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ABSTRACT

Long-Term Residents' Perception of the Effect Newcomers are Having on Nonmetropolitan Utah Communities

by

Michael Carl Lindholm, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1981

Major Professor: Michael B. Toney
Department: Sociology

This study compares the perceptions of long-term residents in rapidly and moderately growing nonmetropolitan communities regarding the effect of newcomers on the community. Data for the study came from a 1975 survey of 1,065 adults in seven Utah communities. Results show that a significantly larger proportion of long-term residents in rapidly growing communities than in moderately growing communities feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community.

The relationship between perceived effect of newcomers and various personal attributes are examined with rate of population growth as a control variable.

The attributes are: 1) length of residence, 2) age, 3) sex, 4) religious preference, 5) income, 6) proportion family living nearby, and 7) proportion of friends living in the community. Brief attention was given to examining newcomers' perception of the effect
newcomers are having on the community with the use of length of residence variable. The differences between the long-term and short-term residents were not statistically significantly different. But because of theoretical and practical consideration the remainder of the analysis focused on the attitude of long-term residents.

None of the differences between the subgrouping for the respective attributes were statistically significant in both moderate and rapidly growing communities. In rapidly growing communities only one hypothesis was supported with respect to the differences in attitude towards newcomers. The supported hypothesis was that Mormons would be more likely to perceive the effect of newcomers as being bad than would non-Mormons. Within the moderately growing communities, statistically significant differences were found between income groups, but they were not in the direction of the hypothesis.

Perhaps the most important evidence that rate of population growth influences the long-term residents' perception of newcomers is that, except for non-Mormons, the percentage feeling that the effect of newcomers was bad was highest in rapidly growing communities. This indicates that the pressures associated with rapid growth are generally perceived across a wide variety of subgroups. The particular exception, the non-Mormons, suggests that in particular cases a subgroup might perceive the changes as beneficial and to view the overall process of growth, including the newcomers, more positively.
INTRODUCTION

In recent years (post 1970), the nonmetropolitan areas of the United States have experienced a reversal in a long established migration trend. Nonmetropolitan areas have long been subject to population decline from out-migration. But recently, these rural areas have begun to grow in population (Beale, 1975). Out-migration from metropolitan areas now exceeds migration to metropolitan areas. Nonmetropolitan areas, overall, are now growing faster than metropolitan areas. The recent trend is real, relatively widespread, and not confined to areas on the fringe of metropolitan centers (Dejong and Sell, 1977). It has been estimated that between 1970 and 1975 migration to rural areas has increased by 23 percent while the number of residents leaving nonmetropolitan areas during the same time was reduced by 12 percent. Also, during this time the population of nonmetropolitan areas grew by 3.5 million people (Beale, 1975). A persistent concern for rapidly growing communities and probably for most rural communities that have reversed long-standing population decline is the absorption of newcomers. This thesis focuses on the extent to which long-term residents feel newcomers are having a good or bad effect on the community. A brief examination of the perception of newcomers is also provided.

The people that make up this population stream from metropolitan to nonmetropolitan areas are generally making the decision to move on the basis of environment and site characteristics or amenities and not to a great extent on the basis of employment-related factors. Much
of the migration from metropolitan areas may be because of its "unattractiveness" and what are called "urban ills" such as crime, pollution, noise, and overcrowding. The move to rural America is for the attractiveness of the open country, fresh air, lack of congestion, etc. (Williams and Sofranko, 1979). Fuguitt, Zuiches (1975) found in their efforts to identify changes which may be influencing the population turnaround, that a clear preference exists for living in a smaller-sized place in comparison to living within the urban center.

One of the popular explanations for this reversal is that rural areas are growing in population because more and more people desire to live in rural areas to satisfy noneconomic motivations. Another explanation is that employment opportunities in rural areas have increased. For example, rural areas are suppliers of raw material for energy (Rainey, 1976). Therefore, jobs are available in these areas to aid in the extraction of energy resources as the country that is trying to become energy independent. The United States has also been witnessing a decentralization of industry from urban areas to rural areas since the 1960's which increases the employment base of rural America (Scott, 1973). Hence, rural areas are also supplying the characteristic that made cities a desirable place to live—employment.

The migration trend to rural America is widespread affecting every region and subregion of the country (Beale, 1976). Given the impact that population growth can have on the social and economic structures of an area, a continuation of the population turnaround will have significant implications for the future of nonmetropolitan America.
Feelings about whether newcomers are having a good or bad impact on communities is important for several reasons. Whether newcomers are readily welcomed and made to feel "at home" for instance, may be determined in part by these perceptions. Perceptions of newcomers might also have implications for the efforts by communities to limit the number of people who can establish residence. The perception of newcomers may have implications for nonmetropolitan communities trying to attract migrants.

There may be many reasons for long-term residents to feel that newcomers are having a good or bad impact on their community. Of primary importance might be evidence which shows a significant increase in community level problems resulting from rapid population growth. In these communities it seems reasonable that many long-term residents would associate the problems with the arrival of newcomers.

The new people moving into these rural communities may be different in character and attitude from the established residents of the community. The newcomer to rural areas tend to be less satisfied with the local services than the established residents. The inmigrants also tend to have a higher proportion of upper-class white-collar workers. They tend to be younger, more highly educated, more likely to be politically independent of any party affiliation and less likely to claim membership in the dominant religion of the community (Stinner and Toney, 1978; Stinner, Toney and Kan, 1978). Hence, the mere dissimilarities between newcomers and long-term residents might be a basis for feelings toward newcomers. In addition, the status of long-term residents may be associated with whether they feel the effect of
newcomers is bad or good. The long-term residents are likely to feel that they are paying a disproportionate share of the cost associated with the population growth the community is experiencing (Frankena, 1980). While some long-term residents might prosper in some social, psychological, or economic fashion as a result of newcomers, others might be likely to experience or perceive a loss in the quality of their own life (Patton and Stabler, 1979).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitude of long-term rural residents toward newcomers. The newcomers perception of the effect that newcomers are having on the community will also be examined on a limited basis in the section on perceived effect of newcomers' length of residence. The remainder of the study will then focus exclusively on the attitude of long-term residents toward newcomers and the relationships between their perceptions and socio-economic characteristics.

