2024-2025

Midland County Health Survey: Final Report

Meghan Baruth, PhD
Ellie Dittenber
Saginaw Valley State University
College of Health and Human Services
Department of Health Science

Table of Contents

The 2024-2025 Midland Health Survey Overview 4
Health Status 7
Personal Health 7
Health Risk Behaviors 8
Sleep 8
Aerobic Physical Activity 9
Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities 10
Diet 11
Fruit and Vegetable Consumption 11
Sugar Sweetened Beverages 12
Food Purchases 13
Seat Belt Utilization 15
Cigarette Smoking, Tobacco Use, and E-cigarettes 16
Secondhand Smoke 17
Alcohol 18
Alcohol Consumption 18
Consequences of Alcohol Consumption 19
Drug Use 20
Marijuana Use 20
Prescription and Illegal Drug Use 21
Consequences of Drug Use 22
Sexual Health 23
Sexual Intercourse Behaviors 23
Sexual Transmitted Infections (STIs) 24
Chronic Diseases 25
Obesity 25
Cancer 26

Cardiovascular Disease 27
Asthma 28
Diabetes 29
Mental Health 30
COVID-19 31
COVID-19 Impacts 31
Preventative Care and Health Screening 32
Cancer 32
Mammogram 32
Pap Test and/or HPV Test 33
Blood Stool Test 34
Colon Cancer Screening 35
Influenza Vaccine 36
Access to Care and Utilization 37
Healthcare Coverage 37
Primary Source of Insurance 37
Insurance Knowledge 38
Healthcare Access 39
Health Literacy 41
Healthcare Provider (HCP) Utilization 42
Doctor Utilization: Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem 42
Therapist Utilization: Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem 43
Delivery of Healthcare Services 44
Satisfaction with Telehealth 44
Other Health Concerns 45
Disability 45
Special Equipment 45
Reliance on Others 46
Falls 47
Injury from a Fall 48
Cognitive Function 49

Belonging 50
Safety 51
Concerns for Child's Safety and Cost of Childcare 52
Community Satisfaction 53
Personal Satisfaction: Access to Resources and Services 53
Personal Satisfaction: Quality of Resources and Services 58
Other 63

The 2024-2025 Midland Health Survey Overview

The 2024-2025 Midland Health Survey was conducted to understand the health and health needs of people living in Midland County. The 2022 Midland Health Survey served as the basis for the 2024-2025 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. Efforts were also made to obtain a sample that was representative of the Midland County population (age, gender, 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. 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 $10 gift card to Meijer, the Bridge Food Store, or the Coleman Community Market). The sample generated a total of 803 surveys to be used for analyses (633 online surveys and 170 paper surveys). Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the survey respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Midland County Sample

	Midland County Sample (%)
Area of Midland County	
City	59.0
Out County	41.0
Gender	
Male	22.6
Female	75.3
Transgender or non-binary	1.2
Identity not listed	0.1
Prefer not to share	0.7
Sexuality	
Heterosexual/straight	90.7
Homosexual/gay/lesbian	2.0
Bisexual	3.7
Orientation not listed	1.3
Prefer not to share	2.4
Age	
18-24	9.1
25-34	14.8
35-44	26.6
45-54	19.0
55-64	14.2
65+	16.3
Race	
White or Caucasian	94.9
Black or African American	0.7
Asian or Asian American	1.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6
Two or more races	1.2
Other	1.0
Origin	
Hispanic or Latino origin	2.6
Non-Hispanic or Latino origin	97.4
Ethnicity	
Middle Eastern or North African	0.6
Not Middle Eastern or North African	99.4
Education	
< High School	2.0
High School	15.2
Some College	26.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	5.6
Bachelor's Degree	29.2
Graduate Degree	21.7
Marital Status	
Married	57.8
Widowed	4.4
Divorced	9.9
Separated	2.5
Not married, but living with a significant other	8.0

Not married	17.5
Income	
< $20,000	14.8
$20,000 -39,999	16.9
$40,000 - 69,999	18.0
$70,000 - 99,999	15.0
$100,000 -149,000	18.5
$150,000+	16.7
Employment Status	
Employed, 30+ hours/week	52.0
Employed, 1-29 hours/week	13.5
Not employed	5.6
Homemaker	5.1
Full-time student	3.0
Retired	16.2
Disabled, not able to work	4.6
Workplace*	
Remote / at home	9.9
In office / out of home	72.5
A combination of remote and in office	17.5

*among those working

Health Status

Personal Health

Participants were asked to describe their current health; 7.0% of respondents said their health was excellent, 31.1% very good, 41.8% good, 17.5% fair, and 2.6% poor.

As shown in Table 2, older respondents were more likely to report their health as fair or poor, while those with more education and more income were less likely to report their health as fair or poor.

Table 2. Health Status Rating as Fair or Poor, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Reporting Health Fair or Poor
Overall	20.1
Gender	
Male	23.2
Female	18.3
Age	
18-24	19.4*
25-34	19.7
35-44	18.0
45-54	14.8
55-64	22.1
65+	28.7
Education	
< High School	37.5*
High School	38.5
Some College	28.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	11.1
Bachelor's Degree	10.7
Graduate Degree	10.4
Income	
<$20,000	45.6*
$20,000-39,999	31.8
$40,000-69,999	20.9
$70,000-99,999	11.3
$100,000-149,999	8.4
$150,000+	7.8
Area of Midland County	
City	20.9
Out County	18.9

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

Health Risk Behaviors

Sleep

Respondents were asked, on average, how many hours of sleep they got in a 24-hour period. On average, respondents got 7.0±1.4 hours of sleep.

As shown in Table 3, results showed that females got significantly more sleep than males.

Table 3. Sleep Behaviors, by Demographic Characteristics

	Hours Mean (SD)
Overall	7.0 (1.4)
Gender	
Male	6.7 (1.5)*
Female	7.1 (1.3)
Age	
18-24	7.2 (1.4)
25-34	7.0 (1.6)
35-44	7.0 (1.2)
45-54	7.0 (1.1)
55-64	6.8 (1.8)
65+	7.1 (1.3)
Education	
< High School	8.0 (3.3)
High School	6.8 (1.5)
Some College	7.0 (1.6)
Technical/Vocational Cert	6.9 (1.1)
Bachelor's Degree	7.0 (1.2)
Graduate Degree	7.1 (1.0)
Income	
<$20,000	7.0 (2.1)
$20,000-39,999	6.9 (1.4)
$40,000-69,999	6.7 (1.2)
$70,000-99,999	7.0 (1.1)
$100,000-149,999	7.1 (1.1
$150,000+	7.0 (0.9)
Area of Midland County	
City	7.1 (1.4)
Out County	6.9 (1.3)

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

Aerobic Physical Activity

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, 14.4% were inactive. As shown in Table 4, those with less education and less income were more likely to engage in no physical activity.

Table 4 also shows the percentage of respondents that met the physical activity guidelines of 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. Overall, 72.1% were classified as meeting physical activity guidelines. There were no significant differences in the percentage of respondents meeting physical activity recommendations by demographic factors.

Table 4. Physical Activity & Sedentary Behavior, by Demographic Characteristics

	Engaged in NO Physical Activity	Met Physical Activity Guidelines
Overall	14.4	72.1
Gender		
Male	18.1	70.0
Female	13.2	72.6
Age		
18-24	15.9	76.6
25-34	15.5	68.5
35-44	11.1	66.9
45-54	12.7	70.9
55-64	11.2	78.0
65+	23.2	77.3
Education		
< High School	23.1*	85.7
High School	24.1	80.0
Some College	14.5	72.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	15.9	70.0
Bachelor's Degree	11.2	69.0
Graduate Degree	11.2	71.7
Income		
<$20,000	22.0*	75.7
$20,000-39,999	19.7	67.9
$40,000-69,999	15.7	70.7
$70,000-99,999	11.7	70.5
$100,000-149,999	8.3	70.0
$150,000+	9.1	77.2
Area of Midland County		
City	14.4	69.5
Out County	14.5	75.7

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

Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities

Respondents were asked to report how many days in a usual week they engaged in muscle strengthening activities and activities to improve flexibility. On average, participants reported engaging in strength training activities 2.1±2.1 times per week, and flexibility activities 2.2±2.3 times per week.

As shown in Table 5, older respondents engaged in flexibility exercises more times per week.

Table 5. Times per Week Engaged in Muscle Strengthening and Flexibility Activities, by Demographic Characteristics

	Strength Training Mean (SD)	Flexibility Activities Mean (SD)
Overall	2.1 (2.1)	2.2 (2.3)
Gender		
Male	2.1 (2.2)	2.0 (2.2)
Female	2.1 (2.1)	2.2 (2.4)
Age		
18-24	2.0 (1.9)	2.1 (2.4)*
25-34	2.1 (2.2)	1.9 (2.0)
35-44	1.9 (2.2)	2.0 (2.3)
45-54	1.8 (1.8)	2.0 (2.5)
55-64	2.4 (2.3)	2.9 (2.4)
65+	2.2 (2.2)	2.4 (2.4)
Education		
< High School	2.9 (2.0)	2.7 (2.2)
High School	2.1 (2.4)	2.2 (2.5)
Some College	2.2 (2.3)	2.5 (2.6)
Technical/Vocational Cert	2.1 (2.2)	1.9 (2.0)
Bachelor's Degree	1.8 (1.9)	1.9 (2.1)
Graduate Degree	2.1 (2.0)	2.1 (2.3)
Income		
<$20,000	2.4 (2.6)	2.6 (2.8)
$20,000-39,999	2.0 (2.3)	2.2 (2.3)
$40,000-69,999	1.8 (1.9)	2.1 (2.6)
$70,000-99,999	1.8 (1.9)	2.4 (2.3)
$100,000-149,999	2.1 (1.9)	1.9 (1.9)
$150,000+	2.2 (2.1)	2.1 (2.2)
Area of Midland County		
City	2.1 (2.2)	2.3 (2.4)
Out County	2.0 (2.0)	2.1 (2.3)

* $p < .05$; 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. Respondents could 'count' fruits and vegetables that were fresh, frozen, or canned. On average, participants reported consuming 1.9±1.4 fruits and 2.3±1.4 vegetables per day.

As shown in Table 6, respondents who lived in the city consumed more total fruits and vegetables per day.

Table 6. Fruit and Vegetable Consumption per Day, by Demographic Characteristics

	Total Fruit Mean (SD)	Total Vegetables Mean (SD)	Total Fruit and Vegetable Mean (SD)
Overall	1.9 (1.4)	2.3 (1.4)	4.2 (2.4)
Gender			
Male	1.8 (1.4)	2.1 (1.6)	4.0 (2.6)
Female	2.0 (1.3)	2.3 (1.4)	4.3 (2.3)
Age			
18-24	2.0 (1.7)	2.3 (1.6)	4.3 (2.7)
25-34	1.8 (1.2)	2.4 (1.6)	4.2 (2.4)
35-44	2.0 (1.4)	2.2 (1.3)	4.3 (2.5)
45-54	1.9 (1.3)	2.3 (1.4)	4.2 (2.3)
55-64	1.8 (1.2)	2.2 (1.4)	4.1 (2.3)
65+	2.0 (1.4)	2.2 (1.4)	4.2 (2.4)
Education			
< High School	2.6 (1.9)	2.0 (1.3)	4.6 (2.5)
High School	2.1 (1.4)	2.3 (1.5)	4.3 (2.6)
Some College	2.0 (1.5)	2.2 (1.5)	4.2 (2.7)
Technical/Vocational Cert	1.6 (1.5)	2.3 (1.3)	4.0 (2.3)
Bachelor's Degree	1.8 (1.2)	2.3 (1.4)	4.1 (2.2)
Graduate Degree	2.0 (1.2)	2.4 (1.4)	4.4 (2.3)
Income			
<$20,000	2.1 (1.5)	2.3 (1.4)	4.4 (2.6)
$20,000-39,999	1.6 (1.3)	2.0 (1.3)	3.7 (2.1)
$40,000-69,999	2.0 (1.5)	2.4 (1.6)	4.4 (2.6)
$70,000-99,999	2.1 (1.4)	2.5 (1.5)	4.6 (2.4)
$100,000-149,999	1.8 (1.2)	2.3 (1.4)	4.1 (2.2)
$150,000+	1.9 (1.3)	2.3 (1.5)	4.2 (2.4)
Area of Midland County			
City	2.0 (1.4)	2.4 (1.5)	4.4 (2.4)*
Out County	1.8 (1.3)	2.2 (1.4)	4.0 (2.4)

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

Sugar Sweetened Beverages

Participants were asked about their consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages. As shown in Table 7, in a typical week, 40.2% reported consuming soda, 16.7% energy drinks, 13.1% sugar-sweetened fruit drinks, and 9.7% sugar-sweetened tea.

