Springettsbury Township Survey Project

Report Prepared by:

Lauren Enlow and Steve Jacob, Ph.D.

Survey Drafted by Dr. Jacob's Research Methods Class (SOC 336) of Fall 2016:

Hasan Alic, Jenna Brill, Isaiah Colmore, Lindsey Corrado, Madison Davis, Corie Elliott, Kiersten Garcia-Moran, Ashley Good, Rachel Hutchins, Samantha LoBue, Michael McDermott, Ashley McManus, Lashawn Scott, Megan Stine, and also Lauren Enlow

Data Collected by:

Hayley Althoff, Garrett Applegate, Lauren Enlow, Zakiyia Hawkins, Madeline Huntington, Bria Jones, Daniel Martinez, Salomon Ocampo, And Zachary Wojnowski

Data Entry by:

Madeline Huntigton and Bria Jones

Open-Ended Data Coding by:

Bria Jones

Data Analysis By:

Lauren Enlow and Steve Jacob, Ph.D.

Executive Summary Springettsbury Township Survey

Description of Methods

In October of 2016, the Springettsbury Township Manager Ben Marchant and Director of Community Development Jessica Fieldhouse met with Dr. Steve Jacob at York College of Pennsylvania about conducting a survey of Township residents in 2017. The purpose of the survey would be to assess citizen views of local government, services, and priorities for the future.

Working directly with Dr. Jacob's SOC 335 (Quantitative Research Methods) class, the township officials and the students drafted many potential questions. Over the course of the Fall Semester and through the semester break and into early Spring Semester, the questions were organized, edited, and formatted into a cohesive survey instrument. The survey contained 130 questions and required an average of 15 minutes to complete.

The project used a cluster sampling technique based on the population of communities throughout the township. The survey responses are proportionate to eight identified communities and their surrounding regions. The survey results are similar to population characteristics for gender, age, and income.

The township officials decided to use a unique data collection technique called drop off/pick up. The data collection involved four teams of two YCP student workers going to an address and personally asking the citizen to have the person in the household with the most recent birthday (over the age of 18) to complete the survey. The team returned the next day to collect it.

Over the week of Spring Break, in March of 2017, 235 completed surveys were gathered. The students had contacted 334 households, but had 99 refusals. This yielded a 70.4% response rate, much higher than typical mail, telephone, and email surveys.

During the analysis phase, it was discovered that the sampling framework had missed many large apartment complexes and renters were under-represented. To address this issue, apartment renters were sampled during early June. During this time, 72 residents were contacted and 56 completed the survey, yielding a 77% response rate. Responses from both samples were combined into a final data set that contained 291 responses and had a combined response rate of 71.7%. (291 completed surveys out of 406 contacts).

Selected Survey Results

The first section of the survey assessed the residents' views of their community and the township.

- 86% of residents felt their community was a desirable or very desirable place to live.
- 76% felt that in five years, their community would be a desirable or very desirable place to live.

- Great majorities 70-85% found the township to have a desirable or very desirable: appeal, prestige, and quality of life.
- "Sense of community cohesiveness" had lower responses, with about 50% of citizens reporting desirable or very desirable levels.
- 74% felt their community was environmentally conscious.
- 89% would encourage friends to live in their community.
- 90% felt their community was a good place to raise a family.
- 77% felt the cost of living was affordable in Springettsbury Township.

Overall, satisfaction in the various communities of the township is very high. There is some small drop-off in assessing the future. Community cohesiveness is an area that could be improved. A sense of community cohesiveness emerges from frequent social interaction with neighbors and involvement with collective actions. Festivals, community projects, and opportunities to gather help residents develop a sense of community cohesiveness.

The second section of the survey assessed employment, business, and recreation opportunities within the township.

- About 40-60% of respondents were unsure about the township as a place for employment, the quality of employment opportunities, or a place to own or operate a business.
- About two thirds of residents were satisfied or very satisfied with employment opportunities, the quality of employment opportunities within the township, or a place to own or operate a business after the Don't Know responses were removed from the analysis. About 20% of respondents were neutral on these issues.
- About two thirds of residents were satisfied or very satisfied with township youth involvement programs, exercise programs, recreation and exercise facilities, and opportunities to live an active healthy lifestyle.

Many residents are unaware of the employment and business opportunity climate of the township. This is an area of potential education for residents. The majority of residents are satisfied with current levels of youth and exercise programs, recreation and exercise facilities, and opportunities to live a healthy lifestyle.

The third section of the survey asked residents to rate their satisfaction with the maintenance of public areas.

- Over 70% were satisfied or very satisfied with the appearance of the township and of the public areas.
- About two thirds were satisfied or very satisfied with landscaping and design and litter and trash removal in parks and gardens.
- 60% were satisfied or very satisfied with local air quality.

Citizens expressed high levels of satisfaction with the appearance of the township and maintenance of parks and gardens. Air quality did not reach the same high levels of satisfaction in the township as appearance and maintenance issues.

The fourth section of the survey assessed participation in township operation and governance.

- 93% of residents reported caring about the township.
- Only 21% said they were interested in participating in township planning for the future.
- 9.7% reported they volunteered with the township.
- 29% said they know how to get involved with township planning.
- 50% said there were enough news sources within the township.

There is a disconnect between respondents who said they care about the township's future and those who are willing to participate in planning. About two thirds of residents do not know how to get involved. Over half would like more news sources about township activities.

The fifth section assessed feelings of safety and satisfaction with services.

- About 95% of residents agreed or strongly agreed that they feel safe during the day in their community and 89% in the township.
- 71% of residents agreed or strongly agreed that they feel safe after dark in the community and 60% in the township.
- About 55% of residents agreed or strongly agreed that traffic enforcement and code enforcement is adequate.
- About 70% of residents indicated that drug, property, and violent crimes were serious or very serious problems.
- Over 95% of respondents felt water, sewer, trash, recycling, maintenance of public areas, police protection, fire protection, traffic management, quality of roads, pedestrian crossings, snow removal and emergency services should be a moderate or high priority.
- Over 85% of respondents felt health and human services, recreation, and health and human services should be a moderate or high priority.
- About 80% of respondents felt code enforcement, tax collection, adequate park space, access and quality of sidewalks, leaf pickup, library services, and maintenance of sport fields should be a moderate or high priority.
- About 70% of respondents Education at all levels should be a moderate or high priority.

In general residents feel very safe in their home community and safe in the township. People feel less safe at night, especially outside of their community. Residents have a great deal of support for traditional township services.

The last section of the survey assessed support for potential future initiatives.

- Residents were asked if they would support a new police station. 30% said YES, 37% said NO, and 33% were UNSURE.
- Support for a new recreation/athletic facility was assessed. 37% said YES, 38% said NO, and 25% were UNSURE.
- Support for a new community center was assessed. 40% said YES, 37% said NO, and 23% were UNSURE.

- Support for a new full service library was assessed. 58% said YES, 22% said NO, and 20% were UNSURE.

Although support for a new police station, recreation facility and community center ranges from 30% to 37%, the undecided remain substantial ranging from 25% to 33%. There is an educational opportunity here to convince residents in the case of genuine need. Over half of respondents support the development of a new full-service library.

Bivariate analyses were conducted to see how major categories of citizens differ on survey responses. Women expected less change in community desirability than men. Men evaluated Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment, the Township Management, and Perceived Safety higher than women.

Age differences were more complicated, with younger and the oldest citizens being less supportive of Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment, the Township Management, and Fire, EMS, and Police Services.

There are many differences between Renters and Owners, in general, Owners were more likely to rate the township and priorities higher than renters. Similarly, long-term residents were more likely to rate the township and priorities higher than shorter-term residents.

In general, wealthier citizens were more likely to rate the township and priorities higher than lower income citizens. However, the very wealthiest category showed lower priorities.

There were relatively few differences or no discernible patterns by Household Size, Number of Full-Time Workers in the Household, Employed Outside of the Township, and Commute Length.

Multivariate Analyses were conducted on four dependent variables that indicated support for a New Police Station, Athletic/Recreation Facility, a Community Center, and a Full-Service Library.

From the Police Station analysis, it is clear there are a sizeable number of older home owners who feel the township is safe and appealing right now. This group shows little support for a new station. Support for the station is seen in the long-term residents, who like how the township is managed, and who generally support emergency services express the most support for the new station.

Age is the only statistically significant variable that predicts support for an Athletic/Recreation facility. As age increases, support decreases.

Three variables were significant in the model for Support for a Community Center. Age was the best predictor. As age increases, support decreases. White respondents were more supportive, while renters were also more likely to support the proposed Community Center.

The model for Support for a Full-Service Library had five contributing variables. The strongest predictor was Income before Taxes. As income increases support for the library decreases. How long have you lived in the township was also a strong predictor, with longer-term residents showing less support for the library. Women were more supportive than men. Those who place the highest spending priorities on education were the most supportive of the library. Households that had more fulltime workers were the most supportive of a new Full-Service Library.

Survey and Results

Springettsbury Township Survey

Measuring your overall satisfaction within the local community.

