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Executive Summary

The Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) conducted a telephone survey of nearly 1,200 Michigan residents for the Michigan State University Extension (MSUE) Marketing Task Force and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES) administration. The survey was intended to gather baseline information related to Michigan residents’ awareness of MSUE and MAES, their programs and goals. This information will be used by MSUE and the MAES in implementing marketing plans and strategies to build citizen awareness.

Selected Findings

- Overall awareness of MSUE was 62.3 percent. MSU Extension awareness was greatest among people 50 to 59 years old (76.9 percent). In general, awareness of MSUE and its programs was higher for older respondents, with 60 to 64 year-olds at 73.1 percent awareness and citizens age 65 and older at 74.3 percent.
- The 4-H Youth Program had the highest overall awareness level of all the program areas (86.7 percent), even higher than MSU Extension (62.3 percent).
- There was great diversity in 4-H awareness by racial background. Whites and Native Americans had very high awareness (91.3 and 92 percent, respectively), awareness was much lower for African Americans (55.5 percent) and Asians/Pacific Islanders (45.5 percent).
- When asked about the most important problem facing their community, respondents most often cited the quality of schools/improving education.
- When respondents were asked the first place they would go for information/education related to the most important issue facing their community, local government was named in more than one-third of the valid responses (35.1 percent).
- The most commonly cited environmental problem respondents noted related to water quality, water pollution, and clean lakes and rivers (34.8 percent). Respondents most often cited three sources for help with environmental problems: a college or university other than MSU (20.7 percent), local government (19.8 percent), and state government or a state agency (17.1 percent).
The most common responses to the question about problems facing children and youths was [lack of] activities/things for kids to do, at 19.8 percent. Close behind, young people and drugs had an 18.6 percent response rate. The most often-mentioned sources of help for problems facing children/youths were local schools or school boards. Colleges or universities other than MSU received 7.2 percent of responses.

The most often-mentioned problem facing Michigan’s farmers was drought or weather. Prices the farmers receive for crops was also frequently cited. Respondents most often cited state government/state governmental agencies when asked where farmers would go for educational programming to help face identified problems. Michigan State University was also frequently mentioned.

Overall awareness of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station was 41.8 percent.

Half of the respondents (50.6 percent) reported hearing about MSU Extension on the radio, seeing it on television or reading about it in the newspaper.

Nearly a quarter of respondents (23.4 percent) who had contact with MSU Extension rated the organization’s service as excellent.

Awareness of MSUE, its main programming areas and the MAES, by MSUE region (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSUE region</th>
<th>MSUE</th>
<th>ECED</th>
<th>4-H</th>
<th>Family Strengths</th>
<th>ANR</th>
<th>MAES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.P.</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Lower</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Introduction

Role of Extension

The U.S. Congress initiated the Cooperative Extension Service more than 85 years ago in 1914 with the passing of the Smith-Lever Act. It was the continuation of a process begun in 1862, when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, which mandated that every state set aside land for use in educating citizens, especially rural residents, in “agriculture and the mechanical arts” (Drabenstott, 1999).

The Cooperative Extension Service was intended to provide an alternative to elitist colleges and universities that, in addition to often being cost-prohibitive to rural families, offered such subjects as rhetoric and Latin, which had limited use in small towns and on farms (Buttel, 1983).

When Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, 80 percent of the nation’s people lived in rural areas and more than half lived on farms. Though a rural population decline was on the horizon, following closely on the heels of a burgeoning industrial revolution, the rate of exodus was not rapid, and at the onset of World War II, the rural population was still 44 percent, with the farm population about 25 percent (Drabenstott, 1999).

The rural population was what we might now call Extension’s first “target audience.” The system was set up to disseminate “useful and practical information” regarding agriculture and the mechanical arts through research in the land-grant universities in an educational system jointly supported by the county, state and federal governments. Through the years, Extension’s role has grown and expanded, as has the U.S. population.

Likewise, Michigan’s Cooperative Extension Service has grown and changed, taking the name Michigan State University Extension (MSUE). Today’s MSUE offers county-based programs and information in three primary areas: agriculture and natural resources; children, youth and families; and community and economic development. But just as society itself faces changes and challenges, MSU Extension must continually work to ensure that it is striving to meet the needs of all citizens within its programming areas.
Just as it has since its inception early in the last century, MSUE works to extend the vast resources of Michigan State University research to all the state’s citizens. Though it was initially grounded in agriculture and rural home economics, today’s MSUE seeks to identify and then meet the needs of all Michigan residents, whether rural or urban, young or old, regardless of race, education or income.

**Assessment of Local Needs**

Two years before the 1914 Smith-Lever Act, Michigan was already taking strides toward establishing an Extension system. The Michigan Legislature authorized county boards of supervisors to appropriate funds and levy taxes to further teaching and demonstrations in Extension work. Eleven agricultural agents were named that year (MSUE Marketing Action Plan, 1999).

Michigan State University, the nation’s first land-grant institution, has been active in expanding its programs and staff expertise to meet citizens’ ever-changing needs. In 1992, the organization undertook a statewide issue identification process to determine what residents saw as the most pressing needs and challenges facing their communities. This effort led to new educational efforts via area of expertise teams that include campus-based researchers, county-based educators and client group members. These teams are charged with providing topic-specific information that continues to reflect audience needs (Suvedi, Lapinski, Campo, 1999).

As more non-profit and educational organizations—MSUE included—become increasingly aware of the need to remain relevant to their clients, they are discovering the value of marketing and marketing research efforts widely used in the public sector. Marketing, which focuses on target audiences, helps ensure that everything about an organization, from its programs and staff to logos and brochures, carries a consistent message. Marketing is also about building relationships with customers.
Market research allows an organization to discover existing knowledge levels among customers and subsequently plan strategies for reaching more traditional customers or entirely new customer groups. MSUE is working to acquire and use this kind of data on knowledge levels among its established customer groups, such as local officials, rural families, rural young people, farmers and other natural resource managers; its untapped customers, such as young, urban minority audiences; and its suppliers—county, state and federal governmental officials.