Soda: Males, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to consume soda.

Energy drinks: Males, younger respondents, and those with less income were more likely to consume energy drinks.

Sugar-sweetened fruit drinks: Males, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to consume sugar-sweetened fruits drinks.

Sugar-sweetened tea: Younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to consume sugar-sweetened tea.

Table 7. Beverage Consumption, % Reporting Consuming, by Demographic Characteristics

	Soda	Energy Drinks	Sugar-sweetened Fruit Drinks	Sugar-sweetened Flavored Tea
Overall	40.2	16.7	13.1	9.7
Gender				
Male	51.8*	26.5*	20.6*	12.2
Female	36.4	14.0	10.5	8.7
Age				
18-24	49.2*	36.1*	32.8*	21.3*
25-34	50.0	31.2	19.4	11.1
35-44	39.1	19.9	8.9	11.1
45-54	42.9	10.8	9.4	5.0
55-64	35.6	4.0	12.5	9.7
65+	31.1	6.8	6.8	5.0
Education				
< High School	50.0*	16.7	46.2*	15.4*
High School	55.5	14.4	19.0	10.4
Some College	42.3	17.2	17.2	13.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	35.7	26.2	9.5	9.5
Bachelor's Degree	38.2	21.4	10.5	8.7
Graduate Degree	30.4	8.9	6.3	5.7
Income				
<$20,000	50.5*	25.7*	29.7*	14.9*
$20,000-39,999	46.3	14.2	14.0	12.3
$40,000-69,999	36.8	18.7	12.9	12.9
$70,000-99,999	38.7	19.1	8.2	5.6
$100,000-149,999	38.0	18.6	9.3	10.1
$150,000+	31.6	8.5	6.0	1.7
Area of Midland County				
City	38.5	17.2	14.1	10.7
Out County	42.6	16.1	11.7	8.4

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

Food Purchases

Participants were asked to report the number of times they purchased food from each of the 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 8 indicates that:

Grocery store: Females were more likely to purchase food at a grocery store than males.

Convenience store: Males, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to purchase food at a convenience store.

Fast Food: Younger respondents, those with less education, and those living in the city were more likely to purchase fast food.

Restaurant: Those with more education and more income were more likely to purchase food from a restaurant.

Farmers market: Older respondents were more likely to purchase food from a farmers' market.

Food pantry: Respondents with less education, less income, and those who lived in the out-county area were more likely to get food from a food pantry.

Meals on Wheels: Those with less education and less income were more likely to get food from Meals on Wheels.

Bridge Food Store: Older respondents and those with less education and less income were more likely to purchase food from the Bridge Food Store.

Coleman Community Market: Respondents with less education, less income, and those who lived in the out-county area were more likely to purchase food from the Coleman Community Market.

Other: Respondents with less income were more likely to purchase food from ‘other’ places.

Table 8. Food Purchasing Locations, % Purchasing Food, by Demographic Characteristics

	Grocery Store	Convenience Store	Fast Food	Restaurant	Farmers' Market	Co-op	Food Pantry	Meals on Wheels	Bridge Food Center	Coleman Community Market	Other
Overall	98.8	31.9	52.3	44.5	36.7	2.6	11.8	2.9	15.0	3.7	14.5
Gender											
Male	97.1*	44.3*	56.4	44.0	33.7	3.7	15.0	6.7*	19.3	5.4	13.6
Female	99.3	27.7	50.9	45.1	37.4	2.2	10.9	1.9	13.9	3.0	14.7
Age											
18-24	95.1	45.0*	75.4*	34.4	21.3*	3.3	9.8	4.9	11.7	5.0	22.8
25-34	100.0	47.3	62.7	34.9	34.9	1.8	14.5	5.6	15.5	5.5	10.6
35-44	99.5	34.7	53.4	44.7	37.0	3.2	10.0	2.1	11.1	3.7	14.0
45-54	99.3	21.7	51.1	50.0	37.1	1.4	6.5	0.0	5.8	0.7	13.8
55-64	100.0	28.4	41.2	49.5	37.3	4.0	13.7	1.0	19.0	3.9	14.9
65+	97.6	20.7	40.7	48.7	43.0	2.7	17.0	6.5	29.2*	5.4	14.0
Education											
< High School	100.0	66.7*	64.3*	38.5*	28.6	7.7	25.0*	7.7*	33.3*	0.0*	41.7
High School	99.1	41.2	56.9	35.3	37.5	2.0	28.8	9.0	34.6	8.8	16.1
Some College	97.9	43.5	58.6	35.6	34.4	3.2	19.2	3.2	22.8	5.2	14.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	100.0	33.3	50.0	42.9	35.7	0.0	14.3	2.6	11.9	4.8	17.5
Bachelor's Degree	99.5	25.9	54.3	51.8	38.5	1.4	3.7	1.4	6.0	2.3	13.1
Graduate Degree	98.1	17.3	39.1	52.6	37.2	4.5	0.6	0.6	4.5	0.6	12.0
Income											
<$20,000	96.3	55.9*	51.0	28.0*	28.2	7.0	32.4*	12.2*	34.3*	6.9*	20.5*
$20,000-39,999	100.0	34.2	57.1	30.4	40.3	0.0	24.8	2.6	35.0	6.0	20.0
$40,000-69,999	100.0	33.1	52.4	39.5	39.0	3.2	10.5	2.4	13.7	4.8	11.0
$70,000-99,999	99.1	29.1	57.7	44.1	36.7	2.7	1.8	0.9	5.6	0.9	13.9
$100,000-149,999	97.7	22.5	49.2	49.6	40.3	0.8	3.1	1.6	1.6	2.4	12.2
$150,000+	100.0	21.6	46.2	70.4	36.8	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	12.4
Area of Midland County											
City	98.9	28.0*	57.2*	46.0	36.9	1.9	9.1*	3.1	15.2	1.4*	12.6
Out County	98.7	37.5	45.3	42.2	36.4	3.8	15.6	2.8	14.8	7.1	17.3

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

Seat Belt Utilization

Participants were asked how often they wore a seat belt when riding or driving in a vehicle. As shown in Table 9, 92.5% of residents reported that they always wore a seat belt.

Females, older respondents, and those with a higher income were more likely to report they always wore a seat belt.

Table 9. Seat Belt Usage, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Always Wore a Seat Belt
Overall	92.5
Gender	
Male	89.4*
Female	94.0
Age	
18-24	84.7*
25-34	83.8
35-44	92.9
45-54	94.7
55-64	98.2
65+	96.1
Education	
< High School	75.0
High School	92.6
Some College	90.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	93.3
Bachelor's Degree	93.2
Graduate Degree	94.8
Income	
<$20,000	87.7*
$20,000-39,999	88.5
$40,000-69,999	92.8
$70,000-99,999	94.8
$100,000-149,999	94.4
$150,000+	96.1
Area of Midland County	
City	91.6
Out County	93.9

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

Cigarette Smoking, Tobacco Use, and E-cigarettes

Respondents were asked to report if they smoked cigarettes, used chewing tobacco, snuff, or any form of smokeless tobacco, or used e-cigarettes/vaped. Overall, 9.5% currently smoked cigarettes on some days or every day, 2.2% used smokeless tobacco, and 9.5% used e-cigarettes or vaped.

Table 10 shows that males, older respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to smoke cigarettes; males were more likely to use smokeless tobacco; younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to use e-cigarettes or vape.

Table 10. Tobacco Usage, % Reporting Usage, by Demographic Characteristics

	Cigarette Smoking	Smokeless Tobacco	E-cigarettes or Vape
Overall	9.5	2.2	9.5
Gender			
Male	16.7*	7.6*	9.9
Female	7.1	0.5	9.3
Age			
18-24	1.7*	3.3	16.4*
25-34	7.3	2.8	16.8
35-44	8.5	3.7	12.1
45-54	8.6	1.4	7.8
55-64	16.2	1.0	2.9
65+	12.9	0.8	4.0
Education			
< High School	50.0*	0.0	21.4*
High School	21.2	1.8	13.4
Some College	11.9	2.6	13.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	2.4	11.9
Bachelor's Degree	5.0	2.7	6.8
Graduate Degree	3.2	1.3	3.9
Income			
<$20,000	27.4*	4.7	19.4*
$20,000-39,999	17.9	0.8	8.2
$40,000-69,999	6.5	2.5	15.3
$70,000-99,999	1.8	2.7	3.6
$100,000-149,999	3.9	3.1	8.6
$150,000+	1.7	0.0	3.4
Area of Midland County			
City	9.0	2.5	10.2
Out County	10.2	1.6	8.5

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

Secondhand Smoke

Participants were asked to report if they were currently exposed to secondhand smoke. As shown in Table 11, 11.8% reported being currently exposed to secondhand smoke.

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

Table 11. Exposure to Secondhand Smoke, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Any Exposure
Overall	11.8
Gender	
Male	15.9
Female	10.5
Age	
18-24	16.4
25-34	14.7
35-44	10.1
45-54	7.9
55-64	17.1
65+	10.4
Education	
< High School	50.0*
High School	18.8
Some College	17.1
Technical/Vocational Cert	7.1
Bachelor's Degree	7.3
Graduate Degree	4.5
Income	
<$20,000	28.0*
$20,000-39,999	15.4
$40,000-69,999	13.0
$70,000-99,999	8.1
$100,000-149,999	6.3
$150,000+	3.4
Area of Midland County	
City	12.0
Out County	11.4

* $p < .05$; 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 drank, how many drinks they consumed. Total alcohol consumption (drinks per week) was calculated. As shown in Table 12, on average, participants consumed 2.0±4.5 drinks per week.

Males and those with more income consumed more alcohol.

Table 12. Alcohol Consumption, by Demographic Characteristics

	Total Alcohol Consumption per Week Mean (SD)
Overall	2.0 (4.5)
Gender	
Male	3.7 (6.7)*
Female	1.5 (3.5)
Age	
18-24	2.6 (5.5)
25-34	1.3 (3.1)
35-44	2.3 (4.9)
45-54	2.3 (4.6)
55-64	1.5 (3.0)
65+	2.0 (5.4)
Education	
< High School	4.7 (12.3)
High School	1.1 (4.0)
Some College	1.5 (4.6)
Technical/Vocational Cert	3.5 (5.9)
Bachelor's Degree	2.3 (3.9)
Graduate Degree	2.1 (3.9)
Income	
<$20,000	1.7 (6.6)*
$20,000-39,999	1.1 (2.9)
$40,000-69,999	1.2 (3.5)
$70,000-99,999	2.3 (5.1)
$100,000-149,999	2.7 (4.3)
$150,000+	3.2 (4.3)
Area of Midland County	
City	2.1 (4.9)
Out County	1.8 (3.8)

* $p < .05$; 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, 15.6% reported feeling like they wanted or needed to cut back, 11.3% reported experiencing negative consequences from their alcohol use, and 5.6% sought treatment or attended a support group to help with their alcohol use.