Dear Citizen,

The purpose of this survey is to assess levels of well-being and satisfaction with services in your local community and township. The information collected will be used to figure out how the township should best provide its efforts in improving, maintaining, and adding new services.

You will be asked about your views on township and community issues. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The information you provide will be kept confidential; only the survey workers will interact with you for the purposes of this study. You may receive further contact depending on your level of interest in township engagement. Your name or address will not be linked to your responses. After the survey workers collect your completed survey, your responses will be kept confidential.

Your decision to be in this research is voluntary and if you participate there is no compensation. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. You may withdraw from this research at any time. To participate in this research study you must be 18 years of age or older. If more than one person over the age of 18 lives in this house, we would like the person who had the latest birthday to take the survey.

Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. Please contact Lauren Enlow at lenlow@ycp.edu or Dr. Steve Jacob at 717-815-6412 with any questions, complaints or concerns about this research.

Completion of the interview implies your consent to participate in this research.

Sincere thanks,

Benjamin Marchant, Jessica Fieldhouse, Steven Jacob, and Lauren Enlow

Springettsbury Township

1501 Mount Zion Road, York, PA 17402
P: (717) 757-3521
F: (717) 757-7856
info@springettsbury.com

Springettsbury Township requests your help by completing the following community assessment survey. The information you provide will help the Township to better provide the services that will best meet your needs and expectations. Thank you for your time.

A) Community Perceptions: First, we would like to ask you some questions concerning your life in the community you live in.

1 What is the name of your community?

_____

	N=291	Very undesirable	Somewhat Undesirable	Neutral	Somewhat desirable	Very desirable	Don't Know: N/A
2	How do you feel about your community as a place to live?	6.2%	4.1%	3.1%	29.6%	56.6%	.3%
3	As you look ahead to the next five years, do you expect your community to become:	5.9%	3.4%	10.0%	30.7%	45.5%	4.5%

B) Community Appeal: Next, we would like to ask you how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following.

	N=291	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't know: N/A
1	The appeal of my Township	.7%	2.4%	13.9%	50.3%	31.3%	1.4%
2	The prestige of my community	.7%	4.5%	19.9%	50.5%	23.7%	.7%
3	Quality of life in the Township	.7%	1.7%	10.4%	51.4%	33.7%	2.1%
4	Springettsbury Township as a place to retire	2.4%	6.9%	23.3%	33.0%	24.3%	10.1%
5	Services for those who are retired	3.8%	7.7%	19.9%	22.6%	8.0%	38.0%
6	Sense of community or cohesiveness	1.7%	8.7%	35.5%	37.3%	10.1%	6.6%

Please circle the answer that most resonates with you. If your answer is "other," please write in your response on the line provided. N=291

7 How Many times a week do you cook or prepare your own dinners?

0-1 Times	1.7%
2-3 Times	13.2%
4-5 Times	49.0%
6-7 Times	36.1%

8 How close is the nearest healthy and affordable food option to your residence?

0-1 Miles	34.7%
1-2 Miles	38.2%
2-3 Miles	20.0%
More than 3 Miles	7.0%

9 What is the most appealing aspect of the community to you?

Location	80.8%
Employment Opportunities	0%
Cost of Living	6.9%
Other _____	7.6%

10 What aspects of the community could use improvements?

Public Transportation	23.8%
Public Works Projects	32.9%
Parks and Leisure	20.3%
Other _____	22.9%

Next, we would like to ask whether you agree with the following statements.

N=291		Yes	No	Don't Know: N/A
11	Do you feel that your community is environmentally conscious?	74.2%	13.9%	11.8%
12	Would you encourage others to live in this community?	89.2%	4.5%	6.3%
13	Do you have children under the age of 18 in your household?	26.2%	73.8%	0%
14	Do you feel that Springettsbury Township is a good place to raise a family?	90.5%	1.8%	7.7%
15	During the past year have you sought child care services in Springettsbury Township?	8.4%	86.4%	5.2%
16	Are you satisfied with the Child Care Services in the Township?	7.7%	4.2%	87.7
17	Do you consider the child care that is available to be affordable?	5.3%	9.9%	84.9%
18	The cost of living in Springettsbury Township is affordable?	77.5%	13.7%	8.8%

C) Citizenship Opportunities: Please answer how satisfied you are with the following areas.

	N=291	Very unsatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know: N/A
1	Employment opportunities	.3%	3.8%	24.4%	25.1%	7.3%	39.0%
2	Quality of employment opportunities	.3%	5.9%	22.3%	28.6%	3.8%	39.0%
3	Internship opportunities for students	.3%	5.6%	15.3%	2.8%	2.4%	73.5%

	N=291	Very Unsatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know: N/A
4	The Township as a place to own or operate a business	2.1%	3.5%	14.3%	18.5%	5.6%	55.9%
5	Recreational opportunities and community involvement for youth.	3.8%	5.9%	17.0%	38.8%	21.5%	13.1%
6	Overall the Township provides enough opportunities that support living a healthy lifestyle	1.0%	5.2%	16.6%	49.5%	21.1%	6.6%
7	The Township offers a good variety of exercise programs.	1.0%	4.5%	15.5%	45.5%	19.0%	14.5%
8	Overall the Township provides recreation and exercise facilities.	2.4%	5.5%	16.2%	46.2%	22.1%	7.6%
9	Overall the Township provides the opportunity to explore arts and culture.	2.8%	16.3%	26.0%	26.0%	9.4%	19.4%
10	Entertainment needs within the Township	3.1%	13.1%	30.1%	34.3%	10.0%	9.3%

D) Housing Options in the Township: Next, we would like to ask you your opinion on whether there is enough housing variety in the Township.

N=291	**Do you feel the Township has a shortage of the following particular types of housing?**	Yes	No	Don't Know: N/A
1	Single family homes in the $100,000 to $200,000 price range	31.9%	40.0%	28.1%
2	Single family homes in the $200,000 to $350,000 price range	22.5%	39.4%	38.0%
3	Single family homes over $350,000	14.9%	33.3%	51.8%
4	Low maintenance housing such as condos	25.0%	35.2%	39.8%
5	Affordable rental units	26.6%	27.7	45.7%
6	Moderately priced rental units	24.0%	24.0%	51.9%
7	Luxury rental units	12.6%	24.2%	63.2%
8	Housing geared towards aging adults	20.1%	32.0%	47.9%

N=291	**If you answered yes to any of the above questions, should the Township encourage the following types of housing?**	Yes	No	Don't Know: N/A
9	New single family home construction	40.2%	31.8%	27.4%
10	Affordable housing for individuals in low to moderate income ranges	44.7%	31.8%	23.5%
11	Multi-family apartments	19.7%	50.9%	29.4%
12	Condo development	37.4%	34.2%	28.3%
13	Age-in-place housing for older adults	57.6%	13.8%	28.6%
14	Continuing care communities for aging adults ex. Willow Valley, Lancaster County, PA	53.4%	14.6%	32.0%
15	Other_____ _____ (please include your own example)			

E) Environmental Concerns: Please answer how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following.

	N=291	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know: N/A
1	Appearance of public areas	.7%	4.5%	13.4%	60.0%	20.3%	1.0%
2	Use of available land	2.8%	9.5%	30.5%	38.6%	7.0%	11.6%
3	Removal of litter in parks and gardens	2.4%	3.5%	19.2%	45.3%	22.0%	7.7%
4	Overall Township appearance	.7%	5.6%	17.7%	53.1%	20.8%	2.1%
5	Air quality	1.4%	9.0%	24.9%	46.0%	11.1%	7.6%
6	Cleaning of public areas	2.1%	4.5%	22.9%	52.4%	14.2%	3.8%
7	Cleaning of public trashcans	.3%	4.2%	22.3%	50.2%	10.1%	12.9%
8	Landscaping and design of the Township	3.2%	3.5%	23.9%	50.7%	13.7%	4.9%

F) Citizenship Engagement: Next, we would like ask you some questions concerning your involvement as a citizen.

	N=291	Yes	No	Don't Know: N/A
1	I care about the future of the Township	93.3%	.7%	6.0%
2	I am interested in participating in planning for the future of the Township	20.5%	50.0%	29.5%
3	I volunteer within the Township.	9.7%	85.1%	5.2%
4	I know how to get involved with Township planning and engagement	28.5%	55.6%	16.0%
5	There are enough news sources within the Township?	50.0%	17.0%	33.0%

6 What are your communication preferences for Township notices of programs and events?	
Email	24.7%
Phone Call	2.3%
Flyers	56.6%
Televisions Announcement	7.8%
Other (please indicate your preference on the line) _____	8.7%

G) Public Safety Issues: We would like to ask a few questions concerning your safety in your community and Township.

N=291		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I feel safe in my community during the day	1.0%	.3%	5.5%	59.2%	33.9%
2	I feel safe in my community after dark	2.4%	5.9%	20.3%	55.5%	15.9%
3	I feel safe in the Township during the day	1.4%	.3%	10.0%	63.3%	24.9%
4	I feel safe in the Township after dark	2.4%	8.7%	28.6%	47.4%	12.9%
5	The level of traffic enforcement is adequate	6.9%	16.7%	19.4%	47.2%	9.7%
6	The level of code enforcement is adequate	8.1%	10.9%	24.6%	46.3%	10.2%

Please answer how serious these issues are to you.