This survey gathered information about citizens’ perceptions of local needs related to families, youths, communities and agriculture. Data will be assessed and used by MSUE educators to plan future programming initiatives in their regions.

**The Study’s Objectives**

MSU Extension began the process of building an organizationwide marketing plan in 1997. Stakeholder (customer) input was gathered in 1998 during two planning sessions, and the input from those two events was gathered and synthesized into a set of marketing objectives. One of these objectives calls for building 80 percent public awareness of MSU Extension’s mission, goals and programs. This study directly relates to meeting that objective. To ascertain whether public awareness about MSUE and its mission, goals and programs has reached 80 percent, it is critical to assess the public awareness level before marketing strategies are implemented. This survey’s results will provide a baseline of information on public awareness of MSUE’s 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths Program, and Agriculture and Natural Resources Program, as well as the umbrella organization (MSUE). It will also give MSUE and the MAES information regarding Michigan citizens’ stated needs for their communities.

Telephone surveys were conducted with residents across the state from a variety of age, educational, race, income and geographic (urban to rural) groups. In addition to providing information about MSUE awareness levels, survey data will also provide local MSUE educators with information for use in designing educational programming efforts, as well as efforts to reach audiences with critically low awareness of Extension.
Methods and Procedures

Population Characteristics

The survey employed a total sample size of 1,156 individuals. The referent population was Michigan’s non-institutionalized, English-speaking adult population (age 18 and older). Because the survey was conducted by telephone, only persons living in households that had telephones were interviewed. For breakdowns of the survey sample by age, race, income, MSUE region and education level, please see Appendix B.

Stratification

To assure representation of major regions within Michigan, the sample was stratified into six regions, each consisting of a set of contiguous counties. The county grouping corresponds to that used by MSU Extension.

The six regions are defined as follows (counties listed within regions):

3. West Central (Allegan, Barry, Ionia, Kent, Lake, Manistee, Mason, Mecosta, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa).
4. East Central (Arenac, Bay, Clare, Clinton, Gladwin, Gratiot, Huron, Isabella, Midland, Saginaw, Sanilac, Shiawassee, Tuscola).

To allow reclassification of the place of residence (county) into the alternative regional groupings, each respondent's county of residence was also coded on the data set.
**Sampling**

Respondents' households were selected using list-assisted, random-digit dial sampling procedures. The initial sample of randomly generated telephone numbers was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. (Survey Sampling generates a list of all working area code/phone number prefix combinations.) In this study, this universe was constrained to include only active Michigan numbers. From within this list of possible phone numbers, Survey Sampling eliminated those banks of numbers represented by the four-digit suffix that are known to be unused or used only by institutions. Telephone numbers were selected at random in proportion to the number of households in each county from all those numbers remaining as possible numbers until the total number of numbers needed within a particular geographic grouping of counties were obtained.

It should be noted that Survey Sampling screens the phone numbers generated against directory-based information on the density of banks (i.e., the number of numbers from within a bank that appear in phone directory listings). Since other research has indicated that unlisted numbers are not assigned to separate banks of phone numbers from those that are listed, for efficiency purposes Survey Sampling excluded any numbers selected from banks with fewer than two published phone numbers. Survey Sampling expects that, on average, 55 to 70 percent of the phone numbers generated at random are working household numbers.

To determine the total number of telephone numbers Survey Sampling generates to achieve the desired sample sizes within each region, the number of completed interviews desired was divided by the product of (a) the proportion of expected household working phone numbers (the hit rate), (b) the proportion of household numbers that would contain an eligible respondent (the eligibility rate), and (c) the proportion of households with eligible respondents who would complete the interview in the time period available (the completion rate).

Sampling design was a stratified sample based on MSUE regions. Regions sampled were somewhat disproportionate to actual population sizes within each region. Stratification was intended to assure a sufficient minimum number of respondents from each stratum to permit detailed analysis.
**Data Analysis**

Survey data were entered and analyzed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, cross-tabulation, means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data. Frequency counts were made from responses to open-ended questions. Whenever questionnaires contained incomplete items because of individual item non-response, they were treated as missing values and were not counted toward the sample statistics.
Findings

Community Needs

Respondents were asked several questions related to problems/challenges facing their communities and families. They were asked where they would go for information or education related to meeting the problem they mentioned. In addition to general community issues, questions related to the environment/natural resources, youths/families and agriculture.

Selected findings are presented in this section.

The 10 most frequent responses to the open-ended question “What is the most important problem facing your community today?” are listed in Table 1A. There were 894 responses to this question. Another 262 respondents did not have an answer or chose not to answer this question. The top 10 responses constitute 58.7 percent of the 894 responses. The remainder of the answers included such issues as pollution, gang violence, water/sewage and the need for more police/law enforcement. Responses to this question by MSUE region are listed in Appendix C.

Table 1A. Ten most often-cited community problems (n=894).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community problem</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improve education</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment/jobs/lack of good jobs</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/road repair/street upkeep</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overexpansion/too much growth</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/drug dealers</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/growth/economy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other responses</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 10 most often-reported responses to the open-ended question “If you were going to find a program that focused on (community problem stated) for yourself or someone in your community, where would you most likely go?” are listed in Table 1B. There were 635 responses to this question. A large number of respondents (262) did not have an answer to this question. Other respondents (259) either chose not to answer this question or the one preceding it. Responses to the question also included the media, medical profession, neighborhood groups, co-workers, family and friends.