As shown in Table 13, males and those with less education and less income were more likely to report feeling like they wanted or needed to cut back; males, and those with less income were more likely to report experiencing negative consequences from their alcohol use; males, and those with less education and less income were more likely to reported seeking treatment or attending a support group to help with their alcohol use.

Table 13. 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	15.6	11.3	5.6
Gender			
Male	22.9*	16.5*	15.0*
Female	12.0	8.6	1.9
Age			
18-24	24.3	24.3	2.7
25-34	12.0	10.4	4.2
35-44	15.7	10.1	5.6
45-54	14.1	10.0	3.7
55-64	16.3	10.6	12.2
65+	15.2	8.5	6.5
Education			
< High School	60.0*	60.0	40.0*
High School	9.4	6.5	3.3
Some College	21.3	20.3	14.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	30.0	14.3	9.1
Bachelor's Degree	12.5	8.3	1.4
Graduate Degree	12.6	7.3	3.2
Income			
<$20,000	33.3*	31.4*	22.2*
$20,000-39,999	12.2	12.2	11.9
$40,000-69,999	18.4	2.1	4.2
$70,000-99,999	13.1	14.5	6.3
$100,000-149,999	8.1	8.1	1.2
$150,000+	19.1	9.0	0.0
Area of Midland County			
City	17.5	12.7	7.0
Out County	12.7	9.1	3.5

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

Drug Use

Marijuana Use

Participants were asked if they currently used marijuana for medical or recreational use (separately). As shown in Table 14, 6.4% of respondents reported marijuana for medical use, and 10.9% for recreational use.

Results showed that younger respondents and those with less education and less income were more likely to use marijuana for medical use and marijuana for recreational use.

Table 14. Marijuana Use in the Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics

	Used for Medical Use	Used for Recreational Use
Overall	6.4	10.9
Gender		
Male	4.7	9.4
Female	6.0	10.6
Age		
18-24	6.7*	16.4*
25-34	13.8	19.4
35-44	8.4	14.1
45-54	2.1	7.1
55-64	3.8	5.7
65+	4.0	5.6
Education		
< High School	21.4*	35.7*
High School	9.8	12.5
Some College	9.9	13.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	2.4	7.1
Bachelor's Degree	3.6	9.5
Graduate Degree	3.2	7.6
Income		
<$20,000	13.1*	15.7*
$20,000-39,999	9.9	15.4
$40,000-69,999	8.1	8.9
$70,000-99,999	4.5	7.2
$100,000-149,999	3.9	13.2
$150,000+	0.9	6.8
Area of Midland County		
City	6.4	12.6
Out County	6.3	8.5

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

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 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, 2.7% of respondents used prescription drugs not prescribed for them, 1.8% used illegal drugs, and 3.8% took opioid pain killers.

As shown in Table 15, respondents with less income were more likely to use prescription drugs not prescribed for them; those with less education and less income were more likely to have used illegal drugs; younger respondents were more likely to have used opioid pain killers.

Table 15. Drug Use in the Past Year, by Demographic Characteristics

	Used Prescription Drugs Not Prescribed	Used Illegal Drugs	Taken Opioid Pain Killers
Overall	2.7	1.8	3.8
Gender			
Male	4.8	3.6	4.1
Female	2.2	1.3	3.7
Age			
18-24	3.3	3.3	6.6*
25-34	3.8	3.8	5.7
35-44	3.8	1.6	4.3
45-54	0.7	0.7	3.6
55-64	4.8	2.9	3.8
65+	0.8	0.0	0.8
Education			
< High School	0.0	14.3*	0.0
High School	3.6	2.7	4.5
Some College	5.2	2.1	3.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	2.4	0.0	7.3
Bachelor's Degree	1.4	1.4	3.6
Graduate Degree	1.3	0.6	3.2
Income			
<$20,000	8.3*	8.4*	6.5
$20,000-39,999	2.5	0.8	3.3
$40,000-69,999	3.3	0.8	4.9
$70,000-99,999	2.8	0.9	2.7
$100,000-149,999	0.8	0.8	4.7
$150,000+	0.0	0.0	0.9
Area of Midland County			
City	3.5	2.6	2.8
Out County	1.7	0.7	5.3

* $p < .05$; 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 16, 17.8% reported feeling like they wanted or needed to cut down on drug use, 11.1% experienced negative consequences from drug use, and 16.0% sought treatment or attended a support group to help with their drug use.

Males, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report needing to cut down on drug use. Males, and those with less income were more likely to have experienced negative consequences from drug use. Males were more likely to have sought treatment or to have attended a support group.

Table 16. Consequences of Drug Use in Past Year, among Drug Users, by Demographic Characteristics

	Felt Like Wanted or Needed to Cut Back	Experienced Negative Consequences	Sought Treatment or Attended a Support Group
Overall	17.8	11.1	16.0
Gender			
Male	28.6*	33.3*	31.0*
Female	11.6	1.5	9.8
Age			
18-24	18.2	9.1	11.1
25-34	33.3	29.4	31.3
35-44	15.2	6.3	12.9
45-54	9.1	8.3	18.2
55-64	16.7	18.2	25.0
65+	13.3	0.0	0.0
Education			
< High School	50.0*	0.0	33.3
High School	29.4	17.6	25.0
Some College	24.1	14.3	20.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	33.3	33.3
Bachelor's Degree	12.9	6.1	6.7
Graduate Degree	0.0	6.7	7.7
Income			
<$20,000	37.5*	25.0*	34.8
$20,000-39,999	16.7	6.7	14.3
$40,000-69,999	7.1	7.1	14.3
$70,000-99,999	10.0	16.7	18.2
$100,000-149,999	10.5	5.3	5.6
$150,000+	7.7	0.0	0.0
Area of Midland County			
City	21.5	11.1	16.7
Out County	11.1	11.1	14.7

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

Sexual Health

Sexual Intercourse Behaviors

Respondents were asked if they have ever had sexual intercourse. As shown in Table 17, 93.8% of respondents stated that they have had sexual intercourse. Participants were also asked how many partners they have had in the past year. Results showed that 16.7% have had no partners in the past year, 75.3% had one partner, and 8.0% had more than one partner. Participants were asked how often they used condoms when having intercourse; 81.3% reported they never used condoms.

Older respondents and those with more education and more income were more likely to have ever had sexual intercourse. Younger respondents and those with less education and less income were more likely to have had more than 1 partner in the past year. Older respondents and those with more income were more likely to report never using condoms in the past year.

Table 17. Sexual Intercourse Practices, by Demographic Characteristics

	Have ever had sexual intercourse	Had more than 1 partner in the past year	Never used condoms in past year
Overall	93.8	8.0	81.3
Gender			
Male	94.3	6.7	78.9
Female	94.0	8.2	81.9
Age			
18-24	69.6*	25.6	40.5*
25-34	90.3	17.6	65.9
35-44	99.4	9.0	84.1
45-54	95.6	2.3	90.7
55-64	97.0	2.1	91.4
65+	95.3	4.0	92.3
Education			
< High School	80.0*	12.5*	83.3
High School	89.2	14.3	78.1
Some College	92.1	11.9	79.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	97.5	5.1	96.4
Bachelor's Degree	94.2	7.2	75.4
Graduate Degree	98.0	1.4	88.8
Income			
<$20,000	86.3*	23.8*	55.6*
$20,000-39,999	93.6	13.0	70.3
$40,000-69,999	90.8	7.3	83.7
$70,000-99,999	95.1	6.1	88.8
$100,000-149,999	97.5	1.7	84.5
$150,000+	100.0	2.7	87.9
Area of Midland County			
City	92.6	8.3	75.9*
Out County	95.4	7.5	88.2

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

Additional analyses examined condom use by the number of partners. Among those who have had a sexual partner in the past year, 84.3% of respondents with 1 partner never used condoms, whereas 50.0% of those who had more than 1 partner never used a condom. This difference was significant.

Sexual Transmitted Infections (STIs)

Participants were asked whether they have ever been told by a doctor or nurse that they have a sexually transmitted infection (STI) and if any of their sexual partners have had a sexually transmitted infection. Results showed that 9.2% have been told they had an STI, and 9.9% reported that a sexual partner had a STI.

As shown in Table 18, younger respondents and those with less income were more likely to have been told they have a STI and more likely to have had a sexual partner with an STI.

Table 18. Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs), by Demographic Characteristics

	Have had an STI	Partner has had an STI
Overall	9.2	9.9#
Gender		
Male	5.3	9.0
Female	10.5	9.9
Age		
18-24	17.9*	18.8*
25-34	16.5	13.5
35-44	10.7	10.8
45-54	4.7	8.4
55-64	8.3	8.4
65+	4.0	5.7
Education		
< High School	12.5	14.3
High School	8.8	6.5
Some College	9.9	9.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	13.2	17.6
Bachelor's Degree	9.2	10.4
Graduate Degree	7.7	9.5
Income		
<$20,000	12.3*	16.7*
$20,000-39,999	14.7	13.8
$40,000-69,999	10.9	10.9
$70,000-99,999	7.1	9.1
$100,000-149,999	8.4	8.6
$150,000+	4.5	5.1
Area of Midland County		
City	10.7	9.9
Out County	7.1	9.9

those who did not know were not included
* $p < .05$; 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 of respondents was 30.0±7.8. As shown in Table 19, respondents with less education and less income had a higher BMI.

Respondents were placed into weight categories based on their BMI. As shown in Table 19, 0.9% were classified as underweight, 25.6% as normal weight, 32.9% as overweight, and 40.7% as obese. Analyses examined demographic differences among those who were obese compared to those who were not obese. Results showed that respondents with less education and less income were more likely to be obese.

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

		Weight Category			
	BMI Mean (SD)	Underweight	Normal Weight	Overweight	Obese
Overall	30.0 (7.8)	0.9	25.6	32.9	40.7
Gender					
Male	30.0 (6.0)	0.0	17.6	42.0	40.3
Female	30.0 (8.1)	1.1	27.3	30.5	41.1
Age					
18-24	26.5 (6.1)	3.1	43.1	29.2	24.6
25-34	31.0 (8.2)	1.0	20.2	33.3	45.5
35-44	30.7 (7.5)	0.6	20.4	34.3	44.8
45-54	31.4 (9.3)	0.0	26.1	29.9	44.0
55-64	29.9 (7.0)	0.0	22.3	36.2	41.5
65+	28.6 (6.8)	1.8	29.8	33.3	35.1
Education					
< High School	29.6 (9.6)*	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.9*
High School	31.9 (8.6)	0.0	18.4	29.1	52.4
Some College	30.1 (8.1)	2.7	22.9	30.9	43.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	30.1 (5.9)	0.0	19.4	33.3	47.2
Bachelor's Degree	29.7 (7.7)	0.5	27.8	33.7	38.0
Graduate Degree	28.9 (6.9)	0.0	32.2	36.9	30.9
Income					
<$20,000	30.9 (7.3)*	2.0	17.2	30.3	50.5*
$20,000-39,999	31.9 (9.3)	1.8	18.6	26.5	53.1
$40,000-69,999	30.1 (7.6)	1.6	22.8	32.3	43.3
$70,000-99,999	30.7 (8.0)	0.0	23.8	30.7	45.5
$100,000-149,999	29.4 (7.5)	0.0	27.4	41.1	31.5
$150,000+	27.5 (5.7)	0.0	40.6	35.8	23.6
Area of Midland County					
City	29.9 (7.8)	1.0	26.4	31.8	40.8
Out County	30.2 (7.7)	0.7	24.4	34.5	40.4

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

Cancer

Respondents were asked if they had ever been diagnosed with cancer. Overall, 7.9% reported they have or had cancer.

