 and 1997 thought their community was friendly and approximately sixty-two percent felt it was both trusting and supportive.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of 1996 and 1997 Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 1990 Census

	1997 Poll	1996 Poll	1990 Census
Age: (*1)			
20 - 39	24%	22%	38%
40 - 64	48%	49%	36%
65 and over	28%	29%	26%
Gender: (*2)			
Female	28%	27%	49%
Male	72%	73%	51%
Education: (*3)			
Less than 9th grade	5%	3%	10%
9th to 12th grade (no diploma)	5%	5%	12%
High school diploma (or equivalency)	34%	34%	38%
Some college, no degree	25%	26%	21%
Associate degree	8%	7%	7%
Bachelors degree	14%	14%	9%
Graduate or professional degree	9%	10%	3%
Household Income: (*4)			
Less than \$10,000	7%	8%	19%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	16%	17%	25%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	19%	19%	21%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	18%	18%	15%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	14%	15%	9%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	10%	9%	5%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	7%	7%	3%
\$75,000 or more	8%	7%	3%
Marital Status: (*5)			
Married	73%	75%	64%
Never married	8%	7%	20%
Divorced/separated	9%	8%	7%
Widowed/widower	10%	10%	10%
Race: (*2)			
White, non-hispanic	97.19%	NA	97.58%
Black	0.16%	NA	0.20%
Asian and Pacific Islander	0.19%	NA	0.32%
Hispanic	0.60%	NA	*
Native American	1.40%	NA	1.00%
Other	0.40%	NA	0.90%

- *1 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over
- *2 1990 Census universe is total non-metro population
- *3 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 18 yrs of age and over
- *4 1990 Census universe is all non-metro households
- *5 1990 Census universe is non-metro population 15 years of age and over
- * Hispanic population is included in the "Other" category in the Census data

Table 2. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

	<i>My community has changed for the...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>			
	<i>Better</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Friendly</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Structure																
<i>Population of Town</i>				*				*				*				*
Less than 100	21 (17)	55 (46)	24 (20)	(83)	74 (61)	11 (9)	16 (13)	(83)	66 (52)	17 (13)	18 (14)	(79)	72 (56)	13 (10)	15 (12)	(78)
100-499	29 (133)	51 (230)	20 (89)	(452)	77 (347)	11 (50)	12 (52)	(449)	71 (307)	16 (68)	14 (60)	(435)	66 (285)	19 (80)	16 (68)	(433)
500-999	32 (129)	51 (205)	17 (68)	(402)	77 (311)	13 (54)	9 (37)	(402)	67 (257)	22 (84)	11 (42)	(383)	68 (259)	21 (80)	11 (43)	(382)
1000-4999	36 (316)	44 (390)	20 (175)	(881)	72 (636)	16 (136)	12 (107)	(879)	65 (560)	19 (161)	16 (136)	(857)	64 (542)	20 (170)	16 (140)	(852)
5000-9999	43 (182)	40 (167)	18 (74)	(423)	68 (282)	19 (78)	13 (53)	(413)	59 (239)	20 (80)	21 (87)	(406)	62 (249)	22 (90)	16 (66)	(405)
10,000 and up	42 (374)	40 (349)	18 (159)	(882)	68 (601)	19 (170)	12 (109)	(880)	56 (472)	26 (219)	19 (158)	(849)	58 (489)	28 (238)	15 (124)	(851)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1151)	44 (1387)	19 (585)	(3123)	72 (2238)	16 (497)	12 (371)	(3106)	63 (1887)	21 (625)	17 (497)	(3009)	63 (1880)	22 (668)	15 (453)	(3001)
Region																
Panhandle	42 (151)	40 (142)	18 (66)	(359)	75 (271)	14 (49)	12 (42)	(362)	63 (218)	20 (70)	17 (57)	(345)	63 (219)	23 (81)	14 (48)	(348)
North Central	37 (162)	46 (201)	16 (70)	(433)	72 (314)	14 (60)	14 (60)	(434)	67 (281)	18 (75)	15 (62)	(418)	64 (269)	20 (84)	16 (66)	(419)
South Central	39 (362)	43 (404)	18 (171)	(937)	71 (665)	17 (157)	12 (110)	(932)	63 (567)	22 (199)	16 (141)	(907)	62 (559)	23 (203)	15 (137)	(899)
Northeast	36 (266)	44 (326)	20 (147)	(739)	71 (519)	19 (138)	11 (79)	(736)	61 (434)	23 (161)	16 (112)	(707)	64 (454)	22 (157)	14 (96)	(707)
Southeast	32 (206)	48 (306)	20 (127)	(639)	73 (457)	15 (94)	12 (75)	(626)	63 (381)	18 (110)	20 (119)	(610)	62 (373)	22 (133)	16 (99)	(605)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1147)	44 (1379)	19 (581)	(3107)	72 (2226)	16 (498)	12 (366)	(3090)	63 (1881)	21 (615)	16 (491)	(2987)	63 (1874)	22 (658)	15 (446)	(2978)
Individual Attributes																
Income Level																
<i>Income Level</i>				*				*								
Under \$10,000	33 (62)	45 (84)	22 (41)	(187)	73 (135)	18 (34)	9 (16)	(185)	65 (104)	18 (28)	17 (27)	(159)	69 (111)	20 (32)	11 (17)	(160)
\$10,000-19,999	31 (141)	50 (232)	19 (88)	(461)	71 (318)	16 (70)	13 (58)	(446)	61 (257)	21 (91)	18 (77)	(425)	60 (254)	24 (99)	16 (68)	(421)
\$20,000-29,999	39 (212)	42 (227)	19 (100)	(539)	71 (388)	16 (88)	13 (68)	(544)	60 (319)	23 (124)	17 (89)	(532)	60 (316)	25 (131)	16 (83)	(530)
\$30,000-39,999	35 (180)	47 (240)	18 (95)	(515)	68 (351)	18 (94)	13 (68)	(513)	62 (315)	21 (108)	17 (85)	(508)	62 (311)	23 (115)	16 (80)	(506)
\$40,000-49,999	37 (143)	45 (172)	18 (70)	(385)	71 (271)	14 (55)	15 (57)	(383)	60 (225)	20 (74)	21 (78)	(377)	59 (221)	24 (92)	17 (64)	(377)
\$50,000-59,999	44 (123)	39 (108)	17 (48)	(279)	69 (195)	18 (52)	13 (36)	(283)	61 (170)	23 (64)	16 (45)	(279)	63 (175)	21 (59)	16 (45)	(279)
\$60,000-74,999	44 (93)	37 (77)	19 (40)	(210)	79 (164)	12 (25)	10 (20)	(209)	71 (149)	17 (35)	12 (26)	(210)	63 (131)	23 (47)	14 (30)	(208)
\$75,000 and over	45 (107)	36 (87)	19 (46)	(240)	81 (196)	13 (32)	5 (13)	(241)	70 (166)	17 (41)	13 (31)	(238)	69 (164)	22 (53)	9 (22)	(239)
<i>Total</i>	38 (1061)	44 (1227)	19 (528)	(2816)	72 (2018)	16 (450)	12 (336)	(2804)	63 (1705)	21 (565)	17 (458)	(2728)	62 (1683)	23 (628)	15 (409)	(2720)
Age																
<i>Age</i>				*				*				*				*
19-29	36 (74)	50 (103)	14 (29)	(206)	71 (148)	19 (39)	10 (21)	(208)	58 (119)	24 (50)	18 (38)	(207)	59 (120)	28 (57)	14 (28)	(205)
30-39	35 (178)	48 (244)	18 (92)	(514)	72 (375)	15 (79)	13 (66)	(520)	59 (304)	22 (115)	19 (95)	(514)	55 (284)	30 (152)	15 (79)	(515)
40-49	38 (267)	41 (293)	21 (152)	(712)	67 (479)	20 (145)	12 (87)	(711)	58 (412)	24 (168)	19 (132)	(712)	60 (426)	24 (170)	16 (112)	(708)
50-64	35 (277)	44 (349)	21 (165)	(791)	69 (544)	18 (139)	14 (109)	(792)	61 (474)	21 (167)	18 (139)	(780)	59 (454)	23 (174)	19 (147)	(775)
65 and up	40 (344)	44 (376)	16 (135)	(855)	80 (665)	11 (92)	10 (80)	(837)	74 (561)	15 (116)	11 (85)	(762)	76 (573)	15 (111)	10 (75)	(759)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1140)	44 (1365)	19 (573)	(3078)	72 (2211)	16 (494)	12 (363)	(3068)	63 (1870)	21 (616)	16 (489)	(2975)	63 (1857)	22 (664)	15 (441)	(2962)