Table 1B. Ten most often-cited sources of educational help related to stated community problem (n=635).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of help</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local government (city/county commission/road commission)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school/school board</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government (state agency, MESC, DNR, DEQ)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local police or sheriff</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local group--cooperative</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university (other than MSU)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/state human service organization</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local church/temple/synagogue</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents who did not state an environment-related subject as the most pressing problem facing their community were then asked the following open-ended question: “Thinking about natural resources and our environment, (in your opinion) what is the most important natural resource or environmental issue facing your community?” Table 2A lists the 10 most often-mentioned issues and the percent of responses they received. Among the other stated responses to this question were overpopulation, natural resource conservation, pesticides and sewage-septic. There were 640 responses to this question. It should be noted that a sizable number of respondents (409) did not have an answer to this question. Six respondents refused to answer, and another 106 either did not answer the previous question or stated an environmental problem in response to it.

Table 2A. Ten most commonly stated environmental problems (n=640).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution/quality/clean lakes, rivers</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land destruction, development, growth</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution/quality</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution in general</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving woods/forests/trees/wetlands</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake levels/low water levels</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm land disappearing/being sold/depletion of farm lands</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas prices/natural gas supply</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills/dumping/trash</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked “If you were going to find an educational program that focused on (stated environmental problem) for yourself or your family, where would you most likely go?”, respondents most often cited three sources for help with environmental problems: a college or
university other than MSU, local government, and state government or a state agency. Other mentioned sources included local schools/school boards, local or state human service organizations, and the Internet. There was an extremely low response to this question, with only about 10 percent (111 people) responding. Forty respondents did not have an answer to this question, two refused to answer and the remainder did not answer the previous question and were automatically counted as non-respondents on this question.

Table 2B. Five most often-stated sources of help related to stated environmental problem (n=111).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of help</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or university (other than MSU)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government/agency</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who did not mention an issue related to children or young people as the most pressing problem facing their community were then asked: “Thinking about young people, (in your opinion) what is the most important problem facing children and youth in your community today?” The 10 most often-stated problems are listed in Table 3A. There were 1,027 responses to this question. Another 106 respondents did not have an answer to this question, and 22 refused to answer. Other responses to the question not listed in Table 3A included unemployment/lack of jobs, youths and drinking/alcohol, and crime.
Table 3A. Top 10 stated issues facing children and youth (n=1027).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem/issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Lack of] Activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people and drugs</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce/broken homes/single parents</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/family time</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs/gang violence/teenage trouble</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/lack of</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/morality/religion</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3B highlights the 10 most-cited answers to the question “If you were going to find an educational program that focused on (stated youth/child issue) for yourself or someone in your family, where would you most likely go?” There were 816 responses to this question. A sizable portion (241) did not have a response to this question, and another 20 refused to answer. Among the less frequently mentioned responses to this question were the medical profession, media and the private sector.
Table 3B. Top 10 sources of help related to stated youth problem (n=816)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local schools/school boards</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches/temples/synagogue</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local group/cooperative</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges or universities other than MSU</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local police/sheriff</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government/agency (MESC, DNR, DEQ, etc.)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/friends/co-workers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local or state human service organization</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents most often mentioned drought or weather when asked “Now, thinking about those who make their living from farming, what is (in your opinion) the most important problem facing farmers and agricultural producers in Michigan?” The top 10 most frequently mentioned responses are listed in Table 4A. There were 863 responses to this question. Nearly 25 percent of survey respondents (285) did not know how they would answer this question, and others either refused (six respondents) or had already said an agriculture-related issue was the most important problem facing their community. Other responses to this question than those listed in Table 4A included lack of funding or loans.
Table 4A. Ten most stated problems facing Michigan farmers (n=863).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem/Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drought/weather</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop prices/fair pricing</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition with big business</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of materials</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms being sold/disappearing/development</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development/buying farmland/sprawl</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government regulations–state/federal</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides/chemical contamination land–water</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked “If you were going to find an educational program that focused on (stated farm problem), to whom or what place would you go first?”, respondents most often cited state government/state governmental agencies. Michigan State University was also frequently mentioned. There were 625 responses to this question. About one-fifth of the respondents (244) did not know how they would answer this question, and others (287) refused or did not answer the previous question. Table 4B shows the 10 most frequently mentioned sources for educational programming related to the stated farm/agricultural problem. Other responses included newspapers/television/media and local or state human service organizations.
Table 4B. Top 10 stated educational sources related to stated farm problem (n=625).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Help</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State government/agency</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/university other than MSU</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local group/cooperative</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school/school board</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness of Michigan State University Extension and its Programs

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their awareness of MSU Extension’s four main programming areas (4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Economic and Community Development, and Agriculture and Natural Resources), as well as their awareness about the organization itself. A final question was intended to gauge their awareness of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station. Responses by MSUE region and for the entire state are listed in Table 5.
Table 5. Awareness of Michigan State University Extension, its main programming areas and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, by Michigan region (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>MSU Extension</th>
<th>Community &amp; Economic Development</th>
<th>4-H Youth</th>
<th>Family Strengths</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources</th>
<th>Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.P.</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Lower</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that awareness of MSU Extension was greatest among people more than 50 years old. For those 50 to 59 it was 75.9 percent, for those 60 to 64 it was 73.1 percent and for those 65 and older, it was 74.3 percent. Among younger respondents, 25 percent of 18 to 24 year-olds expressed awareness of MSUE, as did 34.4 percent of those ages 25 to 29.

Between racial groups, the highest awareness was among whites (66 percent). Native Americans had the second highest awareness rate (56 percent), followed by Asians and Pacific Islanders (45.5 percent), African Americans (42.1 percent) and Hispanics (32.1 percent).

There was little difference in awareness between genders, with women at 64.3 percent and men at 59.2 percent awareness (Table 9). There was more awareness of MSUE among those with four-year college degrees or higher than among those with other educational levels. Those with some college (one to three years) had a 61.4 percent awareness, and high school graduates had a 67.9 percent awareness level. All other educational levels had lower awareness.
Table 10 points out that there was greatest awareness in rural communities (72 percent), slightly less in small cities, villages and towns (61.5 percent), and less in suburbs (57.1 percent) and urban communities (47.4 percent).

