

**2019**

# **Midland County Health Survey: Final Report**

**Meghan Baruth, PhD**

**Becca Schlaff, PhD**

**Saginaw Valley State University  
College of Health and Human Services  
Department of Health Science**

## Table of Contents

Overview.....	2
Demographic Profile.....	3
Health Status.....	4
Personal Health.....	4
Health Risk Behaviors.....	5
Sleep.....	5
Aerobic Physical Activity: Adults.....	6
Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities: Adults.....	7
Physical Activity: Children.....	8
Diet.....	9
Seat Belt Utilization.....	14
Cigarette Smoking, Tobacco, and E-cigarettes.....	15
Secondhand Smoke.....	16
Alcohol.....	17
Drug Use.....	19
Chronic Diseases.....	22
Obesity.....	22
Cancer.....	23
Cardiovascular Disease.....	25
Asthma.....	26
Diabetes.....	27
HIV/AIDS.....	28
Mental Health.....	29
Cognitive Function.....	30
Preventive Care and Health Screening.....	31
Cancer: Females.....	31
Cancer: Males.....	34
Influenza.....	36
Access to Care and Utilization.....	37
Healthcare Coverage.....	37
Healthcare Access.....	39
Healthcare Provider Utilization.....	40
Other Health Concerns.....	51
Disability.....	51
Falls.....	53
Belonging.....	55
Health Literacy.....	56
Community Satisfaction.....	57
Personal Satisfaction: Quality of Resources and Services.....	57
Acknowledgements.....	62

## Overview

The 2019 Midland Health Survey was conducted to understand the health and health needs of people living in Midland County. The 2015 Midland Health Survey served as the basis for the 2019 survey. The Saginaw Valley State University team worked with the Health and Human Services Council (HHSC) to adapt the survey to ensure it met the needs of the HHSC and Midland County agencies, and collected data on any health issues/factors emerging since the previous data collection.

The Saginaw Valley State University team aimed to collect data from a sample across Midland County, including a representative sample from the city and out county areas. The team used existing US Census data to obtain population estimates for each township/city in Midland County, to ensure appropriate representation from each location. Efforts were also made to obtain a sample that was representative of the Midland County population (age, race, education, income).

Data collection occurred via online and paper surveys. Qualtrics was used to administer the online survey and the link was advertised in the local newspaper, and on HHSC agency websites and social media accounts. The face-to-face survey was administered at various locations throughout Midland County. Participants either completed the survey on site or completed it at home and returned it in a postage paid envelope. Site-specific locations for data collection were determined in collaboration with the HHSC of Midland County to maximize access for researchers to reach the target population. An incentive was offered to all those completing the survey (a \$5 gift card to Meijer). The sample generated a total of 715 surveys to be used for analyses (559 online surveys and 156 paper surveys). Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the survey respondents.

**Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Midland County Sample**

	Midland County Sample (%)
Gender	
Male	33.6
Female	66.4
Age	
18-24	13.4
25-34	20.5
35-44	16.2
45-54	14.1
55-64	16.1
65+	19.7
Race	
White	95.4
Non-White	4.6
Education	
< High School	1.7
High School	12.7
Some College	18.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	3.4
Associates	13.6
Bachelors Degree	28.5
Graduate +	21.8
Marital Status	
Married	57.7
Widowed	6.2
Divorced	9.3
Separated	0.6
In a domestic partnership or civil union	0.8
Not married, but living with a significant other	6.9
Not married	18.5
Employment Status	
Employed, 40+ hours/week	46.2
Employed, 1-39 hours/week	2.1
Not employed	4.5
Homemaker	16.3
Full-time student	6.0
Retired	21.5
Disabled, not able to work	3.4
Children under 18	
Yes	37.9
No	62.1
Income	
< \$20,000	13.5
\$20,000 -39,999	13.3
\$40,000 - 69,999	21.1
\$70,000 - 99,999	20.3
\$100,000 -149,000	18.9
\$150,000+	13.0
Area of Midland County	
City	61.4
Out County	38.6

## Health Status

### *Personal Health*

When asked to describe their current health, 50.1% of respondents said their health was either excellent (11.4%) or very good (38.7%; Table 2). As shown in Table 3, older individuals, and those with less income and lower education levels were more likely to report their health as fair or poor.

**Table 2. Perceived Health Status**

	%
Excellent	11.4
Very Good	38.7
Good	37.7
Fair	10.5
Poor	1.7

**Table 3. Health Status Rating as Fair or Poor, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Reporting Health Fair or Poor
Overall	12.2
Gender	
Male	8.9
Female	13.5
Age	
18-24	7.7*
25-34	9.4
35-44	7.3
45-54	13.5
55-64	11.0
65+	18.9
Education	
< High School	33.3*
High School	22.5
Some College	14.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	16.7
Associates	11.3
Bachelors Degree	8.8
Graduate +	7.1
Income	
<\$20,000	28.3*
\$20,000-39,999	19.8
\$40,000-69,999	11.1
\$70,000-99,999	6.5
\$100,000-149,999	9.3
\$150,000+	3.4
Area of Midland County	
City	12.6
Out County	11.7

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Health Risk Behaviors

### *Sleep*

Respondents were asked, on average, how many hours of sleep they got in a 24-hour period. Of the respondents, 29.8% of respondents got 8 or more hours of sleep. Table 4 shows as income level increased, self-reported hours of sleep also increased.

**Table 4. Sleep Behaviors, by Demographic Characteristics**

	≤5 hours	6 hours	7 hours	8 hours	≥9 hours
Overall	11.4	21.6	37.3	23.5	6.3
Gender					
Male	8.3	23.0	37.8	24.3	6.5
Female	12.7	20.9	37.1	23.1	6.2
Age					
18-24	12.5	15.9	33.0	31.8	6.8
25-34	7.6	24.2	42.4	23.5	2.3
35-44	13.9	18.5	42.6	21.3	3.7
45-54	13.2	28.6	34.1	17.6	6.6
55-64	13.1	24.3	38.3	17.8	6.5
65+	10.5	16.5	34.6	29.3	9.0
Education					
< High School	25.0	33.3	8.3	16.7	16.7
High School	17.8	14.4	35.6	24.4	7.8
Some College	14.8	23.4	28.9	26.6	6.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	17.4	30.4	26.1	13.0	13.0
Associates	12.8	23.4	38.3	20.2	5.3
Bachelors Degree	8.2	23.1	43.6	21.0	4.1
Graduate +	5.9	19.0	40.5	27.5	7.2
Income					
<\$20,000	22.2*	22.2	25.6	20.0	10.0
\$20,000-39,999	15.6	23.3	33.3	22.2	5.6
\$40,000-69,999	7.9	24.3	36.4	27.9	3.6
\$70,000-99,999	12.8	21.1	41.4	19.5	5.3
\$100,000-149,999	7.1	20.6	43.7	21.4	7.1
\$150,000+	4.7	19.8	40.7	27.9	7.0
Area of Midland County					
City	12.4	21.4	37.6	23.0	5.6
Out County	9.7	22.1	37.1	23.6	7.5

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## ***Aerobic Physical Activity: Adults***

Respondents were asked to report if, in a usual week, they participated in any physical activity for at least 10 minutes at time, such as brisk walking, running, bicycling, vacuuming, yard work or anything else that causes some increase in breathing or heart rate. Those who said no were considered to be inactive. Of the individuals that responded, 12.0% were inactive. As shown in Table 5, those with less education and less income were more likely to be inactive.

Table 5 also shows total minutes of moderate to vigorous intensity physical activity per week and the percentage of respondents that met the physical activity guidelines of 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. It indicates that males engaged in more weekly minutes of moderate to vigorous intensity physical activity and were more likely to meet the physical activity guidelines. Also, as education and income level increased, the percentage of individuals meeting physical activity guidelines increased.

**Table 5. Physical Activity & Sedentary Behavior, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Engaged in NO Physical Activity	Total Physical Activity Mean (SD)	Met Physical Activity Guidelines
Overall	12.0	213.1 (164.8)	60.1
Gender			
Male	9.5	252.5 (187.4)*	67.0*
Female	12.9	191.5 (146.6)	56.3
Age			
18-24	15.9	235.5 (194.7)	59.7
25-34	7.6	181.5 (149.9)	51.7
35-44	8.3	217.9 (174.5)	63.0
45-54	10.0	198.8 (122.6)	68.3
55-64	14.0	231.1 (159.1)	63.6
65+	16.2	226.9 (186.5)	57.4
Education			
< High School	18.2*	93.0 (94.9)	10.0*
High School	19.1	238.3 (225.8)	55.7
Some College	11.0	196.2 (149.3)	57.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	12.5	180.0 (149.4)	42.7
Associates	14.9	253.0 (207.1)	63.3
Bachelors Degree	11.3	196.4 (136.7)	59.9
Graduate +	7.2	225.2 (143.7)	68.6
Income			
<\$20,000	19.1*	205.7 (197.0)	9.5*
\$20,000-39,999	18.0	197.4 (146.5)	12.3
\$40,000-69,999	10.7	210.5 (166.9)	20.1
\$70,000-99,999	9.0	207.8 (176.4)	20.3
\$100,000-149,999	10.3	216.4 (156.7)	20.3
\$150,000+	7.0	246.7 (150.5)	17.5
Area of Midland County			
City	9.9*	210.3 (158.3)	59.9
Out County	15.4	217.0 (174.0)	60.5

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## ***Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities: Adults***

Respondents were asked to report how many days, in a usual week, he/she engaged in muscle strengthening activities and activities to improve flexibility. As shown in Table 6, males engaged in muscle strengthening activities on more days than females. Older individuals and those with less education engaged in flexibility activities on more days per week.

**Table 6. Times per Week Engaged in Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Strength Training Mean (SD)	Flexibility Activities Mean (SD)
Overall	2.1 (1.9)	2.1 (2.1)
Gender		
Male	2.3 (2.1)*	2.0 (2.1)
Female	1.9 (1.8)	2.1 (2.0)
Age		
18-24	2.4 (2.1)	1.8 (1.9)*
25-34	1.9 (1.9)	1.5 (1.8)
35-44	1.9 (1.7)	1.6 (1.7)
45-54	1.7 (1.8)	1.8 (1.9)
55-64	2.0 (2.2)	2.4 (2.2)
65+	2.5 (1.9)	3.1 (2.2)
Education		
< High School	2.5 (2.6)	1.9 (2.1)*
High School	2.2 (2.2)	2.7 (2.4)
Some College	2.0 (2.0)	2.1 (2.2)
Technical/Vocational Cert	1.7 (1.7)	1.9 (1.9)
Associates	2.1 (1.9)	2.0 (2.0)
Bachelors Degree	1.8 (1.8)	1.8 (1.9)
Graduate +	2.2 (1.9)	2.1 (2.0)
Income		
<\$20,000	2.1 (2.2)	2.5 (2.4)
\$20,000-39,999	2.2 (2.1)	2.1 (2.2)
\$40,000-69,999	1.8 (1.9)	1.9 (2.0)
\$70,000-99,999	1.9 (1.8)	1.8 (1.9)
\$100,000-149,999	2.0 (1.9)	1.9 (2.0)
\$150,000+	2.3 (1.7)	2.2 (2.0)
Area of Midland County		
City	2.1 (2.0)	2.1 (2.1)
Out County	1.9 (1.9)	2.1 (2.1)

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*



## ***Physical Activity: Children***

Respondents were asked to report if they have any children under the age of 18 living in their household. Overall, 38.1% stated that they have at least one child under the age of 18. These respondents were then asked how many minutes or hours a day they actively play with their child/children. As shown in Table 7, younger respondents and those with lower incomes actively played with their children for more minutes per day.

**Table 7. Time Spent Playing with Children, by Demographic Characteristics**

	0 minutes	Less than 30 minutes	30 – 60 minutes	More than 1 hour
Overall	5.8	22.7	37.8	33.8
Gender				
Male	5.5	23.3	42.5	28.8
Female	6.0	21.9	35.8	36.4
Age				
18-24	0.0*	33.3	33.3	33.3
25-34	0.0	12.2	35.1	52.7
35-44	6.9	17.2	44.8	31.0
45-54	10.3	48.7	33.3	7.7
55-64	16.7	41.7	16.7	25.0
65+	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Education				
< High School	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
High School	14.3	7.1	42.9	35.7
Some College	10.3	20.7	31.0	37.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	16.7	16.7	58.3	8.3
Associates	7.1	17.9	35.7	39.3
Bachelors Degree	1.5	30.9	29.4	38.2
Graduate +	4.3	20.0	45.7	30.0
Income				
<\$20,000	0.0*	27.3	18.2	54.5
\$20,000-39,999	17.4	4.3	43.5	34.8
\$40,000-69,999	7.3	24.4	26.8	41.5
\$70,000-99,999	1.7	9.6	48.1	40.0
\$100,000-149,999	5.1	27.1	42.4	25.4
\$150,000+	5.4	40.5	32.4	21.6
Area of Midland County				
City	5.8	21.7	38.4	34.1
Out County	5.8	24.4	36.0	33.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Diet

### Fruit and Vegetable Consumption

Participants were asked to report the number of servings of fruit and vegetables they consumed per day in a typical week. Respondents could ‘count’ fruits and vegetables that were fresh, frozen, or canned, but not dried. As shown in Table 8, older individuals consumed more fruits and vegetables per day. Respondents with higher education and income levels consumed more vegetables per day. Total fruit and vegetable consumption was higher in older respondents and those with higher education and income levels.

