

5-1985

# Survey Results and Demographic Data for United Catholic Social Services' Family Services

David R. DiMartino  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Vincent J. Webb  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives>

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

DiMartino, David R. and Webb, Vincent J., "Survey Results and Demographic Data for United Catholic Social Services' Family Services" (1985). *Publications Archives, 1963-2000*. 236.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives/236>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Public Affairs Research at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications Archives, 1963-2000 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



105

**SURVEY RESULTS  
AND  
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA  
FOR  
UCSS FAMILY SERVICES**

May, 1985



**Center for Applied Urban Research  
University of Nebraska at Omaha**



This project was coordinated by David DiMartino and Vincent Webb of the Center for Applied Urban Research at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. They were assisted by Denise Mueting, Robert Hober, Carol Light, Karla Dorsey, Pelgy Vaz, Emma Elliot, Clay Schutz, and Patricia Purnell. Shehu Zubairu assisted with the preparation of maps. Joyce Carson and Loni Saunders typed the tables. Special thanks to Ann Becker of United Catholic Social Services for her valuable input and assistance.

**TABLES OF  
SURVEY RESULTS**

TABLE 1

## FREQUENCY OF CONTACT BY PEOPLE WITH PERSONAL AND FAMILY PROBLEMS

Frequency	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	5	62.5	5	15.2	16	19.8	7	17.1	3	14.3
Weekly	3	37.5	11	33.3	33	40.7	13	31.7	7	33.3
Monthly	—	—	6	18.2	18	22.2	2	4.9	3	14.3
Occasionally	—	—	9	27.3	13	16.0	10	24.4	6	28.6
Not at all	—	—	2	6.1	1	1.2	9	22.0	2	9.5
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	81	100.0	41	100.0	21	100.0

TABLE 2

## FREQUENCY OF REQUEST FOR INTERVENTION

Frequency	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	4	50.0	1	3.2	11	13.8	4	12.5	2	10.5
Weekly	4	50.0	8	25.8	28	35.0	8	25.0	4	21.1
Monthly	—	—	8	25.8	14	17.5	2	6.3	1	5.3
Occasionally	—	—	11	35.5	23	28.8	15	46.9	9	47.4
Not at all	—	—	3	9.7	4	5.0	3	9.4	3	15.8
Total	8	100.0	31	100.0	80	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0

TABLE 3

## FREQUENCY OF REFERRALS TO PROGRAM COUNSELING SERVICES

Frequency	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	6.3	1	5.3
Weekly	2	25.0	7	22.6	11	13.6	4	12.5	1	5.3
Monthly	3	37.5	9	29.0	19	23.5	4	12.5	6	31.6
Occasionally	3	37.5	12	38.7	43	53.1	17	53.1	11	57.9
Not at all	—	—	3	9.7	7	8.6	5	15.6	—	—
Don't know	—	—	—	—	1	1.2	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	31	100.0	81	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0

TABLE 4

## PROPORTION OF PERSONS REFERRED THAT SEEK SERVICES

Frequency	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All	1	12.5	2	7.1	7	9.5	1	3.6	—	—
Most	5	62.5	19	67.9	37	50.0	9	32.1	9	47.4
Few	2	25.0	7	25.0	21	28.4	7	25.0	8	42.1
None	—	—	—	—	1	1.4	—	—	—	—
Don't know	—	—	—	—	8	10.8	11	39.3	2	10.5
Total	8	100.0	28	100.0	74	100.0	28	100.0	19	100.0



TABLE 5  
REQUEST FOR COUNSELING SERVICES

Types of Counseling	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Individual</b>										
Yes	8	100.0	24	80.0	72	87.8	25	80.6	14	73.7
No	—	—	6	20.0	10	12.2	6	19.4	5	26.3
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	31	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Marriage</b>										
Yes	3	37.5	13	43.3	79	96.3	18	56.3	11	57.9
No	5	62.5	17	56.7	3	3.7	14	43.8	8	42.1
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Family</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	27	90.0	64	78.0	22	68.8	14	73.7
No	2	25.0	3	10.0	18	22.0	10	31.3	5	26.3
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Pre-marriage</b>										
Yes	4	50.0	3	10.0	74	90.2	8	25.0	3	15.8
No	4	50.0	27	90.0	8	9.8	24	75.0	16	84.2
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Parent/Child</b>										
Yes	8	100.0	28	93.3	53	64.6	18	56.3	12	63.2
No	—	—	2	6.7	29	35.4	14	43.8	7	36.8
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Pregnancy</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	2	6.7	45	54.9	8	25.0	4	21.1
No	2	25.0	28	93.3	37	45.1	24	75.0	15	78.9
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Divorce/Separation</b>										
Yes	4	50.0	16	53.3	65	80.2	19	59.4	11	57.9
No	4	50.0	14	46.7	16	19.8	13	40.6	8	42.1
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	81	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Child Abuse/Incest</b>										
Yes	4	50.0	8	26.7	30	36.6	6	18.8	5	26.3
No	4	50.0	22	73.3	52	63.4	26	81.3	14	73.7
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Single Parent</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	22	73.3	45	54.9	13	41.9	9	47.4
No	2	25.0	8	26.7	37	45.1	18	58.1	10	52.6
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	31	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Spouse Abuse</b>										
Yes	1	12.5	4	13.3	39	47.6	6	18.8	4	21.1
No	7	87.5	26	86.7	43	52.4	26	81.3	15	78.9
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Stress</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	17	56.7	55	67.1	21	65.6	12	63.2
No	2	25.0	13	43.3	27	32.9	11	34.4	7	36.8
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Grief/Loss</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	14	46.7	66	80.5	24	75.0	10	52.6
No	2	25.0	16	53.3	16	19.5	8	25.0	9	47.4
Total	8	100.0	30	100.0	82	100.0	32	100.0	19	100.0