**Economic and Community Development Program**

Economic and community development issues are the focus of the Economic Area of Expertise Team’s efforts. MSU Extension specialists and county-based educators working in economic development education educate and assist businesses, communities and organizations, including public and private leaders, in planning and implementing successful economic development programs.

Survey respondents’ awareness of MSUE’s community and economic development programs (ECED) increased with age (Table 6). Those in the 18 to 24 year-old range had a 17.8 percent awareness, while 50 to 59 year-olds were at 61.5 percent; 60 to 64 year-olds were at 64.6 percent, and those older than 65 were at 62.1 percent.

There seemed to be a relationship between awareness of ECED and education levels (Table 11). High school graduates had a 43.1 percent awareness, while those with technical school degrees and four-year college degrees (or graduate education) were at 52.2 and 52.5 percent, respectively.

Tables 7 and 8 note awareness by racial backgrounds. Hispanics had a 58.6 percent awareness level, Native Americans were at 48 percent awareness, whites were at 47.6 and African Americans were at 46.8 percent. Asians and Pacific Islanders were somewhat lower at 36.4 percent.

For MSUE regions (Table 5), the Upper Peninsula had the greatest awareness, at 65.2 percent. The Northern and West Central regions were very similar, at 46.2 and 47 percent, respectively, and the East Central was at 44.9. The Southwest and Southeast both showed the lowest awareness levels related to community and economic development programming -- 42.5 percent and 43.5 percent, respectively.

There was little difference between rural, small city, suburban and urban residents in their awareness of ECED activities (Table 10). Rural residents indicated a 47.6 percent awareness,
very similar to small city, village or town residents’ 47 percent awareness. Suburban residents had a 46.5 percent awareness, and urban residents were at 48.5 percent.

Table 6. Awareness of MSU Extension, Community and Economic Development Program, 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Agriculture and Natural Resources Program, and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station by age category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>MSU Extension (n=1124)</th>
<th>Economic &amp; Community Development (n=1125)</th>
<th>4-H Youth Programs (n=1137)</th>
<th>Family Strengths (n=1124)</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources (n=1126)</th>
<th>Michigan Ag Experiment Station (n=1128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; older</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Awareness of MSU Extension, Community and Economic Development Program, 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Agriculture and Natural Resources Program, and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station by respondents’ racial backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race category</th>
<th>MSU Extension (n=1143)</th>
<th>Economic &amp; Community Development (n=1144)</th>
<th>4-H Youth Programs (n=1156)</th>
<th>Family Strengths (n=1143)</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources (n=1145)</th>
<th>Michigan Ag Experiment Station (n=1147)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall awareness</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Awareness of MSU Extension, Community and Economic Development Program, 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Agriculture and Natural Resources Program, and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station by respondents of Hispanic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic awareness</th>
<th>MSU Extension (n=28)</th>
<th>Economic &amp; Community Development (n=29)</th>
<th>4-H Youth Programs (n=29)</th>
<th>Family Strengths (n=29)</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources (n=28)</th>
<th>Michigan Ag Experiment Station (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 Awareness of MSU Extension, Community and Economic Development Program, 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Agriculture and Natural Resources Program, and Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station by community type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community type</th>
<th>MSU Extension (N=1139)</th>
<th>Economic &amp; Community Development (n=1140)</th>
<th>4-H Youth Programs (n=1152)</th>
<th>Family Strengths (n=1139)</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources (n=1141)</th>
<th>Michigan Ag Experiment Station (n=1143)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent reporting awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city/town/village</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban community</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall awareness</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Awareness of MSU Extension, Community and Economic Development Program, 4-H Youth Programs, Family Strengths, Agriculture and Natural Resources Program and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station by education level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>MSU Extension (N=1140)</th>
<th>Economic &amp; Community Development (n=1141)</th>
<th>4-H Youth Programs (n=1153)</th>
<th>Family Strengths (n=1130)</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources (n=1142)</th>
<th>Michigan Ag Experiment Station (n=1144)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th grade or less</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad/GED</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical school</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college (1-3 yrs)</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad or higher</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall awareness</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-H Youth Programs

4-H Youth Programs has a long tradition of providing opportunities for young people to learn life skills and have fun. It is often associated with its traditions in rural America and images of young people with blue ribbons for animal husbandry, cooking, sewing, making crafts or growing crops. 4-H Youth Development (part of MSU Extension’s Children, Youth and Family Programs) provides fun, educational opportunities and resources to positively develop youth and the volunteers and professionals who work with them.

Michigan 4-H Youth Programs recruits, trains and assists more than 30,000 adult and teen volunteers annually. 4-H also networks and develops partnerships with youth-serving organizations; educational, cultural and human service organizations; and business, industry, government and other community groups to create youth-centered, caring environments for kids.
With its long tradition and easily identified 4-H clover logo, this program area had the highest overall awareness level of all the program areas, even higher than MSU Extension. There were several trends among the awareness findings for 4-H.

Table 6 shows that, though all age groups expressed high awareness of 4-H (the lowest was 18 to 24 year-olds, at 65.8 percent), awareness levels tend to be associated with age.

Awareness was also high for all education levels (Table 10), lowest for those having completed 11th grade or less education (79 percent) and peaking with respondents who had at least a four-year college education (91.6 percent). There was some increase in the level awareness with increased educational levels.

Within MSUE regions (Table 5), awareness was above 80 percent for all regions except Southeast Michigan, where it was 70.8 percent. This is not surprising, given that the Southeast region, including Detroit, is very urban. Likewise, awareness was less for urban respondents than for those from other community types (Table 9).