	N=291	Not Serious	Somewhat Serious	Serious	Very Serious	Uncertain
7	Drug related crimes	7.7%	7.7%	26.0%	51.2%	7.4%
8	Property crimes	9.8%	8.0%	25.9%	50.3%	5.9%
9	Violent crimes	9.1%	5.6%	13.7%	63.5%	8.1%
10	White collar crime	10.6%	17.3%	27.8%	32.7%	11.6%

H) Public Services and Public Recreation: We would like to ask you a few questions concerning how much of a priority these services are to you.

	N=291	Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High Priority	Not sure: N/A
1	Education (Kindergarten – 12th grade)	10.8%	4.9%	13.2%	57.5%	13.6%
2	Education vocational / technical	9.8%	11.1%	25.1%	42.2%	11.8%
3	College and Community College	10.1%	8.7%	28.9%	40.1%	12.2%
4	Library services	5.9%	11.8%	35.1%	39.9%	7.3%
5	Health and human services	3.9%	7.9%	22.9%	61.1%	4.3%
6	Activities for young people	6.7%	4.6%	26.3%	52.3%	10.2%
7	Activities for older and elderly people	8.3%	8.0%	29.5%	47.9%	6.3%
8	Recreation facilities	4.6%	5.6%	33.3%	50.9%	5.6%
9	Water services	1.4%	5.5%	18.0%	73.0%	2.1%
10	Sewer services	1.4%	3.5%	22.8%	70.9%	1.4%
11	Trash collection	1.7%	3.8%	22.8%	69.2%	2.4%
12	Recycling services	2.1%	4.5%	20.4%	72.0%	1.0%
13	Fire protection within the Township	1.4%	3.5%	11.8%	82.6%	.7%
14	Emergency services (ambulance / medical) in the Township	2.8%	1.7%	11.8%	82.7%	1.0%
15	Access to healthcare within the Township	3.8%	7.3%	34.0%	52.1%	2.8%

	N=291	Not a Priority	Low Priority	Moderate Priority	High Priority	Not Sure: N/A
16	Code enforcement in Springettsbury Township	5.2%	17.1%	33.9%	37.4%	6.3%
17	Police Protection	1.4%	2.4%	12.2%	83.2%	.7%
18	Tax collection services within the Township	6.0%	16.1%	45.6%	24.2%	8.1%
19	Adequate park space in the Township	7.3%	8.7%	41.2%	40.8%	2.1%
20	Maintenance of public areas in the Township	3.8%	3.1%	39.7%	51.9%	1.4%
21	Maintenance of sporting fields in the Township	4.9%	8.0%	43.7%	40.2%	3.1%
22	Traffic management	3.5%	4.2%	25.8%	64.5%	2.1%
23	Quality of roads	0%	1.8%	22.1%	75.8%	.4%
24	Access to public transportation in the Township	16.5%	17.6%	37.3%	23.2%	5.3%
25	Parking options	10.2%	21.1%	44.0%	21.5%	3.2%
26	Bike Paths	8.7%	22.0%	36.7%	27.3%	5.2%
27	Access to sidewalks	7.0%	10.9%	36.1%	43.2%	2.8%
28	Quality of sidewalks	6.3%	9.5%	29.5%	51.6%	3.2%
29	Pedestrian crossing (safety, location, visibility)	.4%	10.9%	29.2%	58.1%	1.4%
30	Snow removal services	3.1%	2.8%	21.8%	72.3%	0%
31	Leaf pick up services	6.2%	8.7%	31.8%	52.9%	.3%

I) Future Initiatives: Please indicate whether you would support the following possible upcoming projects.

	N=291	Yes	No	Unsure: Don't Know
1	I would support a new police station	29.6%	37.6%	32.8%
2	I would support a new recreation athletic facility	37.3%	37.7%	25.0%

		Yes	No	Unsure: Don't Know
3	I would support a new community center that hosts the following (meetings, banquets etc….)	39.9%	37.1%	23.0%
4	I would support a new full service library	58.2%	22.1%	19.6%

J) Please answer the following open ended questions concerning likes and dislikes about the Township.

1 What do you like the most about Springettsbury Township?

2 What do you like the least about Springettsbury Township?

3 What concerns you the most about Township Spending?

4 If you are not satisfied with the Township Website, what can be done to improve it?

5 How can the Township get better advice from its citizens?

6 If you are interested in becoming more involved in the community, please provide your contact information.

Name:

Address:

Email:

Telephone Number:

7 Please list any safety concerns you would like to share.

K) Demographics: Please circle the answer the best resonates with you.

1 Gender

Male	48%
Female	52%

2 Approximate Age

18-24	3.2%
25-34	10.5%
35-44	16.1%
45-54	19.3%
55-64	17.2%
65-74	19.6%
75 or older	14.0%

3 Racial and Ethnic Background

White	96.0%
Black	1.4%
Asian	.8%
Hispanic	1.8%

4 Are you a permanent or seasonal resident in your community?

Permanent	99.7%
Seasonal	.3%

5 Do you currently own or rent your dwelling?

Own	77.1%
Rent	22.9%

6 How long have you lived in Springettsbury Township?

Less than 2 years	7.1%
2-5 years	22. %
6-10 years	17.0%
11-20 years	28.0%
More than 30 years	33.0%

7 How many members are there in your household?

1 Person	11.2%
2 People	45.1%
3 People	20.3%
4 People	12.6%
5 People	6.6%
6 People	2.1%
7 People	0%
8 People	1.7%
9 or more People	.3%

8 How many people in your household work over thirty hours per week?

1 person	44.7%
2 People	28.2%
3 People	13.6%
4 People	.5%
5 People	0%

9 Are you employed in Springettsbury Township?

Yes	15.8%
No	84.2%

10 What is your total daily commute to work round trip?

1-10 miles	59.5%
11-20 miles	16.2%
21-30 miles	13.5%
Greater than 30 miles	10.8%

11 In relation to the Township of Springettsbury, please choose which one of the following characteristics best describes you?

Business Owner in the Township	4.8%
Business Operator in the Township	1.1%
Business Owner outside of the Township	2.6%
Business Operator outside the Township	1.1%
Neither a business operator or a business owner	90.4%

12 What was your household income before taxes during the past twelve months?

Less than $25,000	11.3%
$25,000 - $34,999	12.1%
$35,000 - $49,999	14.2%
$50,000 - $74,999	23.8%
$75,000 - $99,000	17.9%
$100,000 or more	20.8%

L) Additional Comments:

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Your feedback is valued and very much appreciated! Have a great day.

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY

9 What is the most appealing aspect of the community to you?

Location	80.8%
Employment Opportunities	0%
Cost of Living	6.9%
Other * _____	7.6%

*Open ended responses

Item	Number	Percent
School District	8	33.3%
Quiet	3	12.5%
Location	3	12.5%
Activities and Events	2	8.3%
Shopping	1	4.2%
Safe	1	4.2%
Appearance	1	4.2%
Social Ties	1	4.2%
Not Appealling	1	4.2%
Neighbors	1	4.2%
Progressive	1	4.2%
Cost of Living	1	4.2%
Total	24	100.0%

10 What aspects of the community could use improvements?

Public Transportation	23.8%
Public Works Projects	32.9%
Parks and Leisure	20.3%
Other* _____	22.9%

*Open ended responses

Item	Number	Percent
Roads	11	23.4%
Traffic	4	8.5%
More Traffic Lights	3	6.4%
Community Center and Pool	3	6.4%
Street Lights	2	4.3%
Burdensome Codes	2	4.3%
Rezoning	2	4.3%
Taxes	2	4.3%
High End Eateries and Shopping	2	4.3%
Sound Barrier	1	2.1%
Neighborhood Rules	1	2.1%
Replace Faded Signs	1	2.1%
Traffic Planning	1	2.1%
Speeding	1	2.1%
Electric Grid	1	2.1%
Healthy Eating Establishments	1	2.1%
Overdevelopment	1	2.1%
Flooding	1	2.1%
Safety	1	2.1%
Limit Commercial Trucks in Driveways	1	2.1%
Junk Cars in Yards	1	2.1%
Grocery Stores	1	2.1%
Senior Center	1	2.1%
Trash Collection	1	2.1%

N=291	**If you answered yes to any of the above questions, should the Township encourage the following types of housing?**	Yes	No	Don't Know: N/A
9	New single family home construction	40.2%	31.8%	27.4%
10	Affordable housing for individuals in low to moderate income ranges	44.7%	31.8%	23.5%
11	Multi-family apartments	19.7%	50.9%	29.4%
12	Condo development	37.4%	34.2%	28.3%
13	Age-in-place housing for older adults	57.6%	13.8%	28.6%
14	Continuing care communities for aging adults ex. Willow Valley, Lancaster County, PA	53.4%	14.6%	32.0%
15	Other_____ _____ (please include your own example)*			

4 Way Stop at 7th and Russell	1	2.1%
Total	47	100.0%

Question D-15 Open-Ended Responses

*Open ended responses

Item	**Number**	**Percent**
Overdeveloped	11	61.1%
Minimize New Construction	2	11.1%
Retirement Housing	1	5.6%
Differing Price Points in Neighborhoods	1	5.6%
Boutiques and Cafes in Neighborhoods	1	5.6%
Affordable 5-10 Acre Lots	1	5.6%
Another Prison/Jobs	1	5.6%
Total	18	100.0%

6 What are your communication preferences for Township notices of programs and events?

Email	24.7%
Phone Call	2.3%
Flyers	56.6%
Televisions Announcement	7.8%
Other (please indicate your preference on the line)* _____	8.7%

*Open ended responses

Item	Number	Percent
Newsletter	9	28.1%
US Mail	5	15.6%
Social Media	5	15.6%
Newspaper	4	12.5%
Quartely Booklet	4	12.5%
Website	2	6.3%
Robo-Call	1	3.1%
Postings at Township Facilities and Property	1	3.1%
Text Message	1	3.1%
Total	32	100.0%

J) Please answer the following open ended questions concerning likes and dislikes about the Township.