* Statistically significant at .05 Level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 2. Measures of Community Attributes in Relation to Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

	<i>My community has changed for the...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>				<i>My community is...</i>			
	<i>Better</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Friendly</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Unfriendly</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
<i>Gender</i>																
Male	36 (806)	45 (1005)	19 (424)	(2235)	73 (1618)	16 (352)	12 (263)	(2233)	62 (1355)	22 (468)	16 (350)	(2173)	62 (1340)	23 (488)	15 (331)	(2159)
Female	39 (337)	43 (368)	18 (153)	(858)	71 (602)	17 (144)	12 (103)	(849)	64 (517)	19 (152)	18 (142)	(811)	64 (524)	22 (179)	14 (112)	(815)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1143)	44 (1373)	19 (577)	(3093)	72 (2220)	16 (496)	12 (366)	(3082)	63 (1872)	21 (620)	17 (492)	(2984)	63 (1864)	22 (667)	15 (443)	(2974)
<i>Education</i>				*				*								
High school or less	34 (443)	47 (622)	19 (248)	(1313)	70 (895)	16 (209)	14 (177)	(1281)	62 (753)	20 (239)	18 (219)	(1211)	63 (752)	21 (253)	16 (191)	(1196)
Some college	35 (352)	47 (465)	18 (179)	(996)	71 (712)	17 (167)	12 (119)	(998)	62 (605)	22 (211)	17 (165)	(981)	61 (600)	24 (239)	15 (147)	(986)
College grad	45 (325)	36 (255)	19 (137)	(717)	77 (561)	15 (109)	9 (63)	(733)	65 (472)	21 (156)	14 (102)	(730)	64 (467)	23 (169)	13 (96)	(732)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1120)	44 (1342)	19 (564)	(3026)	72 (2168)	16 (485)	12 (359)	(3012)	63 (1830)	21 (606)	17 (486)	(2922)	62 (1819)	23 (661)	15 (434)	(2914)
<i>Marital Status</i>								*				*				*
Married	37 (831)	45 (1009)	19 (424)	(2264)	72 (1620)	16 (372)	12 (271)	(2263)	63 (1391)	21 (458)	17 (366)	(2215)	62 (1371)	23 (496)	15 (337)	(2204)
Never married	39 (91)	39 (92)	22 (51)	(234)	72 (170)	17 (41)	10 (24)	(235)	62 (143)	20 (45)	19 (43)	(231)	60 (137)	23 (53)	17 (39)	(229)
Divorced/separated	32 (87)	48 (130)	21 (56)	(273)	67 (183)	18 (49)	15 (41)	(273)	53 (139)	26 (69)	21 (55)	(263)	57 (149)	28 (72)	16 (41)	(262)
Widowed	41 (133)	44 (143)	14 (46)	(322)	80 (249)	10 (32)	10 (30)	(311)	73 (202)	17 (46)	10 (28)	(276)	75 (209)	16 (45)	9 (25)	(279)
<i>Total</i>	37 (1142)	44 (1374)	19 (577)	(3093)	72 (2222)	16 (494)	12 (366)	(3082)	63 (1875)	21 (618)	17 (492)	(2985)	63 (1866)	22 (666)	15 (442)	(2974)

* Statistically significant at .05 Level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 3. Level of Satisfaction with Services and Amenities, 1997.

	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>No opinion</i>		<i>Satisfied</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>			
Entertainment	43		19	38
Retail shopping	37		9	53
City/village government	34		19	48
Streets and highways	33		5	62
Restaurants	32		8	60
County government	32		18	50
Housing	25		13	62
Law enforcement	25		9	66
Solid waste disposal	18		21	61
Basic medical care services	16		10	75
Education (K-12)	15		14	71
Mental health services	14		51	35
Parks and recreation	13		9	77
Day care services	11		39	51
Nursing home care	11		24	65
Water disposal	10		23	67
Sewage disposal	9		22	69
Library services	8		14	79
Head start programs	8		48	44
Senior centers	7		25	69

Table 4. Measures of Satisfaction with Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.**