**Table 8. Fruit and Vegetable Consumption per Day, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Total Fruit Mean (SD)	Total Vegetables Mean (SD)	Total Fruit and Vegetable Mean (SD)
Overall	1.7 (1.2)	2.0 (1.3)	3.6 (2.2)
Gender			
Male	1.6 (1.2)	1.9 (1.3)	3.5 (2.3)
Female	1.7 (1.2)	2.0 (1.2)	3.7 (2.1)
Age			
18-24	1.6 (1.2)*	1.8 (1.3)	3.4 (2.3)*
25-34	1.5 (1.2)	1.9 (1.3)	3.4 (2.2)
35-44	1.4 (1.2)	2.2 (1.3)	3.6 (2.1)
45-54	1.4 (1.8)	2.0 (1.3)	3.4 (2.2)
55-64	1.9 (1.2)	2.1 (1.3)	4.1 (2.1)
65+	1.9 (1.2)	2.0 (1.2)	3.8 (2.1)
Education			
< High School	2.3 (1.6)	1.7 (1.0)*	3.9 (2.2)*
High School	1.8 (1.2)	1.6 (1.2)	3.3 (2.1)
Some College	1.5 (1.1)	1.7 (1.3)	3.3 (2.1)
Technical/Vocational Cert	1.3 (1.1)	1.6 (1.2)	2.9 (2.0)
Associates	1.6 (1.1)	1.9 (1.2)	3.4 (2.0)
Bachelors Degree	1.6 (1.2)	2.1 (1.3)	3.7 (2.2)
Graduate +	1.9 (1.3)	2.3 (1.3)	4.2 (2.3)
Income			
<\$20,000	1.5 (1.2)	1.5 (1.3)*	3.0 (2.1)*
\$20,000-39,999	1.6 (1.2)	1.7 (1.1)	3.2 (2.0)
\$40,000-69,999	1.8 (1.3)	2.1 (1.4)	3.9 (2.4)
\$70,000-99,999	1.6 (1.3)	2.0 (1.2)	3.6 (2.1)
\$100,000-149,999	1.6 (1.1)	2.1 (1.3)	3.7 (2.1)
\$150,000+	1.9 (1.2)	2.1 (1.2)	4.0 (2.1)
Area of Midland County			
City	1.7 (1.2)	2.0 (1.3)	3.7 (2.2)
Out County	1.6 (1.2)	1.9 (1.2)	3.6 (2.1)

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## **Sugar Sweetened Beverages**

Participants were asked about their consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages. Specifically, they were asked to report how often they consumed the following beverages: soda, energy drinks, fruit drinks, or tea in a typical week. Table 9 shows the percentage of respondents who reported never consuming each type of sugar-sweetened beverage; soda consumption was the highest reported beverage consumed in a typical week. In summary:

**Soda:** Males, and respondents who were younger, had less education, and less income reported consuming more soda on a weekly basis.

**Energy Drinks:** Males, and respondents who were younger and had less education reported consuming more energy drinks on a weekly basis.

**Sugar-Sweetened Fruit Drinks:** Males, and respondents who were younger, had less education, and less income reported consuming more sugar-sweetened fruit drinks on a weekly basis.

**Sugar-Sweetened Tea:** Respondents who had less education reported consuming more sugar-sweetened tea on a weekly basis.

**Table 9. Beverage Consumption, % Reporting Never Consuming, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Soda	Energy Drinks	Sugar-sweetened Fruit Drinks	Sugar-sweetened Flavored Tea
Overall	44.3	83.9	71.6	82.9
Gender				
Male	37.0*	72.2*	61.8*	80.1
Female	47.5	90.0	76.9	84.4
Age				
18-24	42.2*	67.5*	47.0*	68.7*
25-34	38.9	78.6	70.2	80.9
35-44	42.9	82.7	71.4	82.9
45-54	48.9	92.2	77.8	91.1
55-64	51.4	93.3	84.8	89.5
65+	49.2	90.8	77.7	84.4
Education				
< High School	16.7*	50.0*	16.7*	36.4
High School	39.1	83.9	74.7	87.4
Some College	37.4	78.7	63.9	72.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	29.2	75.0	58.3	83.3
Associates	37.4	76.9	66.3	82.4
Bachelors Degree	49.7	86.8	75.4	86.4
Graduate +	55.0	92.7	80.8	88.0
Income				
<\$20,000	27.9*	82.6	60.5*	77.9
\$20,000-39,999	39.8	77.0	62.5	77.3
\$40,000-69,999	43.4	85.3	73.5	82.4
\$70,000-99,999	50.0	84.1	74.2	87.9
\$100,000-149,999	45.2	84.6	72.6	83.7
\$150,000+	52.9	85.9	77.6	83.5
Area of Midland County				
City	44.6	82.0	70.7	81.7
Out County	43.8	86.9	72.8	84.6

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* across frequency of consumption categories

## **Food Purchases**

Participants were asked to report the number of times they purchased food from each of following: grocery store, convenience store, fast food restaurant, sit-down restaurant, farmers market, co-op, food pantry, meals on wheels, or other. Overall, across all demographic variables, grocery stores appeared to be the most common resource for food purchases.

Table 10 indicates that:

- Males reported more food purchases from convenience stores, fast food restaurants, and sit down restaurants than females.
- Younger individuals reported more food purchases from convenience stores and fast food restaurants.
- More educated individuals reported more food purchase from grocery stores, whereas less educated individuals reported more food purchases from convenience stores, fast food restaurants, sit down restaurants, farmers markets, food pantries, and meals on wheels.
- Respondents with more income reported more purchases from grocery stores, sit down restaurants, farmers markets, and coops.
- Respondents residing in the city of Midland reported more food purchases from grocery stores and convenience stores. Those in the out county areas reported more food purchases from sit down restaurants.

**Table 10. Food Purchasing Locations, % Purchasing Food at Least Once per Week, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Grocery Store	Convenience Store	Fast Food	Restaurant	Farmer Market	Coop	Pantry	Meals on Wheels
Overall	82.6	15.8	34.5	38.0	29.6	1.6	1.2	1.8
Gender								
Male	83.3	23.1*	40.4*	46.9*	23.9	2.2	1.3	2.2
Female	82.2	11.9	31.1	33.3	32.3	1.1	0.9	1.4
Age								
18-24	68.7	32.5*	43.4*	38.6	26.8	2.4	3.7	2.4
25-34	84.7	19.1	34.4	36.6	30.5	1.5	1.5	0.8
35-44	88.7	13.5	40.0	39.0	41.0	3.8	1.0	1.0
45-54	91.1	10.0	27.8	38.9	25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
55-64	83.8	10.5	28.8	41.7	35.2	1.9	1.9	2.9
65+	77.9	15.7	31.0	33.6	21.9	0.8	0.0	3.9
Education								
< High School	66.7*	50.0*	45.5*	55.6*	50.0*	30.0	27.3*	30.0*
High School	69.0	24.7	41.4	28.4	15.3	1.2	1.2	3.6
Some College	74.2	18.7	37.7	31.1	25.8	0.0	0.8	0.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	79.2	13.0	31.8	13.0	39.1	4.5	0.0	0.0
Associates	88.0	20.5	38.5	32.6	33.0	1.1	2.2	2.2
Bachelors Degree	85.9	9.4	31.9	49.0	30.2	1.0	0.0	1.6
Graduate +	91.4	12.0	28.5	41.3	35.1	2.0	0.7	0.7
Income								
<\$20,000	60.5*	19.8	39.3	24.7*	16.5*	1.2*	1.2	1.2
\$20,000-39,999	78.7	19.1	37.1	22.7	21.3	0.0	1.1	3.4
\$40,000-69,999	80.9	13.3	33.1	34.6	31.9	0.7	0.0	0.7
\$70,000-99,999	85.6	17.1	33.6	34.6	38.2	1.5	0.8	1.5
\$100,000-149,999	92.8	19.2	38.4	50.4	32.0	1.6	1.6	0.8
\$150,000+	94.1	7.1	25.9	55.3	34.1	5.9	3.5	3.6
Area of Midland County								
City	83.1*	17.8*	35.0	35.5*	30.8	1.5	0.5	1.2
Out County	81.6	14.6	34.0	42.3	27.4	1.9	2.3	2.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* across frequency of purchasing categories

## ***Seat Belt Utilization***

Participants were asked how often they wore a seat belt when riding or driving in a vehicle. As shown in Table 11, 91.3% of residents reported that they always wear a seat belt. Respondents with more education and income were more likely to report always wearing a seat belt.

**Table 11. Seat Belt Usage, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Always Wear a Seat Belt
Overall	91.3
Gender	
Male	89.8
Female	92.3
Age	
18-24	82.4
25-34	92.1
35-44	93.6
45-54	94.8
55-64	91.7
65+	91.5
Education	
< High School	66.7*
High School	84.1
Some College	86.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	87.5
Associates	92.8
Bachelors Degree	96.1
Graduate +	94.9
Income	
<\$20,000	82.6*
\$20,000-39,999	92.1
\$40,000-69,999	91.0
\$70,000-99,999	92.1
\$100,000-149,999	94.6
\$150,000+	94.4
Area of Midland County	
City	92.2
Out County	89.7

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend* across seatbelt use categories

## ***Cigarette Smoking, Tobacco Use, and E-cigarettes***

Respondents were asked to report if they currently smoked cigarettes, used chewing tobacco, snuff, or any form of smokeless tobacco, or used e-cigarettes. Overall, 6.2% smoked cigarettes, 2.6% used smokeless tobacco, and 3.7% used e-cigarettes.

Table 12 shows that those with less education and income were more likely to smoke cigarettes. Male respondents and those with less education were more likely to use smokeless tobacco. Younger respondents and those with less education were more likely to use e-cigarettes.

**Table 12. Tobacco Usage, % Reporting Usage, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Cigarette Smoking	Smokeless Tobacco	E-cigarettes
Overall	6.2	2.6	3.7
Gender			
Male	7.1	6.6*	3.1
Female	5.4	0.4	3.6
Age			
18-24	2.4	3.6	10.7*
25-34	10.0	2.3	3.1
35-44	5.7	3.8	3.8
45-54	8.9	1.1	1.1
55-64	4.8	1.9	2.9
65+	3.8	0.8	2.3
Education			
< High School	16.7*	8.3*	27.3*
High School	10.1	6.7	6.7
Some College	7.4	3.2	4.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	16.7	0.0	0.0
Associates	7.7	2.2	3.3
Bachelors Degree	3.7	1.0	2.6
Graduate +	2.7	2.0	1.3
Income			
<\$20,000	11.6*	1.1	5.8
\$20,000-39,999	10.2	2.2	5.6
\$40,000-69,999	8.0	2.9	3.7
\$70,000-99,999	4.6	4.5	0.8
\$100,000-149,999	3.2	3.2	2.4
\$150,000+	0.0	1.2	4.7
Area of Midland County			
City	5.7	3.3	3.6
Out County	7.0	1.5	3.8

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*



## ***Secondhand Smoke***

Participants were asked to report if they were currently exposed to secondhand smoke. As shown in Table 13, 12.4% reported being currently exposed to secondhand smoke.

Respondents with less education and income were more likely to report being exposed to secondhand smoke.

**Table 13. Exposure to Secondhand Smoke, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Any Exposure
Overall	12.4
Gender	
Male	11.0
Female	13.7
Age	
18-24	15.5
25-34	16.0
35-44	9.5
45-54	5.6
55-64	13.3
65+	12.1
Education	
< High School	25.0*
High School	19.3
Some College	19.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	25.0
Associates	15.2
Bachelors Degree	5.7
Graduate +	6.6
Income	
<\$20,000	27.6*
\$20,000-39,999	15.7
\$40,000-69,999	14.6
\$70,000-99,999	9.8
\$100,000-149,999	6.4
\$150,000+	3.6
Area of Midland County	
City	13.1
Out County	11.5

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Alcohol

### Alcohol Consumption

Participants were asked how many days in a typical week they had at least one drink of any alcoholic beverage. They were also asked on the days they did drink, how many drinks they consumed (drinks were equivalent to a 12 ounce beer, a 5 ounce glass of wine, or a drink with one shot of liquor). Total alcohol consumption (drinks) per week was calculated. As shown in Table 14, on average, participants consumed 2.3±4.7 drinks per week. Males, younger respondents, and those with a higher income also consumed more alcohol.