TABLE 6

## ESTIMATED NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR COUNSELING IN AN AVERAGE MONTH

Type of Counseling	Number of Times Requested											
	0-5		6-10		11 or More		Don't Know		Varies		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Individual	108	76.1	21	14.8	12	8.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	142	100.0
Marriage	100	82.6	16	13.2	3	2.5	1	0.8	1	0.8	121	100.0
Family	110	87.3	13	10.3	2	1.6	1	0.8	0	0.0	126	100.0
Pre-marriage	64	71.9	15	16.9	8	9.0	1	1.1	1	1.1	89	100.0
Parent/child	98	86.0	13	11.4	2	1.8	1	0.9	0	0.0	114	100.0
Pregnancy	56	87.5	6	9.4	1	1.6	1	1.6	0	0.0	64	100.0
Divorce/separation	96	86.5	11	9.9	2	1.8	1	0.9	1	0.9	111	100.0
Child abuse/incest	46	88.5	5	9.6	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0	52	100.0
Single parent	81	87.1	9	9.7	1	1.1	1	1.1	1	1.1	93	100.0
Spouse abuse	46	86.8	5	9.4	0	0.0	1	1.9	1	1.9	53	100.0
Stress	90	86.5	12	11.5	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	104	100.0
Grief/loss	98	86.7	11	9.7	1	0.9	2	1.8	1	0.9	113	100.0

TABLE 7

## INDIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF PERSONS SEEKING COUNSELING SERVICES

Type of Counseling	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Individual										
Yes	7	87.5	21	63.6	61	76.3	32	78.0	13	65.0
No	1	12.5	11	33.3	19	23.8	9	22.0	7	35.0
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	41	100.0	20	100.0
Marriage										
Yes	5	62.5	18	54.5	66	82.5	28	68.3	13	68.4
No	3	37.5	14	42.4	14	17.5	13	31.7	6	31.6
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	41	100.0	19	100.0
Family										
Yes	8	100.0	25	75.8	60	75.0	27	67.5	15	75.0
No	—	—	7	21.2	20	25.0	13	32.5	5	25.0
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	40	100.0	20	100.0
Pre-marriage										
Yes	7	87.5	13	39.4	59	73.8	20	52.6	11	61.1
No	1	12.5	19	57.6	21	26.3	18	47.4	7	38.9
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	38	100.0	18	100.0
Parent/Child										
Yes	8	100.0	23	69.7	55	68.8	23	60.5	12	60.0
No	—	—	9	27.3	25	31.3	15	39.5	8	40.0
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	38	100.0	20	100.0
Pregnancy										
Yes	6	75.0	13	39.4	48	60.0	21	55.3	9	50.0
No	2	25.0	19	57.6	32	40.0	17	44.7	9	50.0
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	38	100.0	18	100.0
Divorce/Separation										
Yes	5	62.5	22	66.7	57	71.3	25	65.8	12	66.7
No	3	37.5	10	30.3	23	28.8	13	34.2	6	33.3
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	38	100.0	18	100.0
Child Abuse/Incest										
Yes	5	62.5	12	36.4	36	46.2	18	47.4	7	38.9
No	3	37.5	20	60.6	42	53.8	20	52.6	11	61.1
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	78	100.0	38	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE 7 - Continued

## INDIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF PERSONS SEEKING COUNSELING SERVICES

Type of Counseling	Respondents									
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Single Parent</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	21	63.6	49	61.3	22	56.4	12	66.7
No	2	25.0	11	33.3	31	38.8	17	43.6	6	33.3
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	39	100.0	18	100.0
<b>Spouse Abuse</b>										
Yes	5	62.5	11	33.3	38	48.7	18	46.2	7	38.9
No	3	37.5	21	63.6	40	51.3	21	53.8	11	61.1
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	78	100.0	39	100.0	18	100.0
<b>Stress</b>										
Yes	5	62.5	21	63.6	55	68.8	25	65.8	14	73.7
No	3	37.5	11	33.3	25	31.3	13	34.2	5	26.3
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	38	100.0	19	100.0
<b>Grief/Loss</b>										
Yes	6	75.0	15	45.5	55	69.6	25	65.8	11	61.1
No	2	25.0	17	51.5	24	30.4	13	34.2	7	38.9
Don't know	—	—	1	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	79	100.0	38	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE 8

## FREQUENCY OF REPORTED COUNSELING NEEDS

Type of Counseling	Frequency									
	Very Frequently		Somewhat Frequently		Infrequently		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Individual	14	10.5	72	54.1	46	34.6	1	0.8	133	100.0
Marriage	14	10.9	53	41.1	61	47.3	1	0.8	129	100.0
Family	14	10.4	67	49.6	53	39.3	1	0.7	135	100.0
Pre-marriage	22	19.6	39	34.8	50	44.6	1	0.9	112	100.0
Parent/child	13	10.6	61	49.6	48	39.0	1	0.8	123	100.0
Pregnancy	7	7.1	38	38.8	52	53.1	1	1.0	98	100.0
Divorce/separation	15	12.6	55	46.2	48	40.3	1	0.8	119	100.0
Child abuse/incest	6	7.2	22	26.5	54	65.1	1	1.2	83	100.0
Single parent	9	8.3	50	45.9	49	45.0	1	0.9	109	100.0
Spouse abuse	3	3.7	21	25.9	56	69.1	1	1.2	81	100.0
Stress	14	12.0	54	46.2	48	41.0	1	0.9	117	100.0
Grief/loss	14	12.1	48	41.4	53	45.7	1	0.9	116	100.0