	Streets and highways			Law enforcement			Air service			Bus service			Rail service		
	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>
<i>Population of Town</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Less than 100	55	8	38	57	10	33	27	51	23	14	64	22	16	62	23
100-499	59	4	36	56	10	34	13	64	23	10	66	24	11	64	25
500-999	59	3	38	65	7	28	13	62	26	10	62	28	13	59	28
1000-4999	65	5	31	65	10	25	23	56	22	11	58	32	11	60	29
5000-9999	64	5	30	73	9	19	27	44	30	15	51	34	21	49	30
10,000 and up	63	5	32	70	8	22	25	33	42	19	48	33	17	52	31
<i>Region</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Panhandle	63	4	33	67	10	24	24	27	50	16	39	45	13	42	45
North Central	61	2	37	61	9	30	24	44	31	16	51	34	13	53	34
South Central	63	5	32	67	10	24	20	44	36	15	54	31	20	51	29
Northeast	57	6	37	68	9	23	21	58	21	14	61	25	12	66	22
Southeast	68	6	26	65	9	26	22	62	16	9	65	26	12	67	22
<i>Income Level</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Under \$10,000	59	10	31	61	7	32	25	50	25	19	49	32	20	51	30
\$10,000-19,999	62	5	34	64	10	26	19	54	27	15	52	34	14	54	33
\$20,000-29,999	61	3	36	65	9	26	24	48	28	13	54	33	14	55	31
\$30,000-39,999	66	5	29	64	7	29	20	51	30	14	56	30	17	57	26
\$40,000-49,999	61	5	34	64	10	26	23	49	28	12	59	29	13	61	26
\$50,000-59,999	61	3	36	67	13	21	18	50	33	12	61	28	13	61	27
\$60,000-74,999	66	4	30	75	5	20	20	45	35	15	54	30	14	53	33
\$75,000 and over	67	3	30	71	7	22	24	39	38	11	60	30	11	58	31
<i>Age</i>			*			*			*			*			*
19-29	52	6	42	61	11	28	13	71	16	8	75	16	10	74	16
30-39	59	5	37	66	9	25	16	58	26	11	67	22	11	70	19
40-49	59	4	38	62	9	29	21	47	32	14	58	28	15	58	28
50-64	60	4	36	62	9	29	21	45	33	13	54	34	12	55	33
65 and up	72	6	22	73	9	18	28	42	29	18	42	40	21	43	37
<i>Gender</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Male	63	4	33	65	9	26	22	48	30	14	56	30	16	56	29
Female	61	6	33	67	9	24	20	51	29	14	54	32	11	60	29
<i>Education</i>			*			*			*			*			*
High school or less	62	5	33	64	9	27	24	51	25	15	54	31	16	57	27
Some college	59	4	37	66	9	26	19	50	32	13	58	29	14	58	29
College grad	67	5	28	70	9	21	21	44	35	12	54	33	12	55	33
<i>Marital Status</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Married	62	4	34	65	9	26	22	49	29	13	58	30	14	58	28
Never married	58	6	36	64	8	29	17	55	27	15	60	26	13	65	22
Divorced/separated	62	4	34	58	10	31	21	44	35	16	50	34	16	54	31
Widowed	69	9	23	76	9	15	24	45	31	19	42	39	18	45	37

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

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

Table 4. Measures of Satisfaction with Services and Amenities in Relation to Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.**

	Retail shopping			Restaurants			Entertainment			County government			City/village government		
	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>
<i>Population of Town</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Less than 100	58	14	28	62	9	29	48	19	33	54	12	35	51	24	24
100-499	44	20	36	60	13	27	36	25	40	50	16	34	53	22	25
500-999	46	17	37	58	11	31	31	23	46	53	16	31	51	21	28
1000-4999	47	8	45	54	7	39	34	19	47	52	18	30	48	18	34
5000-9999	52	5	43	55	8	37	35	18	47	49	20	31	46	20	34
10,000 and up	68	4	28	68	5	27	47	14	39	47	19	33	44	15	41
<i>Region</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Panhandle	54	7	39	59	8	34	40	19	41	40	16	44	45	17	38
North Central	45	12	44	68	7	25	39	19	42	51	16	33	48	17	35
South Central	63	7	31	65	7	28	44	17	39	52	19	29	48	17	35
Northeast	50	10	40	58	9	34	35	19	46	50	20	30	49	20	32
Southeast	49	13	38	50	10	41	31	22	47	52	19	30	48	21	31
<i>Income Level</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Under \$10,000	56	13	32	64	13	24	44	21	36	50	20	30	46	20	34
\$10,000-19,999	51	10	40	61	9	30	37	22	42	51	19	30	48	19	33
\$20,000-29,999	54	9	37	62	7	31	38	19	43	48	17	35	49	17	34
\$30,000-39,999	52	9	39	58	8	34	38	14	48	50	18	32	49	20	31
\$40,000-49,999	53	9	38	57	7	37	37	15	47	51	18	31	47	19	35
\$50,000-59,999	54	7	39	59	5	36	41	15	45	52	16	31	48	14	38
\$60,000-74,999	58	8	35	55	7	38	37	16	47	53	15	33	50	13	38
\$75,000 and over	54	9	38	53	8	40	38	17	45	50	15	35	48	15	37
<i>Age</i>			*			*			*			*			*
19-29	49	13	39	64	7	29	37	8	55	38	31	32	34	37	30
30-39	52	8	40	54	7	39	33	11	56	40	24	37	38	22	40
40-49	52	9	39	56	7	37	35	16	49	45	17	38	47	16	37
50-64	51	8	41	57	9	35	35	19	46	50	15	36	46	16	38
65 and up	59	11	31	67	9	24	48	27	25	63	16	21	60	17	23
<i>Gender</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Male	55	9	36	59	8	33	38	19	43	50	17	33	47	17	35
Female	48	9	42	59	8	33	39	17	44	48	23	29	49	22	30
<i>Education</i>			*			*			*			*			*
High school or less	55	11	34	62	9	29	40	21	40	52	17	31	49	19	33
Some college	49	10	41	58	8	34	37	16	47	47	18	35	45	17	38
College grad	56	6	39	56	7	37	39	16	45	51	19	30	51	20	30
<i>Marital Status</i>			*			*			*			*			*
Married	53	9	38	58	8	34	37	19	44	50	17	34	48	18	35
Never married	55	9	36	63	6	30	39	12	49	46	25	29	38	28	34
Divorced/separated	50	11	39	58	7	35	35	15	50	41	22	37	43	19	39
Widowed	57	12	31	68	11	21	48	23	29	60	21	19	61	17	22

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

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

Table 5. Community Housing Supply Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