**Table 14. Alcohol Consumption, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Total Alcohol Consumption per Week Mean (SD)
Overall	2.3 (4.7)
Gender	
Male	3.3 (5.4)*
Female	1.7 (4.2)
Age	
18-24	1.9 (4.8)*
25-34	2.9 (6.4)
35-44	3.0 (4.9)
45-54	2.2 (3.4)
55-64	2.2 (4.0)
65+	1.4 (3.5)
Education	
< High School	3.7 (6.6)
High School	1.9 (4.6)
Some College	1.7 (4.2)
Technical/Vocational Cert	3.4 (7.4)
Associates	1.8 (4.0)
Bachelors Degree	2.4 (5.1)
Graduate +	2.9 (4.4)
Income	
<\$20,000	0.9 (3.8)*
\$20,000-39,999	1.3 (3.4)
\$40,000-69,999	1.9 (3.7)
\$70,000-99,999	3.4 (7.0)
\$100,000-149,999	2.4 (3.8)
\$150,000+	3.7 (4.9)
Area of Midland County	
City	2.5 (5.1)
Out County	2.0 (4.1)

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Consequences of Alcohol Consumption

Respondents that reported current alcohol consumption were asked if in the last year they felt they wanted or needed to cut down on their drinking, if they experienced any negative consequences from their alcohol use in the last year, and if they sought treatment or attended a support group to help with their alcohol use within the last year. Overall, 15.7% reported feeling like they wanted or needed to cut back, 8.1% reported experiencing negative consequences from their alcohol use, and 1.5% sought treatment or attended a support group to help with their alcohol use. As shown in Table 15, younger respondents and those living in the city of Midland were more likely to report wanting or needing to cut back on alcohol. A larger percentage of younger respondents reported experiencing negative consequences of alcohol. Finally, those with a lower education level were more likely to have sought treatment or to have attended a support group.

**Table 15. Consequences of Alcohol in Past Year, among Drinkers, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Felt Like Wanted or Needed to Cut Back	Experienced Negative Consequences	Sought Treatment or Attended a Support Group
Overall	15.7	8.1	1.5
Gender			
Male	14.1	7.6	0.7
Female	19.0	8.1	1.9
Age			
18-24	14.6*	16.3*	2.3
25-34	23.7	11.8	1.1
35-44	19.2	10.1	2.5
45-54	11.1	3.1	3.1
55-64	8.1	6.3	0.0
65+	10.2	0.0	0.0
Education			
< High School	66.7	33.3	66.7*
High School	15.4	7.4	0.0
Some College	15.0	9.8	0.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	30.0	0.0	0.0
Associates	10.9	0.0	2.2
Bachelors Degree	11.4	9.1	0.7
Graduate +	19.3	8.7	0.0
Income			
<\$20,000	8.0	18.5	3.6
\$20,000-39,999	16.7	4.7	0.0
\$40,000-69,999	14.1	6.3	0.0
\$70,000-99,999	11.8	7.5	1.1
\$100,000-149,999	20.5	8.9	2.2
\$150,000+	19.1	8.8	2.9
Area of Midland County			
City	18.5*	9.7	1.2
Out County	10.9	5.4	2.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Drug Use

### Prescription and Illegal Drug Use

Respondents were asked if they used prescription drugs that were not prescribed by a health care provider, such as anti-depressants, painkillers, sedatives or stimulants; if they used illegal drugs, such as marijuana, cocaine, crack, crystal meth, heroin, smack, PCP, LSD, uppers or downers; and if they have taken opioid (narcotic) pain killers within the last 12 months. Overall, in the past year, 3.1% of respondents used prescription drugs not prescribed for him/her, 0.9% used illegal drugs, and 8.7% took opioid pain killers. As shown in Table 16, younger respondents were more likely to have used illegal drugs, and females were more likely to have used opioid pain killers.

**Table 16. Drug Use in the Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Used Prescription Drugs Not Prescribed	Used Illegal Drugs	Taken Opioid Pain Killers
Overall	3.1	0.9	8.7
Gender			
Male	3.1	0.9	4.4*
Female	2.9	0.7	10.9
Age			
18-24	7.2	3.6*	2.4
25-34	3.8	0.8	9.2
35-44	1.9	1.0	5.7
45-54	0.0	0.0	13.5
55-64	3.9	0.0	7.7
65+	2.3	0.0	9.8
Education			
< High School	27.3	27.3	36.4
High School	2.2	0.0	6.7
Some College	3.3	0.0	5.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	0.0	4.2
Associates	4.4	1.1	13.2
Bachelors Degree	2.6	0.5	7.9
Graduate +	2.0	0.7	9.3
Income			
<\$20,000	5.7	2.3	12.8
\$20,000-39,999	2.3	0.0	5.6
\$40,000-69,999	2.2	0.0	11.0
\$70,000-99,999	1.5	0.0	8.3
\$100,000-149,999	4.0	1.6	8.1
\$150,000+	2.4	2.4	6.0
Area of Midland County			
City	3.4	1.0	8.7
Out County	2.7	0.8	8.8

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Marijuana Use

Participants were asked if they used marijuana in the past 12 months. As shown in Table 17, 1.9% of respondents reported using it for medical use, 4.7% for recreational use, and 1.4% used it for medical and recreational use. Analyses examined demographic differences among those who used marijuana (any usage) compared to those who did not. Results showed that younger individuals were more likely to use marijuana.

**Table 17. Marijuana Use in the Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Used for Medical Use	Used for Recreational Use	Used for Medical and Recreational Use	Did Not Use
Overall	1.9	4.7	1.4	92.0
Gender				
Male	2.2	4.8	1.3	91.6
Female	2.0	5.0	1.4	91.6
Age				
18-24	1.2	13.3	7.2	78.3*
25-34	5.4	7.7	1.5	85.4
35-44	2.9	3.8	1.0	92.4
45-54	2.2	1.1	0.0	96.6
55-64	1.0	4.8	0.0	94.3
65+	0.0	0.8	0.0	99.2
Education				
< High School	27.3	0.0	0.0	72.7
High School	2.2	0.0	1.1	96.7
Some College	1.6	8.1	2.4	87.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	8.3	4.2	87.5
Associates	3.3	4.3	1.1	91.3
Bachelors Degree	0.5	6.3	1.6	91.6
Graduate +	2.0	3.4	0.7	94.0
Income				
<\$20,000	1.1	3.4	3.4	92.0
\$20,000-39,999	4.5	2.2	2.2	91.0
\$40,000-69,999	2.9	5.9	0.0	91.2
\$70,000-99,999	0.8	6.1	2.3	90.9
\$100,000-149,999	0.8	4.9	0.8	93.5
\$150,000+	3.6	7.1	1.2	88.1
Area of Midland County				
City	1.4	4.8	1.7	92.1
Out County	3.1	5.0	1.1	90.8

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Consequences of Drug Use

Respondents that reported drug use were asked to report if they wanted to or needed to cut down on drug use, if they experienced negative consequences from drug use, or if they sought treatment or attended a support group to help with their drug use. As shown in Table 18, 9.5% reported feeling like they wanted or needed to cut down on drug use, 5.2% experienced negative consequences of drug use, and 4.3% sought treatment or attended a support group to help with his/her drug use. Younger respondents and those with less education were more likely to report needing to cut down on drug use and to have experienced negative consequences from his/her drug use. Those with less education were more likely to have sought treatment or to have attended a support group.

**Table 18. Consequences of Drug Use in Past Year, among Drug Users, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Felt Like Wanted or Needed to Cut Down	Experienced Negative Consequences	Sought Treatment or Attended a Support Group
Overall	9.5	5.2	4.3
Gender			
Male	16.7	4.0	4.0
Female	5.7	4.3	4.4
Age			
18-24	23.1*	16.7*	7.7
25-34	9.5	4.8	4.8
35-44	10.0	9.1	11.1
45-54	0.0	0.0	7.7
55-64	6.3	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0
Education			
< High School	75.0*	75.0*	75.0*
High School	0.0	0.0	0.0
Some College	6.3	5.9	0.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	50.0	0.0	0.0
Associates	7.7	0.0	6.7
Bachelors Degree	3.8	0.0	0.0
Graduate +	4.8	4.8	0.0
Income			
<\$20,000	23.5	11.1	0.0
\$20,000-39,999	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$40,000-69,999	0.0	0.0	0.0
\$70,000-99,999	12.5	0.0	5.9
\$100,000-149,999	6.3	6.3	6.3
\$150,000+	14.3	14.3	15.4
Area of Midland County			
City	8.8	5.1	3.4
Out County	10.5	5.4	5.6

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Chronic Diseases

### *Obesity*

Respondents were asked to report their height and weight, which were used to calculate body mass index (BMI). Overall, the mean BMI was 29.1±6.6. As shown in Table 19, BMI was higher in older respondents, and those with lower education and less income.

Respondents were placed into weight categories based on his/her BMI. As shown in Table 20, 0.9% were classified as underweight according to his/her BMI, 28.0% as normal weight, 32.4% as overweight, and 38.8% as obese. Analyses examined demographic differences among those who were obese compared to those who were not obese. Results showed that older individuals were more likely to be obese.

**Table 19. Body Mass Index and Weight Category, by Demographic Characteristics**

	BMI Mean (SD)	Weight Category			
		Underweight	Normal Weight	Overweight	Obese
Overall	29.1 (6.6)	0.9	28.0	32.4	38.8
Gender					
Male	29.1 (5.6)	33.3	26.3	39.9	35.9
Female	29.1 (7.1)	66.7	73.7	60.1	64.1
Age					
18-24	26.0 (5.7)*	33.3	22.7	13.0	6.1*
25-34	28.6 (6.9)	16.7	22.7	20.8	17.9
35-44	30.5 (7.5)	16.7	13.5	15.0	19.9
45-54	30.2 (6.2)	16.7	9.2	15.0	17.9
55-64	29.0 (6.6)	16.7	16.8	15.9	16.7
65+	29.7 (6.1)	0.0	15.1	20.3	21.5
Education					
< High School	31.5 (9.5)*	16.7	1.1	0.5	1.9
High School	31.0 (7.1)	0.0	10.6	10.5	16.4
Some College	28.3 (6.4)	16.7	20.6	17.8	15.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	28.0 (6.5)	0.0	5.3	2.7	3.1
Associates	30.8 (7.5)	0.0	7.9	16.4	15.6
Bachelors Degree	29.0 (6.1)	16.7	25.4	32.4	28.2
Graduate +	28.0 (5.9)	50.0	29.1	19.6	19.5
Income					
<\$20,000	30.2 (7.0)*	16.7	11.2	12.8	15.6
\$20,000-39,999	29.4 (7.5)	16.7	13.4	14.7	12.1
\$40,000-69,999	30.0 (7.1)	0.0	19.6	22.7	20.7
\$70,000-99,999	29.2 (6.5)	16.7	20.1	18.5	21.5
\$100,000-149,999	29.4 (6.0)	16.7	16.2	21.8	19.5
\$150,000+	27.0 (5.5)	33.3	19.6	9.5	10.5
Area of Midland County					
City	29.0 (6.9)	66.7	66.7	57.8	60.7
Out County	29.4 (6.2)	33.3	33.3	42.2	39.3

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Cancer

Respondents were asked if they had ever been diagnosed with cancer. Overall, 9.1% reported they have or had cancer. The average age an individual was diagnosed with cancer was 52.0±17.2 years. As shown in Table 20, older respondents and those with less income were more likely to report being diagnosed with cancer. As shown in Table 21, among those with cancer, the most common types were breast cancer (35.7%) and melanoma (skin) cancer (16.1%).