TABLE 9

## FAMILIARITY WITH CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICE COUNSELING UNIT

Frequency	Respondent											
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very familiar	3	37.5	6	18.2	29	35.4	9	22.0	6	28.6	53	28.6
Somewhat familiar	5	62.5	25	75.8	49	59.8	24	58.5	14	66.7	117	63.2
Not familiar	—	—	2	6.1	4	4.9	8	19.5	1	4.8	15	8.1
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	82	100.0	41	100.0	21	100.0	185	100.0

TABLE 10

AWARENESS OF FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICES OFFERED  
BY UCSS AT ITS CENTRAL OFFICE

Respondent	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	8	100.0	—	—	8	100.0
Principal	30	93.8	2	6.3	32	100.0
Priest	77	97.5	2	2.5	79	100.0
Deacon	32	94.1	2	5.9	34	100.0
Leader	20	95.2	1	4.8	21	100.0
Total	167	96.0	7	4.0	174	100.0

TABLE 11

## AWARENESS OF FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICES AT ST. JAMES CENTER

Respondent	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	7	87.5	1	12.5	8	100.0
Principal	19	59.4	13	40.6	32	100.0
Priest	61	77.2	18	22.8	79	100.0
Deacon	23	67.6	11	32.4	34	100.0
Leader	18	85.7	3	14.3	21	100.0
Total	128	73.6	46	26.4	174	100.0



TABLE 12

## LOCATION AS A FACTOR IN MAKING REFERRALS TO UCSS

Respondent	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	100.0
Principal	13	40.6	19	59.4	32	100.0
Priest	28	35.4	51	64.6	79	100.0
Deacon	10	29.4	24	70.6	34	100.0
Leader	5	23.8	16	76.2	21	100.0
Total	60	34.5	114	65.5	174	100.0

TABLE 13

## REFERRALS CONTINGENT UPON CLOSER UCSS SITE

Respondent	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	2	25.0	6	75.0	8	100.0
Principal	13	43.3	17	56.7	30	100.0
Priest	19	25.7	55	74.3	74	100.0
Deacon	10	38.5	16	61.5	26	100.0
Leader	7	35.0	13	65.0	20	100.0
Total	51	32.3	107	67.7	158	100.0

TABLE 14

## DESIRABLE LOCATION

Location	Respondent											
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
South of Dodge and East of 90th Street	1	50.0	1	7.7	1	5.6	1	10.0	1	14.3	5	10.0
South of Dodge and West of 90th Street	—	—	2	15.4	7	38.9	2	20.0	1	14.3	12	24.0
North of Dodge and East of 90th Street	—	—	2	15.4	1	5.6	1	10.0	2	28.6	6	12.0
North of Dodge and West of 90th Street	—	—	—	—	2	11.1	1	10.0	—	—	3	6.0
Northeast Omaha	1	50.0	2	15.4	3	16.7	2	20.0	1	14.3	9	18.0
Bellevue	—	—	1	7.7	1	5.6	1	10.0	2	28.6	5	10.0
Southeast Omaha	—	—	2	15.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	4.0
Fremont	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	10.0	—	—	1	2.0
South Omaha	—	—	1	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2.0
Don't know	—	—	—	—	1	5.6	—	—	—	—	1	2.0

TABLE 15

## MINIMUM AVAILABILITY OF COUNSELORS AT EACH SITE

Respondents	Times											
	Daily		Twice Per Week		Once Per Week		Don't Know		Varies		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	5	62.5	3	37.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	100.0
Principal	7	21.9	19	59.4	3	9.4	2	6.3	1	3.1	32	100.0
Priest	34	42.5	25	31.3	9	11.3	12	15.0	—	—	80	100.0
Deacon	14	35.9	16	41.0	6	15.4	1	2.6	2	5.1	39	100.0
Leader	10	50.0	6	30.0	3	15.0	1	5.0	—	—	20	100.0
Total of Respondents	70	39.1	69	38.5	21	11.7	16	8.9	3	1.7	179	100.0

TABLE 16

## CONVENIENT TIMES FOR PERSONS NEEDING COUNSELING

Respondent	Weekdays		Week Evenings		Weekends		Don't Know		Varies	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	1	12.5	5	62.5	—	—	—	—	2	25.0
Principal	6	18.2	24	72.7	2	6.1	—	—	1	3.0
Priest	10	12.3	61	75.3	1	1.2	2	2.5	7	8.6
Deacon	4	10.3	26	66.7	3	7.7	1	2.6	5	12.8
Leader	6	30.0	12	60.0	—	—	—	—	2	10.0
Total of Respondents	27	14.9	128	70.7	6	3.3	3	1.7	17	9.4

TABLE 17

## MOST PRODUCTIVE MEANS FOR DEVELOPING AWARENESS OF UCSS SERVICE

Means	Respondent											
	Counselor		Principal		Priest		Deacon		Leader		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Regular meetings	2	25.0	8	24.2	10	12.5	4	10.3	3	15.0	27	15.0
Regular mailings	5	62.5	21	63.6	46	57.5	16	41.0	16	80.0	104	57.8
Newspaper articles	1	12.5	3	9.1	19	23.8	18	46.2	—	—	41	22.8
Meetings and mailings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	5.0	1	0.6
Don't know	—	—	—	—	4	5.0	—	—	—	—	5	2.8
Varies	—	—	1	3.0	1	1.3	1	2.6	—	—	2	1.1
Total	8	100.0	33	100.0	80	100.0	39	100.0	20	100.0		