	<i>Is the supply of affordable housing sufficient in your community?</i>				<i>Do you feel that the lack of affordable housing has hurt population & economic growth in your community?</i>			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Total</i>
Community Structure	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
<i>Population of Town</i>				*				*
Less than 100	46 (37)	36 (29)	19 (15)	(81)	66 (19)	14 (4)	21 (6)	(29)
100-499	37 (163)	49 (219)	15 (65)	(447)	82 (178)	13 (28)	5 (11)	(217)
500-999	36 (145)	54 (218)	10 (41)	(404)	81 (173)	15 (31)	5 (10)	(214)
1000-4999	36 (315)	53 (465)	10 (91)	(871)	79 (365)	14 (64)	7 (34)	(463)
5000-9999	32 (134)	57 (239)	11 (44)	(417)	79 (185)	15 (34)	6 (15)	(234)
10,000 and up	32 (278)	57 (502)	11 (95)	(875)	72 (359)	22 (112)	6 (29)	(500)
<i>Total</i>	35 (1072)	54 (1672)	11 (351)	(3095)	77 (1279)	17 (273)	6 (105)	(1657)
Region				*				*
Panhandle	28 (102)	60 (219)	12 (42)	(363)	87 (188)	10 (21)	4 (8)	(217)
North Central	35 (150)	53 (230)	13 (55)	(435)	80 (184)	13 (30)	7 (16)	(230)
South Central	34 (317)	57 (526)	9 (85)	(928)	74 (383)	20 (104)	7 (34)	(521)
Northeast	35 (259)	53 (397)	12 (88)	(744)	72 (284)	21 (83)	6 (25)	(392)
Southeast	40 (254)	48 (305)	13 (83)	(642)	81 (243)	12 (36)	7 (22)	(301)
<i>Total</i>	35 (1082)	54 (1677)	11 (353)	(3112)	77 (1282)	17 (274)	6 (105)	(1661)
Individual Attributes				*				*
<i>Income Level</i>				*				*
Under \$10,000	35 (63)	52 (94)	14 (25)	(182)	74 (68)	16 (15)	10 (9)	(92)
\$10,000-19,999	31 (137)	52 (232)	18 (80)	(449)	80 (183)	11 (26)	9 (21)	(230)
\$20,000-29,999	35 (188)	55 (302)	10 (55)	(545)	77 (229)	17 (52)	6 (18)	(299)
\$30,000-39,999	31 (159)	62 (319)	8 (41)	(519)	74 (233)	20 (64)	5 (16)	(313)
\$40,000-49,999	40 (155)	52 (202)	8 (32)	(389)	78 (157)	17 (34)	5 (11)	(202)
\$50,000-59,999	33 (93)	59 (167)	9 (25)	(285)	84 (139)	13 (22)	3 (5)	(166)
\$60,000-74,999	39 (83)	53 (113)	8 (16)	(212)	74 (83)	24 (27)	3 (3)	(113)
\$75,000 and over	39 (94)	53 (128)	8 (19)	(241)	83 (105)	10 (13)	6 (8)	(126)
<i>Total</i>	34 (972)	55 (1557)	10 (293)	(2822)	78 (1197)	16 (253)	6 (91)	(1541)
<i>Age</i>				*				*
19-29	28 (59)	64 (133)	8 (16)	(208)	68 (90)	24 (32)	8 (11)	(133)
30-39	32 (165)	60 (314)	9 (45)	(524)	78 (242)	17 (53)	5 (15)	(310)
40-49	32 (230)	59 (428)	9 (64)	(722)	79 (334)	16 (69)	5 (21)	(424)
50-64	32 (258)	59 (475)	9 (76)	(809)	81 (380)	14 (64)	6 (28)	(472)
65 and up	43 (353)	39 (326)	18 (148)	(827)	73 (234)	17 (56)	10 (31)	(321)
<i>Total</i>	35 (1065)	54 (1676)	11 (349)	(3090)	77 (1280)	17 (274)	6 (106)	(1660)
<i>Gender</i>				*				*
Male	37 (825)	54 (1209)	10 (227)	(2261)	77 (926)	17 (204)	6 (70)	(1200)
Female	30 (250)	56 (470)	15 (124)	(844)	77 (358)	15 (70)	8 (35)	(463)
<i>Total</i>	35 (1075)	54 (1679)	11 (351)	(3105)	77 (1284)	17 (274)	6 (105)	(1663)
<i>Education</i>				*				*
High school or less	35 (455)	51 (653)	14 (182)	(1290)	77 (498)	16 (101)	7 (48)	(647)
Some college	33 (330)	58 (585)	9 (91)	(1006)	78 (453)	16 (93)	6 (33)	(579)
College grad	35 (256)	56 (415)	9 (67)	(738)	76 (312)	19 (77)	5 (22)	(411)
<i>Total</i>	34 (1041)	55 (1653)	11 (340)	(3034)	77 (1263)	17 (271)	6 (103)	(1637)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 5. Community Housing Supply Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

	<i>Is the supply of affordable housing sufficient in your community?</i>				<i>Do you feel that the lack of affordable housing has hurt population & economic growth in your community?</i>			
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>Total</u>
<i>Marital Status</i>				*				
Married	35 (797)	55 (1250)	10 (236)	(2283)	78 (965)	16 (200)	6 (75)	(1240)
Never married	31 (75)	57 (138)	12 (29)	(242)	71 (97)	21 (29)	7 (10)	(136)
Divorced/separated	29 (81)	62 (172)	9 (26)	(279)	75 (129)	19 (33)	5 (9)	(171)
Widowed	40 (121)	40 (120)	20 (60)	(301)	79 (92)	11 (13)	10 (12)	(117)
<i>Total</i>	35 (1074)	54 (1680)	11 (351)	(3105)	77 (1283)	17 (275)	6 (106)	(1664)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 6. Issues Affecting Community Quality of Life by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

How would the following items affect the quality of life in your community?