The reasons for the majority of this study focusing on only long-term residents are that the separation of long-term residents from newcomers would be advisable because of the two groups combined may bias the interpretation of the findings. A major theme in the literature is that rapid growth is associated with increases in community level problems, such as crowded schools, crime, alcoholism, and others. These disturbances in the community are likely to be perceived by long-term residents and to form a primary basis for their
perceptions of the effect of newcomers. This is likely because long-term residents and newcomers differ on key characteristics (such as: age composition, education level, income level, and religious preference) that generally affect one's attitudes and behavior (see Appendix). The number of respondents in rapid growth communities who are newcomers is low because only two of the communities were experiencing rapid growth. The number is too low in some cases to obtain statistically valid results for the categorization of variables as it exists for long-term residents.

The elimination of newcomers' attitudes should not be interpreted as an indication that the attitudes of newcomers are not important. But, because of the above factors, and for the practical purpose of limiting the scope of the study, the elimination of newcomers from the majority of the data analysis can be justified on theoretical, empirical, and practical grounds.

Specifically, the thesis will attempt to determine if some long-term residents with different socioeconomic characteristics are more likely to feel newcomers have a bad effect on their community, and if the rate of population growth the community has experienced in the previous five years is related to the attitude of long-term residents towards newcomers. This study explores this attitude by looking at responses to questions asked in a 1975 survey of eight rural Utah communities.

Many impacts associated with population growth have been studied (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976; Stinner, Toney and Kan, 1978; Scott, 1973; Summers, 1976; Cortese and Jones, 1977). But, research on the attitude of residents of rural communities toward
newcomers is greatly needed. Therefore, this study will aid in the understanding of the attitude toward newcomers, and under what conditions they are likely to be positive or negative.

The dependent variable used in this study is the question "Do you feel that the new people moving into this area are having a good or bad effect on this community?" The response categories are: 1) good effect, 2) bad effect, or 3) no effect. The independent variables will be: 1) length of residence, 2) community's rate of population growth, 3) sex, 4) age, 5) religion preference, 6) proportion family living nearby, 7) proportion friends living in same community, and 8) income. Much sociological and demographic literature suggest that these are key variables which may determine whether community residents perceive newcomers as having a good or bad impact on their community.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is divided into four sections. The first provides a description of the recent upturn in migration to nonmetropolitan areas. This section is included because it helps to document the importance of studies on recent migration to nonmetropolitan areas. Obviously feelings toward newcomers is increased in importance by the fact that many rural communities are receiving relatively large numbers of them for the first time in history. The second section of the review concerns reasons for the increased migration to nonmetropolitan areas. It is relevant to this thesis because as with the review of the increases in migration it helps to establish the setting for the analysis. Also, an understanding of why people are moving to nonmetropolitan areas should help to understand why some long-term residents might perceive them as having a bad effect while others perceive the effect as good. The third section addresses the impacts that generally accompany rapid population growth. The fourth section looks at attitudes and characteristics of longtimers and newcomers as they may relate to a basis for potential conflict. These last two sections are more relevant to a later analysis because they provide more of a direct basis for the formulation of hypotheses.

Evidence that Nonmetropolitan Areas are Growing in Population

The historical trend of migration patterns in the United States has been one of people leaving nonmetropolitan areas for metropolitan
areas. If a rural area did increase in population, it was normally due to the traditional high levels of natural increase exceeding the population losses due to migration. In the 1960's and 1970's, fertility levels steadily declined. Thus migration has become a more prominent source in effecting population patterns (Johnson and Purdy, 1980).

The United States' shift to an urban economy has had the effect of pushing people out of the agricultural-rural areas and pulling them to the metropolitan centers. According to Johnson and Purdy (1980), this migration stream of the past 100 years was among the most stable demographic patterns in American history. Recent data indicate a reversal in this pattern with nonmetropolitan countries after 1970 (Beale, 1975). Out-migration from metropolitan areas now exceeds migration to metropolitan areas. Nonmetropolitan areas are, overall, now growing faster than nonmetropolitan areas. The evidence shows that this pattern is real, relatively widespread, and most significantly, not confined to areas surrounding metropolitan centers or one region of the country (Dejong and Sell, 1977). The data also indicate that these population gains in nonmetropolitan America are not a result of metropolitan spill-over. Between 1970 and 1975 nonmetropolitan areas grew by 3.5 million people. Almost 75 percent of all nonmetropolitan counties experienced population increases compared with 47 percent between 1960 and 1970 (Johnson and Purdy, 1980). According to Tucker's (1976) estimates, the number of residents leaving nonmetropolitan areas was reduced by 12 percent between 1970 and 1975, while migration into nonmetropolitan areas
increased by 23 percent. Migration is now the main determinant of change in the size and composition of the nonmetropolitan population in the United States (Deavers and Brown, 1980).

The research done on migration patterns in the United States indicates that many rural areas are now experiencing population growth that in the recent past has been experiencing population decline. This migration trend is widespread and affects every region and subregion of the country (Beale, 1976). Johnson and Purdy (1980) believe that "... given the impacts that population change has on social and economic structures of an area, a continuation of this turnaround has significant implications for the future development of nonmetropolitan America" (Johnson and Purdy, 1980, p. 57).

Before a discussion of the impacts associated with population increase is addressed, let us first examine explanations for this reversal of a long established migration pattern.

Explanations for Population Turnaround

Included among the reasons for the rural population increase are: 1) decentralization of industry and energy resource development and 2) the desirability of living in rural areas in comparison to urban areas. Each of these motivations will be discussed separately.

According to Beale (1976), in the 1960's, one of the main economic trends was the decentralization of manufacturing. In that decade, there was little manufacturing growth nationally, but a substantial shift of plants to small cities and rural locations took place. Manufacturing comprised 50 percent of all job growth in nonmetropolitan employment during this time. From 1970 to 1976,
manufacturing jobs only made up 3 percent of the nonmetropolitan job growth. It was the rapid expansion of jobs in trade and services that accounted for the majority of growth at this time period. Also, Wardwell (1977) found in a national study that retirement mobility, growth of recreation and tourism also contribute to rural population growth. The reason for this decentralization are that rural areas have available: low-priced land, water, drainage, and disposal systems. The rural labor force has the traditional Puritan work ethic, good mechanical skill level, the ability to learn new skills, less unionization and lower wages in addition to the industry's flight from urban ills (Scott, 1973).