TABLE 18

## HELPFUL SERVICES TO RESPONDENT, SCHOOLS, AND GROUPS

Type of Services	Helpful to Respondent								Helpful to Schools								Helpful to Groups							
	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In service programs	120	66.3	54	29.8	7	3.9	181	100.0	117	69.2	45	26.6	7	4.1	169	100.0	128	71.1	46	25.6	6	3.3	180	100.0
Skills training	94	51.9	84	46.4	3	1.7	181	100.0	103	59.9	64	37.2	5	2.9	172	100.0	116	64.1	60	33.1	5	2.8	181	100.0
Consultation on specific counseling areas	141	77.5	36	19.8	5	2.7	182	100.0	128	75.3	35	20.6	7	4.1	170	100.0	128	70.3	46	25.3	8	4.4	182	100.0
Referral information	160	87.4	20	10.9	3	1.6	183	100.0	142	82.6	24	14.0	6	3.5	172	100.0	149	82.3	27	14.9	5	2.8	181	100.0
Adult education	109	59.6	70	38.3	4	2.2	183	100.0	110	64.7	54	31.8	6	3.5	170	100.0	140	76.9	37	20.3	5	2.7	182	100.0
Facilitate support groups	124	68.9	49	27.2	7	3.9	180	100.0	121	71.2	41	24.1	8	4.7	170	100.0	137	75.7	37	20.4	7	3.9	181	100.0

TABLE 19

## NEEDS ADDRESSED BY PRESENT PROGRAMS

Respondent	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	5	62.5	2	25.0	1	12.5	8	100.0
Principal	16	50.0	4	12.5	12	37.5	32	100.0
Priest	65	80.2	4	4.9	12	14.8	81	100.0
Deacon	24	60.0	3	7.5	13	32.5	40	100.0
Leader	13	61.9	7	33.3	1	4.8	21	100.0
Total of Respondents	123	67.6	20	11.0	39	21.4	182	100.0



TABLE 20

REFERRALS MADE TO PRIVATE THERAPISTS AND SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES  
(Excluding UCSS)

Respondent	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Counselor	7	87.5	1	12.5	8	100.0
Principal	30	90.9	3	9.1	33	100.0
Priest	40	50.0	40	50.0	80	100.0
Deacon	23	56.1	18	43.9	41	100.0
Leader	15	71.4	6	28.6	21	100.0
Total of Respondents	115	62.8	68	37.2	183	100.0

**SURVEY RESULTS  
FOR  
SERVICE PROVIDERS**



5. Would you make referrals to the UCSS counseling unit if a site was located closer to your location?

yes 2  
no 9

IF YES, ASK:

5a. What location would be desirable?

READ

Omaha, south of Dodge and east of 90th \_\_\_\_\_  
Omaha, south of Dodge and west of 90th 1  
Omaha, north of Dodge and east of 90th \_\_\_\_\_  
Omaha, north of Dodge and west of 90th \_\_\_\_\_  
Northeast Omaha \_\_\_\_\_  
Bellevue area \_\_\_\_\_

DON'T READ

other: 12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IF NO, ASK:

5b. Why not?

ALLOW THREE RESPONSES

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

6. Scheduling is an important consideration in providing counseling services. At a minimum, how often should UCSS counselors be available at each site:

daily, 6  
twice per week, 3  
once per week? 1

7. Which times do you feel are most convenient for those in need of services:

weekdays, 1  
week, evenings, 10  
weekends? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Which of the following would be most productive in making you or potential users more aware of new or existing UCSS services:

- a. regularly scheduled meetings with UCSS professionals, 2
- b. regular mailings from the UCSS Director and staff, 10
- c. or newspaper articles, including the Catholic Voice? \_\_\_\_\_

8b. Do you have any other suggestions for improving awareness?

yes 6  
no \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES, ASK:

What?

ALLOW THREE RESPONSES

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

9. Do existing service programs adequately address current, specific needs?

yes 5  
no 3  
don't know 5

IF NO, ASK:

9b. What needs are not being addressed?

ALLOW THREE RESPONSES

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

SAY

We appreciate your assistance in helping UCSS to plan for strengthened community service programs.

10. Would you like to make any other comments or observations that you feel would be helpful to UCSS?

ALLOW THREE RESPONSES

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

SAY

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

**SURVEY RESULTS  
FOR  
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

Responses to Open Ended Questions

11A. Location desirable

5A of service provider question

southeast  
downtown  
Fremont  
South Omaha

11B. 5b of service provider question Why not making referrals?

I. Location factors

location not a factor in making referrals  
already make all referrals to location  
location is close enough  
wants more locations  
locations are inadequate

II. Individual factors

depends on individuals  
people are resistant  
lack of confidence  
language problem

III. Other services

has own therapist  
uses other counseling services  
have to go just as far to other services

IV. Miscellaneous

money is a factor  
rather not say

14b & 8b of service provider question

Suggestions for Awareness

I. Meetings and contact with priests

more training (work) needed with clergy  
more connection between UCSS and parish  
meetings with UCSS staff & priests/priests

II. Meetings and contact with schools, principals

orientate principals  
UCSS staff go to schools  
deanery meetings where principals meet

### III. Meetings and contacts with parishes

announcements at meetings and churches  
 use local churches for advertisement  
 UCSS staff go to parishes

### IV. Meetings and contact by UCSS Staff

visibility as individuals  
 personal contacts  
 do outreach  
 get out into field  
 have special meetings advertising  
 seminar in (pymthology)?/services counseling  
 seminars  
 use speakers bureau  
 need to work more with clients