	Consolidation of public schools				Consolidation of health care				Consolidation of local government			
	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
Community Structure												
<i>Population of Town</i>				*				*				*
Less than 100	51 (39)	38 (29)	12 (9)	(77)	40 (31)	47 (36)	13 (10)	(77)	40 (31)	42 (32)	18 (14)	(77)
100-499	55 (228)	27 (112)	18 (74)	(414)	31 (125)	47 (191)	22 (90)	(406)	39 (157)	39 (155)	23 (91)	(403)
500-999	48 (183)	30 (113)	23 (86)	(382)	33 (121)	43 (159)	24 (90)	(370)	42 (152)	35 (127)	23 (85)	(364)
1000-4999	37 (306)	40 (333)	23 (186)	(825)	34 (278)	38 (312)	27 (223)	(813)	32 (253)	38 (306)	30 (244)	(803)
5000-9999	29 (113)	49 (196)	22 (88)	(397)	30 (117)	38 (148)	33 (128)	(393)	26 (100)	42 (164)	33 (127)	(391)
10,000 and up	37 (310)	47 (399)	16 (136)	(845)	35 (296)	41 (343)	24 (202)	(841)	24 (199)	38 (314)	38 (313)	(826)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1179)	40 (1182)	20 (579)	(2940)	33 (968)	41 (1189)	26 (743)	(2900)	31 (892)	38 (1098)	31 (874)	(2864)
Region				*				*				*
Panhandle	38 (133)	39 (140)	23 (82)	(355)	28 (99)	40 (140)	32 (112)	(351)	30 (105)	32 (110)	38 (131)	(346)
North Central	49 (200)	33 (135)	18 (72)	(407)	35 (138)	37 (149)	28 (111)	(398)	37 (144)	34 (131)	30 (115)	(390)
South Central	39 (344)	42 (366)	19 (164)	(874)	36 (310)	40 (341)	24 (210)	(861)	31 (263)	38 (328)	31 (268)	(859)
Northeast	42 (295)	41 (287)	17 (123)	(705)	36 (252)	39 (275)	25 (171)	(698)	33 (224)	39 (267)	28 (193)	(684)
Southeast	34 (210)	43 (263)	23 (142)	(615)	30 (180)	47 (286)	23 (142)	(608)	27 (161)	45 (269)	28 (170)	(600)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1182)	40 (1191)	20 (583)	(2956)	34 (979)	41 (1191)	26 (746)	(2916)	31 (897)	38 (1105)	31 (877)	(2879)
Individual Attributes												
<i>Income Level</i>				*								*
Under \$10,000	41 (67)	43 (71)	16 (26)	(164)	38 (60)	38 (60)	25 (40)	(160)	42 (64)	33 (51)	25 (38)	(153)
\$10,000-19,999	40 (166)	39 (162)	22 (90)	(418)	33 (135)	41 (168)	27 (109)	(412)	30 (120)	42 (167)	29 (115)	(402)
\$20,000-29,999	40 (209)	42 (216)	18 (94)	(519)	34 (172)	41 (212)	25 (130)	(514)	32 (163)	40 (202)	28 (139)	(504)
\$30,000-39,999	43 (219)	39 (198)	18 (92)	(509)	34 (171)	40 (202)	26 (130)	(503)	35 (178)	38 (193)	26 (133)	(504)
\$40,000-49,999	39 (146)	42 (159)	19 (72)	(377)	31 (117)	46 (170)	23 (87)	(374)	29 (108)	38 (140)	34 (125)	(373)
\$50,000-59,999	41 (113)	42 (114)	17 (47)	(274)	30 (82)	45 (124)	25 (69)	(275)	27 (72)	42 (113)	32 (86)	(271)
\$60,000-74,999	32 (67)	41 (85)	27 (57)	(209)	32 (67)	36 (75)	32 (67)	(209)	20 (41)	35 (73)	45 (94)	(208)
\$75,000 and over	36 (83)	36 (85)	28 (66)	(234)	34 (79)	39 (91)	27 (62)	(232)	29 (69)	29 (67)	42 (99)	(235)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1070)	40 (1090)	20 (544)	(2704)	33 (883)	41 (1102)	26 (694)	(2679)	31 (815)	38 (1006)	31 (829)	(2650)
Age				*								*
19-29	39 (80)	42 (85)	20 (40)	(205)	30 (61)	42 (84)	28 (57)	(202)	25 (50)	48 (98)	27 (55)	(203)
30-39	44 (223)	38 (193)	18 (94)	(510)	30 (153)	47 (237)	23 (119)	(509)	26 (132)	44 (223)	30 (154)	(509)
40-49	44 (309)	35 (248)	21 (149)	(706)	35 (248)	38 (268)	26 (184)	(700)	32 (225)	33 (232)	34 (238)	(695)
50-64	40 (306)	40 (306)	21 (161)	(773)	34 (264)	39 (296)	27 (207)	(767)	33 (248)	35 (268)	33 (248)	(764)
65 and up	35 (261)	47 (348)	18 (136)	(745)	35 (249)	41 (298)	24 (173)	(720)	35 (239)	39 (270)	26 (181)	(690)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1179)	40 (1180)	20 (580)	(2939)	34 (975)	41 (1183)	26 (740)	(2898)	31 (894)	38 (1091)	31 (876)	(2861)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 6. Issues Affecting Community Quality of Life by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

How would the following items affect the quality of life in your community?

	Consolidation of public schools				Consolidation of health care				Consolidation of local government			
	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>				<i>Percentages</i>			
<i>Gender</i>								*				*
Male	39 (855)	41 (891)	20 (429)	(2175)	32 (690)	42 (903)	26 (556)	(2149)	31 (654)	37 (789)	32 (682)	(2125)
Female	43 (331)	38 (294)	20 (152)	(777)	38 (290)	38 (286)	25 (187)	(763)	33 (244)	41 (309)	26 (197)	(750)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1186)	40 (1185)	20 (581)	(2952)	34 (980)	41 (1189)	26 (743)	(2912)	31 (898)	38 (1098)	31 (879)	(2875)
<i>Education</i>				*				*				*
High school or less	41 (504)	41 (501)	18 (215)	(1220)	35 (420)	41 (487)	24 (287)	(1194)	35 (413)	41 (477)	24 (285)	(1175)
Some college	43 (409)	38 (366)	19 (177)	(952)	35 (335)	40 (383)	24 (229)	(947)	33 (309)	36 (339)	31 (291)	(939)
College grad	34 (245)	41 (294)	25 (180)	(719)	29 (208)	41 (295)	30 (212)	(715)	22 (159)	37 (263)	41 (290)	(712)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1158)	40 (1161)	20 (572)	(2891)	34 (963)	41 (1165)	26 (728)	(2856)	31 (881)	38 (1079)	31 (866)	(2826)
<i>Marital Status</i>												*
Married	41 (906)	39 (855)	20 (434)	(2195)	34 (731)	41 (885)	26 (557)	(2173)	31 (673)	37 (794)	32 (685)	(2152)
Never married	36 (87)	46 (109)	18 (43)	(239)	36 (83)	44 (102)	20 (47)	(232)	29 (67)	43 (100)	29 (67)	(234)
Divorced/separated	40 (106)	39 (103)	21 (54)	(263)	32 (84)	39 (101)	29 (75)	(260)	35 (89)	38 (97)	28 (72)	(258)
Widowed	34 (88)	46 (118)	20 (50)	(256)	33 (82)	41 (102)	26 (63)	(247)	30 (69)	47 (108)	23 (54)	(231)
<i>Total</i>	40 (1187)	40 (1185)	20 (581)	(2953)	34 (980)	41 (1190)	26 (742)	(2912)	31 (898)	38 (1099)	31 (878)	(2875)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 7. Growth in Community Population Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

How would the following items affect the quality of life in your community? Growth in community population by:

	Adding out of state residents				Adding Nebraskans from other areas of the state				Adding members of minority groups			
	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>
Population of Town								*				*
Less than 100	40 (30)	40 (30)	21 (16)	(76)	34 (26)	40 (31)	26 (20)	(77)	47 (35)	44 (33)	9 (7)	(75)
100-499	29 (115)	35 (139)	37 (149)	(403)	14 (55)	42 (167)	45 (179)	(401)	45 (182)	38 (154)	16 (66)	(402)
500-999	30 (110)	33 (122)	38 (139)	(371)	17 (61)	34 (124)	50 (181)	(366)	47 (165)	36 (129)	17 (61)	(355)
1000-4999	28 (223)	34 (268)	38 (301)	(792)	13 (101)	37 (292)	51 (401)	(794)	48 (382)	33 (263)	19 (149)	(794)
5000-9999	26 (101)	33 (129)	41 (157)	(387)	14 (53)	38 (144)	49 (187)	(384)	39 (153)	40 (154)	21 (82)	(389)
10,000 and up	32 (259)	31 (253)	38 (309)	(821)	14 (111)	41 (339)	45 (374)	(824)	55 (455)	29 (241)	16 (131)	(827)
<i>Total</i>	29 (838)	33 (941)	38 (1071)	(2850)	14 (407)	39 (1097)	47 (1342)	(2846)	48 (1372)	34 (974)	18 (496)	(2842)
Region				*				*				*
Panhandle	26 (89)	28 (96)	46 (157)	(342)	15 (53)	31 (106)	54 (187)	(346)	38 (132)	41 (141)	21 (72)	(345)
North Central	29 (114)	33 (131)	38 (148)	(393)	20 (78)	34 (134)	46 (177)	(389)	49 (188)	36 (139)	15 (57)	(384)
South Central	30 (257)	34 (289)	36 (306)	(852)	13 (107)	40 (345)	47 (403)	(855)	50 (429)	34 (287)	17 (141)	(857)
Northeast	35 (239)	31 (212)	33 (225)	(676)	13 (89)	43 (284)	44 (296)	(669)	57 (386)	27 (182)	16 (109)	(677)
Southeast	25 (150)	37 (220)	38 (229)	(599)	14 (81)	39 (235)	47 (281)	(597)	41 (241)	40 (237)	20 (116)	(594)
<i>Total</i>	30 (849)	33 (948)	37 (1065)	(2862)	14 (408)	39 (1104)	47 (1344)	(2856)	48 (1376)	35 (986)	17 (495)	(2857)
Income Level				*				*				*
Under \$10,000	30 (45)	33 (50)	37 (56)	(151)	21 (32)	36 (55)	44 (67)	(154)	43 (64)	34 (51)	23 (34)	(149)
\$10,000-19,999	31 (124)	37 (148)	33 (131)	(403)	16 (64)	42 (169)	42 (171)	(404)	45 (182)	38 (154)	17 (69)	(405)
\$20,000-29,999	28 (139)	33 (165)	40 (201)	(505)	13 (68)	36 (184)	51 (257)	(509)	44 (226)	36 (183)	20 (102)	(511)
\$30,000-39,999	31 (153)	32 (158)	38 (190)	(501)	16 (81)	38 (188)	46 (230)	(499)	52 (256)	32 (160)	16 (79)	(495)
\$40,000-49,999	33 (120)	32 (114)	35 (127)	(361)	13 (48)	41 (149)	46 (165)	(362)	52 (188)	34 (122)	14 (51)	(361)
\$50,000-59,999	29 (78)	37 (100)	35 (94)	(272)	15 (41)	40 (108)	45 (122)	(271)	50 (136)	36 (96)	14 (38)	(270)
\$60,000-74,999	32 (67)	27 (57)	40 (84)	(208)	13 (26)	34 (71)	53 (111)	(208)	50 (104)	31 (65)	18 (38)	(207)
\$75,000 and over	21 (49)	32 (74)	47 (109)	(232)	8 (19)	34 (79)	58 (133)	(231)	44 (102)	33 (76)	23 (54)	(232)
<i>Total</i>	29 (775)	33 (866)	38 (992)	(2633)	14 (379)	38 (1003)	48 (1256)	(2638)	48 (1258)	35 (907)	18 (465)	(2630)
Age				*				*				*
19-29	31 (62)	30 (60)	40 (80)	(202)	11 (23)	36 (72)	53 (108)	(203)	48 (97)	29 (58)	24 (48)	(203)
30-39	26 (132)	30 (148)	44 (222)	(502)	11 (56)	37 (188)	52 (262)	(506)	45 (231)	35 (177)	20 (101)	(509)
40-49	29 (204)	35 (240)	36 (252)	(696)	13 (92)	40 (281)	47 (324)	(697)	46 (318)	35 (246)	19 (132)	(696)
50-64	33 (249)	30 (228)	37 (285)	(762)	16 (123)	35 (265)	49 (369)	(757)	50 (379)	34 (254)	17 (125)	(758)
65 and up	29 (197)	39 (268)	32 (216)	(681)	17 (112)	44 (296)	40 (270)	(678)	51 (340)	37 (251)	12 (81)	(672)
<i>Total</i>	30 (844)	33 (944)	37 (1055)	(2843)	14 (406)	39 (1102)	47 (1333)	(2841)	48 (1365)	35 (986)	17 (487)	(2838)
Gender												
Male	31 (646)	33 (693)	37 (770)	(2109)	15 (305)	39 (811)	47 (989)	(2105)	49 (1036)	34 (712)	17 (358)	(2106)
Female	27 (204)	34 (253)	39 (291)	(748)	14 (103)	40 (296)	47 (350)	(749)	45 (337)	37 (276)	18 (132)	(745)
<i>Total</i>	30 (850)	33 (946)	37 (1061)	(2857)	14 (408)	39 (1107)	47 (1339)	(2854)	48 (1373)	35 (988)	17 (490)	(2851)
Education				*				*				*
High school or less	30 (342)	37 (432)	33 (385)	(1159)	17 (196)	41 (473)	42 (482)	(1151)	52 (589)	35 (395)	14 (159)	(1143)
Some college	31 (294)	32 (299)	37 (344)	(937)	14 (131)	39 (368)	47 (440)	(939)	48 (453)	36 (341)	16 (148)	(942)
College grad	28 (199)	28 (200)	44 (314)	(713)	11 (79)	34 (243)	55 (397)	(719)	43 (310)	32 (228)	25 (178)	(716)
<i>Total</i>	30 (835)	33 (931)	37 (1043)	(2809)	15 (406)	39 (1084)	47 (1319)	(2809)	48 (1352)	34 (964)	17 (485)	(2801)
Marital Status												*
Married	30 (642)	33 (705)	37 (790)	(2137)	14 (291)	39 (832)	47 (1011)	(2134)	48 (1027)	35 (750)	17 (357)	(2134)
Never married	32 (73)	29 (66)	40 (91)	(230)	15 (35)	38 (89)	47 (108)	(232)	47 (107)	30 (69)	23 (53)	(229)
Divorced/separated	32 (83)	35 (90)	33 (84)	(257)	18 (46)	35 (90)	47 (121)	(257)	52 (134)	30 (77)	19 (48)	(259)
Widowed	22 (52)	37 (86)	41 (95)	(233)	16 (36)	42 (96)	43 (99)	(231)	46 (105)	40 (93)	14 (32)	(230)
<i>Total</i>	30 (850)	33 (947)	37 (1060)	(2857)	14 (408)	39 (1107)	47 (1339)	(2854)	48 (1373)	35 (989)	17 (490)	(2852)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 7. Growth in Community Population Issues by Community Structure, Region and Individual Attributes, 1997.