1 What do you like the **most** about Springettsbury Township?

Item	Number	Percent
Location/Convenience	98	35.5%
Appearance	27	9.8%
Parks	26	9.4%
School District	20	7.2%
Safety	19	6.9%
Quiet	17	6.2%
Friendly	15	5.4%
Parks and Rec Programs	11	4.0%
Fire and Police	7	2.5%
Affordable	6	2.2%
Good Place to Raise a Family	5	1.8%
Good Services	5	1.8%
Ability to Walk to Things	4	1.4%
Concerts	3	1.1%
Township Government	3	1.1%
Shaded	3	1.1%
Middle Class Residents	1	0.4%
Street Lights	1	0.4%
Not Densely Populated	1	0.4%
Little Section 8 Housing	1	0.4%
Historic East York	1	0.4%
Fireworks	1	0.4%
Spacing of Homes	1	0.4%
Total	276	100.0%

2 What do you like the **least** about Springettsbury Township?

Item	Number	Percent
Traffic	39	22.8%
Taxes	14	8.2%
Overdevelopment	14	8.2%
Ordinances/Codes	13	7.6%
Unmaintained Properties	11	6.4%
Lack of Sidewalks	6	3.5%
Poor Snow Plowing	6	3.5%
Speeding	5	2.9%
Serious Crimes	5	2.9%
Traffic Lights	4	2.3%
Roadwork	4	2.3%
Close to York City Crime	4	2.3%
Lack of Street Cleaning Year Round	3	1.8%
Zoning	3	1.8%
Officials Hard to Deal With	3	1.8%
Too Many Rentals	3	1.8%
No Library	3	1.8%
Penn Waste	2	1.2%
No High End Shopping	2	1.2%
Flooding	2	1.2%
No Parks for Young Kids	2	1.2%
Lack of Parking Enforcement	2	1.2%
I-83 Noise	2	1.2%
Abandonded Homes	2	1.2%
Spending by Township	2	1.2%
No Pool	2	1.2%
Fees for Permits	1	0.6%
Low Water Pressure	1	0.6%
No Public Transporation	1	0.6%
Odors from Landfill	1	0.6%
No Town Center	1	0.6%
Dog Waste Not Picked Up	1	0.6%
Littering	1	0.6%
Too many Trucks on Route 24	1	0.6%
Mall	1	0.6%
Allowing Therapy Chickens	1	0.6%
No Bike Lanes	1	0.6%
No Metal Detecting in Parks	1	0.6%
Not Allowed to Park RV on Lawn	1	0.6%
Total	171	100.0%

3 What concerns you the most about Township Spending?

Item	Number	Percent
Inefficient Spending	57	59.4%
High Taxes	15	15.6%
Future Initiatives Listed in Survey	4	4.2%
Lack of Transparency	3	3.1%
I'm Happy	3	3.1%
Too Many Businesses/Shops	2	2.1%
Not Enough Police	2	2.1%
Roads	2	2.1%
Salaries	1	1.0%
Drugs	1	1.0%
Not Enough Rec Programs	1	1.0%
Fixed Income Tax Squeeze	1	1.0%
Lawn Service in Parks	1	1.0%
Not Resident Focused	1	1.0%
Not Seeing Results	1	1.0%
Rezoning	1	1.0%
Total	96	100.0%

4 If you are not satisfied with the Township Website, what can be done to improve it?

Item	Number	Percent
Don't Ever Use	25	37.9%
Satisfied	22	33.3%
Difficult to Navigate	7	10.6%
I Don't Own a Computer	5	7.6%
No Fees for Autopay Sewer&Trash	2	3.0%
Street Improvement	1	1.5%
Proofread Posts	1	1.5%
Not Mobile Device Friendly	1	1.5%
Have a Facebook Page	1	1.5%
Show the Debts We Carry	1	1.5%
Total	66	100.0%

5 How can the Township get better advice from its citizens?

Item	Number	Percent
Surveys	52	43.3%
Public Meetings	23	19.2%
Listen to Residents	18	15.0%
Monthly Emails	5	4.2%
Community Events	5	4.2%
Be Honest	2	1.7%
Advise Tab on Website	2	1.7%
Update Facebook Page	2	1.7%
Mail Out Suggestion Forms	2	1.7%
Flyers	2	1.7%
Answer the Phone	1	0.8%
Give Immediate Feedback	1	0.8%
Walk the Neighborhoods with Citizens	1	0.8%
Better Politicians	1	0.8%
Publish Budget Report	1	0.8%
Have After Business Hours	1	0.8%
Townhalls	1	0.8%
Totals	120	100.0%

7 Please list any safety concerns you would like to share.

Item	Number	Percent
Speeding	8	12.9%
Sidewalks	5	8.1%
Ignoring Traffic Signs	5	8.1%
Car Break-In	4	6.5%
Street Lights	3	4.8%
Not Enough Police	3	4.8%
Roads	3	4.8%
Traffic	3	4.8%
Garage Break-In	2	3.2%
Non-Locals Traffic in Residential Area	2	3.2%
Snow Plowing	2	3.2%
Drugs	2	3.2%
Dog Leash Policy	1	1.6%
Fireworks	1	1.6%
Speed Limit Signs	1	1.6%
Signs on Rail Trail for Private Property	1	1.6%
Parking Enforcement	1	1.6%
Dangerous at Night	1	1.6%
Too Many Rentals	1	1.6%
Declining Neighborhood	1	1.6%
Traffic Light Timing Too Short	1	1.6%
Water Quality	1	1.6%
Overdevelopment	1	1.6%
Unsafe Trash Collection	1	1.6%
Road Marking Faded	1	1.6%
Abandonded Vehicles	1	1.6%
Bullying at Recreation Programs	1	1.6%
No More Development on RT 24	1	1.6%
Left Turn Lane Vernon and Market	1	1.6%
Stop Sign 7th and Russell	1	1.6%
Turn Lane Haines RD whole way	1	1.6%
More Lights on Market	1	1.6%
Totals	62	100.0%

L) Additional Comments:

Item	Number	Percent
Improve Services	4	8.7%
Lower Taxes	4	8.7%
Learn from Other Communities	3	6.5%
Domestic Pet Problems	3	6.5%
Good Survey	2	4.3%
Summer Concerts are Loved	2	4.3%
Stop Development on Zion Road	2	4.3%
Shorter Surveys	2	4.3%
Stop Sprawl	2	4.3%
Building Codes Must Be Reviewed	2	4.3%
Recruit Businesses with Jobs	1	2.2%
Need Auto Repair Shop	1	2.2%
Debris around Homes	1	2.2%
Too Many Derelict Cars	1	2.2%
No More Retail Shops	1	2.2%
Friday Traffic is Terrible	1	2.2%
Flooding	1	2.2%
Mosquitoes	1	2.2%
Don't Ask about Income	1	2.2%
Township is in Decline	1	2.2%
Proud to Call This Home	1	2.2%
Public Transportation is Inadequate	1	2.2%
Resurface Roads	1	2.2%
Snow Removal	1	2.2%
Increase Code Enforcement	1	2.2%
Metal Detecting in Parks	1	2.2%
900 Block of S.Russel is a Junkyard	1	2.2%
No Trailers on Narrow Streets	1	2.2%
Camp Security Development	1	2.2%
Green Light at Concord and RT 24 Too Short	1	2.2%

BIVARIATE ANALYSES

Analyses

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Gender

Women and men were statistically different in four of the indicators. For Desirability Change, women were more optimistic than men, expecting less negative change in their community. Women however, were less satisfied then men with Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment within the Township. The mean score for women was close to the neutral category, where for men it was closer to the satisfied category. This pattern continues for satisfaction with Township Management, where women are closer to the neutral category and men are closer to the satisfied category. Women were also more concerned about their safety then men, with their mean close to "agreeing" to feeling safe, and the men's mean being slightly higher.

Table 3. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Gender and the indices.