**Table 20. Prevalence of Cancer, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Any Cancer
Overall	9.1
Gender	
Male	8.0
Female	9.8
Age	
18-24	4.8*
25-34	1.5
35-44	2.9
45-54	5.7
55-64	5.7
65+	28.7
Education	
< High School	27.3
High School	18.6
Some College	5.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0
Associates	7.7
Bachelors Degree	7.4
Graduate +	9.3
Income	
<\$20,000	19.5*
\$20,000-39,999	3.4
\$40,000-69,999	7.5
\$70,000-99,999	8.3
\$100,000-149,999	5.8
\$150,000+	8.3
Area of Midland County	
City	9.7
Out County	7.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*



**Table 21. Prevalence of Cancer Types, among those Reporting Cancer**

Type of Cancer	% Reporting
Breast cancer	35.7
Melanoma (skin) cancer	16.1
Prostate cancer	8.9
Colorectal	8.9
Endometrial cancer	8.9
Bladder cancer	5.4
Lung cancer	5.4
Kidney cancer	3.6
Non- Hodgkin Lymphoma cancer	1.8
Ovarian cancer	1.8
Leukemia	1.8
Esophageal cancer	1.8

## Cardiovascular Disease

Respondents were asked if a doctor, nurse, or other healthcare provider had ever told them they have had a heart attack (myocardial infarction), angina or coronary heart disease, or a stroke. Among respondents, 3.6% were told they have had a heart attack, 4.6% were told they had angina or coronary heart disease, 3.0% had been told they have had a stroke, and 29.9% were told they had hypertension. As shown in Table 22, the prevalence of all chronic conditions was higher among older respondents, those with lower education levels, and less income (with the exception of angina or coronary heart disease which was not associated with income).

**Table 22. Prevalence of Cardiovascular Disease, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Heart Attack	Angina/CHD	Stroke	Hypertension
Overall	3.6	4.6	3.0	29.9
Gender				
Male	3.1	6.3	1.8	28.7
Female	3.9	3.4	3.7	30.5
Age				
18-24	1.2*	2.4*	3.6*	7.3*
25-34	0.8	1.5	0.8	10.7
35-44	1.0	1.9	1.0	21.9
45-54	2.2	3.4	2.2	25.8
55-64	1.0	2.9	1.9	38.5
65+	10.9	12.5	8.8	60.6
Education				
< High School	50.0*	36.4*	36.4*	75.0*
High School	7.2	7.2	8.5	46.5
Some College	2.5	3.3	2.5	23.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	4.2	8.7	0.0	46.7
Associates	3.3	4.4	4.4	42.2
Bachelors Degree	2.1	3.1	0.0	25.1
Graduate +	0.7	3.3	1.3	22.7
Income				
<\$20,000	12.8*	8.3	11.8*	43.0*
\$20,000-39,999	3.4	6.9	4.7	42.7
\$40,000-69,999	2.2	1.5	0.0	31.9
\$70,000-99,999	0.8	1.5	0.8	21.2
\$100,000-149,999	1.6	2.5	0.8	22.3
\$150,000+	2.4	6.0	3.6	17.9
Area of Midland County				
City	2.9	4.6	3.4	29.3
Out County	4.6	4.7	2.3	30.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## *Asthma*

Among respondents, 14.2% reported being told by a doctor, nurse or other health professional that they had asthma. As shown in Table 23, the prevalence of asthma was higher in females and those with less income.

**Table 23. Prevalence of Asthma, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Asthma
Overall	14.2
Gender	
Male	9.4*
Female	16.2
Age	
18-24	22.0
25-34	19.1
35-44	9.5
45-54	10.1
55-64	12.4
65+	14.1
Education	
< High School	40.0
High School	15.5
Some College	9.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	8.3
Associates	14.4
Bachelors Degree	14.7
Graduate +	16.0
Income	
<\$20,000	17.9*
\$20,000-39,999	21.3
\$40,000-69,999	15.7
\$70,000-99,999	9.8
\$100,000-149,999	7.4
\$150,000+	15.5
Area of Midland County	
City	13.4
Out County	15.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Diabetes

Among all respondents, 2.0% reported being told by a healthcare provider that they have Type 1 diabetes, 8.3% have Type 2 diabetes, and 11.1% have been told they have pre-diabetes/borderline diabetes; 52.8% reported having their blood sugar tested in the past 3 years. As shown in Table 24, those with less education were more likely to report having Type 1 diabetes. Older individuals, and those with lower education levels and less income were more likely to report having Type 2 diabetes. Older individuals and those with less income were more likely to report being told they had pre-diabetes/borderline diabetes. Older individuals were more likely to report having his/her blood sugar tested in the past 3 years.

**Table 24. Prevalence of Diabetes-related Conditions and Blood Sugar Screening, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Type 1 Diabetes	Type 2 Diabetes	Pre- Diabetes/ Borderline Diabetes	Blood sugar test in past 3 years
Overall	2.0	8.3	11.1	52.8
Gender				
Male	1.4	9.4	8.6	52.7
Female	2.3	7.8	12.4	53.6
Age				
18-24	3.7	1.2*	4.9*	18.1*
25-34	0.8	0.8	7.6	39.7
35-44	1.9	2.9	9.5	44.8
45-54	3.4	7.9	11.2	60.7
55-64	1.0	14.3	12.6	70.8
65+	2.5	18.1	18.4	70.5
Education				
< High School	30.0*	40.0*	40.0	83.3
High School	3.8	15.5	14.6	48.9
Some College	2.5	5.7	8.2	39.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	4.2	4.2	41.7
Associates	2.2	12.2	17.8	67.0
Bachelors Degree	1.0	5.8	10.5	52.6
Graduate +	0.0	6.0	7.4	56.7
Income				
<\$20,000	1.2	16.5*	13.1*	51.7
\$20,000-39,999	4.6	12.6	14.9	57.3
\$40,000-69,999	0.7	7.4	12.8	48.5
\$70,000-99,999	1.5	4.5	10.7	54.2
\$100,000-149,999	1.7	6.6	8.2	52.5
\$150,000+	2.4	3.6	6.0	53.6
Area of Midland County				
City	1.2	7.1	11.3	51.8
Out County	3.1	10.4	10.5	54.4

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## ***HIV/AIDS***

Respondents were asked if they have ever been diagnosed with HIV or AIDS. As shown in Table 25, 0.9% of respondents have been diagnosed with HIV/AIDS. Those with lower education levels were more likely to report having HIV/AIDS.

**Table 25. Prevalence of HIV or AIDS, by Demographic Characteristics**

	HIV or AIDS
Overall	0.9
Gender	
Male	1.4
Female	0.7
Age	
18-24	1.2
25-34	1.5
35-44	1.0
45-54	1.1
55-64	0.0
65+	0.8
Education	
< High School	25.0*
High School	1.1
Some College	0.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0
Associates	0.0
Bachelors Degree	0.0
Graduate +	0.7
Income	
<\$20,000	2.4
\$20,000-39,999	0.0
\$40,000-69,999	0.7
\$70,000-99,999	0.0
\$100,000-149,999	0.8
\$150,000+	2.4
Area of Midland County	
City	0.5
Out County	1.5

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## ***Mental Health***

Overall, in the past year, 25.9% of participants reported being diagnosed with depression, 29.0% with anxiety, and 2.4% with a substance use disorder; 14% of respondents reported being in recovery from a past mental health issue. As shown in Table 26, the prevalence of depression was higher in females, younger respondents, those with less income, and those living in the City of Midland. The prevalence of anxiety was higher in females, younger respondents, and those with less income. Those with less education were more likely to report being diagnosed with a substance use disorder in the past year. Females and younger respondents were more likely to report being in recovery for a past mental health issue.

**Table 26. Mental Health Diagnosis in the past year, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Depression	Anxiety	Substance Use Disorder	Recovery from Past Mental Health Issue
Overall	25.9	29.0	2.4	14.0
Gender				
Male	15.8*	18.4*	3.1	9.5*
Female	30.8	34.6	1.8	16.2
Age				
18-24	24.4*	33.3*	2.5	20.7*
25-34	32.8	38.9	3.1	21.5
35-44	30.5	38.1	1.9	18.1
45-54	33.7	28.1	3.4	12.4
55-64	23.1	27.6	2.9	12.4
65+	15.9	13.5	0.8	3.9
Education				
< High School	60.0	60.0	40.0*	45.5
High School	20.5	24.4	2.4	6.0
Some College	25.4	25.4	2.5	18.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	16.7	33.3	4.2	12.5
Associates	31.5	36.0	1.1	17.6
Bachelors Degree	27.2	29.3	1.1	12.6
Graduate +	23.3	27.3	2.0	12.1
Income				
<\$20,000	37.6*	28.6*	6.0	15.1
\$20,000-39,999	28.7	37.9	1.1	15.1
\$40,000-69,999	25.4	31.3	2.2	13.4
\$70,000-99,999	29.5	34.1	1.5	18.3
\$100,000-149,999	21.5	27.3	2.5	12.3
\$150,000+	20.2	16.7	2.4	10.7
Area of Midland County				
City	29.1*	31.5	2.7	15.4
Out County	20.9	25.3	1.9	11.9

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## ***Cognitive Function***

Respondents were asked to report whether they personally have concerns about their memory, concentration, decision making that affects how they perform familiar tasks, and confusion when driving in familiar locations. As shown in Table 27, 19.7% reported concerns about memory, 15.1% had concerns about concentration, 3.1% had concerns about decision making, and 1.5% had concerns about confusion when driving in familiar locations. Older individuals and those with less income were more likely to report memory concerns; those with less income were more likely to report concerns with concentration; those with lower education levels and less income were more likely to report concerns with decision making; those with less income were more likely to report confusion while driving.

**Table 27. Concerns with Cognitive Function, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Memory Concerns	Concentration Concerns	Decision Making Concerns	Confusion when Driving
Overall	19.7	15.1	3.1	1.5
Gender				
Male	20.9	11.4	2.3	0.5
Female	19.1	16.9	3.3	1.9
Age				
18-24	20.5*	21.8	5.1	1.3
25-34	11.7	14.8	3.1	0.8
35-44	12.1	12.1	0.0	0.0
45-54	28.7	21.8	0.0	1.1
55-64	21.0	16.0	8.0	3.0
65+	26.2	10.0	2.3	3.1
Education				
< High School	36.4	27.3	18.2*	0.0
High School	25.3	12.0	4.8	2.4
Some College	22.0	20.3	6.8	2.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	12.5	20.8	4.2	4.2
Associates	13.6	17.0	1.1	1.1
Bachelors Degree	20.7	14.9	1.1	1.1
Graduate +	16.8	9.8	1.4	0.7
Income				
<\$20,000	33.3*	24.1*	10.3*	5.7*
\$20,000-39,999	20.0	17.6	4.7	1.2
\$40,000-69,999	24.4	16.8	1.5	1.5
\$70,000-99,999	13.5	11.9	0.8	0.0
\$100,000-149,999	13.7	12.0	0.9	0.0
\$150,000+	18.5	12.3	3.7	1.3
Area of Midland County				
City	18.5	14.2	3.7	1.3
Out County	21.8	16.7	2.0	2.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Preventative Care and Health Screening

### *Cancer: Females*

#### **Mammogram**

Female respondents were asked how long it has been since their last mammogram. As shown in Table 28, among females aged 50-75, 69.3% had a mammogram less than 1 year ago, 18.2% had one within the last 1-2 years, 4.4% have had one within the last 3-5 years, 3.6% reported it had been 5 or more years, and 4.4% stated they have never had a mammogram. Analyses examined which demographic subgroups were more likely to have had a mammogram in the past 2 years. Results showed that those with a higher income were more likely to have had a mammogram in the past 2 years.

**Table 28. Females, aged 50-75 Who had a Mammogram, by Demographic Characteristics**

	< 1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years	≥5 years	Never
Overall	69.3	18.2	4.4	3.6	4.4
Age					
50-54	78.8	3.0	6.1	6.1	6.1
55-64	72.1	19.1	2.9	1.5	4.4
65-75	55.6	30.6	5.6	5.6	2.8
Education					
< High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
High School	37.5	43.8	12.5	0.0	6.3
Some College	65.0	30.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Associates	52.4	23.8	4.8	4.8	14.3
Bachelors Degree	84.6	5.1	2.6	5.1	2.6
Graduate +	81.8	6.1	6.1	3.0	3.0
Income					
<\$20,000	42.9*	28.6	14.3	4.8	9.5
\$20,000-39,999	47.4	42.1	0.0	0.0	10.5
\$40,000-69,999	64.3	14.3	3.6	10.7	7.1
\$70,000-99,999	83.3	12.5	4.2	0.0	0.0
\$100,000-149,999	90.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
\$150,000+	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Area of Midland County					
City	69.6	16.5	2.5	3.8	7.6
Out County	70.2	21.1	5.3	3.5	0.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* for getting mammogram within the past 2 years vs. not



## Clinical Breast Exam

Female respondents were asked how long it has been since their last clinical breast exam. As shown in Table 29, 53.0% had a breast exam less than 1 year ago, 23.2% had one within the last 1-2 years, 7.7% had one within the last 3-5 years, 6.6% reported it has been 5 or more years, and 9.5% stated they have never had a breast exam. As age, income, and education increased, the time since the last clinical breast exam decreased.