As shown in Table 20, older individuals and those with less education were more likely to report being diagnosed with cancer.

Table 20. Prevalence of Cancer, by Demographic Characteristics

	Any Cancer
Overall	7.9
Gender	
Male	6.7
Female	8.0
Age	
18-24	5.1*
25-34	1.0
35-44	3.8
45-54	4.3
55-64	12.6
65+	21.7
Education	
< High School	14.3*
High School	12.0
Some College	8.6
Technical/Vocational Cert	5.0
Bachelor's Degree	6.0
Graduate Degree	6.5
Income	
<$20,000	10.4
$20,000-39,999	9.3
$40,000-69,999	8.3
$70,000-99,999	6.5
$100,000-149,999	4.7
$150,000+	6.1
Area of Midland County	
City	7.3
Out County	8.7

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

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, a stroke, or hypertension. Among respondents, 4.2% were told they have had a heart attack, 4.3% were told they had angina or coronary heart disease, 2.8% had been told they have had a stroke, and 32.6% were told they had hypertension.

As shown in Table 21, males, older respondents and those with less education and less income were more likely to have had a heart attack and angina/CHD; older respondents and those with less education and less income were more likely to have had a stroke; males, those living in an out-county area, and those with less education and less income were more likely to have hypertension.

Table 21. Prevalence of Cardiovascular Disease, by Demographic Characteristics

	Heart Attack	Angina/CHD	Stroke	Hypertension
Overall	4.2	4.3	2.8	32.6
Gender				
Male	7.8*	7.8*	2.4	41.7*
Female	3.2	3.2	3.0	29.6
Age				
18-24	1.7*	1.7*	3.4*	13.6*
25-34	1.9	1.0	0.0	16.3
35-44	1.1	1.6	0.0	20.2
45-54	2.1	2.8	2.1	31.9
55-64	7.8	6.9	4.9	47.6
65+	9.8	9.8	6.5	60.5
Education				
< High School	7.1*	14.3*	0.0*	50.0*
High School	7.4	7.4	4.7	43.6
Some College	8.1	6.4	4.3	36.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	2.4	2.4	4.9	36.6
Bachelor's Degree	0.9	1.4	1.4	26.5
Graduate Degree	1.9	2.6	1.3	26.5
Income				
<$20,000	8.9*	8.7*	7.7*	45.2*
$20,000-39,999	9.0	7.4	6.7	40.7
$40,000-69,999	4.2	3.4	1.7	32.5
$70,000-99,999	0.9	3.7	1.8	28.0
$100,000-149,999	2.4	2.4	0.0	28.3
$150,000+	0.9	0.9	0.0	20.0
Area of Midland County				
City	3.1	3.5	2.4	29.3*
Out County	5.7	5.4	3.3	37.3

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

Asthma

Among respondents, 21.5% reported being told by a doctor, nurse or other health professional that they had asthma.

As shown in Table 22, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to have asthma.

Table 22. Prevalence of Asthma, by Demographic Characteristics

	Asthma
Overall	21.5
Gender	
Male	17.6
Female	22.0
Age	
18-24	35.6*
25-34	23.5
35-44	21.1
45-54	17.4
55-64	23.3
65+	16.1
Education	
< High School	14.3*
High School	27.6
Some College	26.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	27.5
Bachelor's Degree	18.6
Graduate Degree	14.4
Income	
<$20,000	26.5*
$20,000-39,999	25.8
$40,000-69,999	25.8
$70,000-99,999	24.1
$100,000-149,999	17.3
$150,000+	13.4
Area of Midland County	
City	20.9
Out County	22.4

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

Diabetes

Among all respondents, 1.8% reported being told by a healthcare provider that they have Type 1 diabetes, 10.6% have been told they have Type 2 diabetes, and 15.6% have been told they have pre-diabetes/borderline diabetes; 52.3% reported having their blood sugar tested in the past 3 years.

As shown in Table 23, those with less income were more likely to report having Type 1 diabetes; older respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report having Type 2 diabetes; older respondents were more likely to report being told they had pre-diabetes/borderline diabetes. Older respondents, and those who live in an out-county area were more likely to report having their blood sugar tested in the past 3 years.

Table 23. 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	1.8	10.6	15.6	52.3
Gender				
Male	3.1	12.9	16.0	55.8
Female	1.3	10.2	15.9	51.5
Age				
18-24	3.4	3.4*	1.7	15.5
25-34	0.0	3.8	9.7	35.6
35-44	2.2	4.9	14.1	43.2
45-54	0.0	10.1	17.1	57.6
55-64	1.9	16.8	22.3	73.3
65+	3.4	23.3	22.5*	71.3*
Education				
< High School	0.0	7.7*	7.7	53.8
High School	6.5	18.9	16.2	52.3
Some College	2.2	15.1	14.3	52.1
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	7.5	10.3	53.8
Bachelor's Degree	0.5	4.1	14.7	48.6
Graduate Degree	0.0	9.7	20.0	56.5
Income				
<$20,000	4.9*	18.3*	12.6	48.6
$20,000-39,999	3.4	16.9	16.7	50.0
$40,000-69,999	1.7	13.3	11.8	56.2
$70,000-99,999	0.0	3.7	24.8	58.3
$100,000-149,999	0.8	3.1	10.2	49.2
$150,000+	0.0	5.2	18.3	48.2
Area of Midland County				
City	1.4	11.4	13.5	49.2*
Out County	2.4	9.5	18.5	56.7

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

Mental Health

Participants were asked about their mental health. Overall, 39.6% of participants reported ever being diagnosed with depression, 50.5% with anxiety, and 4.6% with a substance use disorder; 6.6% were in recovery from a past substance use disorder, and 24.9% were in recovery from a past mental health issue; 22.1% reported being limited in activities due to mental or emotional problems.

As shown in Table 24, females, younger respondents, and those with less income were more likely to have depression. Females and younger respondents were more likely to have anxiety. Those who live in the city, and those with less education and less income were more likely to have a substance use disorder.

Table 24. Mental Health Diagnosis, by Demographic Characteristics

	Depression	Anxiety	Substance Use Disorder	Recovery from Past Substance Use Disorder	Recovery from Past Mental Health Issue	Limited in Activities due to Mental or Emotional Problems
Overall	39.6	50.5	4.6	6.6	24.9	22.1
Gender						
Male	25.5*	31.7*	10.8*	13.2*	16.7*	17.3
Female	42.9	55.4	2.6	4.6	26.2	22.4
Age						
18-24	40.7*	66.1*	0.0	5.2	44.8*	23.6*
25-34	44.7	61.5	5.8	9.6	31.7	34.2
35-44	47.0	63.2	4.3	7.0	31.0	21.9
45-54	32.1	42.6	4.3	6.4	20.7	22.0
55-64	42.9	46.7	9.5	9.4	21.7	25.0
65+	29.4	27.1	2.5	2.5	8.3	10.1
Education						
< High School	21.4	21.4	7.1*	14.3*	21.4	18.8*
High School	40.0	48.6	7.4	8.3	20.2	26.2
Some College	44.4	54.8	9.0	9.6	30.3	29.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	61.5	70.0	2.6	7.5	27.5	24.4
Bachelor's Degree	35.9	49.1	0.9	4.1	25.6	20.6
Graduate Degree	34.8	46.5	2.6	4.5	20.8	12.1
Income						
<$20,000	44.3*	54.7	13.2*	18.3*	37.1*	41.2*
$20,000-39,999	46.2	51.3	7.4	8.3	28.9	31.8
$40,000-69,999	44.9	55.8	3.4	7.5	25.0	23.0
$70,000-99,999	38.9	49.5	2.8	4.6	25.7	20.9
$100,000-149,999	34.6	48.8	0.8	2.4	16.5	11.9
$150,000+	30.4	44.3	0.9	0.9	19.1	11.6
Area of Midland County						
City	39.3	52.5	5.9*	7.2	28.7*	23.7
Out County	39.9	47.7	2.7	5.7	19.5	19.8

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

COVID-19

COVID-19 Impacts

Respondents were asked whether the COVID-19 pandemic continues to affect several aspects of their life.

As shown in Table 25, females, younger respondents and those with less income were more likely to report that the COVID-19 pandemic continues to impact their overall level of stress and their mental well-being; females, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report that it still impacts their economic well-being.

Table 25. Negative Impact of Covid on Various Aspects of Life, by Demographic Characteristics

	Overall level of stress	Mental well-being	Economic well-being
Overall	21.7	21.5	23.5
Gender			
Male	14.3*	13.5*	15.2*
Female	23.2	23.2	25.2
Age			
18-24	24.1*	32.8*	34.5*
25-34	24.0	21.2	32.7
35-44	28.4	29.7	29.5
45-54	17.5	18.8	20.3
55-64	19.2	19.2	18.1
65+	14.0	9.8	9.8
Education			
< High School	0.0	0.0	0.0*
High School	20.4	16.7	27.5
Some College	25.5	28.3	30.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	19.5	26.8	34.1
Bachelor's Degree	22.7	22.0	22.5
Graduate Degree	18.2	16.3	12.9
Income			
<$20,000	30.1*	33.3*	35.3*
$20,000-39,999	22.7	21.8	29.2
$40,000-69,999	18.3	19.8	28.1
$70,000-99,999	23.8	22.4	27.4
$100,000-149,999	20.8	20.2	14.4
$150,000+	13.9	14.8	12.2
Area of Midland County			
City	21.2	21.4	21.1
Out County	22.3	21.7	26.9

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

Preventative Care and Health Screening

Cancer
Mammogram

Respondents were asked how long it has been since their last mammogram. Results were analyzed for respondents who had breasts and were aged 40-74. As shown in Table 26, 68.2% had a mammogram within the last year, 13.7% had one within the last 2 years, 9.7% reported it had been 2 or more years, and 8.4% stated they have never had a mammogram.

When looking at compliance for recommendations (based on age group), among those 40-54 years of age, 66.3% have had a mammogram in the last year. Among those 55-74, 88.1% have had a mammogram within the last 2 years. Among respondents 40-54 years of age, those with more education and more income were more likely to have gotten a mammogram in the last year. Among respondents 55-74 years of age, those with more income were more likely to have gotten a mammogram in the past 2 years.

Table 26. Those Who had a Mammogram, aged 45-74, by Demographic Characteristics

	Within 1 year	Within 2 years	>2 years	Never
Overall	70.4	13.7	9.8	6.2
Age				
40-54	66.3	14.5	9.3	9.9
55-74	75.6	12.6	10.4	1.5
Education				
< High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
High School	61.0	14.6	12.2	12.2
Some College	65.8	14.5	14.5	5.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	75.0	6.3	12.5	6.3
Bachelor's Degree	67.8	16.7	10.0	5.6
Graduate Degree	81.9	10.8	3.6	3.6
Income				
<$20,000	41.7	20.8	20.8	16.7
$20,000-39,999	58.5	18.9	18.9	3.8
$40,000-69,999	64.6	16.7	10.4	8.3
$70,000-99,999	71.4	14.3	6.1	8.2
$100,000-149,999	83.1	3.4	8.5	5.1
$150,000+	80.6	12.9	3.2	3.2
Area of Midland County				
City	67.7	16.1	8.1	8.1
Out County	73.3	11.0	11.6	4.1

Pap Test and/or HPV Test

Respondents were asked if they have had an HPV test (or HPV/Pap Co-test) in the past 5 years OR a pap test in the past 3 years. Results were analyzed for respondents who had a cervix and were aged 21-65. As shown in Table 27, 84.5% have had an HPV test (or HPV/Pap Co-test) in the past 5 years OR a pap test in the past 3 years.

Younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to have gotten an HPV test (or HPV/Pap Co-test) in the past 5 years OR a pap test in the past 3 years.

Table 27. Those Who Had a Pap/HPV Test, aged 21-65 by Demographic Characteristics

	Yes
Overall	84.5
Age	
21-24	50.0*
25-34	87.5
35-44	92.5
45-54	80.9
55-65	88.9
Education	
< High School	100.0*
High School	86.5
Some College	73.1
Technical/Vocational Cert	75.0
Bachelor's Degree	87.9
Graduate Degree	93.4
Income	
<$20,000	80.5*
$20,000-39,999	73.2
$40,000-69,999	71.8
$70,000-99,999	87.9
$100,000-149,999	95.1
$150,000+	91.5
Area of Midland County	
City	82.5
Out County	87.1

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

Blood Stool Test

Respondents were asked how long it has been since their last blood stool test using a home kit. Results were analyzed among those aged 45-75. As shown in Table 28, 15.6% have had a blood stool test within the last year, 14.4% had one within the last 3 years, 13.5% reported it has been more than 3 years, and 56.6% reported they have never had a blood stool test.

There were no significant differences in getting a blood stool test in the past 3 years according to demographic characteristics.

Table 28. Blood Stool Test, by Demographic Characteristics

	Within 1 year	Within 3 years	>3 years	Never
Overall	15.6	14.4	13.5	56.6
Gender				
Male	17.3	11.1	4.9	66.7
Female	14.9	15.3	16.5	53.2
Age				
45-54	11.5	13.7	4.3	70.5
55-64	19.4	14.6	16.5	49.5
65-75	17.4	15.2	23.9	43.5
Education				
< High School	12.5	25.0	0.0	62.5
High School	17.6	15.7	19.6	47.1
Some College	18.8	12.9	15.3	52.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	8.7	8.7	8.7	73.9
Bachelor's Degree	18.0	12.4	12.4	57.3
Graduate Degree	10.4	18.2	11.7	59.7
Income				
<$20,000	23.3	16.3	14.0	46.5
$20,000-39,999	16.4	11.5	18.0	54.1
$40,000-69,999	11.3	17.0	13.2	58.5
$70,000-99,999	13.2	11.3	26.4	49.1
$100,000-149,999	18.5	13.0	5.6	63.0
$150,000+	14.3	16.1	7.1	62.5
Area of Midland County				
City	14.2	16.4	13.1	56.3
Out County	17.2	11.9	13.9	57.0

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

Colon Cancer Screening

Respondents were asked how long it has been since they received a colonoscopy or virtual colonoscopy. Results were analyzed among those aged 45-75. As shown in Table 29, 56.9% reported that they had been screened within the last 5 years, 12.7% had been screened within the last 10 years, 2.7% stated it had been more than 10 years, and 27.7% reported they have never been screened for colon cancer.

Older respondents were more likely to have gotten a colonoscopy within the past 10 years.

Table 29. Colon Cancer Screening, by Demographic Characteristics

	Within 5 years	Within 10 years	>10 years	Never
Overall	56.9	12.7	2.7	27.7
Gender				
Male	56.5	10.6	0.0	32.9
Female	57.0	13.7	3.6	25.7
Age				
45-54	50.7	2.9	1.4	45.0
55-64	62.3	13.2	2.8	21.7
65-75	60.2	26.9	4.3	8.6
Education				
< High School	37.5	0.0	0.0	62.5
High School	58.5	15.1	1.9	24.5
Some College	59.1	12.5	4.5	23.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	39.1	30.4	4.3	26.1
Bachelor's Degree	53.9	11.2	2.2	32.6
Graduate Degree	63.6	9.1	1.3	26.0
Income				
<$20,000	37.8	15.6	2.2	44.4
$20,000-39,999	49.2	19.7	4.9	26.2
$40,000-69,999	64.8	9.3	3.7	22.2
$70,000-99,999	67.9	7.5	1.9	22.6
$100,000-149,999	57.4	14.8	1.9	25.9
$150,000+	58.9	8.9	0.0	32.1
Area of Midland County				
City	58.1	9.1	2.2	30.6
Out County	55.6	17.0	3.3	24.2

Influenza Vaccine

Respondents were asked if they received a flu vaccination for the 2023-2024 flu season. As shown in Table 30, 53.5% stated they had received a flu vaccination.

Older respondents, and those with more education and more income were more likely to have received a flu vaccination.

Table 30. Got a Flu Vaccine in 2023-2024, by Demographic Characteristics

	Flu Vaccine
Overall	53.5
Gender	
Male	52.7
Female	53.9
Age	
18-24	47.5*
25-34	37.1
35-44	47.5
45-54	53.6
55-64	54.3
65+	77.2
Education	
< High School	46.2*
High School	43.6
Some College	46.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	55.0
Bachelor's Degree	52.6
Graduate Degree	71.0
Income	
<$20,000	39.8*
$20,000-39,999	47.2
$40,000-69,999	45.1
$70,000-99,999	61.7
$100,000-149,999	55.6
$150,000+	69.6
Area of Midland County	
City	54.4
Out County	52.3

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

Participants were also asked if they had received the 2024-2025 flu vaccine. As shown in Table 31, 38.4% reported they had received the vaccine, whereas 18.2% reported they had not, but were planning to.

Table 31. Got a flu Vaccine in 2024-2025

	%
Yes	38.4
No	43.4
Not yet, but I plan to	18.2

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 (59.8%). As shown in Table 32, 4.8% reported being uninsured.

Those with less education and less income were more likely to be uninsured.

Table 32. Primary Source of Insurance, by Demographic Characteristics

	Employer-sponsored Health Insurance Plan	Individual Plan Purchased on the Health Insurance Exchange	Medicaid	Medicare	Uninsured
Overall	59.8	4.5	14.3	16.5	4.8
Gender					
Male	52.7	2.4	15.0	22.8	7.2
Female	62.7	5.0	13.6	14.9	3.9
Age					
18-24	58.6	10.3	19.0	1.7	10.3
25-34	61.0	5.7	27.6	1.0	4.8
35-44	76.8	2.7	13.5	1.6	5.4
45-54	77.9	5.0	10.0	4.3	2.9
55-64	65.1	4.7	14.2	7.5	8.5
65+	12.2	3.3	5.7	78.0	0.8
Education					
< High School	0.0	7.7	30.8	38.5	23.1*
High School	25.2	4.5	30.6	31.5	8.1
Some College	47.1	4.2	24.1	19.4	5.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	62.5	5.0	7.5	20.0	5.0
Bachelor's Degree	79.5	6.0	4.7	5.6	4.2
Graduate Degree	77.4	2.6	4.5	14.2	1.3
Income					
<$20,000	9.5	2.9	51.4	26.7	9.5*
$20,000-39,999	29.3	2.4	24.4	32.5	11.4
$40,000-69,999	62.3	10.7	9.0	10.7	7.4
$70,000-99,999	80.6	3.7	1.9	13.0	0.9
$100,000-149,999	86.5	4.8	0.8	7.1	0.8
$150,000+	93.0	2.6	0.0	4.3	0.0
Area of Midland County					
City	59.2	4.5	14.9	16.0	5.4
Out County	60.7	4.6	13.5	17.20	4.0

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

Insurance Knowledge

Participants were asked how well they understood what their health insurance covers, including co-pays and deductibles. As shown in Table 33, 18.4% reported being very knowledgeable, 38.1% were moderately knowledgeable, 36.3% were somewhat knowledgeable, and 7.3% were not knowledgeable at all.

Older respondents, and those with more education and more income were more likely to report being moderately or very knowledgeable about their health insurance coverage.

Table 33. Health Insurance Coverage Knowledge, by Demographic Characteristics

	Health insurance coverage knowledge
	% moderately or very knowledgeable
Overall	56.4
Gender	
Male	55.9
Female	56.4
Age	
18-24	28.9*
25-34	42.1
35-44	57.1
45-54	60.4
55-64	62.2
65+	65.5
Education	
< High School	12.5*
High School	51.1
Some College	53.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	60.5
Bachelor's Degree	55.3
Graduate Degree	65.8
Income	
<$20,000	49.4*
$20,000-39,999	51.0
$40,000-69,999	50.5
$70,000-99,999	58.7
$100,000-149,999	62.4
$150,000+	63.5
Area of Midland County	
City	54.7
Out County	58.8

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

Healthcare Access

Respondents were asked if they were unable to see a doctor, dentist, or counselor/therapist in the past 12 months because of cost or an inability to schedule an appointment. As shown in Table 34, 13.9% did not see a doctor because of cost and 27.5% did not see a doctor because of an inability to schedule an appointment; 20.8% did not see a dentist because of cost, and 14.1% did not see a dentist because of an inability to schedule an appointment; 14.1% did not see a counselor or therapist because of cost, and 11.7% did not see a counselor or therapist because of an inability to schedule an appointment.

Doctor: younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report an inability to see a doctor because of cost; younger respondents, and those who live in an out-county area were more likely to report an inability to see a doctor because they could not get an appointment.

Dentist: younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report an inability to see a dentist because of cost; younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report an inability to see a dentist because they could not get an appointment.

Counselor/Therapist: females, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report an inability to see a counselor or therapist because of cost; younger respondents were more likely to report an inability to see a counselor or therapist because they could not get an appointment.

Table 34. Could Not See a Doctor, Dentist, or Counselor/Therapist for Various Reasons, by Demographic Characteristics

	Doctor		Dentist		Counselor or therapist	
	Because of Cost	Could Not Get Appointment	Because of Cost	Could Not Get Appointment	Because of Cost	Could Not Get Appointment
Overall	13.9	27.5	20.8	14.1	14.1	11.7
Gender						
Male	11.5	23.5	16.6	11.5	7.2*	7.3
Female	14.2	27.8	21.2	14.6	15.8	12.5
Age						
18-24	21.4*	31.6*	26.8*	24.6*	22.8*	10.5*
25-34	17.6	27.5	27.5	13.6	20.4	15.7
35-44	16.1	30.4	23.6	15.9	16.9	15.4
45-54	11.6	31.2	19.1	14.6	11.6	13.2
55-64	12.4	23.8	16.3	14.6	11.4	10.5
65+	8.3	20.5	14.8	4.9	5.9	3.4
Education						
< High School	25.0*	8.3	36.4*	9.1*	18.2*	0.0
High School	13.2	23.6	24.5	17.8	14.2	11.4
Some College	16.8	28.9	30.6	22.0	21.5	18.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	22.0	34.1	17.1	12.2	14.6	2.4
Bachelor's Degree	15.2	30.4	17.9	11.3	11.7	12.2
Graduate Degree	6.5	24.2	10.4	6.5	8.4	6.5
Income						
<$20,000	13.7*	26.7	28.4*	25.7*	16.0*	15.0
$20,000-39,999	15.8	21.8	37.3	20.8	18.3	11.8
$40,000-69,999	29.4	31.7	30.0	18.3	23.3	10.0
$70,000-99,999	17.3	28.3	19.2	8.6	15.9	16.2
$100,000-149,999	6.4	29.6	12.1	10.4	12.0	12.8
$150,000+	1.8	28.9	1.7	2.6	1.7	6.1
Area of Midland County						
City	13.5	24.0*	21.3	13.2	14.9	11.8
Out County	14.6	32.3	20.1	15.5	13.1	11.5

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

Health Literacy

Respondents were asked if they understood what their health care professional tells them and the handouts they were given when they needed medical care. Overall, 96.2% of respondents reported understanding information relayed to them from their health care professional, and 94.6% understood the handouts provided.