Energy resource development also contributed to the increasing population of rural areas by supplying jobs. Rural areas in the United States are suppliers of raw materials for energy, such as coal, natural gas and petro chemicals (Rainey, 1976). As the need for energy increases, so does the needed supply of labor. Simply stated, this part of the explanation for the population turnaround points out that some reasons for moving to rural areas are explained by the fact that there are jobs there and the need for labor is continuing to grow. But there are more reasons for the population turnaround than this factor. The rural areas seem to have an attractive force. Urban residents see rural areas as a place in which they can escape the ills of the metropolitan area and improve their quality of life. In a twelve-state telephone survey, Williams and Sofranko

---

¹When older high-cost plants in urban areas are in need of replacement, the probability is high that new replacement plants will be located in smaller population centers than the older plant (Scott, 1973).
(1979) found that the metropolitan to nonmetropolitan migration stream is characterized by decision making on the basis of environment and site characteristics of amenities, and not to a great extent on the basis of employment-related factors. While nonmetropolitan to metropolitan migrants are more likely to give employment reasons for leaving the rural area, reasons for leaving metropolitan areas in favor of nonmetropolitan areas are centered on the unattractiveness of urban areas and the relative attractiveness of rural areas. These attitudes are expressed in such statements as: "I want to live in open areas"; "I want the rural life"; "I want to get away from the city"; or, "I got tired of the big city." The data available show a clear preference for living in a small-sized place within commuting radius of the metropolitan center, and for smaller sized placed beyond that radius to living within the metropolitan center itself (Williams and Sofranko, 1979). Patton and Stabler (1979) found the most cited reason respondents gave for moving to a rural area was the "small town environment." Baden, Albrecht, and Fullerton (1974) found in a study done in rural Utah, that rural residents are more willing to express satisfaction with their location than are residents of urban places—despite the rural areas lacking in various human services such as health care amenities. Rural area residents also rate their communities high on such characteristics and friendliness of people, access to out-of-doors, and absence of pollution.

Economic considerations have historically determined migration intention (Patton and Stabler, 1979). There is speculation that economic factors have diminished as influences on migration, at least for the new urban/rural stream. Migrants are directed towards
destination areas presumed to be rich in quality of life (Williams and Sofranko, 1979). Characteristics of urban places appear to be pushing people to rural areas due to what are called "external diseconomies." These are costs that firms (industry) and individuals impose on others for which they are not charged, such as noise, pollution, crime, congestion. Rural areas appear to be attracting people with "external diseconomies" such as lack of pollution, friendliness of neighbors, closeness to out-of-doors, or what has commonly been called the "rural environment" (Olson, 1973). For example, a study done by Graber (1974) found that immigrants of a mountain town 47 miles away from Denver felt that what was gained by moving to a rural community was worth the 47-mile commuting distance to Denver for work. Americans have stated that the most desirable place to live is the small town, and more and more people are moving to these rural places (Patton and Stabler, 1979).

The migration turnaround is in part a result of people being pushed away from the urban areas due to what they feel is an undesirable situation, and pulled toward the rural areas in search of improving their quality of life. Today more jobs are being located in rural areas due to decentralization of industry and energy resource development. This is allowing those people with a desire to locate in rural America the opportunity to do so.

Impacts Associated with Population Growth

In the past, most rural towns have welcomed the location of industries in their community. As a matter of fact, local business
associations, as well as public agencies have carried out aggressive programs of industrial and commercial expansion. Local progress was, and still may be, equated with the number of jobs created and dollar increases in local spendings (Urban Land Use Institute, 1975). Rural residents' attitudes regarding community growth include:

"Growth stabilizes or improves the local tax situation by broadening the tax base and reducing per capita tax burdens ..." "Most growth pays its own way and even though some growth may have costs which exceed new tax revenues, the overall benefits (as increased retail spending, etc.) counterbalance the direct cost." "New development brings a broader range of goods and services to the community through secondary and tertiary, as well as primary growth." "Growth improves local wage levels and brings greater flexibility in job opportunities to existing resident workers, women not currently employed, and young persons who might otherwise leave the community for employment possibilities." "Growth brings a wider range of choice in housing types and locations." "Development and expansion eventually result in improved community facilities such as fire and health services, roads, schools, and so forth." (Urban Land Institute, 1975)

Cortese and Jones (1977) found that most people when they first heard of an energy development project coming to their community thought that the rapid increase in population would bring prosperity to the community in which everyone would benefit.

Other studies indicate that development of a rural area does not always result in benefits for the host community. New industry or energy resource development projects often cost the host community more than it gains (Rainey, 1976). When industry moves into a rural
community, that community mainly bears the costs associated with its existence, while the benefits from employment are spread over a larger area (Scott, 1973). Summers (1976) points out that these costs can make a resident wish that industry never came to their town. The host community is expected to supply police and fire protection, road maintenance, and sewage disposal. The new industry has brought environmental costs, such as air, water, and noise pollution. The town also finds that people cost money, and more people cost more money. The major cost to the local government is the delivery of basic services to its residents. As a rule: when population increases it creates a greater need for public services (Clawson, 1976).

As a result of the population turnaround and the subsequent increase in rural populations, rural governments are being pressed to increase their support of public services which includes educational resources, the providing of more housing units (plus the water, sewer, utilities and other services associated with housing), recreational facilities, increased police and fire protection, along with other services (Deavers and Brown, 1980). These demands on a small rural government can be quite disruptive to a community. Problems associated with rapid population growth can be illustrated by looking at boom towns due to energy resource development projects.

The most visual impacts upon a local governmental institution are those that deal with providing basic municipal services to a rapidly expanding population. The government is being asked to do more than they are already doing (Cortese and Jones, 1977).
The following are services commonly delivered to the residents of rural areas and how they are affected by rapid population growth.

Education. The school systems in boom towns are not normally physically prepared for the influx of students, thus overcrowding occurs (Cortese and Jones, 1977). Due to overcrowding, double sessions may result, school taxes will have to rise to keep pace with the expenses of handling more students (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976). Taxpayers are not the only ones to be affected. School teachers find their workload increasing without any compensation in wages. Teachers even find their incomes decreasing due to inflation of prices caused by the rapid growth in population. The quality of learning is damaged due to the transiency of the children of the mobile construction workers. The teachers must spend more time integrating the new students and this distracts from the student's learning experience (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

Social services. The impacts associated with rapid population growth can cause very serious social problems in rural communities. Boom towns in the state of Wyoming have witnessed increases in alcoholism, divorce, and mental health cases (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976). Wechsler (1961) found in a study of a Massachusetts community experiencing rapid population growth that the frequency of hospital depression and suicide is positively associated with a community's population growth rate. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (1976) found that, Human services programs capabilities—medical, educational, recreation, and public safety are often overburdened by rapid growth rates. Expansion of these services always lags behind the influx of people ... . (p. 26)
It is undeniable that human beings need companionship and intimate affection. It is probably one of our strongest human needs. Most societies rely on the family to fulfill these needs, especially in a situation where the surroundings are changing, impersonal and ruthless. The family acts as a sanctuary for social pressures (Horton and Hunt, 1972; Federico, 1979).