**Table 29. Females Who Had a Clinical Breast Exam, by Demographic Characteristics**

	< 1 year	1–2 years	3–5 years	≥5 years	Never
Overall	53.0	23.2	7.7	6.6	9.5
Age					
18-24	28.8*	13.5	1.9	1.9	53.8
25-34	56.3	28.7	3.4	3.4	8.0
35-44	50.0	31.9	12.5	4.2	1.4
45-54	77.3	15.2	4.5	3.0	0.0
55-64	59.1	22.7	4.5	9.1	4.5
65+	45.1	23.1	13.2	15.4	3.3
Education					
< High School	28.6*	0.0	0.0	28.6	42.9
High School	35.6	22.0	11.9	10.2	20.3
Some College	33.8	18.9	14.9	10.8	21.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	57.1	28.6	0.0	7.1	7.1
Associates	55.7	26.2	8.2	8.2	1.6
Bachelors Degree	58.0	29.8	2.3	4.6	5.3
Graduate +	71.3	17.0	8.5	1.1	2.1
Income					
<\$20,000	25.4*	22.0	15.3	18.6	18.6
\$20,000-39,999	40.8	32.4	8.5	4.2	14.1
\$40,000-69,999	57.1	21.4	8.3	6.0	7.1
\$70,000-99,999	62.4	24.7	4.7	1.2	7.1
\$100,000-149,999	55.7	22.9	5.7	8.6	7.1
\$150,000+	80.4	15.7	2.0	0.0	2.0
Area of Midland County					
City	50.2	24.3	6.7	7.9	10.9
Out County	57.9	21.1	8.8	4.7	7.6

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Pap Test

Female respondents were asked how long it has been since their last pap test. Of females aged 21-64, 41.4% had a pap exam less than 1 year ago, 32.6% had one within the last 1-2 years, 9.7% had one within the last 3-5 years, 11.0% reported it has been 5 or more years, and 5.3% stated they have never had a pap test. As shown in Table 30, as education and income increased, the time since the last pap test decreased.

**Table 30. Females, aged 21-64, Who Had a Pap Test, by Demographic Characteristics**

	< 1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years	≥5 years	Never
Overall	41.4	32.6	9.7	11.0	5.3
Age					
21-24	35.7	21.4	3.6	0.0	39.3
25-34	52.9	37.9	1.1	3.4	4.6
35-44	38.9	37.5	19.4	4.2	0.0
45-54	40.9	30.3	9.1	19.7	0.0
55-64	31.8	27.3	13.6	24.2	3.0
Education					
< High School	50.0*	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
High School	35.3	5.9	5.9	23.5	29.4
Some College	40.0	33.3	8.9	11.1	6.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	55.6	22.2	0.0	11.1	11.1
Associates	45.2	21.4	9.5	21.4	2.4
Bachelors Degree	40.8	38.3	9.2	8.3	3.3
Graduate +	40.5	36.9	13.1	7.1	2.4
Income					
<\$20,000	20.0*	10.0	10.0	30.0	30.0
\$20,000-39,999	31.1	44.4	4.4	4.4	15.6
\$40,000-69,999	48.5	27.9	8.8	13.2	1.5
\$70,000-99,999	45.8	30.6	8.3	11.1	4.2
\$100,000-149,999	35.9	31.3	20.3	12.5	0.0
\$150,000+	48.9	44.7	4.3	2.1	0.0
Area of Midland County					
City	41.5	32.3	8.7	11.3	6.2
Out County	41.1	33.1	11.3	10.5	4.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Cancer: Males

### Blood Stool Test

Male respondents were asked how long it has been since their last blood stool test using a home kit. As shown in Table 31, of the male respondents aged 50-75, 13.9% had a blood stool test less than 1 year ago, 7.6% had one within the last 1-2 years, 12.7% had one within the last 3-5 years, 17.7% stated it's been 5 or more years, and 48.1% stated they have never had a blood stool test. Analyses examined which demographic subgroups were more likely to have had a blood stool test in the past year. Results showed no differences according to demographic characteristics.

**Table 31. Males, aged 50-75, Who Had a Blood Stool Test using a Home Kit, by Demographic Characteristics**

	< 1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years	≥5 years	Never
Overall	13.9	7.6	12.7	17.7	48.1
Age					
50-54	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	90.9
55-64	18.4	5.3	7.9	15.8	52.6
65+	13.3	13.3	20.0	26.7	26.7
Education					
< High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
High School	6.3	18.8	12.5	12.5	50.0
Some College	7.7	7.7	0.0	23.1	61.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Associates	14.3	14.3	28.6	0.0	42.9
Bachelors Degree	15.8	0.0	15.8	21.1	47.4
Graduate +	21.7	4.3	13.0	17.4	43.5
Income					
<\$20,000	10.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	40.0
\$20,000-39,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
\$40,000-69,999	16.7	11.1	11.1	16.7	44.4
\$70,000-99,999	14.3	7.1	0.0	28.6	50.0
\$100,000-149,999	17.6	5.9	11.8	23.5	41.2
\$150,000+	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	58.3
Area of Midland County					
City	18.9	5.4	10.8	18.9	45.9
Out County	9.5	9.5	14.3	16.7	50.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Screened for Colon Cancer

Male respondents were asked how long it has been since they were screened for colon cancer. Of the male respondents aged 50-75, 22.2% had been screened less than 1 year ago, 26.4% had been screened within the last 1-2 years, 15.3% had been screened within the last 3-5 years, 16.7% stated it had been more than 5, and 19.4% reported they have never been screened for colon cancer. As shown in Table 32, the time since the last colon cancer screening was not associated with any demographic characteristics.

**Table 32. Males, aged 50-75, Who Have Been Screened for Colon Cancer, by Demographic Characteristics**

	< 1 year	1–2 years	3–5 years	>5 years	Never
Overall	22.2	26.4	15.3	16.7	19.4
Age					
50-54	10.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	50.0
55-64	22.9	28.6	11.4	25.7	11.4
65-75	25.9	29.6	18.5	7.4	18.5
Education					
< High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
High School	33.3	33.3	16.7	8.3	8.3
Some College	16.7	8.3	16.7	16.7	41.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Associates	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7
Bachelors Degree	11.1	22.2	27.8	22.2	16.7
Graduate +	26.1	34.8	0.0	21.7	17.4
Income					
<\$20,000	28.6	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6
\$20,000-39,999	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
\$40,000-69,999	26.7	26.7	26.7	0.0	20.0
\$70,000-99,999	14.3	28.6	14.3	21.4	21.4
\$100,000-149,999	29.4	17.6	5.9	41.2	5.9
\$150,000+	16.7	41.7	16.7	8.3	16.7
Area of Midland County					
City	25.7	20.0	8.6	22.9	22.9
Out County	18.9	32.4	21.6	10.8	16.2

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## *Influenza*

Respondents were asked if they received a flu vaccination for the 2018-2019 flu season. As shown in Table 33, 62.4% stated they had received a flu vaccination. Older respondents, and those with more education and higher incomes were more likely to have received a flu vaccination.

**Table 33. Got a Flu Vaccine in 2018-2019, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Flu Vaccine
Overall	62.4
Gender	
Male	60.9
Female	63.6
Age	
18-24	47.0*
25-34	57.3
35-44	54.3
45-54	60.7
55-64	64.4
65+	81.8
Education	
< High School	83.3*
High School	63.2
Some College	53.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	37.5
Associates	59.3
Bachelors Degree	59.7
Graduate +	77.2
Income	
<\$20,000	55.2*
\$20,000-39,999	55.7
\$40,000-69,999	57.0
\$70,000-99,999	60.6
\$100,000-149,999	67.2
\$150,000+	73.5
Area of Midland County	
City	61.5
Out County	63.6

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Access to Care and Utilization

### Healthcare Coverage

#### Primary Source of Insurance

Respondents were asked to indicate their primary source of insurance. A majority reported having an employer-sponsored health insurance plan (67.7%). As shown in Table 34, 2.5% reported being uninsured. Trends in insurance status (insured vs. uninsured) were investigated across all demographic characteristics. Those with less income were more likely to be uninsured.

**Table 34. Primary Source of Insurance, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Employer-sponsored Health Insurance Plan	Individual Plan Purchased on the Health Insurance Exchange	Medicaid	Medicare	Uninsured
Overall	67.7	5.8	7.5	16.6	2.5
Gender					
Male	70.2	3.3	4.7	19.5	2.3
Female	66.5	6.9	8.8	15.4	2.4
Age					
18-24	65.8	11.4	13.9	3.8	5.1
25-34	83.2	4.6	9.9	0.8	1.5
35-44	88.6	4.8	3.8	1.0	1.9
45-54	83.9	5.7	3.4	3.4	3.4
55-64	75.7	5.8	8.7	5.8	3.9
65+	11.1	3.7	5.6	79.6	0.0
Education					
< High School	22.2	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0
High School	40.6	5.8	23.2	29.0	1.4
Some College	55.7	9.6	12.2	17.4	5.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	70.8	4.2	4.2	20.8	0.0
Associates	56.3	5.7	5.7	26.4	5.7
Bachelors Degree	81.7	5.2	2.6	8.9	1.6
Graduate +	80.4	3.4	2.0	13.5	0.7
Income					
<\$20,000	13.0	10.4	32.5	36.4	7.8*
\$20,000-39,999	37.5	15.0	16.3	27.5	3.8
\$40,000-69,999	73.8	3.1	3.8	15.4	3.8
\$70,000-99,999	81.8	6.8	0.0	10.6	0.8
\$100,000-149,999	89.3	1.7	0.8	7.4	0.8
\$150,000+	89.3	2.4	3.6	4.8	0.0
Area of Midland County					
City	69.3	4.0	7.3	16.9	2.5
Out County	65.3	8.6	7.8	15.9	2.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend* (insured vs. uninsured)

## Insurance Information Continued

Respondents who reported their primary source of insurance as an individual plan purchased on the health insurance exchange were asked additional questions. As shown in Table 35, 48.6% reported having premium supports under the ACA and 37.1% were able to afford health insurance premiums without ACA premium supports. Table 37 also indicates males were less likely to report receiving premium supports through the ACA.

Nearly half (48.7%) of respondents who reported an individual plan purchased through the health insurance exchange or employer-sponsored health insurance had a high deductible plan. High deductible plans were more common with higher levels of education and income.

All participants (regardless of health insurance status) were asked about their ability to pay an \$8,000 Emergency Department bill. Male respondents and those with higher income and education levels were more likely to report being able to pay this bill.

**Table 35. Healthcare Coverage, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Receive Premium Supports	Afford Insurance Without ACA Premium Supports	High Deductible Plan	Pay \$8,000 ER Bill
Overall	48.6	37.1	48.7	38.6
Gender				
Male	28.6*	71.4	51.6	48.4*
Female	55.2	29.6	47.1	33.8
Age				
18-24	22.2	33.3	30.0	19.0
25-34	66.7	20.0	53.0	38.9
35-44	60.0	40.0	50.0	39.0
45-54	60.0	40.0	54.5	37.5
55-64	66.7	33.3	60.7	51.9
65+	25.0	75.0	6.3	38.5
Education				
< High School	0.0	100.0	33.3*	27.3*
High School	50.0	75.0	40.6	20.2
Some College	36.4	36.4	41.9	18.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	0.0	52.9	33.3
Associates	60.0	20.0	35.2	24.4
Bachelors Degree	60.0	22.2	51.5	46.3
Graduate +	60.0	50.0	56.9	65.3
Income				
<\$20,000	37.5	57.1	33.3*	6.0*
\$20,000-39,999	75.0	0.0	42.9	11.5
\$40,000-69,999	25.0	50.0	43.0	30.4
\$70,000-99,999	55.6	33.3	50.0	40.5
\$100,000-149,999	0.0	100.0	52.8	57.4
\$150,000+	0.0	100.0	53.9	81.0
Area of Midland County				
City	37.5	37.5	49.7	36.5
Out County	57.1	36.8	47.2	42.1

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Healthcare Access

Respondents were asked if they were unable to see a doctor in the past 12 months because of cost or an inability to schedule an appointment. As shown in Table 36, 10.4% did not see a doctor because of cost and 15.6% did not see a doctor because of an inability to schedule an appointment. Younger individuals, those with lower education, and less income were more likely to report an inability to see a doctor because of cost. Younger respondents were more likely to report an inability to see a doctor because of difficulty in scheduling an appointment.