As shown in Table 35, older respondents, and those with more income were more likely to understand what their health care professional told them; those with more education and more income were more likely to understand the information within the handouts.

Table 35. Health Literacy, by Demographic Characteristics

	Can Understand What Healthcare Professional Tells Me	Can Understand the Handouts Given to Me
Overall	96.2	94.6
Gender		
Male	97.0	92.6
Female	95.9	95.1
Age		
18-24	87.9*	89.5
25-34	94.2	92.2
35-44	97.3	96.7
45-54	97.8	96.4
55-64	98.1	96.2
65+	97.5	93.0
Education		
< High School	100.0	91.7*
High School	95.4	91.3
Some College	94.1	90.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	97.4	97.5
Bachelor's Degree	96.7	96.3
Graduate Degree	98.1	98.7
Income		
<$20,000	87.4*	87.1*
$20,000-39,999	98.3	95.8
$40,000-69,999	92.5	90.8
$70,000-99,999	99.1	95.2
$100,000-149,999	99.2	99.2
$150,000+	99.1	99.1
Area of Midland County		
City	96.9	95.5
Out County	95.3	93.4

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

Healthcare Provider (HCP) Utilization

Doctor Utilization: Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance use disorder or mental health problem. Overall, 65.9% reported being "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance use disorder, and 78.0% reported being "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to visit a doctor if they felt they had a mental health problem.

As shown in Table 36, older respondents, and those with more income were more likely to visit a doctor if they felt they had a substance use disorder. Females, older respondents, and those with more education and more income were more likely to visit a doctor if they felt they had a mental health problem.

Table 36. % Somewhat or Very Likely to go to a Doctor for a Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem, by Demographic Characteristics

	Substance Use Disorder	Mental Health Problem
Overall	65.9	78.0
Gender		
Male	64.2	69.1*
Female	67.3	81.4
Age		
18-24	54.2*	63.3*
25-34	54.9	67.3
35-44	72.9	84.2
45-54	65.6	78.8
55-64	69.7	87.3
65+	67.3	74.8
Education		
< High School	27.3	54.5*
High School	65.4	76.9
Some College	65.9	74.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	71.8	82.5
Bachelor's Degree	63.2	78.3
Graduate Degree	72.1	83.6
Income		
<$20,000	55.2*	70.6*
$20,000-39,999	64.3	78.8
$40,000-69,999	55.6	68.1
$70,000-99,999	74.8	78.5
$100,000-149,999	72.8	85.2
$150,000+	74.3	85.0
Area of Midland County		
City	65.7	76.2
Out County	66.3	80.7

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

Therapist Utilization: Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to visit a therapist if they felt they had a substance use disorder or mental health problem. Overall, 67.9% reported being "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to visit a therapist if they felt they had a substance use disorder, and 77.8% reported being "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to visit a therapist if they felt they had a mental health problem.

As shown in Table 37, females, those with more education and those who live in the city were more likely to visit a therapist if they felt they had a substance use disorder. Females, younger respondents, and those with more education and more income were more likely to visit a therapist if they felt they had a mental health problem.

Table 37. % Somewhat or Very Likely to go to a Therapist for a Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health Problem, by Demographic Characteristics

	Substance Use Disorder	Mental Health Problem
Overall	67.9	77.8
Gender		
Male	57.6*	65.9*
Female	70.8	81.4
Age		
18-24	69.0	80.0*
25-34	67.6	84.6
35-44	71.5	79.3
45-54	72.9	80.3
55-64	62.2	78.1
65+	60.0	63.2
Education		
< High School	40.0*	83.3*
High School	59.0	62.5
Some College	71.3	78.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	64.1	78.0
Bachelor's Degree	66.8	78.4
Graduate Degree	74.8	86.2
Income		
<$20,000	65.2	74.5*
$20,000-39,999	65.5	69.2
$40,000-69,999	61.9	73.9
$70,000-99,999	75.5	86.2
$100,000-149,999	70.2	79.7
$150,000+	72.5	83.0
Area of Midland County		
City	71.6*	80.3
Out County	62.6	74.2

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

Delivery of Healthcare Services

Respondents were asked what type of health-related service delivery method they prefer to receive (e.g. medical, mental health, substance use). Most (68.1%) respondents preferred services to be delivered in person (in office); 9.0% preferred virtual (telehealth), while 22.9% had no preference.

Satisfaction with Telehealth

Respondents who used telehealth were asked about their satisfaction with the quality of their telehealth experiences. As shown in Table 38, of those who accessed telehealth for any health-related services, 63.8% reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of services, and 69.3% were satisfied or very satisfied with access to services.

Those with more education and more income were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to telehealth services.

Table 38. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Telehealth, by Demographic Characteristics

	Quality of Services	Access to Services
Overall	63.8	69.3
Gender		
Male	64.8	71.3
Female	64.3	69.4
Age		
18-24	61.1	75.0
25-34	62.8	69.2
35-44	59.6	64.2
45-54	67.4	71.7
55-64	58.2	66.7
65+	78.2	76.8
Education		
< High School	50.0	50.0*
High School	65.5	66.0
Some College	60.7	64.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	66.7	66.7
Bachelor's Degree	60.8	70.5
Graduate Degree	71.6	77.7
Income		
<$20,000	58.7	65.1*
$20,000-39,999	60.5	56.6
$40,000-69,999	65.8	71.8
$70,000-99,999	65.2	65.7
$100,000-149,999	65.5	77.0
$150,000+	69.9	80.5
Area of Midland County		
City	63.9	69.6
Out County	63.6	68.8

* $p < .05$; 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 39, 8.9% of respondents stated that they have a physical health problem that requires them to use special equipment.

Older respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report using special equipment.

Table 39. Used Special Equipment, by Demographic Characteristics

	Use Special Equipment
Overall	8.9
Gender	
Male	8.6
Female	8.4
Age	
18-24	5.6*
25-34	1.7
35-44	4.8
45-54	7.4
55-64	7.3
65+	27.0
Education	
< High School	18.8*
High School	12.8
Some College	11.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	9.1
Bachelor's Degree	4.7
Graduate Degree	7.0
Income	
<$20,000	23.4*
$20,000-39,999	13.4
$40,000-69,999	6.5
$70,000-99,999	7.8
$100,000-149,999	0.7
$150,000+	3.9
Area of Midland County	
City	7.5
Out County	10.9

* $p < .05$; 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 40. Overall, a low percentage of respondents relied on others for help with these activities (0.9-5.3%).

Males were more likely to rely on others for bathing; females, and those with less education and less income were more likely to rely on others for shopping; younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to rely on others for meals.

Table 40. Relied on Others for Help for the Following, by Demographic Characteristics

	Bathing	Dressing	Shopping	Meals	Banking
Overall	1.3	0.9	5.3	3.7	2.7
Gender					
Male	2.8*	0.6	1.7*	5.6	3.4
Female	0.8	1.0	6.2	2.9	2.4
Age					
18-24	1.4	1.4	5.6	11.4*	7.0
25-34	0.9	0.0	1.7	2.6	0.9
35-44	1.4	0.5	5.8	3.3	2.4
45-54	0.0	0.7	4.8	2.0	1.4
55-64	2.7	1.8	6.3	4.5	3.6
65+	1.6	1.6	7.0	1.6	3.1
Education					
< High School	0.0	0.0	6.3*	18.8*	6.3
High School	0.0	0.8	7.6	1.7	3.4
Some College	1.9	0.5	7.8	5.8	3.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	0.0
Bachelor's Degree	2.2	1.3	4.7	3.5	2.6
Graduate Degree	0.6	1.2	2.3	1.2	1.8
Income					
<$20,000	0.9	1.8	12.6*	9.0*	2.7
$20,000-39,999	0.8	0.8	10.2	4.7	2.4
$40,000-69,999	2.2	1.4	4.3	2.2	3.6
$70,000-99,999	1.8	0.9	3.5	3.5	2.6
$100,000-149,999	1.4	0.7	2.1	2.1	1.4
$150,000+	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6	3.1
Area of Midland County					
City	1.3	1.3	6.0	3.4	1.9
Out County	1.2	0.3	4.3	4.0	3.7

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

Falls

Respondents were asked if they had fallen in the past 12 months. Overall, 18.1% reported a fall in the past 12 months.

As shown in Table 41, falls were more commonly reported among older respondents and those with less income.

Table 41. Fallen in the Past 12 Months, by Demographic Characteristics

	Fallen in Past 12 Months
Overall	18.1
Gender	
Male	14.4
Female	18.7
Age	
18-24	16.9*
25-34	9.4
35-44	12.4
45-54	18.9
55-64	22.5
65+	30.2
Education	
< High School	31.3
High School	17.4
Some College	20.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	24.4
Bachelor's Degree	16.3
Graduate Degree	14.6
Income	
<$20,000	29.2*
$20,000-39,999	24.0
$40,000-69,999	16.5
$70,000-99,999	14.9
$100,000-149,999	10.6
$150,000+	12.5
Area of Midland County	
City	16.3
Out County	20.6

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

Injury from a 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, 45.5% said they sustained an injury.

As shown in Table 42, results showed that those with less education were more likely to report an injury due to a fall.

Table 42. Sustained an Injury Due to Falling, by Demographic Characteristics

	Injured by Fall
Overall	45.5
Gender	
Male	53.8
Female	44.1
Age	
18-24	33.3
25-34	63.6
35-44	57.7
45-54	35.7
55-64	48.0
65+	41.0
Education	
< High School	40.0*
High School	57.1
Some College	55.8
Technical/Vocational Cert	63.6
Bachelor's Degree	37.8
Graduate Degree	24.0
Income	
<$20,000	54.5
$20,000-39,999	50.0
$40,000-69,999	43.5
$70,000-99,999	35.3
$100,000-149,999	60.0
$150,000+	18.8
Area of Midland County	
City	42.1
Out County	49.3

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

Cognitive Function

Respondents were asked to report whether they 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 43, 21.9% reported concerns about memory, 20.8% had concerns about concentration, 6.7% had concerns about decision making, and 2.6% had concerns about confusion when driving in familiar locations.

Those with less education and less income were more likely to report memory concerns; younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report concerns with concentration; those with less education 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 43. Concerns with Cognitive Function, by Demographic Characteristics

	Memory Concerns	Concentration Concerns	Decision Making Concerns	Confusion when Driving
Overall	21.9	20.8	6.7	2.6
Gender				
Male	26.0	15.4	7.7	4.1
Female	19.8	21.7	6.1	2.2
Age				
18-24	27.6	29.3*	10.3	3.4
25-34	23.8	24.8	8.6	6.7
35-44	15.5	21.9	7.5	2.1
45-54	27.1	21.4	5.0	0.7
55-64	18.7	15.0	4.7	2.8
65+	24.4	14.3	5.9	1.7
Education				
< High School	14.3*	14.3*	0.0*	0.0
High School	27.5	23.9	10.1	3.7
Some College	26.3	25.8	9.1	3.2
Technical/Vocational Cert	24.4	19.5	4.9	0.0
Bachelor's Degree	19.7	22.9	6.9	3.7
Graduate Degree	15.4	10.3	2.6	0.6
Income				
<$20,000	35.0*	32.0*	15.5*	6.8*
$20,000-39,999	23.8	24.6	13.1	4.9
$40,000-69,999	21.7	22.5	5.0	0.8
$70,000-99,999	21.1	17.4	3.7	0.0
$100,000-149,999	10.8	15.4	4.6	2.3
$150,000+	21.9	14.0	0.0	0.9
Area of Midland County				
City	22.9	22.9	7.3	2.4
Out County	20.5	17.8	5.9	3.0

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

Belonging

Respondents were asked if they ever felt isolated from others. Overall, 44.3% of respondents reported sometimes or always feeling isolated, 89.2% said they felt like they belonged at home, work, their community or other group/place, and 92.8% felt that people cared about them.