There was great difference in 4-H awareness by racial background (Tables 7 and 8). Whites and Native Americans had very high awareness--91.3 and 92 percent, respectively--but awareness was much lower for Hispanics, African Americans and Asians/Pacific Islanders, at 65.5, 55.5 and 45.5 percent, respectively.

**Family Strengths Program**

Formerly known as the Home Economics Program, Family Strengths is committed to helping families succeed by providing educational programs and resources and in-service education for family professionals, and by preparing paraprofessionals to work with families.

MSU Extension home economists serve every county in the state and work in partnership with MSU campus faculty members to provide research-based, up-to-date information on important topics that affect families across the life cycle. They transmit information through newsletters, workshops, radio and television programs, newspaper columns, meetings, and group and person-to-person contacts. They also offer specialized publications, computer-assisted instruction, telephone hotlines, and educational programs delivered by satellite and interactive cable.
Among MSUE regions (Table 5), the lowest awareness was in the Southeast (29.9 percent), and highest was in Upper Peninsula (47.4 percent) and the Northern Lower (46.2 percent).

Older respondents tended to be more aware of the Family Strengths Program than younger respondents (Table 6). It was highest among persons ages 60 to 64 (60.6 percent). There was no association between awareness level and education level. Table 10 shows highest awareness among technical school graduates (54.5), followed by those who completed less than 12 years of education (46.3) and college graduates (39.2).

Among racial backgrounds (Tables 7 and 8), awareness was highest among Native Americans (56 percent), followed by whites (39 percent) and African Americans (35.4 percent). Asian or Pacific Islander awareness was at 27.3 percent, which was similar to that of Hispanics (27.6 percent).

By community type (Table 9), awareness was highest for rural residents at 43.9 percent, closely followed by small city, town or village residents at 40.6 percent, and similarly low for suburban (28.9 percent) and urban (29.4 percent) audiences.

**Agriculture and Natural Resources Program**

Michigan State University's Extension Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Program provides research-based educational programs to Michigan citizens involved in or affected by agriculture or natural resources to help them make informed decisions, prosper, and contribute to Michigan's economy and quality of life. The effort directly or indirectly affects every Michigan citizen.

When asked about their awareness of the ANR Program, respondents’ it appears older respondents were more aware of ANR Programs than younger respondents (Table 6). It was highest for those 65 and older (70.4 percent) and lowest for 18 to 24 year-olds (17.8 percent).

By education level (Table 10), awareness was highest for technical school-trained respondents, at 52.2 percent, though not significantly higher than for those with college or postgraduate education (50.8 percent). Awareness in this category was lowest for those with some college experience (43.7 percent).
Within MSUE regions (Table 5), there was highest awareness in the Northern Lower Peninsula (63.6 percent), followed by the East Central Region at 57.1 percent. The Southwest Region (49.7 percent), the Upper Peninsula (49.2 percent) and the West Central Region (47 percent) all showed similar levels of awareness. Awareness was lowest in the urban Southeast Region (31.3 percent).

Among racial groups (Tables 7 and 8), awareness was highest among Native Americans (52 percent) and whites (50.6 percent) and significantly lower for Hispanics (32.1 percent), African Americans (25 percent) and Asians/Pacific Islanders (27.3 percent).

As might be expected, awareness in various community types (Table 9) ranged from highest in rural communities (57.5 percent) to lowest for urban communities (28.1 percent), with small city, town or village (46.3 percent) and suburban (43.4 percent) residents in between.

**Awareness of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station**

Much of the information that MSUE educators extend to Michigan citizens is generated through the work of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES). The two organizations work closely together in a mutually supportive relationship. MAES projects are conducted by more than 300 scientists in five MSU colleges: Agriculture and Natural Resources, Natural Science, Social Science, Veterinary Medicine and Human Ecology. There are also 14 MAES field stations across Michigan, focusing on meeting research needs related to commodities such as fruit, vegetables, beef and dairy, as well as managing natural resources such as forests, wildlife, fisheries and water resources.

Because MSUE and the MAES work so closely together and are charged with applying the university’s knowledge to meeting citizens’ needs, it was deemed appropriate to gauge Michigan residents’ awareness of both organizations. Respondents were asked: “Before today, did you know of any organization or agency in the state that does research and investigates topics in the area of farming or agriculture?” Table 11A shows the top five responses to this question. Other responses included the federal government, miscellaneous other organizations, and neighborhood groups or associations.

Though only about a quarter of the total respondents (24.1 percent) could answer this question and a full 75 percent (869 respondents) did not have a response to this question.
When the question was “Before today, had you heard of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station at Michigan State University?” more than 40 percent (41.8 percent) answered yes (Table 11B). This may point to confusion about the Experiment Station’s role or its connection to MSUE.

Table 11A. Five most frequently named organizations that conduct agricultural research (n=279).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU/Cooperative Extension/Extension Service</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group/association/organization</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/university/community college (other than MSU)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/local government/township/county government</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11B. Awareness of Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (n=1147).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware of MAES?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within MSU Extension regions (Table 5), MAES awareness was highest in the Southwest, at 50.6 percent, but very similar in the Upper Peninsula (49.6 percent) and the Northern Lower (47.6 percent), West Central and East Central (both at 45.7 percent). Awareness was lowest in the Southeast (26.6 percent).
Older respondents were more aware of MAES than younger respondents (Table 6). The youngest two groups showed the least awareness--18 to 24 year-olds were at 25 percent, and 25 to 29 year-olds were at 24.2 percent. Awareness increased to 65 percent among those age 65 and older.

As Tables 7 and 8 show, among racial groups, MAES awareness was relatively low for Hispanics (20.7 percent), African Americans (21.1 percent) and Asians and Pacific Islanders (18.2 percent). It was higher for whites (44.6 percent) and Native Americans (60 percent).