Variables	Female	Male	F	P
Desirability Change	-.054	-.196	4.15	.043
Appeal	3.98	4.07	.790	.375
Retire	2.89	2.98	.435	.510
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.17	3.51	6.96	.009
Township MGMT	3.43	3.63	4.98	.026
Perceived Safety	3.82	4.01	4.99	.025
Crime	3.08	3.13	.150	.699
Education Priorities	2.98	2.95	.053	.818
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.54	3.51	.263	.608
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.69	3.71	.060	.807
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.26	3.26	.002	.968
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.28	3.21	.445	.505

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Age

There were four variables that were statistically significant in the analysis of Age. Desirability Change by age shows an interesting pattern where younger respondents expect their community to either stay the same or get better, where respondents over 55 are much less optimistic. For Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment, those aged 55-74 are the most satisfied, while the other age groups are slightly less satisfied. Satisfaction with township management is lowest for the youngest and oldest groups, and similarly high for the middle. Last, Fire, EMS, and Police was a lower priority (still very close to the high priority category of 4) for the first three younger groups, then is higher for the last three older groups (nearly reaching the high priority category of 4).

Table 4. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Age and the indices.

Variables	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	F	P
Desirability Change	.000	.186	.000	-.312	-.259	-.343	6.98	.000
Appeal	3.88	3.83	4.11	3.97	4.26	4.07	2.06	.070
Retire	2.80	2.29	2.68	2.89	3.56	3.31	9.399	.000
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.16	3.11	3.25	3.60	3.57	3.07	2.51	.031
Township MGMT	3.22	3.64	3.48	3.59	3.69	3.35	2.49	.032
Perceived Safety	3.84	3.91	3.91	3.82	4.10	3.86	1.14	.337
Crime	3.19	2.94	3.02	3.17	3.31	3.04	1.03	.397
Education Priorities	3.14	3.09	2.92	2.81	3.02	2.80	.801	.550
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.68	3.40	3.37	3.53	3.59	3.64	1.96	.085
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.67	3.59	3.48	3.83	3.87	3.77	3.05	.011
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.29	3.15	3.13	3.33	3.41	3.31	1.58	.165
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.29	3.30	3.00	3.29	3.37	3.29	1.36	.238

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Race

Eight of the 12 variables produced statistical differences with the Race variable. Because there were relatively few racial minorities in the sample, they are coded into two categories of White and Non-white. This is often done in census and social analyses. For satisfaction with the township as a place to Retire, non-whites were in the dissatisfied category while whites were in the neutral category. Satisfaction with Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment was also similarly patterned. For Non-whites in the sample, Crime was reported as less of a problem (near the somewhat serious category) than for Whites (who are in the serious category). Non-whites felt education should be a lower priority (in the low priority category) than Whites (in the moderate priority category). For the following four variables, 1) Water, Sewer, and Trash; 2) Fire, EMS, and Police; 3) Traffic, Roads, and Parking; and 4) Sidewalks and Crossings the analysis reveals a similar pattern of Non-whites indicating a lower priority (between low and moderate priority categories) than Whites (who are near moderate or high priority).

Table 5. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Race and the indices.

Variables	Non-White	White	F	P
Desirability Change	-.125	-.123	.000	.992
Appeal	4.09	4.05	.023	.879
Retire	1.57	2.98	11.90	.001
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	1.95	3.36	15.39	.000
Township MGMT	3.50	3.52	.007	.932
Perceived Safety	4.15	3.90	.914	.340
Crime	1.97	3.18	13.71	.000
Education Priorities	1.92	3.02	8.28	.004
Water, Sewer, & Trash	2.57	3.57	22.10	.000
Fire, EMS, and Police	2.46	3.76	45.36	.000
Traffic, Roads, & Park	2.67	3.30	8.40	.004
Sidewalks & Crossings	2.62	3.29	5.66	.018

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Rent or Own

Ten of the 12 variables show statistically significant differences between Renters and Owners.

Renters were more optimistic about the future desirability of their community. Renters were slightly less likely to be satisfied with the appeal of the township and the township as a place to retire. Renters felt slightly less safe than Owners, but saw crime as a slightly less serious problem. Renters were also less likely to make education and township services a priority than owners.

Table 6. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Rent or Own and the indices.

Variables	Rent	Own	F	P
Desirability Change	.153	-.209	22.29	.000
Appeal	3.80	4.10	6.75	.010
Retire	2.48	3.00	15.18	.000
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.16	3.36	1.75	.187
Township MGMT	3.38	3.55	2.63	.106
Perceived Safety	3.68	3.98	4.52	.002
Crime	2.70	3.23	12.26	.000
Education Priorities	2.75	3.02	4.06	.045
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.30	3.60	12.26	.001
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.49	3.76	9.50	.002
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.04	3.34	11.10	.001
Sidewalks & Crossings	2.93	3.30	13.47	.000

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Years Lived in the Township

Nine of the 12 indices were statistically significant with Years Lived in the Township. Those with the shortest time in the township (less than two years) were the most optimistic about the future desirability of the township. Those with the longest time lived in the township were the most pessimistic. Those with the longest time lived were the most satisfied with the appeal of the township and the township as a place to retire. Those with the shortest time lived were the most concerned with crime. Interestingly, those with the shortest and longest times lived were the most likely to give a higher priority to the last five variables.

Table 7. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Years lived in the township and the indices.

Variables	LT 2	2-5	6-10	11-20	GT20	F	P
Desirability Change	.315	-.097	-.130	-.082	-.258	4.50	.002
Appeal	3.90	3.55	4.02	4.11	4.18	5.16	.000
Retire	2.37	2.42	2.80	3.07	3.19	5.49	.000
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.31	3.12	3.06	3.27	3.51	1.96	.101
Township MGMT	3.38	3.48	3.57	3.50	3.53	.233	.920
Perceived Safety	3.88	3.76	3.89	3.98	3.91	.650	.628
Crime	3.41	2.70	3.07	3.16	3.18	2.57	.038
Education Priorities	3.31	2.47	3.21	3.05	2.95	4.04	.003
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.72	3.14	3.39	3.61	3.66	6.90	.000
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.68	3.38	3.72	3.74	3.80	3.30	.011
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.28	2.92	3.31	3.28	3.38	3.92	.004
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.40	2.84	3.16	3.32	3.40	4.08	.003

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Persons in the Household

Nine of the 12 variables were statistically significant with Persons in the Household. In general, the smaller the household the less optimistic the respondent was about the future desirability of the township. The largest households were the most optimistic. Smaller households were more likely to be satisfied with the township as a place to retire. There is no clear patterning with the Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment variable, but those with 4 members in the household were most satisfied and those with 3 in the household were least satisfied. There was an unclear pattern in seriousness of Crime as well. In general, for Education Priorities as household size increases so does Education as a priority. Smaller households are slightly more likely to prioritize Water, Sewer, and Trash and Fire, EMS, and Police services, but the patterns are not strong and clear. Smaller household were the most likely to prioritize Traffic, Roads, and Parks and Sidewalks and Crossings.

Table 8. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Persons in the Household and the indices.

Variables	1 in HH	2 in HH	3 in HH	4 in HH	GT 5 in HH	F	P
Desirability Change	-.481	-.141	-.018	-.114	.060	4.28	.002
Appeal	4.07	4.05	4.05	3.88	3.96	.398	.810
Retire	3.34	3.17	2.67	2.70	2.28	6.80	.000
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.30	3.43	2.92	3.55	3.18	3.01	.018
Township MGMT	3.45	3.49	3.49	3.55	3.62	.260	.903
Perceived Safety	4.03	3.86	3.92	4.07	3.77	1.27	.281
Crime	3.20	3.23	2.82	3.32	2.87	2.90	.022
Education Priorities	2.95	2.82	2.89	3.41	3.25	3.013	.015
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.69	3.60	3.30	3.66	3.36	3.91	.004
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.70	3.82	3.40	3.81	3.62	5.29	.000
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.54	3.6	3.04	3.29	3.13	3.14	.015
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.44	3.35	2.89	3.43	3.18	4.47	.002

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Persons in the Household Working Full-Time

Only three of the 12 indices were statistically different. For Desirability Change, the more people working full-time in the Household the more optimistic the respondent was about the future. Also, the more people working full-time in the household the more satisfied respondents were with Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment. Last, for Education Priorities, the single full-time worker households indicated education was a slightly lower priority.

Table 9. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Persons in the Household Working Full-Time and the indices.

Variables	1 FT in HH	2 FT in HH	3 FT in HH	F	P
Desirability Change	-.200	-.050	.222	5.69	.004
Appeal	3.94	3.86	4.23	2.25	.108
Retire	2.75	2.60	2.98	1.37	.257
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.17	3.30	3.72	3.48	.033
Township MGMT	3.30	3.52	3.42	.828	.438
Perceived Safety	3.82	3.97	3.83	1.04	.354
Crime	2.96	3.15	3.25	1.24	.291
Education Priorities	2.75	3.16	2.98	3.58	.030
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.35	3.58	3.56	2.80	.063
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.56	3.73	3.67	1.54	.217
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.22	3.35	3.01	3.75	.025
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.15	3.22	3.29	.371	.690

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Persons Employed In or Out of the Township

Only one variable was statistically significant, Water, Sewer, and Trash was a higher priority for those who are Employed in the Township.