Although the family provides emotional support, friends also perform functions important to the individual (Horton and Hunt, 1972). Where the family is not around to provide the family members with companionship and emotional support, friends become very important. Social workers note that problems the family once dealt with are now ending up in the social worker's office (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

The nature of the problems associated with rapid growth differ from those which small town social agencies are accustomed. Beyond this, rural communities have a difficult time attracting professional staff. As a result the social service staff is not qualified to work on the problems that population growth brings. Thus, the clients and community suffers. Of all the social services, the medical services suffer the most. In just a few years, the same number of doctors may be handling double case loads. Extra patient loads are also placed on hospitals. Boom towns appear to have a universal problem of attracting and retaining medical personnel (Cortese and Jones, 1977). This has serious ramifications for the level of health care the residents receive.

Recreation. Dissatisfaction with entertainment opportunities in rural communities experiencing rapid growth is relatively common.
Rural communities generally lack opportunities for indoor recreation. These inadequacies become noticeable once the newcomers start arriving. Some residents of these towns see the recreational opportunities as so limited that they attribute the rise in alcoholism, crime, and juvenile delinquency to the lack of recreational opportunities (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

**Infrastructure.** For many rural communities their existing water systems are not adequate to service the population increase (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976). According to Scott (1973, p. 4) "... utilities for water, sewage and solid waste disposal, electricity and gas are usually poorly developed ...."

**Housing.** Due to the rapid growth in population, there is an increase in the demand for a limited amount of housing. Thus there is an increase in the price of homes, lots, and rent. Because of this short supply of housing, more people are forced to live in mobile homes. Mobile homes are rarely the cause of adverse impacts themselves. It is the scattered location, lack of laundry and recreation facilities, the dirt paths and lack of trees and the isolation for wives and children that cause the problems (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976).

The research done by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (1976) points out that money is where all impacts show up. New pay scales caused by the new industry and new money causes wages to increase beyond the limits of some local business enterprises. These local business people must adapt to more modern advertising and must compete with newcomer entrepreneurs. Sometimes this is too much for
them. Many fold up, retire, move away, or join a national chain operation (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

Landlords raise the rent to whatever the market will bear. Local merchants forget their old friends and the informal way they used to do business and cater to the newcomers to get the "almighty dollar" (Scott, 1973).

To compound these problems, the local government is called on to do things it hasn't ever done before, such as, planning and zoning, conducting new and complicated intergovernmental or government-industry relations, devising new taxation programs, seek federal and state funds. One of the major contributing factors to the problems that occur because of the growth is that twentieth-century municipal services and community decision-making processes are being demanded of nineteen-century government structures in rural communities. The conservative nature of the residents is also restricting the government. The local residents are keeping the local government from engaging in new activities, for example, planning, zoning, and seeking federal aid (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

With rapid population growth comes overcrowding of schools, higher prices and taxes, traffic congestion, pressures put on the housing market, lower quality medical and social services. Loss of the relaxed pace of life and friendly life-style may occur. A community can certainly pay more in cost than it derives benefits from rapid growth.

Certain segments of a community experiencing rapid population growth are impacted more than others. In a study done in Craig,
Colorado by Lantz and McKeown (1978), it was found that even under the best possible conditions, it appears that rapid growth produces a higher number of emotional life stress problems than a comparable increase in populations over a greater period of time. Although everyone in the community is affected by this stress brought on by rapid population growth, the study found that women are greatly impacted by the problems. According to Lantz and McKeown (1978), there is little concern for the needs of women in these communities experiencing rapid growth. Working opportunities are usually limited. The housewife must deal with the inadequate water and disposal systems, a crowded mobile home, and the children. She has few opportunities to pursue personal needs and interests.

Senior citizens can also be adversely impacted from the rapid influx of people. Senior citizens can experience an increase in alienation, which can have the affect of making these older citizens feel like "a stranger in their own land." Most rural communities have a high percentage of residents sixty years old or older. Many of these older residents are on fixed incomes. When the influx of people hits the community with its inflation, the older people may be forced to leave the community. It is too expensive for them to live in the community. The older residents also find it increasingly difficult to obtain health care. Since the older ages tend to require more health care than other age groups, they experience greater impact from the limited health services that the rest of the community (Davenport and Davenport III, 1979).
Another group severely impacted by rapid population growth in rural communities are the economically disadvantaged. These people must spend a much larger proportion of their income on the necessities of life—such as, food, shelter, clothing, and energy—than those with greater financial resources (Cose, 1978). As with the elderly on fixed incomes, when inflation accompanies the population growth it has profound impact on the poor who are already spending a substantial portion of their income on items of necessity. The economically disadvantaged have a much more difficult time in making their financial ends meet under conditions of rapid population growth than under conditions of stability in the community (Davenport and Davenport III, 1979).

*Attitudes and Characteristics of Longtimers and Newcomers with Potential Consequences*

The long-time resident in a rural community and the new people coming in are different in character in several significant ways. In Utah, the recent immigrants (persons who have moved in since 1970), and the settled immigrants (persons who have moved into community prior to 1970), tend to have a higher proportion of upper white collar workers than do the native residents (those who were born in the community and have never lived elsewhere) (Stinner, Toney, and Kan, 1978). They also tend to be younger, more highly educated, less likely to earn low income, less likely to own land, more likely to be politically independent of any party affiliation, and less likely to claim membership in the community's dominant religion.
What brings us even more aware of these differences in character between the resident's status groups is that most inmigrants come from other states, and according to Zuiches (1970) its standardized effect on the community is more than twice as large as the effect of intrastate migrants.