Awareness of MAES did not seem to be associated with education level (Table 10). High school graduates had a 36.5 percent awareness, those with one to three years of college were at 39.5 percent and four-year college/post graduate educated respondents were at 49.5 percent. Technical school graduates showed highest awareness, at 52.2 percent.

Table 11C. Five most commonly mentioned organizations that research natural resources and environmental issues (n=391).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State/Cooperative Extension/Extension Service</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/university/community college (other than MSU)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group/association/organization</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11C lists the five most frequent responses participants gave to the question “Before today, did you know of any organization or agency in the State that does research and investigates topics in natural resources and environmental issues?” Only one third of the respondents could answer this question. Other responses to the question included city, local, township and county government and neighborhood groups and associations.

Table 11D. Five most commonly mentioned organizations that conduct food safety, nutrition and health related research (n=440).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Health department</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU/Cooperative Extension/Extension Service</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked “Before today, did you know of any organization or agency in the State that does research and investigates topics in food safety, nutrition and health related issues?” respondents most frequently mentioned the federal government (29.3 percent). The five top responses to this question are listed in Table 11D. Once again there was a high number of respondents who did not have an answer to this question (60.1 percent), which lowered the total response rate to less than 40 percent. Other responses to this question beyond the top five included community groups, associations and organizations, colleges or universities other than MSU and city, local, township and county government.
Table 11E. Five most commonly mentioned organizations conducting research on topics in community and economic development (n=204).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/local/township/county government</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group/association/organization</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU/Cooperative Extension/Extension Service</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents most frequently named some form of local government (22.5 percent) when asked “Before today, did you know of any organization or agency in the State that does research and investigates topics in community and economic development?” Table 11E highlights the five most frequent responses, which again received a very low response rate (17.6 percent). More than 80 percent of survey respondents did not know how to answer this question. Those who did respond also cited chambers of commerce, colleges and universities other than MSU and neighborhood groups and associations as sources of research in this area.

**Participation in Extension Programs**

Respondents who indicated awareness of MSUE and the MAES were further asked to indicated the types of educational programming they participated in during the past year. Table 12 shows respondents’ participation, by MSUE region, in MSUE-sponsored workshops and meetings, bulletin/fact sheet and newsletter reading, videotape use, and 4-H club meetings and state-level 4-H events. Participation in workshops and meetings was low for all regions, with the highest regional participation in the Southwest (12.3 percent). There was very similar participation in the North (10.6 percent) and the Southeast (10.4 percent). The East Central and
the Upper Peninsula had the same participation level (7.1 percent), and they were followed by the West Central region at 5.3 percent.

Table 12. Participation in MSUE workshops and meetings, by MSUE Region, during the past year (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/meeting</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin/fact sheet</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H club meeting</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H state event</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bulletin and fact sheet use ranged from 25.9 percent in the Northern Region to 9.6 in the Southeast. Newsletters were similar, with Northern Region respondents reporting 35.3 percent use, the Southwest at 28.1 percent, and the East Central and Upper Peninsula similar at 23.6 and 22.1 percent, respectively. The Southeast Region showed the least newsletter use--14.7 percent.

Participation in 4-H club meetings by respondents or their family members ranged from nearly 12 percent (11.9) in the Northern Region to 6.8 percent in the Southeast Region. The East Central Region was at 11.5 percent, with both the Upper Peninsula and the West Central Region at 10.9 percent. The Southwest Region showed 8.4 percent participation.

These numbers contrast with higher participation at state-level 4-H events and activities, which peaked with 36.4 percent in the Northern Region, followed closely by 35.4 percent in the East Central Region. The West Central (28.1 percent), Southwest (27.7) and Upper Peninsula (26 percent) were all very similar. Lowest participation was in the Southeast (14.6 percent).
Table 13. Participation by respondents (or family members) in MSUE activities during the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/event</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended MSUE workshop/meeting</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired MSUE bulletin/fact sheet</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received local MSUE newsletter</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed/purchased MSUE videotape</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 4-H club meeting</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 4-H state event</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard/read about MSUE activities via radio, TV, newspaper</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted local MSUE office with question</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited MSU campus</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSUE educator visited home</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that about half of all respondents (50.6 percent) stated they had heard or read about MSU Extension activities through newspapers, television or radio stations (Table 13). Significantly lower numbers reported attending MSUE meetings or workshops (8.9 percent) or 4-H club meetings (9.7 percent). More people had received MSU Extension newsletters (22.2 percent) or attended state-level 4-H events (26.6 percent).

Respondents were asked “Taking all types of contact you or members of your family have had with MSU Extension in the past 12 months into consideration, how would you rate the quality of educational program offered by MSU Extension?” Of those who had taken part in MSU Extension programs, used materials or participated in activities, nearly one quarter (23.4 percent) rated the service they received as excellent.
Conclusion

Public awareness of MSU Extension and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station was 62 and 42 percent, respectively. Awareness levels differ between regions. The Upper Peninsula had the highest awareness (75.8 percent for MSUE and 49.6 percent for the MAES). Lowest awareness levels for both organizations were reported in the Southeast Region (45.6 for MSUE and 26.6 for the MAES). Awareness levels were also low among minority audiences, with Hispanics at 32.1 percent for MSUE and 20.7 for the MAES, and African Americans at 42.1 percent for MSUE and 21.1 percent for the MAES.

Further, people who had heard of MSUE and the MAES did not tend to know about the actual programs these organizations offer. They also tended to be unfamiliar with the functions or goals of programs offered by both organizations.

Considering these findings, the MSU Extension Marketing Taskforce should consider targeting efforts towards minority populations and younger populations, along with people living in urban and suburban communities. The marketing effort should not only generate awareness, but educate citizens about the programs these organizations offer and the resources available to them through Michigan State University.
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Appendix A

MSU Extension Marketing Survey
Telephone Interview Questions

INTERVIEWER, DIAL THE TELEPHONE NUMBER: ________________

(If a young child answers, ask to speak with an adult or the best time to call back when an adult will be there.)