Table 10. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Persons Employed In or Out of the Township.

Variables	Employed Out	Employed In	F	P
Desirability Change	-.149	.023	3.38	.067
Appeal	4.01	4.06	.154	.695
Retire	2.92	2.91	.005	.941
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.34	3.01	3.76	.053
Township MGMT	3.48	3.72	3.52	.062
Perceived Safety	3.90	3.92	.040	.841
Crime	3.10	3.11	.000	.990
Education Priorities	2.94	3.09	.729	.394
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.57	3.31	6.24	.013
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.72	3.58	1.75	.186
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.28	3.13	2.00	.158
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.28	3.08	2.05	.153

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Commuting Distances

There are four statistically significant variables for commuting distance. The patterning is not clear or dominant in a linear fashion for any of the relationships. For satisfaction with Appeal, respondents with a 1-10 mile commute and a 21-30 mile commute were most satisfied. Those with the shortest and longest commutes felt the safest in their communities. For Fire, EMS and Police, respondents with a 1-10 mile commute and a 21-30 mile commute ranked the higher priorities. Those with the longest commute were most likely to prioritize sidewalks and crossings.

Table 11. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Commuting Distances and the indices.

Variables	1-10	11-20	21-30	GT 30	F	P
Desirability Change	-.103	.170	.000	.000	1.88	.134
Appeal	4.09	3.74	4.21	3.72	3.21	.024
Retire	2.75	2.75	3.16	2.23	2.63	.051
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	3.39	3.11	3.42	2.88	1.92	.127
Township MGMT	3.56	3.24	3.58	3.54	1.44	.234
Perceived Safety	3.99	3.51	3.80	3.97	3.93	.010
Crime	3.06	3.16	3.21	2.97	.320	.811
Education Priorities	3.08	2.82	2.81	3.12	1.05	.370
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.53	3.40	3.58	3.56	.528	.663
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.75	3.28	3.62	3.53	3.98	.009
Traffic, Roads, & Park	3.31	3.15	3.12	3.36	1.46	.227
Sidewalks & Crossings	3.35	2.94	3.12	3.46	2.86	.038

Oneway Analysis of Variance: Income before Taxes

Eight of the 12 variables are significant with Income. Those in the lowest and highest two income categories are the most satisfied with the township as a place to retire. In general, as income increases, so does satisfaction with Recreation, Arts, and Entertainment. Satisfaction with Township Management is consistently high across income categories with the exception of those earning $50,000-$74,999, which lower than the other categories. For the priority variables, 1) Education Priorities; 2) Water Sewer, and Trash; 3) Fire, EMS and Police; 4) Traffic, Roads, and Parking, and 5) Sidewalks and Crossings, the priorities are lowest for the two lowest income groups.

Table 12. Oneway Analysis of Variance for Income before Taxes and the indices.

Variables	LT $25K	$25K-$34,999	$35K-$49,999	$50K-$74,999	$75K-$99,999	GT $100K	F	P
Desirability Change	-.076	-.142	-.062	-.160	-.023	-.127	.356	.878
Appeal	3.65	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.15	4.04	1.833	.107
Retire	3.18	2.86	2.84	3.10	3.13	2.49	2.66	.023
Recreation, Arts, & Ent	2.99	2.87	3.39	3.39	3.32	3.73	3.52	.004
Township MGMT	3.51	3.62	3.54	3.27	3.68	3.76	2.28	.047
Perceived Safety	3.76	3.88	3.94	3.79	3.90	4.16	1.94	.088
Crime	2.94	2.92	3.05	3.34	3.11	3.19	1.17	.322
Education Priorities	2.23	2.88	3.30	2.92	3.32	3.07	4.90	.000
Water, Sewer, & Trash	3.07	3.47	3.65	3.65	3.59	3.60	4.06	.001
Fire, EMS, and Police	3.59	3.48	3.94	3.84	3.79	3.70	2.97	.013
Traffic, Roads, & Park	2.80	3.24	3.27	3.40	3.30	3.39	4.30	.001
Sidewalks & Crossings	2.73	3.07	3.45	3.31	3.41	3.39	3.83	.002

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Police Station.

Women are slightly more likely to support a new police station then men. Men are far more likely to say no to a new station. Women are more likely to be unsure about this issue.

Table 13. Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for New Police Station.

	Gender		
New Police Station	Female	Male	Total Percent
Percent Yes	30.4	28.7	29.7
Percent No	32.3	46.1	38.1
Percent Unsure	37.3	25.2	32.2
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =6.43	P=.040	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Recreation/Athletic Facility.

Women are substantially more supportive for a new facility then men, while men are far more likely to say no. Women are also more likely to be unsure.

Table 14. Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Recreation/Athletic Facility.

	Gender		
New Rec/Athl Facility	Female	Male	Total Percent
Percent Yes	41.0	35.1	38.5
Percent No	28.8	45.6	35.9
Percent Unsure	30.1	19.3	25.6
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =8.78	P=.012	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Community Center

Women are far more likely to support a new Community Center then Men. Men are far more likely to respond no. A similar number of men and women are unsure.

Table 15. Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Community Center.

	Gender		
New Community Center	Female	Male	Total Percent
Percent Yes	47.4	31.6	40.7
Percent No	30.1	45.6	36.7
Percent Unsure	22.4	22.8	22.6
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =8.37	P=.015	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Library

Women are very supportive of a new library (68%), while men are less so. About a third of men say no. A similar number of men and women are unsure about a new library.

Table 16. Chi Square Analysis for Gender X Support for a New Library.

	Gender		
New Library	Female	Male	Total Percent
Percent Yes	68.2	44.7	58.3
Percent No	12.1	36.0	22.1
Percent Unsure	19.7	19.3	19.6
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =23.20	P=.000	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Police Station.

Those aged 35-44 are very supportive of a new station (59%) while those aged 65 and older are not supportive (over half saying no). About a quarter to one third of respondents were unsureTable 17. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Police Station.

	Age						
New Police Station	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Total%
Percent Yes	33.3	58.7	36.4	29.2	12.5	7.9	29.8
Percent No	30.8	15.2	38.2	31.3	55.4	52.6	37.6
Percent Unsure	35.9	26.1	25.5	39.6	32.1	39.5	32.6
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =42.58	P=.000			

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Recreation/Athletic Facility.

There is a strong linear relationship between age and support for a New Athletic/Recreation Facility. Support is extremely high for younger respondents and extremely low for the oldest respondents. Uncertainty also generally increases with age.

Table 18. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Athletic/Recreation Facility.

	Age						
New Rec/Athl Facility	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Total%
Percent Yes	79.5	66.7	38.2	31.9	14.5	2.6	38.0
Percent No	2.6	15.6	32.7	40.4	65.5	60.5	37.3
Percent Unsure	17.9	17.8	29.1	27.7	20.0	36.8	24.7
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =89.23	P=.000			

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Community Center.

There is a linear relationship between age and support for a new community center. Support is extremely high for younger respondents and lower for the oldest respondents. Uncertainty also generally increases with age.

Table 19. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Community Center.

	Age						
New Community Center	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Total%
Percent Yes	74.4	60.0	29.1	38.3	25.5	21.6	40.3
Percent No	10.3	22.2	45.5	31.9	50.9	54.1	36.7
Percent Unsure	15.4	17.8	25.5	29.8	23.6	24.3	23.0
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =43.69	P=.000			

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Library.

There is a linear relationship between age and support for a new library. Support is extremely high for younger respondents and somewhat lower for the oldest respondents. Uncertainty also generally increases with age.

Table 20. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Age X Support for a New Library.

	Age						
New Library	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Total%
Percent Yes	84.6	75.6	67.3	51.1	37.5	42.1	58.9
Percent No	5.1	15.6	9.1	27.7	39.3	31.6	21.8
Percent Unsure	10.3	8.9	23.6	21.3	23.2	26.3	19.3
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =40.16	P=.000			

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Police Station.

There is a startling difference between renters and those who own their houses. Renters are three times more supportive of a new police station, while owners are greatly more likely to say no or be unsure.

Table 21. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Police Station.

	Rent or Own		
New Police Station	Rent	Own	Total Percent
Percent Yes	60.0	20.8	29.9
Percent No	26.2	41.2	37.7
Percent Unsure	13.8	38.0	32.4
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =37.61	P=.000	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a Recreation/Athletic Facility.

Once again, there is a startling difference between renters and those who own their houses. Renters are far more supportive of a new recreation/athletic facility, while owners are greatly more likely to say no or be unsure.

Table 21. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a Recreation/Athletic Facility.

	Rent or Own		
New Rec/Athl Facility	Rent	Own	Total Percent
Percent Yes	67.7	29.1	38.1
Percent No	20.0	42.7	37.4
Percent Unsure	12.3	28.2	24.5
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =31.44	P=.000	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Community Center.

Renters are different than those who own their houses. Renters are far more supportive of a new community center, while owners are greatly more likely to say no or be unsure.

Table 23. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Community Center.