How would the following items affect the quality of life in your community? Growth in community population by:

	Adding elderly residents				Adding young families				Adding single parent households			
	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Reduce</i>	<i>No effect</i>	<i>Improve</i>	<i>Total</i>
Population of Town								*				*
Less than 100	23 (18)	61 (47)	16 (12)	(77)	9 (7)	31 (24)	60 (47)	(78)	31 (23)	56 (42)	13 (10)	(75)
100-499	19 (78)	55 (220)	26 (105)	(403)	6 (25)	16 (68)	78 (324)	(417)	31 (125)	44 (179)	26 (104)	(408)
500-999	18 (65)	56 (200)	26 (94)	(359)	7 (25)	14 (51)	80 (297)	(373)	35 (127)	42 (152)	23 (84)	(363)
1000-4999	17 (136)	59 (471)	24 (189)	(796)	6 (47)	16 (133)	78 (630)	(810)	35 (285)	41 (329)	24 (191)	(805)
5000-9999	16 (60)	58 (219)	27 (101)	(380)	7 (26)	21 (81)	73 (283)	(390)	34 (130)	43 (164)	24 (92)	(386)
10,000 and up	17 (139)	60 (492)	24 (196)	(827)	7 (61)	24 (197)	69 (576)	(834)	38 (315)	43 (359)	19 (154)	(828)
Total	18 (496)	58 (1649)	25 (697)	(2842)	7 (191)	19 (554)	74 (2157)	(2902)	35 (1005)	43 (1225)	22 (635)	(2865)
Region				*								*
Panhandle	16 (54)	56 (190)	28 (97)	(341)	5 (18)	18 (62)	77 (264)	(344)	36 (123)	39 (135)	25 (85)	(343)
North Central	20 (78)	53 (206)	27 (105)	(389)	8 (31)	16 (65)	76 (302)	(398)	34 (134)	43 (167)	23 (89)	(390)
South Central	17 (142)	57 (488)	26 (226)	(856)	7 (61)	20 (172)	73 (638)	(871)	33 (280)	45 (385)	23 (197)	(862)
Northeast	18 (118)	63 (424)	20 (131)	(673)	6 (42)	21 (143)	73 (508)	(693)	37 (250)	46 (314)	17 (118)	(682)
Southeast	18 (109)	58 (342)	24 (143)	(594)	7 (42)	19 (117)	74 (447)	(606)	35 (212)	40 (241)	25 (147)	(600)
Total	18 (501)	58 (1650)	25 (702)	(2853)	7 (194)	19 (559)	74 (2159)	(2912)	35 (999)	43 (1242)	22 (636)	(2877)
Income Level				*				*				*
Under \$10,000	28 (42)	41 (63)	31 (47)	(152)	17 (26)	22 (35)	61 (97)	(158)	27 (42)	39 (61)	34 (52)	(155)
\$10,000-19,999	16 (64)	58 (239)	26 (106)	(409)	8 (33)	24 (101)	68 (285)	(419)	33 (133)	45 (183)	23 (92)	(408)
\$20,000-29,999	13 (68)	60 (307)	26 (134)	(509)	4 (23)	21 (106)	75 (388)	(517)	28 (144)	48 (245)	24 (124)	(513)
\$30,000-39,999	19 (92)	58 (285)	24 (119)	(496)	7 (37)	18 (91)	75 (375)	(503)	38 (187)	40 (201)	22 (111)	(499)
\$40,000-49,999	16 (59)	63 (227)	21 (77)	(363)	5 (17)	19 (70)	76 (278)	(365)	38 (138)	45 (163)	17 (62)	(363)
\$50,000-59,999	21 (56)	57 (154)	23 (61)	(271)	8 (21)	18 (50)	74 (201)	(272)	33 (90)	45 (123)	22 (59)	(272)
\$60,000-74,999	21 (42)	58 (119)	22 (44)	(205)	6 (12)	13 (27)	81 (169)	(208)	40 (83)	36 (75)	23 (48)	(206)
\$75,000 and over	14 (32)	58 (132)	28 (64)	(228)	5 (12)	12 (28)	83 (193)	(233)	40 (93)	41 (96)	19 (43)	(232)
Total	17 (455)	58 (1526)	25 (652)	(2633)	7 (181)	19 (508)	74 (1986)	(2675)	34 (910)	43 (1147)	22 (591)	(2648)
Age								*				*
19-29	13 (27)	59 (121)	28 (56)	(204)	6 (12)	16 (33)	78 (159)	(204)	26 (52)	44 (90)	30 (61)	(203)
30-39	18 (90)	58 (295)	24 (123)	(508)	4 (22)	15 (76)	81 (409)	(507)	28 (140)	49 (247)	24 (122)	(509)
40-49	19 (131)	57 (398)	24 (167)	(696)	6 (42)	18 (125)	76 (534)	(701)	37 (256)	42 (292)	21 (146)	(694)
50-64	16 (121)	57 (431)	27 (200)	(752)	6 (45)	20 (153)	74 (570)	(768)	36 (277)	41 (313)	23 (175)	(765)
65 and up	19 (128)	59 (399)	22 (152)	(679)	10 (71)	24 (168)	67 (474)	(713)	40 (273)	42 (286)	19 (130)	(689)
Total	18 (497)	58 (1644)	25 (698)	(2839)	7 (192)	19 (555)	74 (2146)	(2893)	35 (998)	43 (1228)	22 (634)	(2860)
Gender												*
Male	17 (367)	58 (1216)	25 (521)	(2104)	7 (140)	18 (394)	75 (1605)	(2139)	36 (770)	43 (911)	21 (439)	(2120)
Female	18 (133)	58 (434)	24 (181)	(748)	7 (55)	22 (165)	71 (549)	(769)	31 (233)	43 (324)	26 (197)	(754)
Total	18 (500)	58 (1650)	25 (702)	(2852)	7 (195)	19 (559)	74 (2154)	(2908)	35 (1003)	43 (1235)	22 (636)	(2874)
Education								*				*
High school or less	18 (206)	58 (662)	24 (278)	(1146)	8 (97)	24 (277)	68 (804)	(1178)	33 (385)	45 (525)	21 (248)	(1158)
Some college	17 (163)	59 (558)	23 (219)	(940)	7 (63)	18 (170)	76 (722)	(955)	34 (320)	44 (420)	22 (208)	(948)
College grad	16 (118)	56 (405)	27 (195)	(718)	5 (35)	15 (108)	80 (579)	(722)	39 (282)	37 (264)	24 (171)	(717)
Total	17 (487)	58 (1625)	25 (692)	(2804)	7 (195)	19 (555)	74 (2105)	(2855)	35 (987)	43 (1209)	22 (627)	(2823)
Marital Status								*				*
Married	17 (351)	59 (1254)	25 (523)	(2128)	6 (129)	18 (391)	76 (1645)	(2165)	37 (792)	42 (910)	21 (443)	(2145)
Never married	23 (53)	53 (124)	24 (56)	(233)	10 (23)	23 (53)	68 (160)	(236)	32 (74)	42 (98)	26 (61)	(233)
Divorced/separated	19 (48)	53 (137)	28 (72)	(257)	8 (20)	21 (55)	71 (183)	(258)	24 (62)	45 (116)	31 (81)	(259)
Widowed	20 (48)	58 (136)	22 (51)	(235)	9 (23)	25 (61)	66 (165)	(249)	32 (75)	47 (111)	22 (51)	(237)
Total	18 (500)	58 (1651)	25 (702)	(2853)	7 (195)	19 (560)	74 (2153)	(2908)	35 (1003)	43 (1235)	22 (636)	(2874)

* Statistically significant at .05 level.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are numbers of observations.