Hello. My name is _________________. I’m calling from the Office for Survey Research in East Lansing. We are doing a statewide survey about how familiar Michigan citizens are about certain educational programs and services. Have I reached you at your home phone?

In order to represent the views of different people in Michigan, I need to randomly select an adult (that is a person 18 years of age or older) within your household. We do that by asking to speak with the adult who has the next birthday.

I will be asking you some questions about the community you live in, about some of the difficulties facing your community, and about what can be done to meet the needs of residents. The results will be used to develop educational programs to meet the needs of your community.

Your telephone number was drawn in a random sample of the entire state. The questions I need to ask should take about eight minutes. Before we begin, let me tell you that this interview is completely voluntary. All of the information you provide will remain confidential. For quality control purposes, this interview may be monitored by my supervisor. Should we come to any question you would prefer not to answer, just let me know and we will go onto the next question.

I will begin now, OK. <1> Yes to proceed, <2> refusal, <3> call later

>XX< I’d like to start by asking you some general questions about the community in which you live.

Would you say you live in a rural community, a small city or town, a suburb, or an urban community?
<1> RURAL COMMUNITY
<2> SMALL CITY OR TOWN, VILLAGE
<3> A SUBURB
<4> URBAN COMMUNITY
<5> OTHER: SPECIFY
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>XX< How close(in miles) are you to a city?
<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

>XX< In your opinion, what is the most important problem facing your community today?
<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM
If you were going to find a program that focused on (FILL IN ANSWER FROM PREVIOUS QUESTION), for yourself or someone in your community, where would you most likely go?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT DID NOT IDENTIFY SOMETHING ABOUT NATURAL RESOURCES OR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM, ASK FOLLOW UP QUESTION (M1 & M1a)

Are you aware of a natural resources or environmental issue facing your community?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

If you were going to find a program that focused on (FILL IN ANSWER FROM PREVIOUS QUESTION), for yourself or someone in your community, where would you most likely go?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Thinking about young people, (in your opinion), what is the most important problem facing children and youth in your community today?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

If you were going to find a program that focused on (FILL IN ANSWER FROM PREVIOUS QUESTION), for yourself or someone in your community, where would you most likely go?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Now, thinking about those who make their living from farming, what is, (in your opinion) the most important problem facing farmers and agricultural producers in Michigan?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

If you were going to find an educational program that focused on (FILL IN ANSWER FROM PREVIOUS QUESTION) to whom or what place would you go first?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Now, I would like to mention some programs or services that are available in your community. Please tell me whether or not you have heard of each:
Before today, had you heard of Community and Economic Development Program?

[DEF: ONES THAT FOCUS ON THE SOLUTIONS OF COMMUNITY PROBLEMS SUCH AS THE PROVISION OF SERVICES LIKE WATER AND SEWERS; LAND USE PLANS; THE EXPANSION OF BUSINESSES AND INDUSTRY; AND THE FORMATION OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS.]

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

If yes, do you know what organizations or agencies in the State coordinate these services?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Before today, had you heard of 4-H Youth Programs?

[DEF: They stress the development of young people through projects, activities, and leadership development.]

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

If yes, do you know what organization or agency in the State coordinates the 4-H youth Programs?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Before today, had you heard of Family Strengths, Food Nutrition and Health programs formerly known as Home Economics program or Homemaker Club?

[DEF: PROGRAMS IN SUCH AREAS AS FOOD AND NUTRITION, FAMILY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, HOUSING AND HEALTH.]

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

Do you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate Family Strengths and Food, Nutrition and Health programs?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

Before today, had you heard of Extension Agricultural and Natural Resources Programs?

[DEF: ANY ASPECT OF CROP AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND MARKETING, FORESTRY, FISHERIES, WILDLIFE AND CONSERVATION. IT INCLUDES SUCH THINGS AS LAWN AND GARDEN CARE, AS WELL AS FARMING.]
<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>M6a< If yes, do you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate the Extension Agricultural and Natural Resources Programs?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

>M7< Before I called today, have you ever heard of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, which is now known as Michigan State University Extension?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>M8< Before today, did you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate research in the area of farming or production agriculture?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

[DEF: ANY ASPECT OF CROP AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING.]

>M9< Before today, did you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate research in natural resources and environmental issues?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

[DEF: ANY ASPECT OF NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT INCLUDING FORESTRY, LAKES AND RIVERS, FISHERIES, WILDLIFE & CONSERVATION.]

>M10< Before today, did you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate research in food safety, nutrition and health related issues?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

[DEF: ANY ASPECT OF FOOD HANDLING & STORAGE, HEALTH & NUTRITION.]

>M11< Before today, did you know any organizations or agencies in the State that coordinate research in community and economic development?

<0> RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM

[DEF: ANY ASPECT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT, ETC.]
>M12< Before I called today, had you heard of Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

**IF ANSWERS TO Q M2 THROUGH M12 are NO, SKIP TO Q.CD1**

>X18< Please tell me if in the past year, you or some other members of your family attended any of the following programs.

Attended MSU Extension organized educational workshops or meetings?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED

>X19< (In the past year, have you or some other member of your family)

Acquired an MSU Extension bulletin or fact sheet?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED

>X20< (In the past year, have you or some other member of your family)

Received county Extension newsletters or mailers?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED

>X21< (In the past year, have you or some other member of your family)

Borrowed or purchased a MSU Extension-produced video tape?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>X22< (In the past year, have you or some other member of your family)

Attended a 4-H club or group meeting?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER
>X23< (In the **past year**, have you or some other member of your family) 
Attended a 4-H club event?

<1> YES 
<5> NO 
<8> DO NOT KNOW 
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>X24< (In the **past year**, have you or some other member of your family) 
Heard or read about MSU Extension activities in the radio, TV, or in the newspaper?