As shown in Table 44, younger respondents, those who live in the city, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report sometimes or always feeling isolated. Those with more education and more income were more likely to report feeling like they belonged at home, work, their community or other group/place; older respondents, and those with more education and more income were more likely to report they felt that people cared about them.

Table 44. Feelings of Belonging, by Demographic Characteristics

	Feel Isolated Sometimes or Always	Belong at Home, Work, Your Community or Other Group/Place	People Care About You
Overall	44.3	89.2	92.8
Gender			
Male	42.8	86.4	94.3
Female	44.3	90.8	93.1
Age			
18-24	67.6*	85.9	83.1*
25-34	56.4	80.3	86.3
35-44	46.9	92.3	94.7
45-54	39.2	91.2	94.6
55-64	38.4	91.0	94.6
65+	28.1	90.4	98.4
Education			
< High School	50.0*	100.0*	87.5*
High School	46.3	82.5	88.3
Some College	47.6	85.9	89.3
Technical/Vocational Cert	48.9	95.5	95.5
Bachelor's Degree	47.4	89.7	94.8
Graduate Degree	32.9	94.7	97.6
Income			
<$20,000	55.3*	79.3*	85.7*
$20,000-39,999	52.8	85.0	87.4
$40,000-69,999	45.7	87.7	94.2
$70,000-99,999	48.2	91.2	93.9
$100,000-149,999	35.2	93.7	94.4
$150,000+	32.0	97.7	99.2
Area of Midland County			
City	48.5*	87.6	91.6
Out County	38.3	91.6	94.4

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

Safety

Respondents were asked a number of questions about their feelings of safety. Overall, 98.1% of respondents felt safe at home, 98.2% felt safe in their current relationship, 10.0% have been abused by their partner, and 5.0% have a partner from a previous relationship making them feel unsafe.

As shown in Table 45, those with more education and more income were more likely to report feeling safe at home. There were no significant differences in respondents feeling safe in their current relationship according to demographic characteristics. Females, and those with less income were more likely to report having been threatened or abused by their partner. Those with less education and less income were more likely to report that a previous partner is making them feel unsafe.

Table 45. Safety at Home and in Relationships, by Demographic Characteristics

	Feel Safe at Home	Feel Safe in Current Relationship	Have Been Abused by Partner	Previous Partner Making Feel Unsafe
Overall	98.1	98.2	10.0	5.0
Gender				
Male	97.0	100.0	2.5*	5.1
Female	98.3	97.7	11.5	5.1
Age				
18-24	93.2	97.3	10.8	4.7
25-34	100.0	97.5	6.4	5.6
35-44	98.9	98.2	13.7	6.1
45-54	97.8	97.3	8.6	3.4
55-64	98.1	100.0	9.0	5.4
65+	98.3	100.0	8.8	4.2
Education				
< High School	85.7*	100.0	33.3	14.3*
High School	97.3	98.7	7.6	5.2
Some College	98.4	99.2	15.6	11.5
Technical/Vocational Cert	95.0	93.9	5.9	3.2
Bachelor's Degree	98.6	98.3	10.3	2.7
Graduate Degree	99.3	97.9	5.8	1.6
Income				
<$20,000	94.2*	95.7	35.8*	11.5*
$20,000-39,999	97.5	97.2	17.4	12.2
$40,000-69,999	99.2	97.9	6.5	4.1
$70,000-99,999	100.0	99.0	8.2	2.1
$100,000-149,999	98.4	100.0	5.1	2.6
$150,000+	99.1	98.2	4.5	2.9
Area of Midland County				
City	97.9	97.4	9.5	4.4
Out County	98.3	99.2	10.5	5.7

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

Concerns for Child's Safety and Cost of Childcare

Respondents were asked if they had any concerns for their child's safety and security while they were in childcare. Respondents were also asked how much stress the cost of childcare is on the family budget. As shown in Table 46, 47.4% of respondents felt some or a lot of concern about their child's safety, and 57.5% said the cost of childcare is a some or a lot of stress on their budget.

Those with less education and less income were more likely to report some or a lot of concern for their child's safety and security while at childcare; females, younger respondents, and those with less education and less income were more likely to report that the cost of childcare is some or a lot of stress on the family budget.

Table 46. Child Safety and Cost of Childcare, by Demographic Characteristics

	% reporting some or a lot	
	Concern for Child's Safety	Cost is a Stress
Overall	47.4	57.5
Gender		
Male	40.7	43.6*
Female	50.0	63.0
Age		
18-24	90.0	55.6*
25-34	41.4	67.3
35-44	44.1	57.4
45-54	52.2	38.1
55-64	53.8	70.0
65+	50.0	0.0
Education		
< High School	66.7*	100.0*
High School	50.0	58.6
Some College	59.2	67.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	60.0	66.7
Bachelor's Degree	46.0	61.7
Graduate Degree	33.3	37.8
Income		
<$20,000	58.1*	70.8*
$20,000-39,999	43.5	56.5
$40,000-69,999	51.6	70.6
$70,000-99,999	59.4	74.1
$100,000-149,999	46.8	57.1
$150,000+	28.6	28.9
Area of Midland County		
City	49.2	63.0
Out County	44.9	50.6

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

Community Satisfaction

Personal Satisfaction: Access to Resources and Services

Personal satisfaction with respondents' access to various aspects of Midland County are shown in Tables 47-49. Levels of satisfaction (satisfied or very satisfied) were highest amongst fresh produce and other healthy foods (73.9%), recreational activities (71.0%), educational services for children (64.8%), dental services (61.6%), and primary care services (60.9%), and lowest for affordable internet services (35.7%), public transportation (36.5%), and affordable housing (39.3%).

Table 47. Personal Satisfaction with Access to the following in Midland County

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction			
	Recreational Activities	Public Assistance Programs	Public Transportation	Jobs
Very Dissatisfied	1.6	6.5	12.1	5.1
Not Satisfied	5.8	11.8	18.8	15.8
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	21.6	33.3	32.6	28.5
Satisfied	46.4	35.8	27.3	36.9
Very Satisfied	24.6	12.6	9.2	13.6

Table 48. Personal Satisfaction with Access to the following in Midland County

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction			
	Adult Education Services	Educational Services for Children	Fresh Produce and other Healthy Foods	Substance Use Disorder Services
Very Dissatisfied	3.6	3.0	3.9	5.2
Not Satisfied	12.0	9.5	10.2	13.1
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	42.3	22.6	12.0	39.0
Satisfied	30.7	43.3	47.3	30.7
Very Satisfied	11.4	21.6	26.5	11.9

Table 49. Personal Satisfaction with Access to the following in Midland County

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction					
	Mental Health Services	Affordable Housing	Affordable Internet Services	Quality Childcare	Dental Services	Medical services- primary care
Very Dissatisfied	8.1	17.6	15.4	7.6	7.4	7.4
Not Satisfied	20.7	22.7	29.7	12.3	9.6	11.6
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	27.4	20.4	19.2	34.0	21.5	20.2
Satisfied	31.9	27.4	26.6	32.8	40.9	40.6
Very Satisfied	11.9	11.9	9.1	13.2	20.7	20.3

The percentage of respondents satisfied or very satisfied with various aspects of their community, by demographic characteristics, are shown in Tables 50-52. Overall, these tables indicate that:

- Male respondents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to public assistance programs, mental health services, affordable internet services, and medical services – primary care.

- Older respondents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to recreational activities, public assistance programs, public transportation, fresh produce and other healthy foods, and affordable housing.

- Those with more education were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to recreational activities, jobs, educational services for children, fresh produce and other healthy foods, mental health services, affordable housing, dental services, and medical services – primary care; those with less education were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to public transportation.

- Those with more income were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to recreational activities, jobs, adult educational services, educational services for children, fresh produce and other healthy foods, affordable housing, affordable internet services, quality childcare, dental services, and medical services – primary care; those with less income were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to public transportation.

- City residents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with access to mental health services.

Table 50. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Access to the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied				
	Recreational Activities	Public Assistance Programs	Public Transportation	Jobs	Adult Education Services
Overall	71.0	48.4	36.5	50.6	42.1
Gender					
Male	71.1	59.7*	43.8	58.2	47.0
Female	71.7	45.0	34.7	48.9	40.5
Age					
18-24	69.2*	45.7*	32.7*	48.4	46.8
25-34	56.6	32.4	28.4	46.6	36.5
35-44	72.4	46.8	30.9	50.0	39.9
45-54	72.3	44.7	34.8	52.0	41.6
55-64	73.1	58.6	42.7	47.8	38.2
65+	76.7	58.2	50.7	60.0	51.8
Education					
< High School	85.7*	50.0	58.3*	45.5*	60.0
High School	61.8	49.0	45.9	42.5	44.7
Some College	60.1	44.5	37.0	42.1	31.9
Technical/Vocational Cert	73.3	45.5	35.3	43.2	51.6
Bachelor's Degree	75.3	47.9	33.8	52.6	43.0
Graduate Degree	82.1	56.8	28.6	65.2	48.8
Income					
<$20,000	60.7*	52.6	44.3*	35.7*	34.2*
$20,000-39,999	61.9	45.9	40.4	42.6	39.5
$40,000-69,999	66.9	40.0	33.7	38.4	41.1
$70,000-99,999	71.3	41.9	38.2	53.7	42.9
$100,000-149,999	78.2	52.6	31.0	65.8	44.7
$150,000+	83.7	62.8	27.7	62.3	52.9
Area of Midland County					
City	72.8	49.0	35.0	52.9	42.1
Out County	68.4	47.5	38.8	47.0	42.0

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

Table 51. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Access to the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied			
	Educational Services for Children	Fresh Produce and other Healthy Foods	Substance Use Disorder Services	Mental Health Services
Overall	64.8	73.9	42.6	43.9
Gender				
Male	69.6	79.9	50.0	52.3*
Female	64.1	72.9	40.4	41.9
Age				
18-24	68.1	65.2*	34.9	44.8
25-34	62.5	66.1	50.0	44.3
35-44	67.0	75.6	36.1	39.5
45-54	66.7	73.9	49.2	41.1
55-64	60.0	74.8	45.6	47.4
65+	61.4	81.3	42.4	53.8
Education				
< High School	75.0*	84.6*	62.5	66.7*
High School	51.2	65.8	45.6	46.7
Some College	54.5	60.3	33.1	29.7
Technical/Vocational Cert	52.9	75.0	44.0	41.0
Bachelor's Degree	74.7	80.5	45.0	47.3
Graduate Degree	73.8	85.3	49.3	54.8
Income				
<$20,000	49.3*	55.1*	40.3	42.4
$20,000-39,999	52.4	70.6	44.0	48.5
$40,000-69,999	60.0	68.2	37.8	39.0
$70,000-99,999	67.0	77.5	39.6	37.8
$100,000-149,999	71.6	77.9	43.4	44.4
$150,000+	80.4	88.7	51.9	51.2
Area of Midland County				
City	66.6	75.8	46.1	48.0*
Out County	62.7	71.0	37.7	37.8

Table 52. Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Access to the following in Midland County, by Demographic Characteristics