Table 8. Measures of Community Attributes, 1996 and 1997.

	My community has changed for the...						My community is...					
	1996			1997			1996			1997		
	Better	Same	Worse	Better	Same	Worse	Friendly	No opinion	Unfriendly	Friendly	No opinion	Unfriendly
<i>Population of Town</i>												
Less than 100	21	56	23	21	55	24	80	11	9	74	11	16
100-499	28	45	27	29	51	20	75	16	8	77	11	12
500-999	31	43	26	32	51	17	74	15	11	77	13	9
1000-4999	39	40	21	36	44	20	74	15	10	72	16	12
5000-9999	46	35	20	43	40	18	70	17	13	68	19	13
10,000 and up	45	31	24	42	40	18	70	21	9	68	19	12
<i>Region</i>												
Panhandle	43	37	20	42	40	18	75	17	8	75	14	12
North Central	34	40	26	37	46	16	70	18	12	72	14	14
South Central	44	34	23	39	43	18	72	17	11	71	17	12
Northeast	38	38	24	36	44	20	71	20	9	71	19	11
Southeast	32	45	23	32	48	20	77	12	11	73	15	12
<i>Income Level</i>												
Under \$10,000	29	37	34	33	45	22	74	15	12	73	18	9
\$10,000-19,999	35	40	25	31	50	19	73	16	11	71	16	13
\$20,000-29,999	39	42	19	39	42	19	73	17	11	71	16	13
\$30,000-39,999	44	39	17	35	47	18	73	18	9	68	18	13
\$40,000-49,999	39	34	27	37	45	18	68	22	10	71	14	15
\$50,000-59,999	36	39	26	44	39	17	78	14	8	69	18	13
\$60,000-74,999	41	39	21	44	37	19	73	16	11	79	12	10
\$75,000 and over	49	31	20	45	36	19	81	13	7	81	13	5
<i>Age</i>												
19-29	39	42	19	36	50	14	77	15	8	71	19	10
30-39	39	40	21	35	48	18	70	21	10	72	15	13
40-49	37	38	25	38	41	21	70	19	12	67	20	12
50-64	38	36	26	35	44	21	74	17	10	69	18	14
65 and up	40	39	21	40	44	16	78	13	10	80	11	10
<i>Gender</i>												
Male	38	38	23	36	45	19	74	17	9	73	16	12
Female	39	38	23	39	43	18	72	17	12	71	17	12
<i>Education</i>												
High school or less	35	41	24	34	47	19	74	16	10	70	16	14
Some college	39	36	25	35	47	18	69	20	11	71	17	12
College grad	45	36	20	45	36	19	77	14	10	77	15	9
<i>Marital Status</i>												
Married	38	38	24	37	45	19	73	17	10	72	16	12
Never married	33	49	18	39	39	22	67	23	11	72	17	10
Divorced/separated	39	29	32	32	48	21	67	21	12	67	18	15
Widowed	43	39	19	41	44	14	83	10	8	80	10	10

Table 8. Measures of Community Attributes, 1996 and 1997.

	My community is...						My community is...					
	1996			1997			1996			1997		
	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>Trusting</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Distrusting</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Hostile</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Hostile</i>
<i>Population of Town</i>												
Less than 100	74	7	19	66	17	18	75	14	11	72	13	15
100-499	71	17	12	71	16	14	67	19	14	66	19	16
500-999	66	18	17	67	22	11	61	23	16	68	21	11
1000-4999	65	19	15	65	19	16	63	23	14	64	20	16
5000-9999	55	25	20	59	20	21	58	26	16	62	22	16
10,000 and up	54	27	19	56	26	19	57	27	16	58	28	15
<i>Region</i>												
Panhandle	64	21	15	63	20	17	66	23	11	63	23	14
North Central	63	20	17	67	18	15	60	23	18	64	20	16
South Central	62	22	17	63	22	16	63	21	15	62	23	15
Northeast	59	24	17	61	23	16	59	26	15	64	22	14
Southeast	65	18	17	63	18	20	61	23	16	62	22	16
<i>Income Level</i>												
Under \$10,000	64	17	18	65	18	17	62	22	17	69	20	11
\$10,000-19,999	66	18	16	61	21	18	66	20	14	60	24	16
\$20,000-29,999	62	22	16	60	23	17	63	24	13	60	25	16
\$30,000-39,999	62	22	16	62	21	17	62	22	16	62	23	16
\$40,000-49,999	57	26	17	60	20	21	55	27	18	59	24	17
\$50,000-59,999	60	22	18	61	23	16	56	29	15	63	21	16
\$60,000-74,999	62	19	19	71	17	12	61	24	15	63	23	14
\$75,000 and over	66	21	13	70	17	13	66	23	11	69	22	9
<i>Age</i>												
19-29	59	21	20	58	24	18	67	19	15	59	28	14
30-39	56	24	19	59	22	19	54	28	18	55	30	15
40-49	56	25	19	58	24	19	54	29	17	60	24	16
50-64	63	20	17	61	21	18	62	22	16	59	23	19
65 and up	73	15	12	74	15	11	73	17	11	76	15	10
<i>Gender</i>												
Male	62	21	17	62	22	16	61	23	16	62	23	15
Female	63	21	17	64	19	18	63	23	14	64	22	14
<i>Education</i>												
High school or less	64	21	15	62	20	18	63	21	16	63	21	16
Some college	60	23	18	62	22	17	57	27	16	61	24	15
College grad	63	20	17	65	21	14	64	22	13	64	23	13
<i>Marital Status</i>												
Married	62	21	17	63	21	17	61	23	16	62	23	15
Never married	58	20	22	62	20	19	60	27	13	60	23	17
Divorced/separated	52	25	23	53	26	21	50	30	20	57	28	16
Widowed	76	16	8	73	17	10	78	16	7	75	16	9

Center Working Paper 97-2, August 1997.

© 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

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.