### V. Information Services

fliers, brochures  
 list services  
 keep people posted to available services  
 bulletins, billboards  
 articles in Catholic Voice  
 mailings  
 commercial advertisements i.e. TV, radio, cable TV, press  
 Quarterly Press, Good News publications  
 Acts of the Apostles publication  
 advertise in newspaper  
 saturate press  
 World Herald  
 through parish information  
 marketing firms  
 word of mouth  
 combination of mailings, articles and meetings  
 conduct survey on consumers  
 professional referrals

### VI. Specific information from UCSS

information on specialized areas  
 notice from UCSS on focus programs  
 knowledge of how program operates

### VII. Services

fees are too high  
 not sure who is going to help client  
 more help for poor families  
 accomodate schedules  
 get back to client quicker



## (Suggestions for Awareness Continued)

let people know cost  
 have payment plan  
 hot line number  
 crisis intervention  
 make own referrals

## VII. Counselors

need to be prepared  
 knowledge of who counselors are  
 need stable staff  
 consistency as individuals

16b and 9B of service provider questionnaire

## Needs Not Met

## I. Specific Services

in school programs  
 teenage pregnancy/adoption  
 youth services  
 financial assistance services  
 affordable programs for children and chemical dependents  
 single parent services  
 individual counseling  
 family counseling  
 divorce services  
 parent support services  
 employment training  
 elderly services  
 information on services  
 more room needed at shelter  
 Operation Bridge  
 language problems

## II. Scheduling and Availability

availability of counselors  
 after school/evening hours  
 more counselors

## III. Location needs

closer location  
 location problems

## IV. Information

lack of feedback  
 information on counselors

## 17D Not included on service provider questionnaire

## Referrals to other agencies, for What Services

## I. For Specific Services

## A. Vocational Services

- jobs
- vocational counseling
- employee assistance

## B. Psychological/Psychiatric services/specialized areas

- psychological counseling
- psychotherapy
- mental health problems
- suicidal counseling
- psychiatric counseling
- psychiatric counseling
- behavior counseling
- behavior modification
- learning problems

## C. Testing

- testing
- academic testing
- specific testing

## D. Basic Support Services

- professional accounting services
- consumer services
- welfare services
- monetary/financial
- food/housing
- food pantry

## E. Medical and Legal Service (professional)

- doctors
- nursing
- medical
- medical/legal services
- legal service
- legal aid
- attorneys

## For What Services

## F. Chemical Dependency

chemical dependency  
 drug counseling  
 alcohol/drugs  
 alcohol counseling

## G. Pregnancy/Adoption Services

pregnancy  
 adoptions  
 pregnancy counseling

## H. Individual and Family Services

personal contact  
 counseling  
 individual/personal counseling  
 personal/family  
 individual/family  
 family counseling  
 marriage/family  
 marriage counseling  
 parenting  
 family, stress problems  
 family/parent/child  
 parenting  
 child/parent

## III. For Specific Agencies

Eppley  
 Lutharan Social Services  
 Salvation Army  
 Boys Town  
 United Way  
 SID Foundation  
 Multi-Service Ctr-Bellevue  
 Meyer Rehabilitation  
 NPI  
 NPI

## IV. Mics.

(left blank?)  
 all of them

## 18B to 10B of Service Provider Questionnaire

## I. Positive Observations

support counseling excellent  
 provide good services  
 satisfied with UCSS  
 program available to many people  
 pregnancy counseling excellent  
 services getting better  
 uniqueness of services, no duplication

## II. Suggestions for Improvements

train staff/counselors better  
 increase Spanish speaking services  
 help poor with meals  
 need emergency shelter  
 provide bus service  
 UCSS determine priority to Catholic families  
 keep program simple

## III. Negative Observations

UCSS very impersonal  
 not direction enough  
 lack of successful outcome of referrals  
 counseling doesn't follow Catholic standards

## IV. Better Information

need brochures on services  
 boost credibility  
 lack of information relating to program success  
 more awareness of programs  
 more information on counselors  
 should communicate about services provided  
 personal contact from UCSS  
 how UCSS would make referrals  
 better feedback from counselors  
 must define intervention counseling  
 consultant needed  
 have Director visit site

## V. Money/Financial Observations

be able to finance services  
 too much emphasis on money  
 prices too high

## 18B to 10B Other Comments and Observations

## VI. Location

closer location  
services located in northwest Omaha

## VII. Availability of counselors and scheduling

cancellation of appointments a problem  
more services needed evening hours  
referrals have to wait to get in  
increase staff  
need more direct care therapists  
volunteer counselor program  
use para-professionals

## VIII. Priests/Parish

acquaint counselors and priests  
UCSS work closer with deacons  
locate counselors close to parish

## IX. School

work through home/school associations  
contact principals for inputs  
get back to school regarding treatment

## X. Social

help people get back to school  
reduce stigma of getting counseling  
bridge gap of people needing services and available services

## XI. Other Agencies

hardly refer to UCSS  
like College of St. Mary's

## XII. Survey

more information on survey results  
survey very broad  
not satisfied with survey  
satisfied with survey  
ask why UCSS not used

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewer initials: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Category of respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Appointment times: a. \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. \_\_\_\_\_

Case number: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Category of respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sex of respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

SAY

“Hello, I’m \_\_\_\_\_ from the University of Nebraska at Omaha. We’re conducting a short survey for United Catholic Social Services concerning parish counseling needs. You were mailed a letter letting you know that we would be calling. We would like to ask you a few questions.”

READ CHOICES

Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Occasionally, or Not at all?