**Table 36. Could Not See Doctor for Various Reasons, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Because of Cost	Could Not Get Appointment
Overall	10.4	15.6
Gender		
Male	7.1	11.7
Female	11.6	17.2
Age		
18-24	15.9*	17.1*
25-34	14.6	24.6
35-44	14.3	23.8
45-54	13.5	11.2
55-64	3.8	10.7
65+	3.8	8.2
Education		
< High School	33.3*	25.0
High School	8.1	11.6
Some College	17.4	12.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	12.5	12.5
Associates	11.0	19.8
Bachelors Degree	7.9	14.7
Graduate +	6.7	18.8
Income		
<\$20,000	15.5*	16.5
\$20,000-39,999	12.4	12.5
\$40,000-69,999	16.3	14.1
\$70,000-99,999	5.3	16.8
\$100,000-149,999	9.0	15.6
\$150,000+	3.6	16.9
Area of Midland County		
City	10.9	15.6
Out County	9.6	15.8

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*



## Healthcare Provider (HCP) Utilization

### HCP Utilization: Doctor

Respondents were asked how many times in the past 12 months they had seen a doctor. As shown in Table 37, 92.4% reported seeing a doctor at least once. Females reported seeing a doctor more frequently than males within the last 12 months. As age increased, the number of times respondents had seen a doctor within the past 12 months increased.

**Table 37. Saw Doctor in Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Never	Once	2–5 times	6–9 times	≥10 times
Overall	7.6	32.4	48.7	7.0	4.3
Gender					
Male	10.3*	36.3	48.0	4.0	1.3
Female	5.9	30.4	49.4	8.4	5.9
Age					
18-24	6.1*	38.7	46.3	4.9	4.9
25-34	12.3	32.3	36.9	9.2	9.2
35-44	11.4	34.3	46.7	4.8	2.9
45-54	3.4	39.3	44.9	9.0	3.4
55-64	8.7	33.0	49.5	5.8	2.9
65+	2.3	22.6	64.7	8.3	2.3
Education					
< High School	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	0.0
High School	4.6	25.3	55.2	9.2	5.7
Some College	9.2	38.7	40.3	7.6	4.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	8.3	50.0	33.3	4.2	4.2
Associates	12.1	31.9	40.7	8.8	6.6
Bachelors Degree	7.9	34.0	49.7	4.7	3.7
Graduate +	4.0	28.2	57.7	6.7	3.4
Income					
<\$20,000	6.0	20.2	50.0	17.9	6.0
\$20,000-39,999	11.2	29.2	47.2	7.9	4.5
\$40,000-69,999	11.2	35.8	42.5	6.0	4.5
\$70,000-99,999	8.3	35.4	47.0	4.5	3.8
\$100,000-149,999	4.9	30.3	54.1	5.7	4.9
\$150,000+	2.4	44.6	45.8	4.8	2.4
Area of Midland County					
City	7.3	32.8	47.7	7.3	4.9
Out County	8.0	32.1	50.4	6.1	3.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## HCP Utilization: Nurse

Respondents were asked how many times in the past 12 months they had seen a nurse. As shown in Table 38, 45.7% reported never seeing a nurse. Frequency of visits with a nurse did not vary by demographic characteristics.

**Table 38. Saw Nurse in Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Never	Once	2–5 times	6–9 times	≥10 times
Overall	45.7	27.7	20.8	3.0	2.8
Gender					
Male	48.6	26.4	21.6	2.4	1.0
Female	44.0	28.8	20.1	3.3	3.8
Age					
18-24	27.5	36.3	27.5	3.8	5.0
25-34	48.0	29.9	13.4	3.9	4.7
35-44	46.3	28.4	22.1	2.1	1.1
45-54	44.0	32.1	20.2	2.4	1.2
55-64	53.8	26.9	15.1	2.2	2.2
65+	50.5	15.2	27.6	3.8	2.9
Education					
< High School	63.6	18.2	9.1	9.1	0.0
High School	41.4	24.3	21.4	5.7	7.1
Some College	47.7	32.4	15.3	3.6	0.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	54.2	33.3	8.3	4.2	0.0
Associates	45.1	24.4	23.2	4.9	2.4
Bachelors Degree	40.9	32.7	22.2	0.6	3.5
Graduate +	49.6	21.3	24.8	2.1	2.1
Income					
<\$20,000	40.8	26.3	22.4	6.6	3.9
\$20,000-39,999	52.6	23.1	17.9	5.1	1.3
\$40,000-69,999	43.4	27.9	23.8	2.5	2.5
\$70,000-99,999	44.1	30.5	22.0	1.7	1.7
\$100,000-149,999	40.4	27.2	24.6	3.5	4.4
\$150,000+	53.2	32.5	11.7	0.0	2.6
Area of Midland County					
City	44.7	26.5	22.8	3.4	2.6
Out County	47.8	29.6	17.8	1.7	3.0

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## HCP Utilization: Dentist

Respondents were asked how many times in the past 12 months they had seen a dentist. As shown in Table 39, 82.8% reported seeing a dentist at least once. As education and income level increased, the number of dental visits within the past 12 months increased.

**Table 39. Saw Dentist in Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Never	Once	2–5 times	6–9 times
Overall	17.2	24.8	57.3	0.8
Gender				
Male	16.9	24.7	58.0	0.5
Female	17.0	24.7	57.7	0.7
Age				
18-24	17.1	28.0	54.9	0.0
25-34	20.0	25.4	54.6	0.0
35-44	12.4	22.9	63.8	1.0
45-54	16.1	21.8	62.1	0.0
55-64	14.7	27.5	55.9	2.0
65+	23.6	18.7	56.1	1.6
Education				
< High School	45.5*	9.1	45.5	0.0
High School	32.9	30.5	35.4	1.2
Some College	17.9	33.3	48.7	0.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	25.0	25.0	45.8	4.2
Associates	21.3	18.0	59.6	1.1
Bachelors Degree	13.2	24.3	61.4	1.1
Graduate +	6.8	20.5	72.6	0.0
Income				
<\$20,000	38.8*	27.5	32.5	1.3
\$20,000-39,999	30.2	23.3	45.3	1.2
\$40,000-69,999	18.0	27.1	54.1	0.8
\$70,000-99,999	6.1	28.8	63.6	1.5
\$100,000-149,999	11.0	17.8	71.2	0.0
\$150,000+	4.8	22.9	72.3	0.0
Area of Midland County				
City	18.4	21.4	59.5	0.7
Out County	15.4	30.3	53.9	0.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## HCP Utilization: Counselor, Social Worker, or other Behavioral Health Professional

Respondents were asked how many times in the past 12 months they had seen a counselor, social worker, or other behavioral health professional. As shown in Table 40, 84.8% had not seen a counselor, social worker, or other behavioral health professional within the past 12 months. As age decreased, the number of visits to a counselor, social worker, or other behavioral health professional within the past 12 months increased.

**Table 40. Saw Counselor, Social Worker, or other Behavioral Health Specialist in Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Never	Once	2–5 times	6–9 times	≥10 times
Overall	84.8	3.7	4.5	2.5	4.5
Gender					
Male	86.6	1.4	6.0	1.4	4.6
Female	83.8	5.0	3.8	2.9	4.5
Age					
18-24	85.4*	6.1	3.7	1.2	3.7
25-34	80.8	3.1	6.2	3.8	6.2
35-44	79.4	3.9	8.8	2.0	5.9
45-54	87.4	3.4	2.3	4.6	2.3
55-64	83.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	8.0
65+	93.2	4.3	1.7	0.9	0.0
Education					
< High School	54.5	18.2	9.1	0.0	18.2
High School	90.9	1.3	1.3	2.6	3.9
Some College	82.9	3.4	4.3	2.6	6.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	86.4	0.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Associates	81.8	6.8	5.7	2.3	3.4
Bachelors Degree	86.8	3.8	4.9	1.6	2.7
Graduate +	84.5	2.7	4.7	3.4	4.7
Income					
<\$20,000	79.0	3.7	3.7	2.5	11.1
\$20,000-39,999	91.7	3.6	2.4	0.0	2.4
\$40,000-69,999	82.0	7.0	3.9	3.1	3.9
\$70,000-99,999	86.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	6.3
\$100,000-149,999	83.1	2.5	9.3	3.4	1.7
\$150,000+	87.8	3.7	2.4	2.4	3.7
Area of Midland County					
City	82.9	4.3	5.8	2.5	4.5
Out County	87.8	2.8	2.4	2.4	4.5

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## HCP Utilization: Other Health Care Professional

Respondents were asked how many times in the past 12 months they have seen a health professional classified as “other.” As shown in Table 41, 21.3% reported visiting a health professional classified as “other” at least once within the past 12 months. Females reported visiting an “other” health care professional more frequently within the past 12 months, compared to males.

**Table 41. Saw “Other” Health Care Professional in Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Never	Once	2–5 times	6–9 times	≥10 times
Overall	78.7	8.9	8.2	1.6	2.7
Gender					
Male	84.6*	7.0	7.0	0.0	1.4
Female	75.7	9.6	8.9	2.4	3.4
Age					
18-24	79.0	11.1	4.9	0.0	4.9
25-34	77.2	12.6	6.3	0.8	3.1
35-44	76.2	10.9	8.9	2.0	2.0
45-54	81.6	4.6	6.9	3.4	3.4
55-64	78.6	8.2	8.2	3.1	2.0
65+	82.1	5.1	11.1	0.9	0.9
Education					
< High School	72.7	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0
High School	81.8	3.9	13.0	1.3	0.0
Some College	80.9	7.0	7.8	0.9	3.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	78.3	8.7	13.0	0.0	0.0
Associates	77.3	10.2	8.0	2.3	2.3
Bachelors Degree	75.6	10.6	9.4	1.1	3.3
Graduate +	80.6	9.7	3.5	2.8	3.5
Income					
<\$20,000	79.2	5.2	14.3	0.0	1.3
\$20,000-39,999	75.6	9.3	10.5	2.3	2.3
\$40,000-69,999	80.5	10.2	5.5	3.1	0.8
\$70,000-99,999	79.5	8.7	8.7	0.8	2.4
\$100,000-149,999	84.2	7.9	4.4	0.9	2.6
\$150,000+	72.0	12.2	7.3	2.4	6.1
Area of Midland County					
City	79.4	8.2	7.2	1.8	3.4
Out County	77.4	10.1	9.7	1.2	1.6

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Doctor Utilization: Substance Abuse Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance abuse problem. Overall, 71.7% reported being “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance abuse problem. As shown in Table 42, older respondents and those with more income were more likely to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance abuse problem.

**Table 42. Likelihood of going to a Doctor for a Substance Abuse Problem, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neither Likely or Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
Overall	44.3	27.4	11.1	7.0	10.3
Gender					
Male	39.5	27.9	13.5	7.9	11.2
Female	47.2	27.3	9.6	6.6	9.3
Age					
18-24	33.8*	32.5	11.3	12.5	10.0
25-34	31.3	28.1	18.0	10.2	12.5
35-44	35.4	33.3	12.1	7.1	12.1
45-54	50.6	33.3	6.2	4.9	4.9
55-64	49.5	26.3	10.1	3.0	11.1
65+	61.4	16.7	7.0	3.5	11.4
Education					
< High School	40.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	10.0
High School	56.4	17.9	3.8	6.4	15.4
Some College	43.9	25.4	9.6	11.4	9.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	45.5	13.6	22.7	4.5	13.6
Associates	36.5	25.9	16.5	8.2	12.9
Bachelors Degree	44.7	27.4	12.8	6.7	8.4
Graduate +	42.4	26.8	8.3	4.2	8.3
Income					
<\$20,000	46.9*	13.6	13.6	6.2	19.8
\$20,000-39,999	47.5	22.5	7.5	7.5	15.0
\$40,000-69,999	45.3	25.0	13.3	8.6	7.8
\$70,000-99,999	38.1	31.0	12.7	5.6	12.7
\$100,000-149,999	45.6	31.6	9.6	7.9	5.3
\$150,000+	42.0	37.0	11.1	6.2	3.7
Area of Midland County					
City	46.5	26.4	10.6	7.2	9.3
Out County	41.0	29.1	11.9	6.6	11.5

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Therapist Utilization: Substance Abuse Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a therapist if they felt they had a substance abuse problem. Overall, 66.4% reported being “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance abuse problem. As shown in Table 43, female respondents, and those with more education and income were more likely to visit a therapist if they felt they had a substance abuse problem.