Research indicates that newcomers with different values, beliefs, norms, experiences, and life-styles moving to rural America are altering rural America's character. The reason is that the newcomers are becoming a substantial portion of the rural community's population. This could result in far reaching social and economic changes for most rural communities (Stinner and Toney, 1978). As a result of the above mentioned, the potential to foster bad feelings and even conflict between the newcomers and the longer term residents exists. Jirovec (1979) states that

... resentment between current residents and newcomers often develops because the former may absorb the brunt of the expenses (in the form of higher taxes and bond issues) of new facilities and services needed by the latter. Boom town residents often perceive the energy developer as the source of the difficulties experienced by the town. At the same time, energy company officials may blame the boom town for contributing to the development of an unstable labor pool which causes, over runs in both the time and money needed to get projects built and operating. Finally, the lack of cooperation and coordination between local, state, regional, and federal governments, prompts each sector to blame the other for the unintended negative consequences resulting from their independent decisions about energy development. (p. 80)

Colfer and Colfer (1978) found similar situations in a study done in Bushler Bay, Washington. The locals and government workers in this town were constantly in conflict. They did not socialize together
and each often accused the other of laziness and the locals referred to the public employees as "paper-shuffling lackeys." The locals are those who have lived in Bushler Bay for many years and are not government employed, while the government workers are usually newcomers to the community who work there a few years and go on to another assignment in another location. Newcomers to a rural community are at times perceived as a threat to the structure of the community, as disruptive to the status quo, and as a disturbance to the existing life-style (Urban Land Use Institute, 1975).

For communities that have experienced rapid population growth, Stinner and Toney (1978) point out that conflict between recent migrants and other members of the community is likely to be focused rather than generalized; while Cortese and Jones (1977) suggest that the most likely place for this conflict to take place is in the schools. The reason for this is that the earliest and most intense contact will occur here.

Longtime residents in rapid growth communities report that the changes the community has experienced are affecting their personal lives. They now feel less of a sense of community, they no longer know a great many people in town, that they have experienced or witnessed poor intergroup relations and see the newcomers as not integrating well into the community (Cortese and Jones, 1977).

Jackson Hole, Wyoming is a rural community that has recently been experiencing rapid population growth. It has also been experiencing conflict between the newcomers and oldtimers (longtime residents). The conflict is centered on the control of land through
the use of land-use planning and zoning ordinances. The newcomers are in favor of controlling the rate in which their community grows, while the oldtimers see it as a way to keep from making money on land sales to developers. It appears that the newcomers want to keep the town from growing any larger, they fear the coming of urban type characteristics which they moved to Jackson Hole to escape (Cockerham and Blevins Jr., 1977).

The social impacts of rapid growth are among the most critical a community can experience. In a large measure, they affect the entire range of structures and processes bearing on a community's identity and integrity (Shields, 1975). Patton and Stabler (1979, p. 90) comment that, "Experiencing rapid growth seems to result in stronger opinions against future growth."

As the literature points out, conflict between the newcomers and longtime residents is a problem that rapidly growing communities will or should face. In these rapidly growing communities, who are the people who feel that the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community? This research project is designed to find out what the characteristics are of those who feel that the newcomers are having a "bad effect," "no effect," or "good effect" on the community under conditions of the community experiencing moderate or rapid population growth.

Summary

From this literature review it is obvious that in some cases the impact of newcomers is positive while in other situations it is negative. An overriding condition appears to be the number of
newcomers. A consensus seems to be that the negative impact is more persuasive in rapidly growing communities. Also, it appears that a person's status in the community, along such dimensions as age, sex, religious preference, proportion family living nearby, proportion friends living in community and income might influence long-term residents' experience with and perception of newcomers. Also, it seems plausible that the relationship between the status variables and the perceived effect of newcomers might differ according to the community's rate of growth because the pressures of growth are likely to be felt differently across social groups. These considerations provide the basis for the formulation of the following hypotheses.

Hypotheses

1. Long-term residents are more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than newcomers themselves.

2. Long-term residents who reside in communities that have recently experienced rapid growth are more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those in communities that have not recently experienced rapid population growth.

3. Among long-term residents females will be more likely than males to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community.

4. Long-term resident senior citizens (60 years old or more) will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than will other age groups.

5. Long-term residents of the dominant religion will be more likely to feel that newcomers have a bad effect on the community than those of other religious preference.
6. Nonmetropolitan community long-term residents with a smaller proportion of their family living near or in their community are more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those with a larger proportion of family living nearby.

7. Long-term residents with a smaller proportion of their friends living in the same community are more likely to believe that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those with a large proportion of friends living in the community.

8. Long-term residents in the lower income group ($7,999 annual income or less) will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community in comparison to other income groups.
METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The data analyzed in this research project came from a larger study of eight rural communities in Utah. The study was conducted by the Department of Sociology at Utah State University and the Agricultural Experiment Station at Utah State University. The data were collected in the fall of 1975. The purpose of the study broadly was to examine characteristics and attitudes in rural community life under conditions of varying rates of population growth. The eight communities were selected to represent communities with various rates of growth. The growth rates from 1970 to 1975 ranged from 2.4 percent to 201.6 percent. The populations of the communities at the time of the study ranged from 1,350 to 6,300.

The data were collected through the use of self-administered questionnaires with half designated to be filled out by adult males and half be adult females. To define the boundaries of the communities enumeration district maps provided by the United States Bureau of the Census were used. The sampling was conducted by households in fear that telephone sampling would be biased due to some communities rapid rate of growth and that the more recent immigrants would be inadvertently bypassed. The households sampled were selected through multi-stage sampling procedures. First, detailed block maps were prepared for each of the eight communities and sample blocks were chosen following a systematic sampling method. A systematic random sampling procedure was used to identify households on the
blocks to be surveyed, resulting in a possible sample size of 2,000 households. Then, vacant homes, vacationers, seasonal workers, and a small portion of residents who were physically unable to respond were eliminated. This left a reduced sample size of 1,603 households.

The questionnaire contained over 200 items. The questionnaires were hand-delivered by trained enumerators in each community. Special telephone and mailing follow-ups were used to increase the response rate. Of the 1,603 questionnaires, 1,126 were returned from the eight communities combined, for a response rate of 70.3 percent. The lowest response rate was 50 percent with the highest 81.6 percent. Because of the characteristics and pattern of response of the low response rate community, that community was eliminated from this study. This made the lowest response rate for the seven remaining communities 70.2 percent.

Methods of Data Analysis

The first procedure was to separate the communities according to rates of population growth. Those with annual growth rates over 15 percent were categorized as rapid growth rate communities, and the others as moderate growth rate communities. This is consistent with previous research that shows that a community will experience a "breakdown" when the annual population growth is 15 percent or greater (Davenport, 1980).