1. How often are you contacted by people with personal and family problems: \_\_\_\_\_

IF NOT AT ALL, GO TO 6

2. How often are you asked to intervene in those problems: \_\_\_\_\_

3. How often do you refer those people to program counseling services: \_\_\_\_\_

IF NOT AT ALL, GO TO 5

READ CHOICES

All, Most, Few, or None?

DON'T READ

Don't know

4. What proportion of persons you refer actually seek services: \_\_\_\_\_

5a. Please tell me whether people have approached you seeking any of the following counseling services?

IF YES, ASK:

5b. For \_\_\_\_\_, how many have sought counseling in an average month:  
0-5, 6-10, or 11 or more?

	yes	no	0-5,	6-10,	or 11 or more?
a. Individual counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Marriage counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Family counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Pre-marriage counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Parent/child counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Pregnancy counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Divorce/separation counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Child abuse/incest counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Single parent counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Spouse abuse counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. Stress counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
l. Grief loss counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

IF YES, RETURN TO 5b ABOVE

6a. Do you hear of other people who, while not approaching you, are seeking any of the following counseling services?

IF YES, ASK:

6b. How often in an average month do you hear of those people concerning \_\_\_\_\_:  
very frequently, somewhat frequently, or infrequently?

	yes	no	very frequently,	somewhat frequently,	or infrequently?
a. Individual counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Marriage counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Family counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Pre-marriage counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Parent/child counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Pregnancy counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Divorce/separation counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Child abuse/incest counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Single parent counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Spouse abuse counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. Stress counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
l. Grief loss counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

IF YES, RETURN TO 6b ABOVE

READ CHOICES

Very Familiar, Somewhat Familiar, or Not at all Familiar?

7. How familiar are you with United Catholic Social Services counseling unit:

\_\_\_\_\_

IF NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR, GO TO QUESTION 12.



8. Are you aware that family counseling services are offered by UCSS at its Central Office on South 42nd Street?      yes \_\_\_\_\_  
no \_\_\_\_\_

9. Are you aware that these services are also offered at the St. James Center on North 60th Street?      yes \_\_\_\_\_  
no \_\_\_\_\_

10. Is location a factor in making referrals to the UCSS counseling unit?      yes \_\_\_\_\_  
no \_\_\_\_\_

11. Would you make referrals to the UCSS counseling unit if a site were located closer to your location?      yes \_\_\_\_\_  
no \_\_\_\_\_

**IF YES, ASK:**

11a. What location would be desirable?

**READ**

- Omaha, south of Dodge and east of 90th \_\_\_\_\_
- Omaha, south of Dodge and west of 90th \_\_\_\_\_
- Omaha, north of Dodge and east of 90th \_\_\_\_\_
- Omaha, north of Dodge and west of 90th \_\_\_\_\_
- Northeast Omaha \_\_\_\_\_
- Bellevue area \_\_\_\_\_

**DON'T READ**

other: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**IF NO, ASK:**

11b. Why not?

**ALLOW THREE RESPONSES**

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

12. Scheduling is an important consideration in providing counseling services. At a minimum, how often should UCSS counselors be available at each site?      daily \_\_\_\_\_  
twice per week \_\_\_\_\_  
once per week \_\_\_\_\_

13. Which times do you feel most convenient for those in need of services?      weekdays \_\_\_\_\_  
week, evenings \_\_\_\_\_  
weekends \_\_\_\_\_



SAY

We appreciate your assistance in helping UCSS to plan for strengthened community service programs.

18. Would you like to make any other comments or observations that you feel would be helpful to UCSS?

ALLOW THREE RESPONSES

a. \_\_\_\_\_

b. \_\_\_\_\_

c. \_\_\_\_\_

SAY

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

**CATHOLIC POPULATION**


REGISTERED CATHOLICS BY PARISH AND SUBAREA, 1985

56 Parishes (1984)

1. <u>Urban South Central</u>	Total	Adults	Children
St. Adalbert	585	500	85
St. Bridget	1,218	981	237
St. Francis Assisi	570	515	55
Holy Cross	5,010	3,415	1,595
Our Lady of Lourdes	3,104	1,812	1,292
St. Stanislaus	1,739	1,320	419
St. Thomas More	5,078	3,812	1,266
subtotal	17,304	12,355	4,949
2. <u>Urban South</u>			
St. Agnes	1,290	842	448
St. Anthony	300	289	11
Assumption	1,600	1,250	350
St. Bernadette	4,262	2,678	1,584
Holy Ghost	3,250	2,000	1,250
St. Mary	1,866	1,400	466
Our Lady of Guadalupe			
St. Peter & Paul	3,327	2,385	942
St. Mary (Bellevue)	5,077	2,855	2,222
subtotal	20,972	13,699	7,273
3. <u>Urban Northeast</u>			
St. Benedict	275	200	75
Blessed Sacrament	1,400	1,000	400
St. Cecilia	4,008	3,055	953
Holy Family	569	475	94
Holy Name	2,550	1,925	625
St. John	3,500	3,500	-
St. Richard	1,193	785	408
Sacred Heart	270	200	70
St. Therese	122	110	12
subtotal	13,887	11,250	2,637
4. <u>Urban Northwest</u>			
St. Bernard	5,390	3,497	1,893
St. Elizabeth Ann	2,672	1,566	1,106
St. James	7,308	5,219	2,089
St. Leo	5,775	3,497	2,278
St. Margaret Mary	3,694	2,450	1,244
St. Philip Neri	3,100	2,186	914
Mother of Perpetual Help	80	60	20
St. Pius	4,500	3,200	1,300
St. Francis (Blair)	1,086	600	486
St. Patrick (Elkhorn)	2,138	1,400	738
St. John (Ft. Calhoun)	395	225	170
St. John (Valley)	492	310	182
subtotal	36,630	24,210	12,420