**Table 43. Likelihood of going to a Therapist for a Substance Abuse Problem, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neither Likely or Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
Overall	38.8	27.6	13.8	8.3	11.4
Gender					
Male	31.8*	23.4	16.8	9.8	18.2
Female	42.6	30.3	12.0	7.8	7.3
Age					
18-24	31.6	36.7	8.9	15.2	7.6
25-34	32.8	28.9	22.7	5.5	10.2
35-44	34.3	35.4	15.2	6.1	9.1
45-54	45.7	29.6	11.1	7.4	6.2
55-64	44.9	21.4	13.3	11.2	9.2
65+	44.4	19.4	8.3	6.5	21.3
Education					
< High School	40.0*	30.0	30.0	0.0	0.0
High School	35.8	20.9	7.5	9.0	26.9
Some College	39.5	28.1	14.9	8.8	8.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	40.9	13.6	22.7	4.5	18.2
Associates	31.0	20.7	20.7	10.3	17.2
Bachelors Degree	39.1	30.7	12.8	11.2	6.1
Graduate +	43.8	32.6	10.4	4.2	9.0
Income					
<\$20,000	38.0*	16.5	13.9	11.4	20.3
\$20,000-39,999	44.2	20.8	9.1	10.4	15.6
\$40,000-69,999	33.3	29.5	20.2	9.3	7.8
\$70,000-99,999	36.5	26.2	19.0	4.0	14.3
\$100,000-149,999	43.4	34.5	8.0	8.0	6.2
\$150,000+	43.2	30.9	11.1	8.6	6.2
Area of Midland County					
City	41.3	27.4	13.3	8.6	9.4
Out County	35.1	28.0	14.6	7.9	14.2

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Doctor Utilization: Mental Health Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a doctor if they felt they had a mental health problem. Overall, 74.6% reported being “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to visit a doctor if they felt they had a mental health problem. As shown in Table 44, females and older respondents were more likely to visit a doctor if they felt they had a mental health problem.

**Table 44. Likelihood of going to a Doctor for a Mental Health Problem, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neither Likely or Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
Overall	49.1	25.5	9.6	7.0	8.7
Gender					
Male	42.7*	26.8	10.9	7.3	12.3
Female	52.6	25.5	9.0	6.6	6.4
Age					
18-24	36.1*	33.7	14.5	9.6	6.0
25-34	36.4	31.8	11.6	10.1	10.1
35-44	44.6	31.7	6.9	6.9	9.9
45-54	58.6	26.4	8.0	4.6	2.3
55-64	53.9	18.6	10.8	6.9	9.8
65+	61.2	16.5	5.8	5.0	11.6
Education					
< High School	54.5	9.1	36.4	0.0	0.0
High School	54.9	20.7	3.7	6.1	14.6
Some College	47.0	23.9	16.2	4.3	8.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	47.8	17.4	13.0	8.7	13.0
Associates	42.7	24.7	12.4	9.0	11.2
Bachelors Degree	51.6	26.9	6.5	8.6	6.5
Graduate +	47.9	30.8	7.5	6.8	6.8
Income					
<\$20,000	49.4	16.9	12.0	7.2	14.5
\$20,000-39,999	52.4	22.0	11.0	7.3	7.3
\$40,000-69,999	53.4	22.1	9.2	5.3	9.9
\$70,000-99,999	46.2	25.4	10.0	8.5	10.0
\$100,000-149,999	50.0	33.9	5.9	5.1	5.1
\$150,000+	43.4	32.5	14.5	7.2	2.4
Area of Midland County					
City	50.9	25.6	8.0	7.3	8.3
Out County	46.2	25.7	12.3	6.7	9.1

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*



## Therapist Utilization: Mental Health Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a therapist if they felt they had a mental health problem. Overall, 71.5% reported being “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to visit a therapist if they felt they had a mental health problem. As shown in Table 45, female respondents and those with more education and income were more likely to visit a therapist if they felt they had a mental health problem.

**Table 45. Likelihood of going to a Therapist for a Mental Health Problem, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neither Likely or Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
Overall	47.9	23.6	11.3	7.1	10.1
Gender					
Male	43.1*	20.8	13.9	7.9	14.4
Female	50.4	25.7	10.0	6.6	7.3
Age					
18-24	39.5	25.9	13.6	14.8	6.2
25-34	41.1	25.6	14.0	10.9	8.5
35-44	49.5	29.7	9.9	3.0	7.9
45-54	58.3	21.4	10.7	6.0	3.6
55-64	52.0	22.5	11.8	4.9	8.8
65+	48.6	18.3	6.4	4.6	22.0
Education					
< High School	50.0*	10.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
High School	36.2	20.3	8.7	8.7	26.1
Some College	48.7	19.1	15.7	7.8	8.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	43.5	17.4	13.0	8.7	17.4
Associates	39.8	25.0	14.8	6.8	13.6
Bachelors Degree	50.0	25.8	10.2	8.1	5.9
Graduate +	55.6	27.1	6.3	4.9	6.3
Income					
<\$20,000	48.1*	14.3	13.0	9.1	15.6
\$20,000-39,999	44.2	18.2	10.4	14.3	13.0
\$40,000-69,999	47.0	24.2	14.4	6.1	8.3
\$70,000-99,999	48.1	24.8	10.9	4.7	11.6
\$100,000-149,999	50.4	29.1	8.5	6.0	6.0
\$150,000+	49.4	26.5	13.3	6.0	4.8
Area of Midland County					
City	50.6	21.6	10.8	8.7	8.2
Out County	43.7	26.9	12.2	4.5	12.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## HCP Utilization: Patient Preferences

Respondents were asked who they preferred to see when they needed medical care. Options included Medical Doctor, Physician Assistant, Registered Nurse, and Mental Health Professional. Respondents could select all that applied. As shown in Table 46, a Medical Doctor was the most selected healthcare professional to see (79.0%). Table 46 also indicates that:

- Preference for seeing a Medical Doctor increased with age, education, and income.
- Preference for seeing a Physician Assistant was more common among women and increased with education and income.
- Preference for seeing a Mental Health Professional increased as education increased.

**Table 46. Patient Preference in Health Care Provider, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Medical Doctor	Physician Assistant	Registered Nurse	Mental Health Professional
Overall	79.0	38.8	10.9	8.2
Gender				
Male	77.6	33.6*	11.2	9.0
Female	79.3	41.8	10.7	7.7
Age				
18-24	62.2*	39.0*	17.1	6.1
25-34	73.6	39.5	8.5	10.9
35-44	77.1	45.7	12.4	8.6
45-54	84.3	38.2	9.0	7.9
55-64	84.3	37.3	10.8	9.8
65+	88.1	32.1	8.2	6.0
Education				
< High School	58.3*	16.7*	8.3	0.0*
High School	79.3	18.4	6.9	6.9
Some College	68.3	37.5	11.7	5.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	70.8	41.7	8.3	12.5
Associates	70.0	40.0	8.9	4.4
Bachelors Degree	84.2	42.1	13.7	7.9
Graduate +	89.3	48.3	10.7	13.4
Income				
<\$20,000	69.4*	23.5*	7.1	11.8
\$20,000-39,999	78.4	38.6	9.1	3.4
\$40,000-69,999	74.6	41.8	10.4	5.2
\$70,000-99,999	80.3	40.2	9.8	9.8
\$100,000-149,999	79.3	45.5	16.5	10.7
\$150,000+	89.2	47.0	12.0	9.6
Area of Midland County				
City	78.7	38.7	12.0	9.8
Out County	79.4	39.3	9.2	5.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Healthcare Location: Patient Preferences

Respondents were asked where they preferred to go when they needed medical care. Options included Urgent Care, Emergency Room, Clinic, Pharmacy, or self-treatment. Respondents could select all that applied. As shown in Table 47, Urgent Care was the most selected place to go (42.0%). Table 47 indicates that:

- Preference for going to Urgent Care decreased with age and increased with education and income.
- Preference for going to the Emergency Room increased with age and decreased with education and income.
- Preference for going to a Pharmacy was more common among city residents and increased with education.
- Preference for self-treatment decreased with age and education.

**Table 47. Patient Preference in Health Care Location, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Urgent Care	Emergency Room	Clinic	Pharmacy	Self-Treatment
Overall	42.0	15.3	6.4	7.9	23.5
Gender					
Male	42.2	17.0	7.2	7.5	26.9
Female	42.0	14.1	5.7	7.6	21.6
Age					
18-24	46.3*	18.3*	12.2	1.2	31.7*
25-34	53.5	10.1	7.8	10.1	31.0
35-44	61.9	11.4	5.7	10.5	33.3
45-54	34.8	9.0	3.4	10.1	14.6
55-64	33.3	13.7	3.9	7.8	22.5
65+	23.9	24.6	6.0	6.0	9.0
Education					
< High School	25.0*	25.0*	16.7	8.3*	8.3*
High School	26.4	18.4	8.0	3.4	8.0
Some College	43.3	18.3	8.3	5.0	25.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	54.2	20.8	0.0	0.0	20.8
Associates	37.8	13.3	5.6	5.6	21.1
Bachelors Degree	45.8	14.7	5.3	10.0	32.1
Graduate +	47.0	11.4	6.0	12.8	23.5
Income					
<\$20,000	28.2*	25.9	8.2	9.4	20.0
\$20,000-39,999	35.2	14.8	8.0	4.5	25.0
\$40,000-69,999	41.8	13.4	4.5	3.7	23.9
\$70,000-99,999	47.0	12.1	6.1	8.3	25.8
\$100,000-149,999	54.5	14.9	9.1	12.4	24.8
\$150,000+	45.8	13.3	2.4	10.8	21.7
Area of Midland County					
City	41.9	17.2	7.8	10.0*	24.3
Out County	42.0	12.2	4.2	4.6	22.5

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Other Health Concerns

### *Disability*

#### Special Equipment

Respondents were asked to report if they have a physical health problem that required them to use special equipment such as a cane, wheelchair, walker, Amigo, special bed, or special telephone. As shown in Table 48, 7.3% of respondents stated that they have a physical health problem that requires them to use special equipment. Females, older respondents, those with less education and income, and those living in the City of Midland were more likely to report using special equipment.

**Table 48. Used Special Equipment, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Use Special Equipment
Overall	7.3
Gender	
Male	2.5*
Female	9.5
Age	
18-24	2.2*
25-34	2.9
35-44	1.8
45-54	4.2
55-64	3.7
65+	24.4
Education	
< High School	33.3*
High School	18.4
Some College	8.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	8.3
Associates	9.3
Bachelors Degree	3.4
Graduate +	1.9
Income	
<\$20,000	23.3*
\$20,000-39,999	15.4
\$40,000-69,999	3.5
\$70,000-99,999	1.4
\$100,000-149,999	0.8
\$150,000+	3.4
Area of Midland County	
City	8.9*
Out County	4.8

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## Reliance on Others

The percentage of participants who reported relying on others for help with bathing, dressing, shopping, and meals is shown in Table 49. Overall, a low percentage of respondents relied on others for help with these activities (0.8-4.4%). Those with lower education levels were more likely to report relying on others for dressing, shopping, meals, and banking. Those with a lower level of income were more likely to report relying on others for shopping, meals, and banking.

**Table 49. Relied on Others for Help for the Following, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Bathe	Dress	Shop	Meals	Banking
Overall	1.0	0.8	4.4	3.4	2.4
Gender					
Male	0.4	0.4	2.1	4.0	1.3
Female	1.3	1.1	5.0	2.1	2.8
Age					
18-24	1.1	1.1	4.4	4.4	4.4
25-34	0.7	0.7	3.6	2.9	1.4
35-44	0.9	0.9	1.8	1.8	0.9
45-54	1.1	1.1	4.2	3.2	2.1
55-64	0.9	0.9	2.8	0.0	1.0
65+	1.5	0.8	7.7	6.2	3.8
Education					
< High School	27.3	30.0*	40.0*	40.0*	50.0*
High School	0.0	1.1	6.7	4.4	6.7
Some College	0.8	0.8	4.7	3.2	0.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Associates	0.0	0.0	6.3	5.2	3.1
Bachelors Degree	1.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.5
Graduate +	0.6	0.6	1.9	1.9	0.0
Income					
<\$20,000	2.2	2.2	12.2*	11.5*	10.2*
\$20,000-39,999	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	1.1
\$40,000-69,999	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.4	1.4
\$70,000-99,999	0.7	0.0	2.9	1.4	0.7
\$100,000-149,999	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.6	0.8
\$150,000+	2.2	2.2	3.4	3.4	2.2
Area of Midland County					
City	1.2	0.9	4.1	3.3	2.8
Out County	0.7	0.7	4.8	3.7	1.8

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## *Falls*

Respondents were asked if they had fallen in the past 12 months. Overall, 24.5% reported a fall in the past 12 months. As shown in Table 50, falls were more commonly reported among older respondents, and those with less education and income.