	Rent or Own		
New Community Center	Rent	Own	Total Percent
Percent Yes	64.6	33.0	40.4
Percent No	26.2	40.1	36.8
Percent Unsure	9.2	26.9	22.7
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =21.72	P=.000	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Library.

Support for a new library is high among all respondents, but very high for renters. Renters are far more supportive of a new library. About one quarter of owners said no or unsure about a new library.

Table 24. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Rent or Own X Support for a New Library

	Rent or Own		
New Library	Rent	Own	Total Percent
Percent Yes	84.6	50.5	58.4
Percent No	13.8	24.8	22.2
Percent Unsure	1.5	24.8	19.4
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =26.56	P=.000	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for How Long Have You Lived in the Township X Support for a Recreation/Athletic Facility.

New residents are far more supportive of a new Recreation/Athletic Facility than long-term residents. Uncertainty increases with age in a close to linear relationship.

Table 25. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for How Long Have You Lived in the Township X Support for a Recreation/Athletic Facility

	How long have you lived in the Township					
New Rec/Athl Facility	LT 2	2-5	6-10	11-20	GT 20	Total%
Percent Yes	80.0	57.5	43.8	26.9	26.7	38.0
Percent No	10.0	20.0	31.2	44.9	45.6	36.6
Percent Unsure	10.0	22.5	25.0	28.2	27.7	25.4
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =32.37	P=.000		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for How Long Have You Lived in the Township X Support for a New Library.

Support for a new library is high for all residents, except those who have lived in the township for more than 20 years. New residents are far more supportive of a new Library than long-term residents. Uncertainty increases with age in a close to linear relationship.

Table 25. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for How Long Have You Lived in the Township X Support for a New Library.

	How long have you lived in the Township					
New Library	LT 2	2-5	6-10	11-20	GT 20	Total%
Percent Yes	85.0	77.5	62.5	57.0	42.2	58.1
Percent No	10.0	15.0	16.7	22.8	31.1	22.4
Percent Unsure	5.0	7.5	20.8	20.3	26.7	19.5
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =17.75	P=.023		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a New Police Station.

There is a strong linear relationship between number of people in the household and support for a new police station. As the number of household members increase, so does support. The opposite relationship is seen with uncertainty.

Table 26. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a New Police Station.

	Number of People in the Household					
New Police Station	1	2	3	4	5 or More	Total%
Percent Yes	6.5	25.2	29.3	41.7	58.1	29.7
Percent No	45.2	40.2	43.1	22.2	29.0	37.8
Percent Unsure	48.4	34.6	27.6	36.1	12.9	32.5
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =27.48	P=.001		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a New Recreation/Athletic Facility.

Once again, there is a strong linear relationship between number of people in the household and support for a new facility (in this case, a Recreation/Athletic Facility). As the number of household members increase, so does support. The opposite relationship is seen with uncertainty.

Table 27. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a Recreation/Athletic Facility.

	Number of People in the Household					
New Rec/Athl Facility	1	2	3	4	5 or More	Total%
Percent Yes	22.6	30.4	43.9	47.2	61.3	37.9
Percent No	32.3	46.4	26.3	33.3	29.0	37.1
Percent Unsure	45.2	23.2	29.8	19.4	9.7	25.0
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =24.28	P=.002		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a New Library.

The linear relationship for household size and support for a new library is observed but it is not as strong as in the case for the Police Station or Recreational facility. As the number of household members increase, in general, so does support. The opposite relationship is seen with uncertainty.

Table 28. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Number of People in the Household X Support for a New Library.

	Number of People in the Household					
New Library	1	2	3	4	5 or More	Total%
Percent Yes	48.4	46.8	70.2	66.7	80.6	58.0
Percent No	22.6	29.4	14.0	16.7	12.9	22.1
Percent Unsure	29.0	23.8	15.8	16.7	6.5	19.9
Percent Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
			X^2 =19.98	P=.010		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Full-Time Workers in the Household X Support for a New Police Station.

There is a very strong linear relationship between number of people in the household working full-time and support for a new police station. As the number of household members working full-time increase, so does support. The opposite relationship is seen with uncertainty.

Table 29. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Full-Time Workers in the Household X Support for a New Police Station.

	Fulltime Workers in Household			
New Police Station	1	2	3	Total Percent
Percent Yes	27.0	38.3	60.7	36.4
Percent No	32.6	34.6	25.0	32.3
Percent Unsure	40.4	27.2	14.3	31.3
Percent Total	100	100	100	100
	X^2 =37.61	P=.000		

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Those Employed in the Township X Support for a New Police Station.

People who are Employed in the Township are much more likely to support a new police station, while those who do not are much more likely to be unsure.

Table 30. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for Employed in the Township X Support for a New Police Station.

	Employed in Township		
New Police Station	Not in Township	Yes in Township	Total Percent
Percent Yes	28.3	40.9	30.3
Percent No	36.5	45.5	38.0
Percent Unsure	35.2	13.6	31.8
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =8.14	P=.017	

Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis for those Employed in the Township X Support for a New Recreation and Athletic Facility.

People who are Employed in the Township are much more likely to support a Recreation/Athletic Facility, while those who do not are much more likely to be unsure.

Table 31. Crosstabulation and Chi Square Analysis Employed in the Township X Support for a New Recreation and Athletic Facility.

	Employed in Township		
New Rec/Athl Facility	Not in Township	Yes in Township	Total Percent
Percent Yes	35.4	55.8	38.6
Percent No	38.9	30.2	37.5
Percent Unsure	25.8	14.0	23.9
Percent Total	100	100	100
	X^2 =6.75	P=.034	

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Analysis

Support for a New Police Station

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.273	.200		1.369	.172
	Age	-.091	.020	-.321	-4.461	.000
	Own or Rent	-.323	.064	-.302	-5.041	.000
	How long have you lived in the township	.093	.025	.259	3.763	.000
	Retirement Appeal	-.061	.025	-.148	-2.411	.017
	Township Management	.121	.037	.201	3.246	.001
	Perceived Safety	-.089	.041	-.135	-2.196	.029
	Fire, EMS, & Police Services	.098	.041	.138	2.391	.018

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.152	7	2.022	12.386	.000

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.501	.251	.231

Seven Variables were statistically significant in the model that explains Support for a New Police Station. The overall model explained about a quarter of the variation $R^2 = .251$. The overall model was statistically significant. The strongest explanative variables were Age, Own or Rent, and How Long Have You Lived in the Township, as seen in the largest Standardized Beta Coefficients. Older respondents and those who own their homes were less supportive of the new station. However, those who were long-term townships residents were more supportive. If you responded that the township was a great place to retire or you perceived the township as safe you were less supportive of the new station. Not surprisingly, those who expressed confidence in the Township Management and those who prioritized Fire, EMS, and Police services, you were more likely to support the new station.

From the analysis, it is clear that there are a sizeable number of older home owners who feel the township is safe and appealing right now. This group shows little support for a new station.

Support is seen in the long-term residents, who like how the Township is managed, and generally support emergency services express the most support for the new station.

Support for a Athletic/Recreation Facility

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.924	.059		15.650	.000
	Age	-.155	.015	-.521	-10.279	.000

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.521	.272	.269

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.099	1	18.099	105.660	.000

Age is the only statistically significant variable that predicts support for an Athletic/Recreation facility. As age increases, support decreases. This is a strong predictor, with as much explanative power as the model above with seven variables. Overall the model explains over one quarter of the variation $R^2 = .272$ and the overall model is highly significant.

Support for a Community Center

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.555	.168		3.294	.001
	Age	-.084	.019	-.280	-4.537	.000
	White and Non-white Population	.333	.166	.115	2.006	.049
	Own or Rent	-.194	.073	-.167	-2.676	.008

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.376	.141	.132

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.991	3	2.997	14.391	.000

Three variables were statistically significant in the model for Support for a Community Center. Age, White and Non-White Population, and Own or Rent. The overall model is statistically significant but weak in explanative power $R^2 = .141$. Age was the best predictor. As age increases, support decreases. White respondents were more supportive, while renters were also more likely to support the Community Center.

Support for a Full-Service Library

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.853	.143		5.968	.000
	Education Priority	.140	.032	.288	4.379	.000
	Gender	-.255	.063	-.263	-4.086	.000
	How long have you lived in the township	-.112	.024	-.301	-4.666	.000
	How many work fulltime in the household	.152	.043	.232	3.514	.001
	Income before Taxes	-.098	.020	-.332	-4.930	.000

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.594[a]	.353	.332

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.053	5	2.611	17.338	.000[b]

The model for Support for a Full-Service Library was statistically significant and explained about one third of the variation $R^2 = .332$. This was the strongest model and five variables were statistically significant. The strongest predictor was Income before Taxes. As income increases support for the library decreases. How long have you lived in the township was also a strong predictor, with longer-term residents showing less support. Women were more supportive than men. Those who place the highest spending priorities on education were most supportive of the library. Household that had more fulltime workers were the most supportive of a new Full-Service Library.

APPENDIX: INDEX CONSTRUCTION AND STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

Analytical Methods: Indices

Index Components and Internal Reliability

There are over 150 survey items included in this research. For efficiency and to enhance the reliability of the items, we have developed indices or composite scores of related items. For example, we developed an Index called Appeal that consists of the following three items.

How satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following:

1. The appeal of my Township
2. The prestige of my community
3. Quality of life in the Township

The scores for these items ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The scores for all three items can be summed and treated as a single variable. There are many advantages to doing this, including efficiency and the ability to measure a larger concept such as Appeal. However, it is not sufficient to just simply sum the items as they may not be measuring the concept that is intended. There are analytical techniques that enable researchers to establish if all the items are in fact measuring the main concept (in this case Appeal). This is typically referred to as internal reliability.

To establish internal reliability of the social indicators used in this study, multiple survey items for each concept are necessary. At a minimum it is necessary to include enough items to fully cover the range of the concept, while maintaining unidimensionality (only measuring one central concept). In general, multiple measures are preferred and do increase internal validity when the items are significantly intercorrelated. However as more variables are added to the index it is harder to maintain unidimensionality. Unidimensionality, in part is established by principal components analysis. In a principal components analysis a single factor solution provides evidence that the various index items only measure a single concept. The indices in this study range from a low of three items to a high of seven items. Indices with three or fewer items are generally thought to be insufficient to establish internal validity through Cronbach's Alpha or Armor's Theta. Factor loadings below .350 are generally considered to be inadequate and fail to contribute to the index in a meaningful way. Below you will find a description of the components of each index, the principal components analysis and factor loadings, and measures of internal validity including the percentage explained variation, and Armor's Theta Reliability.

Latent Constructs and Index Development

The appropriate tool to analyze the underlying concepts is structural equation modeling, of which factor analysis is the most used technique. In this sense, exploratory factor analysis is used to reveal items that do not share an underlying structure of covariance and these items are usually eliminated from the index. In that sense the factor analysis is similar in function to how many researchers use Chronbach's Alpha in constructing indices, however in this instance factor analysis is preferable because the items are also checked for unidimensionality, a key factor in

producing strong indices. In addition, the factor analysis can standardize the variables and produce a factor score that weights the specific items in their relationship to the underlying construct. Factor indices are standardized and weighted for their effects in the model. Factor scores are similar to composite scores, with the exception that the items are standardized and weighted in regard to their factor loadings. The factor loadings are a rough indication of correlation of the domain concept's latent structure to the single variable. Therefore, items that are most important in an index receive a higher weighting than a less important item.

Index Development Strategy

Three steps were taken to develop the indices. First, correlation coefficients were examined to find underlying patterns of variation. Second, the variables that were most highly intercorrelated and reflected the range of ideas of interest were placed in a principal components analysis, where these variables were determined to be reliable indices. Last, the variables were standardized and weighted for their effects in the model. Index factor scores were used. In principal components, factor loadings less than 0.350 are generally not considered to be significant and in most cases should be removed from a factor scale.

Scales were subsequently tested for internal consistency by using Armor's (1974) theta reliability for factor scales. The theta coefficient is interpreted similarly to Cronbach's Alpha, and is used for factor scales because it does not assume that all items are weighted equally in the scale. Theta is calculated as: $\theta = [p/(p-1)]*[1-(1/\lambda)]$, where p = the number of items in the scale and where λ denotes the largest eigenvalue from the principal component analysis. Theta scores ranging from .550 to .700 are considered acceptable. Scores above .700 to .800 are considered strong, and above .800 are considered very strong.

Factor analysis also gives an indication of how well the index variables relate to the underlying concept they measure. This is the latent structure, and is measured with explained variation. Explained variation represents the percentage of the relationship of the latent factor (in this case Appeal) that is accounted for by the index variables. Explained variation is abbreviated as R^2 and is considered meaningful when above 50% for a single factor solution.

Table 1. Indices

Index Variable	**Factor Loadings**	**Explained Variation and Armor's Theta**
a. Appeal		
The appeal of my township	.899	R^2 = 76.6%
The prestige of my community	.878	
Quality of life in the township	.848	Θ = .847
b. Retire		
Township as a place to retire	.823	R^2 = 66.2%
Services for retirees	.850	
Sense of community cohesiveness	.762	Θ = .757
c. Recreation, Arts, & Entertainment		
Recreational opportunities for youth	.834	R^2 = 69.2%
Township provides opportunities for a healthy lifestyle	.831	
Offers a good variety of exercise programs	.835	Θ = .911
Provides recreation and exercise facilities	.854	
Opportunities to explore arts and culture	.857	
Entertainment needs are met	.779	
d. Township Management		
Appearance of public areas	.751	R^2 = 63.7%
Use of available land	.702	
Removal of litter in parks and gardens	.853	Θ = .916
Overall township appearance	.828	
Air quality	.585	
Cleaning public areas	.906	
Cleaning public trashcans	.874	
Landscaping and design of the township	.835	
e. Perceived Safety		
I feel safe in the day, my community	.840	
I feel safe in the night, my community	.862	R^2 = 73.6%
I feel safe in the day, the township	.848	
I feel safe in the night, the township	.883	Θ = .881
f. Crime		
Drug related crimes	.873	
Property crimes	.906	R^2 = 74.1%
Violent crimes	.894	
White collar crimes	.763	Θ = .884

Table 2. Indices

Index Variable	Factor Loadings	Explained Variation and Armor's
g. Education Priorities		
K-12	.894	R^2 = 71.9%
Vocational/Technical	.921	
College and Community College	.900	Θ = .870
Library Services	.648	
h. Water, Sewer, and Trash Services		
Water Services	.919	R^2 = 87.2%
Sewer Services	.958	
Recycling Services	.961	Θ = .951
Trash Collection	.897	
i. Fire, EMS, and Police Services		
Fire Protection in the Township	.816	R^2 = 79.1%
EMS in the Township	.849	
Police Protection	.706	Θ = .867
j. Traffic, Roads, and Parking		
Appearance of public areas	.849	R^2 = 55.4%
Use of available land	.812	
Removal of litter in parks and gardens	.531	Θ = .598
k. Sidewalks and Crossings		
Access to sidewalks	.927	R^2 = 78.8%
Quality of sidewalks	.900	
Pedestrian crossings	.834	Θ = .865

The indices that were created in Tables 1 and 2 represent very strong levels of internal reliability as evidenced by the Armor's Θ scores. All 11 of the indices were single factor solutions meaning that they are unidimensional (measuring only on aspect of the latent structure). Only two of the 11 indices have a scores below .800 (Traffic, Roads, and Parking, Θ=.598 and Retire, Θ=.757) and the remaining nine indices fall into the very strong categories. After the indices were tested and found to be unidimensional with a high degree of internal reliability, the index score was calculated by summing the responses for the items then dividing the total by the number of items. This has the effect of standardize the score back to the original answer categories. For example, in the case of Appeal, the sum of responses can be added up as follows:

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The appeal of my Township	1	2	3	4	5
The prestige of my community	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of life in the Township	1	2	3	4	5

1. The appeal of my Township = 5
2. The prestige of my community = 4
3. Quality of life in the Township = 3

Total Index Sum = 12

If we take the total index sum (12) and divided it by the number of items (3) we get a score of 4 for the index (12/3=4). This is useful because it returns the index score back to the original metric of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). In this case the index score is 4 and it means this respondent is in the "Satisfied" range.

Desirability Change Score

There is one variable used in this analysis that is not an index. The desirability change score is the difference from how desirable respondents rate their community now, subtracted from how desirable they expect their community to be in the future.

	Very undesirable	Somewhat Undesirable	Neutral	Somewhat desirable	Very desirable
How do you feel about your community as a place to live?	1	2	3	4	5
As you look ahead to the next five years, do you expect your community to become:	1	2	3	4	5

A negative score indicates that the township will be less desirable in the future, while a positive score indicates expected improvement.

Independent Variables

In these analyses there are 11 independent variables that will be used to relate to the above 11 indices and four additional questions about support for future initiatives (police station, recreation facility, community center, and library). These variables are: 1) Gender, 2) Age, 3) Race (white and non-white), 4) Rent or Own, 5) Years lived in in the Township, 6) Number of people in the household, 7) Number of fulltime workers in the household, 8) Employed in the Township, 9) Miles of work commute, and 10) Income.

Analytical Methods: Statistical Techniques

Oneway Analysis of Variance

Oneway Analysis of Variance establishes if the means of two or more independent (unrelated) groups are statistically different. For example, if the mean for females is statistically different than the mean for males. Analysis of variance allows for efficient presentation of the analyses, therefore all tests are shown. Statistically significant differences in the means are highlighted.

Crosstabulation and Chi Square

Chi Square is a test of goodness of fit, or how well the data observations conform to expectations. When the observed data are statistically different from the expected, the differences in the groups are thought to be substantial.

Multiple Linear Regression

Multiple Linear Regression identifies the linear relationship between two or more independent variables that attempt to explain differences in a dependent variable. Essential parts of a linear regression include standardized Betas which give an indication of how strong the independent variable's relationship with the dependent variable is (while controlling for the effects of all the variables in the model). Explained variation, or R^2 indicates how much of the variation (percentage) in the model is explained by all the independent variables.