5.	<u>Urban West</u>			
	Christ the King	4,450	3,400	1,050
	St. Joan of Arc	2,882	1,911	971
	St. John Vianney	6,690	3,394	3,296
	Mary Our Queen	4,800	3,500	1,300
	St. Robert	5,907	4,015	1,892
	St. Wenceslaus	4,348	2,154	2,194
	Immaculate Conception (BoysTown)	308	58	250
	St. Patrick's (Gretna)	1,230	730	500
	St. Columbkil (Papillion)	4,543	2,719	1,824
	St. Gerald	4,859	3,400	1,459
	St. Joseph (Springfield)	725	375	350
	subtotal	<u>40,742</u>	<u>25,656</u>	<u>15,086</u>
6.	<u>Urban Southeast</u>			
	St. Ann	740	548	155
	St. Francis Cabrini	1,773	1,500	273
	Immaculate Conception	841	485	356
	St. Joseph	931	791	140
	St. Mary Magdalene	150	150	
	St. Patrick	1,080	900	180
	St. Peter	1,356	1,020	336
	St. Rose	688	652	36
	subtotal	<u>7,559</u>	<u>6,083</u>	<u>1,676</u>
GRAND TOTAL		137,094	93,253	43,841

ARCHDIOCESE SUBAREAS, AND  
METROPOLITAN CENSUS TRACTS:  
OMAHA AND VICINITY, 1980



CENSUS TRACTS  
MAP






Notes: Census Tract 2.99 is not shown on this map.  
 Census Tract 75 extends to the western edge of Douglas County; its entirety is not shown on this map.

**POPULATION/HOUSEHOLD CHANGE**



POPULATION CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980

Population Gain by Census Tract




POPULATION CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980

Population Loss by Census Tract




HOUSEHOLD CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY  
BY CENSUS TRACT,  
1970-1980

Percent Population Gain




HOUSEHOLD CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY  
BY CENSUS TRACT,  
1970-1980

Percent Household Loss









PERCENT POPULATION CHANGE DUE TO NATURAL INCREASE,  
 BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980






## POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS




FEMALES AS A  
PERCENT OF TOTAL  
POPULATION,  
BY CENSUS TRACT

-  39% or less
-  40 to 44%
-  45 to 48%
-  49 to 51%
-  52 to 55%
-  56% or more







PERSONS AGE  
5 TO 13  
AS PERCENT OF  
TOTAL POPULATION  
BY CENSUS TRACT





PERSONS AGE  
14 TO 18  
AS PERCENT OF  
TOTAL POPULATION



MINORITY POPULATIONS IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1980




Percent Non-White




Percent Black

Percent Hispanic








Percent Indian



# PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN BLACK POPULATION

1970-1980

Black Population Gain by Census Tract

-  Tracts with Black loss
-  0.0 to 30.0 percent gain
-  30.1 to 50.0 percent gain
-  50.1 or more percent gain
-  \* Not computed—Black population in 1970 totaled to less than 20 in a tract.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*








0 1 2  
miles

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN BLACK POPULATION

1970-1980


Black Population Loss by Census Tract

-  Tracts with Black gain
-  0.0 to 30.0 percent loss
-  30.1 to 50.0 percent loss
-  50.1 or more percent loss









## ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS










CHANGE IN FAMILY  
POVERTY LEVEL  
1969-1979






RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS AS A PERCENT  
OF ALL HOUSING UNITS



NEED AREAS


"ONE PARENT  
HOUSEHOLDS WITH  
FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER"  
(HOUSEHOLDS WITH  
CHILDREN AND FEMALE  
HOUSEHOLDER BUT NO  
HUSBAND PRESENT),  
AS A PERCENT OF  
ALL HOUSEHOLDS  
WITH CHILDREN,  
BY CENSUS TRACT







POPULATION NOT WORKING AS THE RESULT OF DISABILITY  
AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION, 1980

- 0.1 - 5.0 percent
- ▤ 5.1 - 10.0 percent
- ▥ 10.1 - 12.0 percent
- ▧ 12.1 - 14.0 percent
- ▨ 14.1 or more percent



POPULATION ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AS A PERCENT  
OF TOTAL POPULATION




DEMOGRAPHIC DATA  
FOR  
UCSS FAMILY SERVICES

April 9, 1985



Center for Applied Urban Research  
University of Nebraska at Omaha





Notes: Census Tract 2.99 is not shown on this map.  
 Census Tract 75 extends to the western edge of Douglas County; its entirety is not shown on this map.