Cross tabulation was then used with the dependent variable in every case being the response to the question, "Do you feel the new people moving into this area are having a good or bad effect on the community?" The independent variables included: length of residence,
proportion of close friends that live in the community, proportion of family that lives within a close distance of the community, sex, age, religious preference, and family income. The relationships are then examined to determine if they hold true for the different rates of population growth. After the examination of length of residence, the remaining analysis will focus exclusively on the attitudes of long-term residents.

To determine if the bivariate relationships are statistically significant, the measure Chi square is used since the data have been broken into dichotomous categories or are mostly nominal level data by nature. Cramer's V will be used to determine the level of association between the dependent and independent variables. Since the measure of association varies with the type of data categories of which the independent variable consist. Chi square helps in determining if a systematic relationship exist between the dependent and independent variables. Chi square becomes larger as the discrepancies between the expected and actual frequencies increase. If no relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables, then any deviations from the expected values are due to chance. Small values for Chi square are interrupted as an absence of a relationship, while a large Chi square is interpreted as the existence of a systematic relationship. The hypotheses will be accepted if the statistical significance is less than or equal to .05. A statistical significance level between .05 and .10 will be considered marginal, thus the hypotheses will not be accepted nor rejected. For statistical significance levels greater than .10, the hypotheses
will be rejected. Although Chi square does tell us if the variables are independent or related, it cannot tell us how strong a relationship is— if one does exist. For this purpose a statistical measure of association is used (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975). Cramer’s V measures the strength of a relationship. Cramer’s V is a version which is suitable for cross tabulation tables larger than 2 x 2. Values for Cramer’s V range from 0 to 1 when nominal categories are involved. The larger the value, the higher the degree of association that exists between the dependent and independent variable. But it does not measure the manner in which the variables are associated (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975).
FINDINGS

Effect of Newcomers by Length of Residence

The hypothesis that "long-term residents are more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than newcomers themselves," is not supported by the results for moderate and rapid growth communities. For all communities combined, the statistical significance level of .0996 cannot lend support to the hypothesis or disclaim it.

The literature suggests that long-term residents are more likely to feel that recent migrants are having a bad effect on the community than newcomers (Patton and Stabler, 1979). There is opposition to this assertion. Cockerham and Blevins Jr. (1977) found in their study of Jackson Hole, Wyoming, that it is the newcomers who no longer want population growth for their community. This suggests that more recent migrants will want to close off in-migration.

As can be seen from Table 1, all seven communities combined show the difference in attitude between the people who have lived in the community one to five years and those who have lived there six or more years. The attitudes are marginally statistically different towards the perceived effect of newcomers at the .10 level. The people that have lived in the community one to five years are more likely to feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community than those who have lived there six or more years.
Table 1. Effect of Newcomers by Length of Residence and Community’s Growth Rate

| Effect | Moderate Growth Rate | | | Rapid Growth Rate | | | Combined | | |
|--------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|        | 1-5 years | 6+ years | 1-5 years | 6+ years | 1-5 years | 6+ years | 1-5 years | 6+ years |
|        | (newcomer) | (long-term) | (newcomer) | (long-term) | (newcomer) | (long-term) | (newcomer) | (long-term) |
| Good   | 69.3 | 60.4 | 67.0 | 57.5 | 68.5 | 59.8 |   |   |
|        | (113) | (297) | (65) | (73) | (178) | (370) |   |   |
| Bad    | 11.1 | 13.2 | 14.4 | 23.6 | 12.3 | 15.3 |   |   |
|        | (18) | (65) | (14) | (30) | (32) | (95) |   |   |
| No     | 19.6 | 26.4 | 18.6 | 18.9 | 19.2 | 24.9 |   |   |
|        | (32) | (130) | (18) | (24) | (50) | (154) |   |   |
| Total  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |   |   |
|        | (163) | (492) | (97) | (127) | (260) | (619) |   |   |

\[ x^2 = 3.552 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ x^2 = 2.085 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ x^2 = 4.674 \text{ with 2df} \]

\[ p = .1693 \]
\[ p = .3525 \]
\[ p = .0966 \]

\[ v = .0710 \]
\[ v = .0910 \]
\[ v = .0699 \]
Under conditions of a community experiencing rapid population growth, the difference in attitude between the two groups is not statistically significant. Although the proportionally largest group to feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community are those who have lived in rapid growth communities for six or more years (21.3 percent).

Neither Patton and Stabler (1979) nor Cockerham and Blevins Jr.'s (1977) research results can be supported by this study under conditions in which a community is experiencing moderate or rapid population growth. Although under conditions of moderate population growth, this study best supports the results of Patton and Stabler (1979). The people living in the community one to five years are more likely than those living there six or more years to feel that the newcomers are having a good effect on the community.

Although these results are not statistically significant, the direction of the differences support the hypothesis that recent migrants are more favorable to newcomers than are long-term residents, which again lends support to Patton and Stabler's findings. It is

It is perhaps most important to note that differences between newcomers in both the moderate and rapidly growing communities are very slight, while the differences between the long-term residents, particularly the percentage feeling the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community are substantial. This increase in the percentage feeling that the effect of newcomers is bad is consistent with the idea that rate of population growth influences perceptions and with the decision to focus the remainder of the analysis on long-term
residents. It can be seen from Table 2 that these differences are substantially different at the .01 level.

**Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Community's Rate of Population Growth**

The hypothesis is that long-term residents in communities that have recently experienced rapid population growth are more likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those in communities that have not recently experienced rapid population growth is accepted. The results indicate that long-term residents in rapid growth rate communities are more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community (23.6 percent) than those in communities with slower growth rates (13.2 percent). The differences between long-term residents in moderate and rapid growth communities with respect to the percentage feeling that the effect of newcomers on the community is good is slight, 57.5 percent and 60.4 percent respectively.

These findings support the findings of Patton and Stabler (1979) and Davenport and Davenport III, (1978).

**Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Sex**

The hypothesis that among long-term residents females will be more likely than males to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community is not supported by the finding of this study.