<1> YES 
<5> NO 
<8> DO NOT KNOW 
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>X25< (In the past year, have you or some other member of your family) 
Contacted a local MSU Extension office with a question?

<1> YES 
<5> NO 
<8> DO NOT KNOW 
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>X26< (In the **past year**, have you or some other member of your family) 
Visited the MSU campus for an Extension event such as AG Expo, 4-H Exploration Days, the Michigan Families Conference, or Animal Science Day?

<1> YES 
<5> NO 
<8> DO NOT KNOW 
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

>X27< (In the **past year**, have you or some other member of your family) 
Had an MSU Extension educator or county agent visit your home or business or school?

[DEF: This could include a 4-H agent, home economist, agricultural agent, community and economic development agent, Parent instructions, Nutrition instructions, Breast feeding instructors].

<1> YES 
<5> NO 
<8> DO NOT KNOW 
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER
Taking all types of contact you or members of your family have had with MSU Extension in the past 12 months into consideration, how would you rate the quality of educational program offered by MSU Extension?

Would you say they were excellent, very good, good, fair, or Poor?

<1> EXCELLENT
<2> VERY GOOD
<3> GOOD
<4> FAIR
<5> POOR
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

Do you own or regularly use a computer that has access to the Internet or World-Wide-Web?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER

NOW, WE ARE ALMOST FINISHED, I JUST HAVE A FEW BACKGROUND QUESTIONS WHICH WILL HELP US KNOW OUR SAMPLE INDEED REPRESENTS ADULTS ACROSS THE STATE.

Record gender of respondent here, ask only if in doubt:

<1> MALE
<5> FEMALE

In what year were you born?

YEAR

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

<0> DID NOT GO TO SCHOOL
<1-11> GRADE
<12> HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR GED HOLDER
<13-15> SOME COLLEGE (ONE TO THREE YEARS)
<16> COLLEGE GRADUATE (FOUR YEARS)
<17> SOME POST GRADUATE
<18> GRADUATE DEGREE
<20> TECHNICAL SCHOOL OR JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADUATE

Are you engaged in any type of farming or production agriculture?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED/NO ANSWER
If yes, what type of farm do you operate or work in?

[DEF: IF THE RESPONDENT MENTIONS TWO THINGS, ASK 'Which one would you say brings you the most income or takes up most of your time?']

<1> LIVESTOCK/DAIRY
<2> POULTRY/TURKEY
<3> ROW CROPS
<4> ORCHARD
<5> VEGETABLES
<6> FORAGES
<7> OTHERS

Which of the following describes your racial background? Would you say African-American or Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American, or White or Caucasian?

<1> AFRICAN-AMERICAN OR BLACK
<2> ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
<3> NATIVE AMERICAN
<4> WHITE OR CAUCASIAN
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED TO ANSWER

Are you of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Spanish, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or another Latin American background?

<1> YES
<5> NO
<8> DO NOT KNOW
<9> REFUSED TO ANSWER

Are you currently married, divorced, separated, widowed, member of an unmarried couple, or have you never been married?

<1> MARRIED
<2> DIVORCED
<3> SEPARATED
<4> WIDOWED
<5> MEMBER OF AN UNMARRIED COUPLE
<6> SINGLE, NEVER BEEN MARRIED
<9> REFUSED-NO ANSWER

Including yourself, how many individuals live in your household?

<---> PERSONS
<99> REFUSED-NO ANSWER
We are interested in learning about the different ways people may earn their living. Last week, were you working full-time, part-time, going to school, a home-maker or something else?

[DEF: IF THE RESPONDENT MENTIONS TWO THINGS, ASK 'Which one would you say you do the most or takes up most of your time?'][n]

- <0> SELF EMPLOYED EITHER FULL OR PART TIME
- <1> WORK FULL TIME
- <2> WORK PART TIME
- <3> WORK AND GO TO SCHOOL
- <4> IN THE ARMED FORCES
- <5> HAVE A JOB, BUT NOT AT WORK LAST WEEK (ON VACATION OR LEAVE)
- <6> UNEMPLOYED, LAID OFF, LOOK FOR WORK
- <7> RETIRED
- <8> SCHOOL FULL TIME
- <9> HOME-MAKER
- <10> DISABLED

To get a picture of people's financial situations, we'd like to know the general range of incomes of all households we interview. This is for statistical analysis purposes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. What is the gross annual income of your household--that is, before taxes or other deductions?

- <1> Less than $10,000
- <2> $10,000 - $14,999
- <3> $25,000 - $49,999
- <4> $50,000 - $99,000
- <5> $100,000 - $249,000
- <6> $250,000 - $499,000
- <6> $500,000 - or more
- <99> REFUSED-NO ANSWER

In which county do you live (County of primary residence)?

NAME OF COUNTY
Appendix B

Respondents by type of community (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural community</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city/town/village</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by racial background (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents of Hispanic background (n= 1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic background</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Education Level (n=1153).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th grade or less</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad/GED</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college (1-3 yrs)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or higher</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by age (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by MSUE Region (n=1156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Lower Peninsula</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C
Most often-stated community problems by MSUE region.

Upper Peninsula (n=104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment/jobs/lack of jobs</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/road repair/street upkeep</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/drug dealers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes/city taxes/city finance/high taxes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northern Lower Peninsula (n=111).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development/growth/economy</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overexpansion/too much growth</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment/jobs/lack of jobs</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous other (not specific)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Central (n=151).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overexpansion/too much growth</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs/gang violence/teenage trouble</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Central (n=128).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activities/things for kids to do</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/drug dealers</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs/gang violence/teenage trouble</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southwest (n=130).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/drug dealers</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/public schools</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overexpansion/too much growth</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southeast (n=270).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools/improving education</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/drug dealers</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/road repair/street upkeep</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>