**CATHOLIC POPULATION**

REGISTERED CATHOLICS BY PARISH AND SUBAREA, 1985

56 Parishes (1984)

1. <u>Urban South Central</u>	Total	Adults	Children
St. Adalbert	585	500	85
St. Bridget	1,218	981	237
St. Francis Assisi	570	515	55
Holy Cross	5,010	3,415	1,595
Our Lady of Lourdes	3,104	1,812	1,292
St. Stanislaus	1,739	1,320	419
St. Thomas More	5,078	3,812	1,266
subtotal	17,304	12,355	4,949
2. <u>Urban South</u>			
St. Agnes	1,290	842	448
St. Anthony	300	289	11
Assumption	1,600	1,250	350
St. Bernadette	4,262	2,678	1,584
Holy Ghost	3,250	2,000	1,250
St. Mary	1,866	1,400	466
Our Lady of Guadalupe			
St. Peter & Paul	3,327	2,385	942
St. Mary (Bellevue)	5,077	2,855	2,222
subtotal	20,972	13,699	7,273
3. <u>Urban Northeast</u>			
St. Benedict	275	200	75
Blessed Sacrament	1,400	1,000	400
St. Cecilia	4,008	3,055	953
Holy Family	569	475	94
Holy Name	2,550	1,925	625
St. John	3,500	3,500	-
St. Richard	1,193	785	408
Sacred Heart	270	200	70
St. Therese	122	110	12
subtotal	13,887	11,250	2,637
4. <u>Urban Northwest</u>			
St. Bernard	5,390	3,497	1,893
St. Elizabeth Ann	2,672	1,566	1,106
St. James	7,308	5,219	2,089
St. Leo	5,775	3,497	2,278
St. Margaret Mary	3,694	2,450	1,244
St. Philip Neri	3,100	2,186	914
Mother of Perpetual Help	80	60	20
St. Pius	4,500	3,200	1,300
St. Francis (Blair)	1,086	600	486
St. Patrick (Elkhorn)	2,138	1,400	738
St. John (Ft. Calhoun)	395	225	170
St. John (Valley)	492	310	182
subtotal	36,630	24,210	12,420

5. Urban West

Christ the King	4,450	3,400	1,050
St. Joan of Arc	2,882	1,911	971
St. John Vianney	6,690	3,394	3,296
Mary Our Queen	4,800	3,500	1,300
St. Robert	5,907	4,015	1,892
St. Wenceslaus	4,348	2,154	2,194
Immaculate Conception (BoysTown)	308	58	250
St. Patrick's (Gretna)	1,230	730	500
St. Columbkil (Papillion)	4,543	2,719	1,824
St. Gerald	4,859	3,400	1,459
St. Joseph (Springfield)	725	375	350
subtotal	<u>40,742</u>	<u>25,656</u>	<u>15,086</u>

6. Urban Southeast

St. Ann	740	548	155
St. Francis Cabrini	1,773	1,500	273
Immaculate Conception	841	485	356
St. Joseph	931	791	140
St. Mary Magdalene	150	150	
St. Patrick	1,080	900	180
St. Peter	1,356	1,020	336
St. Rose	688	652	36
subtotal	<u>7,559</u>	<u>6,083</u>	<u>1,676</u>


GRAND TOTAL

137,094

93,253

43,841

ARCHDIOCESE SUBAREAS, AND  
METROPOLITAN CENSUS TRACTS:  
OMAHA AND VICINITY, 1980






**POPULATION/HOUSEHOLD CHANGE**



POPULATION CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980

Population Gain by Census Tract




POPULATION CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980

Population Loss by Census Tract




HOUSEHOLD CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY  
BY CENSUS TRACT,  
1970-1980

Percent Population Gain




HOUSEHOLD CHANGE IN DOUGLAS COUNTY  
BY CENSUS TRACT,  
1970-1980

Percent Household Loss





PERCENT POPULATION CHANGE DUE TO NATURAL INCREASE,  
 BY CENSUS TRACT, 1970 - 1980




## POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

FEMALES AS A  
PERCENT OF TOTAL  
POPULATION,  
BY CENSUS TRACT







PERSONS AGE

0 TO 4


AS PERCENT OF  
TOTAL POPULATION  
BY CENSUS TRACT

0 - 1


2 - 5

6 - 10

11 - 17




PERSONS AGE  
5 TO 13  
AS PERCENT OF  
TOTAL POPULATION  
BY CENSUS TRACT




- 0 to 5%
- 6 to 10%
- 11 to 15%
- 16 to 20%
- More than 20%






MINORITY POPULATIONS IN DOUGLAS COUNTY,  
BY CENSUS TRACT, 1980

Percent Non-White




Percent Black




- 80 - 100
- ▨ 60 - 79.9
- ▧ 40 - 59.9
- ▦ 20 - 39.9
- ▤ 10 - 19.9
- ▣ 5 - 9.9
- \* Area of 50.0%  
or more

Percent Hispanic








Percent Indian



# PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN BLACK POPULATION

1970-1980

Black Population Gain by Census Tract

-  Tracts with Black loss
-  0.0 to 30.0 percent gain
-  30.1 to 50.0 percent gain
-  50.1 or more percent gain
-  \* Not computed—Black population in 1970 totaled to less than 20 in a tract.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*




\*

\*




0 1 2  
miles

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN BLACK POPULATION  
1970-1980  
Black Population Loss by Census Tract





## ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS






MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD  
INCOME, 1979









POOR FAMILIES AS A PERCENT  
OF ALL FAMILIES, 1979




- 0 - 3.0
- ⋯ 3.1 - 5.0
- ⋯ 5.1 - 10.0
- ⋯ 10.1 - 20.0
- ⋯ 20.1 - 35.0
- 35.1+

N  
0 1 2  
miles

CHANGE IN FAMILY  
POVERTY LEVEL  
1969-1979






RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS AS A PERCENT  
OF ALL HOUSING UNITS





NEED AREAS

"ONE PARENT  
HOUSEHOLDS WITH  
FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER"  
(HOUSEHOLDS WITH  
CHILDREN AND FEMALE  
HOUSEHOLDER BUT NO  
HUSBAND PRESENT),  
AS A PERCENT OF  
ALL HOUSEHOLDS  
WITH CHILDREN,  
BY CENSUS TRACT



POPULATION NOT WORKING AS THE RESULT OF DISABILITY  
AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION, 1980





POPULATION ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AS A PERCENT  
OF TOTAL POPULATION

- 0.1 - 5.0 percent
- ▤ 5.1 - 10.0 percent
- ▥ 10.1 - 12.0 percent
- ▧ 12.1 - 14.0 percent
- 14.1 or more percent