This hypothesis was formulated from the writings of Lantz and McKeown (1978) and Davenport and Davenport III (1978). As can be seen in Table 3, for moderate growth rate communities, rapid growth
Table 2. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Community's Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td>% (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60.4 (297)</td>
<td>57.5 (73)</td>
<td>59.8 (370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>13.2 (65)</td>
<td>23.6 (30)</td>
<td>15.3 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.4 (130)</td>
<td>18.9 (24)</td>
<td>24.9 (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (492)</td>
<td>100 (127)</td>
<td>100 (619)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.560 \text{ with } 2 \text{df} \]
\[ p = .000 \]
\[ V = .1851 \]
Table 3. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Sex and Community's Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Growth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>(214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td>(273)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>(346)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.186 \text{ with } 2 \text{ df} \]
\[ P = .5525 \]
\[ V = .0493 \]

\[ x^2 = 2.325 \text{ with } 2 \text{ df} \]
\[ P = .3128 \]
\[ V = .1353 \]

\[ x^2 = 1.463 \text{ with } 2 \text{ df} \]
\[ P = .4811 \]
\[ V = .0487 \]
rate communities and all communities combined, the results show that differences in attitude between males and females is not statistically significant. The majority of both males and females (regardless of community’s growth rate) feel the new people are having a good effect on their community.

In moderate growth rate communities, 12.8 percent of the females believe the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community while 13.9 percent of the males feel the same way. For rapid growth communities, the percent of both sexes that feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community has increased in comparison to moderate growth communities, but the difference in attitude between males and females is not statistically significant. Of the males 29.6 percent feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, while 19.2 percent of the females feel this way. It is interesting to note that the percentage of males and females feeling that the effect of newcomers is bad is substantially greater in rapidly growing than moderately growing communities. The increase for males is particularly large, perhaps indicating that they are more impacted by rapid growth more than females. These findings do not support the findings of Lantz and McKeown (1978) nor Davenport and Davenport III (1978), which suggest that females are more likely to suffer the negative impacts of rapid population growth.

Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Age

The next hypothesis was derived from the literature of Davenport and Davenport III (1978) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (1976). The hypothesis states, "Long-term residents who
are senior citizens (60 years old or more) will be more likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than will other age groups." This hypothesis is not supported by the findings regardless of community's growth rate (see Table 4).

The difference in attitude of the two age groups (17 to 59 years old and 60 years old or more) is marginally statistically significant for the moderate growth rate communities, but not statistically significant for the rapid growth communities or all communities combined. For the older age groups in the moderate growth rate communities, 9.3 percent of these people feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, while 15.8 percent of the younger age group feel that way. These results are opposite of the hypothesis prediction. For the rapid growth communities, a higher percentage of both age groups feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community compared with those in the moderate growth communities. The percentage of the elderly feeling the effect of newcomers is bad is particularly increased among those in rapidly growing communities. In the moderately growing communities, only 9.3 percent feel that the effect is bad whereas 89.0 percent of the elderly in rapidly growing communities feel this way. Among the younger respondent this increase is only 5.5 percentage points from 15.8 percent to 21.3 percent for those in moderate and rapid growth communities, respectively.

**Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Religious Preferences**

The next hypothesis to be examined is, "Long-term residents of the dominant religion will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having
a bad effect on the community than those of other religious preferences." This hypothesis was formulated from the writing of Stinner and Toney (1978) which has found that newcomers in rural Utah tend not to be of dominant religion of the community in proportion to the long-term residents. The dominant religion in the rural Utah communities studied are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) or "Mormons."

The results of this study support the hypothesis for rapid growth rate communities; however, the results do not show a statistically significant difference in attitude between the Mormons and non-Mormons in moderate growth rate communities, nor all the communities combined (see Table 5).

In rapid growth rate communities, 27.4 percent of the Mormons feel that the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, while 12.5 percent of the non-Mormons also feel this way. For moderate growth rate communities, a perceived bad effect of newcomers is more likely to be the attitude of non-Mormons (17.6) than Mormons (12.0). Recall, however, that these results are not statistically significant.

The group that is most likely to perceive the newcomers as having a bad effect on the community are Mormons in rapid growth communities (27.4 percent). In rapid growth rate communities, slightly over half (54.6 percent) of the newcomers are not members of the Mormon religion. In moderate growth rate communities, over one-third of the newcomers are not of the community's dominant religion (Mormon). The absolute number of non-Mormon newcomers
Table 4. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Age on Community's Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>Rapid Growth</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-59</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>17-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(169)</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(298)</td>
<td>(194)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X^2 = 5.765$ with 2df</td>
<td>$X^2 = .8793$ with 2df</td>
<td>$X^2 = 3.168$ with 2df</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P = .0560$</td>
<td>$P = .6443$</td>
<td>$P = .2052$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V = .1082$</td>
<td>$V = .0832$</td>
<td>$V = .0715$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Religious Preference and Community's Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>Non-Mormon</td>
<td>Mormon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(239)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(384)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.300 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ P = .1920 \]
\[ V = .0819 \]

\[ x^2 = 7.465 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ P = .0239 \]
\[ V = .2424 \]

\[ x^2 = .170 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ P = .9182 \]
\[ V = .0166 \]
is obviously much higher in rapid growth rate communities than in moderate growth rate communities. This might make them more visible in rapid growth communities and increase their impact on community life. This may explain why Mormons in rapid growth communities are more likely to perceive newcomers as having a bad effect on their community. It is particularly noteworthy that the percentage of non-Mormons in rapidly growing communities perceiving a bad effect on the community by newcomers is less than the corresponding percentage of non-Mormons in moderately growing communities. Conversely, the relationship for Mormons is reversed.

These results may mean that the religious groups are reacting to the influence of population recompositions and socio-religious changes that might accompany population changes. In rapidly growing communities, the increased proportion of non-Mormons might threaten the status of Mormons and elevate the status of non-Mormons by merely increasing their number.

**Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Proportion Family**

The hypothesis that "nonmetropolitan community long-term residents with a smaller proportion of their family living near or in their community are more likely to feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those with a larger proportion of family living nearby," cannot be accepted. The findings do not support this hypothesis for moderate or rapid growth communities nor all communities combined (see Table 6).
Table 6. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Proportion Family Living Nearby and Community Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Half</td>
<td>Half or More</td>
<td>Less than Half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>63.6 (210)</td>
<td>53.7 (87)</td>
<td>57.7 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>11.5 (38)</td>
<td>16.7 (27)</td>
<td>24.4 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.9 (82)</td>
<td>29.6 (48)</td>
<td>17.9 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (330)</td>
<td>100 (162)</td>
<td>100 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(408)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.899 \text{ with } 2\text{df} \]
\[ P = .0864 \]
\[ V = .100 \]

\[ \chi^2 = .144 \text{ with } 2\text{df} \]
\[ P = .9304 \]
\[ V = .0337 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 3.083 \text{ with } 2\text{df} \]
\[ P = .1464 \]
\[ V = .0788 \]
Those in moderate growth rate communities with half or more of their family within an hour's drive are more likely to perceive the newcomers as having a bad effect on the community, than those with less than half of their family living nearby (16.7 percent and 11.5 percent, respectively). Again the majority of both groups in both moderate and rapid growth communities feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community. The group most likely to see the newcomers as having a bad effect on the community are those living in rapid growth rate communities with less than half of their family living nearby (24.4 percent).