**Table 50. Fallen in the Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Fallen in Past 12 Months
Overall	24.5
Gender	
Male	24.9
Female	24.4
Age	
18-24	26.4*
25-34	15.2
35-44	22.7
45-54	25.3
55-64	26.6
65+	31.8
Education	
< High School	45.5*
High School	27.5
Some College	26.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	33.3
Associates	26.3
Bachelors Degree	23.6
Graduate +	17.9
Income	
<\$20,000	34.1*
\$20,000-39,999	21.3
\$40,000-69,999	30.1
\$70,000-99,999	22.3
\$100,000-149,999	17.2
\$150,000+	22.5
Area of Midland County	
City	23.9
Out County	25.7

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Injury from Fall

Respondents who reported a fall within the last 12 months were asked if it caused an injury that limited regular activities for at least a day and/or resulted in a visit to a doctor. Among those who reported falling, 27.5% said they sustained an injury. As shown in Table 51, females were more likely to sustain a fall-related injury.

**Table 51. Sustained an Injury Due to Falling, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Injured by Fall
Overall	27.7
Gender	
Male	16.9*
Female	33.0
Age	
18-24	20.8
25-34	23.8
35-44	20.0
45-54	26.1
55-64	37.9
65+	31.0
Education	
< High School	60.0
High School	36.0
Some College	28.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	25.0
Associates	33.3
Bachelors Degree	18.8
Graduate +	25.0
Income	
<\$20,000	40.0
\$20,000-39,999	31.6
\$40,000-69,999	30.2
\$70,000-99,999	19.4
\$100,000-149,999	18.2
\$150,000+	25.0
Area of Midland County	
City	32.0
Out County	21.4

\*  $p < .05$ ; statistically significant *trend*

## ***Belonging***

Respondents were asked if they felt they belonged at home, work, their community, or in any other group or place. As shown in Table 52, 90.6% of respondents reported feeling a sense of belonging. As education and income decreased, feelings of belonging decreased.

Additionally, respondents were asked if they felt that their family or the people they lived with, in their neighborhood, community and/or coworkers cared about them. Nearly all respondents (97.0%) indicated they felt cared for. As shown in Table 52, there were no differences among any demographic characteristics.

**Table 52. Feelings of Belonging, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Belong at Home, Work, Your Community or Other Group/Place	People Care About You
Overall	90.6	97.0
Gender		
Male	91.9	96.2
Female	90.2	97.8
Age		
18-24	90.9	97.8
25-34	91.9	97.8
35-44	89.1	94.5
45-54	93.6	94.7
55-64	91.7	98.1
65+	86.2	98.5
Education		
< High School	72.7*	100.0
High School	82.4	94.4
Some College	91.3	97.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	79.2	100.0
Associates	94.7	96.8
Bachelors Degree	92.9	97.0
Graduate +	92.3	97.4
Income		
<\$20,000	77.0*	92.1
\$20,000-39,999	85.7	100.0
\$40,000-69,999	92.1	96.5
\$70,000-99,999	92.8	97.1
\$100,000-149,999	94.5	99.2
\$150,000+	97.8	97.8
Area of Midland County		
City	91.3	97.0
Out County	89.6	97.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*



## Health Literacy

Respondents were asked whether they understood 1) what their health care professional tells them and 2) the handouts they are given when they need medical care. Overall, a vast majority of respondents (96.1%) reported understanding information relayed to them from their health care professional and the handouts provide. As shown in Table 53, those with lower education and income levels were less likely to understand what their health care professional told them and the information within the handouts.

**Table 53. Health Literacy, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Can Understand What Healthcare Professional Tells Me	Can Understand the Handouts Given to Me
Overall	96.1	96.1
Gender		
Male	95.5	95.9
Female	96.4	96.3
Age		
18-24	90.2	91.5
25-34	97.7	96.2
35-44	97.1	97.1
45-54	97.8	97.7
55-64	95.2	97.1
65+	97.7	96.9
Education		
< High School	83.3*	91.7*
High School	93.0	94.2
Some College	94.2	93.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	95.8	100.0
Associates	94.4	94.5
Bachelors Degree	97.4	96.9
Graduate +	100.0	99.3
Income		
<\$20,000	89.4*	89.4*
\$20,000-39,999	93.2	95.4
\$40,000-69,999	94.0	96.2
\$70,000-99,999	99.2	97.7
\$100,000-149,999	99.2	98.3
\$150,000+	98.8	98.8
Area of Midland County		
City	95.4	96.8
Out County	97.3	95.4

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend*

## Community Satisfaction

### *Personal Satisfaction: Quality of Resources and Services*

Personal satisfaction with the quality of various aspects of Midland County are shown in Tables 54-56. Overall, a majority of respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of 7 of the 14 available response options: recreational activities, neighborhood safety, air and water quality, schools, jobs, educational services for children, and fresh produce and other healthy foods.

Aspects of the county where the combined percentage of respondents who reported being satisfied or very satisfied was below a majority included: public assistance programs, public transportation, adult education services, substance abuse services, mental health services, affordable housing, and 211. It is important to note, that for these aspects of Midland County, the most common response was “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” (Tables 54-56).

**Table 54. Personal Satisfaction with the Quality of the following in Midland County**

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction				
	Recreational Activities	Public Assistance Programs	Neighborhood Safety	Air and Water	Schools
Very Dissatisfied	2.6	3.0	0.8	1.8	1.8
Not Satisfied	4.8	7.7	5.0	6.9	4.0
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	11.0	45.1	13.5	12.2	12.5
Satisfied	46.2	29.9	45.9	48.7	40.2
Very Satisfied	35.3	14.2	34.8	30.4	41.5

**Table 55. Personal Satisfaction with the Quality of the following in Midland County**

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction				
	Public Transportation	Jobs	Adult Education Services	Educational Services for Children	Fresh Produce and other Healthy Foods
Very Dissatisfied	7.8	4.4	2.7	1.6	2.3
Not Satisfied	15.1	9.4	6.4	6.3	8.5
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	35.5	23.9	45.0	21.6	6.7
Satisfied	26.8	40.2	30.6	37.9	48.4
Very Satisfied	14.7	22.1	15.4	32.6	34.1

**Table 56. Personal Satisfaction with the Quality of the following in Midland County**

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction			
	Substance Abuse Services	Mental Health Services	Affordable Housing	211
Very Dissatisfied	2.4	5.6	7.9	1.9
Not Satisfied	9.2	12.2	16.6	2.4
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	46.4	35.0	35.7	52.8
Satisfied	26.1	28.2	25.4	27.0
Very Satisfied	15.9	19.0	14.4	15.8

The percentage of respondents satisfied or very satisfied with various aspects of their community, by demographic characteristics, are shown in Tables 57-59. Overall, these tables indicate that:

- Male respondents were more likely to be satisfied with recreational activities, neighborhood safety, air and water quality, and affordable housing.
- Older respondents were more satisfied with the quality of public assistance programs, transportation quality, fresh produce and other healthy foods, substance abuse services, mental health services, affordable housing, and 211.
- As education increased, satisfaction with the quality of recreational activities, neighborhood safety, schools, and fresh produce and other healthy foods increased, while satisfaction with public transportation decreased.
- As income increased, satisfaction with the quality of recreational activities, neighborhood safety, air and water quality, schools, jobs, educational services for children, fresh produce and other healthy foods, mental health services, and affordable housing increased.
- Out-county residents were more likely to be dissatisfied with the quality of schools, while city residents were more likely to be dissatisfied with recreational activities and neighborhood safety.

**Table 57. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the Quality of the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied			
	Recreational Activities	Public Assistance Programs	Neighborhood Safety	Air and Water
Overall	81.6	44.1	80.7	79.1
Gender				
Male	85.7*	46.0	85.9*	83.7*
Female	79.7	43.3	78.5	76.7
Age				
18-24	78.6	41.8*	78.3	81.0
25-34	80.5	40.4	76.7	76.0
35-44	79.6	29.5	82.2	69.4
45-54	77.8	36.1	78.4	80.0
55-64	80.2	48.2	84.3	84.3
65+	87.0	63.3	82.9	84.2
Education				
< High School	72.7*	55.6	72.7*	81.8
High School	78.0	55.7	72.2	76.5
Some College	75.4	40.0	73.0	73.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	62.5	40.0	70.8	66.7
Associates	82.0	40.9	81.1	77.2
Bachelors Degree	85.7	42.3	85.2	86.9
Graduate +	86.6	44.0	87.3	77.7
Income				
<\$20,000	64.2*	41.7	69.5*	70.6*
\$20,000-39,999	80.0	50.0	76.2	68.2
\$40,000-69,999	84.7	44.6	79.7	78.2
\$70,000-99,999	78.0	43.8	81.5	82.4
\$100,000-149,999	87.9	45.0	89.4	85.4
\$150,000+	89.4	38.9	85.5	85.7
Area of Midland County				
City	43.3*	44.4	76.7*	77.1
Out County	46.0	43.2	83.7	82.3

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* across all satisfaction categories

**Table 58. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the Quality of the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied				
	Schools	Public Transportation	Jobs	Adult Education Services	Educational Services for Children
Overall	81.7	41.6	62.4	46.0	70.5
Gender					
Male	82.2	42.0	63.0	45.0	67.6
Female	81.8	41.5	62.2	46.9	72.8
Age					
18-24	85.5	51.5*	68.8	46.3	69.9
25-34	79.8	32.3	69.4	41.5	71.1
35-44	75.7	29.3	55.6	36.3	69.8
45-54	83.9	34.2	56.8	36.1	72.0
55-64	77.1	40.4	60.0	47.6	64.4
65+	85.2	60.6	60.0	64.7	72.2
Education					
< High School	87.5*	60.0*	50.0	71.4	83.3
High School	78.1	63.0	60.6	54.2	65.6
Some College	77.5	44.8	56.3	39.3	69.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	80.0	50.0	47.4	50.0	75.0
Associates	75.3	44.4	59.5	49.3	69.4
Bachelors Degree	85.9	32.4	67.8	42.2	71.4
Graduate +	85.1	31.9	65.4	47.3	71.8
Income					
<\$20,000	66.2*	48.7	38.1*	41.4	58.3*
\$20,000-39,999	73.6	54.9	58.7	52.4	64.2
\$40,000-69,999	78.0	40.0	57.9	40.0	67.2
\$70,000-99,999	84.8	36.2	68.1	50.0	74.5
\$100,000-149,999	93.0	37.4	72.3	46.1	77.1
\$150,000+	86.1	38.1	73.7	50.0	73.3
Area of Midland County					
City	83.4*	40.0	59.7	44.0	70.7
Out County	79.0	44.0	66.4	49.2	70.0

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* across all satisfaction categories

**Table 59. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the Quality of the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics**

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied				
	Fresh Produce and other Healthy Foods	Substance Abuse Services	Mental Health Services	Affordable Housing	211
Overall	82.5	42.0	47.2	39.8	42.8
Gender					
Male	83.6	44.9	48.8	43.7*	35.6
Female	82.3	40.5	46.5	37.8	46.3
Age					
18-24	75.3*	44.6*	50.0*	38.8*	33.3
25-34	79.5	33.7	39.8	35.3	41.6
35-44	81.1	36.4	41.7	31.9	37.7
45-54	84.3	40.0	48.8	34.6	39.1
55-64	83.8	36.7	44.8	34.9	45.6
65+	89.6	61.4	60.3	53.5	54.1
Education					
< High School	83.3*	80.0	66.7	70.0	57.1
High School	80.0	54.7	57.4	54.5	58.5
Some College	73.7	34.8	43.6	34.0	41.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	66.7	41.2	42.1	40.0	50.0
Associates	84.6	39.7	41.7	28.6	31.0
Bachelors Degree	86.8	36.7	42.5	40.4	33.6
Graduate +	86.9	47.7	53.5	39.7	51.1
Income					
<\$20,000	73.3*	35.3	40.0*	40.3*	44.1
\$20,000-39,999	81.9	40.0	46.2	41.4	43.1
\$40,000-69,999	85.1	45.4	49.5	32.7	37.8
\$70,000-99,999	78.9	36.6	42.3	35.2	41.0
\$100,000-149,999	85.1	46.0	53.8	45.8	44.0
\$150,000+	92.9	46.4	48.4	48.4	52.9
Area of Midland County					
City	82.2	43.8	49.2	37.6	41.4
Out County	83.1	39.1	43.9	43.5	45.2

\* p < .05; statistically significant *trend* across all satisfaction categories

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to acknowledge three undergraduate students from Saginaw Valley State University who were instrumental in various aspects of this project: Malorie McGowan, Faith LaFramboise, and Kaylynn Miesen.