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied				
	Affordable Housing	Affordable Internet Services	Quality Childcare	Dental Services	Medical Services-Primary care
Overall	39.3	35.7	46.0	61.6	60.9
Gender					
Male	44.8	47.2*	53.3	68.3	68.8*
Female	38.3	32.8	44.1	60.6	59.4
Age					
18-24	28.6*	45.9	55.6	63.2	64.4
25-34	26.4	27.0	44.0	54.6	56.4
35-44	39.3	33.2	40.6	60.5	59.1
45-54	36.4	31.6	53.2	65.0	63.1
55-64	45.7	36.1	41.7	59.6	48.6
65+	58.8	47.4	59.3	67.9	72.9
Education					
< High School	36.4*	50.0	42.9	30.8*	69.2*
High School	34.7	35.2	42.6	49.0	55.0
Some College	30.0	30.2	44.4	48.7	53.1
Technical/Vocational Cert	20.5	22.7	42.9	63.6	55.6
Bachelor's Degree	41.2	35.9	48.9	70.6	65.9
Graduate Degree	57.7	45.1	48.6	74.8	68.6
Income					
<$20,000	35.0*	33.3*	49.1*	43.0*	54.7*
$20,000-39,999	27.3	26.1	37.5	41.5	54.2
$40,000-69,999	27.5	30.2	33.9	53.7	56.3
$70,000-99,999	34.3	33.0	41.2	63.2	60.7
$100,000-149,999	45.6	38.6	47.7	76.1	65.7
$150,000+	63.9	52.1	63.8	84.4	70.2
Area of Midland County					
City	40.4	37.8	45.6	63.1	63.1
Out County	37.5	32.6	46.6	59.3	57.7

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

Personal Satisfaction: Quality of Resources and Services

Personal satisfaction with the quality of various aspects of Midland County are shown in Tables 53-55. Levels of satisfaction (satisfied or very satisfied) were highest amongst: neighborhood safety (77.7%), schools (75.3%), fresh produce and other healthy foods (73.1%), recreational activities (71.5%), air and water quality (71.2%), educational services for children (67.7%), and lowest for public transportation (37.6%), internet options (38.1%), and affordable housing (42.4%).

Table 53. 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	1.5	4.6	2.3	3.5	3.1
Not Satisfied	5.4	15.1	4.0	8.1	6.7
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	21.6	32.7	16.0	17.2	14.9
Satisfied	48.5	35.2	49.2	48.5	48.2
Very Satisfied	23.0	12.4	28.5	22.7	27.1

Table 54. 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	Substance Use Disorder Services
Very Dissatisfied	9.1	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.8	5.1
Not Satisfied	19.1	15.2	11.0	9.1	8.7	10.9
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	34.2	27.9	42.0	19.9	14.3	40.0
Satisfied	28.6	40.3	31.7	46.3	49.2	30.6
Very Satisfied	9.1	13.0	11.7	21.4	23.9	13.4

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

	% Reporting Level of Satisfaction							
	Mental Health Services	Affordable Housing	211	Cell Phone Coverage	Internet Options	Childcare	Primary Care	Dental Care
Very Dissatisfied	7.4	14.9	3.5	6.7	13.7	5.1	6.3	5.8
Not Satisfied	18.9	21.4	7.2	16.3	27.8	12.6	11.2	9.7
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	25.9	21.4	39.7	17.4	20.3	31.5	17.1	20.3
Satisfied	35.0	31.1	33.4	44.6	28.2	36.3	43.5	42.7
Very Satisfied	12.9	11.3	16.2	15.0	10.0	14.4	21.9	21.5

The percentage of respondents satisfied or very satisfied with various aspects of their community, by demographic characteristics, are shown in Tables 56-58. Overall, these tables indicate that:

- Male respondents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of public assistance programs, air and water, mental health services, internet options, and primary care.

- Older respondents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of recreational activities, public assistance programs, public transportation, fresh produce and other healthy foods, affordable housing, cell phone coverage, and dental care.

- Those with more education were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of recreational activities, neighborhood safety, schools, jobs, educational services for children, fresh produce and other healthy foods, mental health services, affordable housing, primary care, and dental care; those with less education were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of public transportation.

- Those with more income were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of recreational activities, neighborhood safety, air and water, schools, jobs, educational services for children, fresh produce and other healthy foods, mental health services, affordable housing, childcare, primary care, and dental care.

- City residents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of recreational activities, neighborhood safety, schools, jobs, adult educational services, educational services for children, substance use disorder services, cell phone coverage, and internet options.

Table 56. 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	Schools
Overall	71.5	47.6	77.7	71.2	75.3
Gender					
Male	67.7	56.5*	81.2	79.5*	78.0
Female	73.3	44.9	76.9	69.9	74.4
Age					
18-24	73.3*	48.8*	82.8	72.9	75.0
25-34	58.9	32.9	70.4	63.3	64.9
35-44	71.3	46.5	76.2	68.7	77.4
45-54	71.2	46.8	79.9	74.3	80.8
55-64	75.5	47.8	78.6	72.6	73.1
65+	76.9	61.0	80.5	76.2	76.5
Education					
< High School	75.0*	54.5	83.3*	83.3*	71.4*
High School	63.5	48.9	66.7	61.5	61.4
Some College	60.5	40.4	70.7	57.3	65.4
Technical/Vocational Cert	70.5	46.7	70.5	70.5	75.0
Bachelor's Degree	77.1	48.0	81.1	77.2	82.7
Graduate Degree	81.5	58.3	90.3	86.1	84.7
Income					
<$20,000	62.0*	50.0	67.0*	57.1*	62.0*
$20,000-39,999	59.3	44.0	72.3	57.9	64.1
$40,000-69,999	68.3	43.0	75.0	65.9	73.7
$70,000-99,999	70.3	43.5	80.0	72.7	78.9
$100,000-149,999	77.6	47.4	78.5	80.3	79.5
$150,000+	87.5	68.2	90.0	88.3	87.0
Area of Midland County					
City	74.9*	48.9	81.4*	73.6	78.7*
Out County	66.3	45.6	72.3	67.7	70.8

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

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

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied					
	Public Transportation	Jobs	Adult Educational Services	Educational Services for Children	Fresh Produce and Other Healthy Foods	Substance Use Disorder Services
Overall	37.6	53.3	43.3	67.7	73.1	44.1
Gender						
Male	41.4	55.7	49.5	67.5	77.9	52.0
Female	36.6	53.1	41.9	68.7	72.3	41.5
Age						
18-24	37.0*	56.9	50.0	67.5	70.5*	42.1
25-34	28.0	46.1	34.3	65.4	63.0	48.4
35-44	33.3	52.9	38.0	70.9	73.7	33.6
45-54	39.4	52.1	50.0	67.9	73.9	50.8
55-64	35.5	58.0	50.0	63.2	72.5	47.6
65+	51.2	57.8	42.1	65.1	81.1	49.1
Education						
< High School	54.5*	55.6*	75.0	66.7*	75.0*	75.0
High School	50.0	46.4	48.7	57.7	63.0	49.3
Some College	38.7	44.7	33.8	57.0	64.2	35.0
Technical/Vocational Cert	28.1	48.5	41.4	56.3	77.3	48.0
Bachelor's Degree	32.4	54.9	45.1	72.5	76.5	40.0
Graduate Degree	33.7	66.7	48.7	82.4	84.6	55.2
Income						
<$20,000	43.0	42.4*	42.5	53.6*	57.8*	47.2
$20,000-39,999	39.6	40.9	42.5	58.4	64.5	40.6
$40,000-69,999	38.6	45.7	40.0	61.1	73.0	42.0
$70,000-99,999	39.4	54.6	40.3	68.2	77.3	49.0
$100,000-149,999	32.3	62.8	47.6	72.5	76.9	37.2
$150,000+	32.4	71.3	51.0	84.3	86.0	54.3
Area of Midland County						
City	39.4	57.7*	47.7*	72.4*	75.1	49.4*
Out County	34.8	46.4	36.9	61.1	70.3	36.1

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

	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied							
	Mental Health Services	Affordable Housing	211	Cell Phone Coverage	Internet Options	Childcare	Medical Services - Primary Care	Dental Services
Overall	47.9	42.4	49.6	59.6	38.1	50.8	65.4	64.2
Gender								
Male	59.7*	47.8	54.3	61.7	49.0*	53.3	75.3*	67.7
Female	45.0	41.4	48.8	59.4	35.9	50.0	63.7	64.2
Age								
18-24	55.3	37.9*	63.0	68.4*	50.9	62.5	72.7	66.7*
25-34	44.3	31.1	42.2	55.0	38.9	44.4	60.0	55.8
35-44	42.1	35.4	46.5	51.0	29.3	48.3	64.2	62.4
45-54	49.5	41.3	45.5	56.1	32.8	51.1	65.9	67.9
55-64	47.6	52.2	43.5	63.6	42.0	48.7	56.4	62.2
65+	56.2	61.0	61.0	72.5	49.5	65.5	73.7	71.7
Education								
< High School	75.0*	36.4*	55.6	63.6	37.5	66.7	60.0*	44.4*
High School	46.5	40.2	59.7	60.7	36.0	44.1	60.4	52.0
Some College	34.2	34.9	40.0	59.9	36.0	46.3	55.4	50.0
Technical/Voc.	50.0	30.2	21.7	56.8	31.8	39.1	59.1	61.4
Bachelor's Degree	51.8	44.3	48.5	59.7	40.8	51.6	73.0	72.8
Graduate Degree	60.0	54.7	65.2	58.9	40.0	62.5	72.3	79.1
Income								
<$20,000	50.0*	40.2*	50.0	55.4	44.1	50.0*	60.6*	52.2*
$20,000-39,999	39.8	29.0	54.2	59.7	28.2	40.4	58.6	42.2
$40,000-69,999	38.7	37.6	36.8	61.3	38.7	42.1	56.7	54.7
$70,000-99,999	50.5	35.7	45.3	64.5	36.7	49.0	68.2	64.5
$100,000-149,999	47.4	44.3	49.2	58.3	38.5	54.7	68.5	81.4
$150,000+	62.0	63.7	63.2	58.3	41.9	64.3	76.7	83.9
Area of Midland County								
City	52.4	44.9	52.5	67.7*	42.7*	55.1	68.2	66.7
Out County	41.3	38.5	45.4	47.8	31.6	44.5	61.3	60.6

Other

Participants were asked to report how many people, including themselves, live in their household, home ownership status, if in the past 12 months there has been 3 or more months in which they were not able to pay all of their bills or could not pay all of them on time because they did not have enough money, if there was a time in the past 12 months where there has been a time they did not have a place to live, and the mode of transportation they used for work, recreational activities, and doctor or medical services. This information is shown in Table 59.

Table 59. Other participants characteristics

	Mean (SD) or %
Number of people in household	3.1 (1.5)
Home ownership	
Own primary home	71.2
Rent primary home	19.3
Other	9.6
Have not had a place to live	
Yes	4.4
No	95.6
Not able to pay bills / pay on time	
Yes	27.4
No	72.6
Mode of transportation – work	
Personal vehicle	95.2
Walk	2.5
Carpool	0.9
Senior services courtesy car	0.3
Public transportation	0.2
Non-motorized vehicle (bike)	0.9
Mode of transportation – recreational activities	
Personal vehicle	91.9
Walk	4.2
Carpool	1.1
Senior services courtesy car	0.3
Public transportation	1.4
Non-motorized vehicle (bike)	1.2
Mode of transportation – doctor or medical services	
Personal vehicle	94.6
Walk	1.5
Carpool	1.8
Senior services courtesy car	0.3
Public transportation	1.1
Non-motorized vehicle (bike)	0.8