This study's findings do not support those of Horton and Hunt (1972) nor Federico (1979) which suggest that those with more family would be receptive to newcomers since they are stable within the community because of their family. This study found the opposite to be true. For moderate growth rate communities, it was the people with less than half of their family living nearby that were more favorable to newcomers. In rapid growth rate communities, the proportion of family nearby did not affect the attitude towards the perceived effect of newcomers.

Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Proportion Friends

Although the family provides emotional support, friends also perform functions important for individuals (Horton and Hunt, 1972). The hypothesis that "long-term residents with a smaller proportion of their friends living in the same community are more likely to believe that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those
with a larger proportion of friends living in the community," is not supported by the findings (see Table 7).

For rapid growth communities there is a marginally statistically significant difference in attitude between the two groups at the .067 level. However, it is those with half or more of their friends living in the community that are more likely to feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, and not those with less than half of their friends living in the community as the hypothesis states. Indeed, 31.0 percent of those with half or more of their friends living in a rapidly growing community feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, while 17.4 percent of those with less than half of their friends living in the community agree. This study's results found it was those with less than half of their friends living in the community that are more favorable to newcomers than those with half or more of their friends living in the community. It seems reasonable to assume that those with most of their friends living nearby are in closed networks and have fewer ties to the outside. This may influence their perception of newcomers. On the other hand, having friends who live outside the community might indicate a greater openness for establishing relationships with a variety of people.

Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Income

The hypothesis that "long-term residents in the lower income group ($7,999 or less annual income) will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community in comparison
Table 7. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Proportion of Friends Living in Community and Community's Growth Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Half</td>
<td>Half or More</td>
<td>Less than Half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58.1 (154)</td>
<td>63.0 (143)</td>
<td>59.9 (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>14.3 (38)</td>
<td>11.9 (27)</td>
<td>15.0 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.6 (73)</td>
<td>25.1 (57)</td>
<td>25.1 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (265)</td>
<td>100 (227)</td>
<td>100 (334)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.311 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 5.399 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ \chi^2 = .090 \text{ with 2df} \]
\[ P = .5192 \]
\[ P = .0672 \]
\[ P = .9560 \]
\[ V = .0516 \]
\[ V = .2062 \]
\[ V = .0121 \]
to those in other income groups," is not supported by the findings of this study (see Table 8).

The work of Davenport and Davenport III (1979) and Cose (1978) suggests that lower income groups are more likely to perceive newcomers as having a bad effect on the community than those with higher incomes. In contrast to this, Patton and Stabler (1979) suggest that the higher income households are more likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those of lower income households.

This study's results show that when perceived effect of newcomers is looked at in relation to annual income broken down into three categories (0-$7,999, $8,000 to $15,999 and $16,000 or more), the differences are significant for moderate growth rate communities and all communities combined (.03 level), but not for rapid growth communities. In moderate growth communities as well as for all communities combined, it is the people with annual income from $8,000 to $15,999 that are most likely to feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community, 18.5 percent and 20.4 percent, respectively. For rapid growth communities, it is those with annual incomes below $8,000 that are most likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community (37.5%). However, the results for rapid growth communities are not statistically significant.

For both the moderate and rapid growth rate communities, the majority of those in each income category feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community. An exception is the 0-$7,999
Table 8. Long-Term Residents' Perceived Effect of Newcomers by Income and Community's Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rapid Growth Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to $7,999</td>
<td>$8,000 to $15,999</td>
<td>$16,000+</td>
<td>0 to $7,999</td>
<td>$8,000 to $15,999</td>
<td>$16,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>65.2 (107)</td>
<td>53.7 (110)</td>
<td>65.0 (80)</td>
<td>41.7 (10)</td>
<td>56.4 (31)</td>
<td>66.7 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>9.8 (16)</td>
<td>18.5 (38)</td>
<td>9.0 (11)</td>
<td>37.5 (9)</td>
<td>27.3 (15)</td>
<td>12.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.0 (41)</td>
<td>27.8 (57)</td>
<td>26.0 (32)</td>
<td>20.8 (5)</td>
<td>16.3 (9)</td>
<td>20.8 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (164)</td>
<td>100 (205)</td>
<td>100 (123)</td>
<td>100 (24)</td>
<td>100 (55)</td>
<td>100 (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 10.480 \text{ with } 4df \]
\[ x^2 = 6.871 \text{ with } 4df \]
\[ x^2 = 10.580 \text{ with } 4df \]
\[ P = .0331 \]
\[ P = .1429 \]
\[ P = .0317 \]
\[ V = .1032 \]
\[ V = .1664 \]
\[ V = .0924 \]
income category in rapid growth rate communities, where only 41.7 percent feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community. The groups that are proportionally largest that feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community are those of the highest income category ($16,000 or more annual income) in both the moderate and rapid growth rate communities (65.0 percent and 66.7 percent, respectively). Again, it is interesting to note that the percentage feeling that the effect of newcomers on the community is bad for each income group is much greater in rapidly growing communities than in moderately growing communities.

In moderate population growth communities, it is those people with incomes between $8,000 and $15,999 that are most likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community. This study’s findings tend to support those findings of Davenport and Davenport III (1979) and Cose (1978), while being in opposition to the findings of Patton and Stabler (1979). The findings of this study show that it is those people with lower incomes that will feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community and those with higher incomes are more likely to feel the newcomers are having a good effect on the community.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to examine the attitude of long-term residents in moderately and rapidly growing nonmetropolitan communities towards newcomers. More specifically, perceptions of long-term residents regarding whether newcomers were having a good or bad effect on the community was examined in relation to a series of socio-economic attributes. The study was undertaken in the face of an increase in the number of people moving into nonmetropolitan communities and an accumulating body of literature which suggests that the resulting population growth is creating many community level problems. The study of the perception of long-term residents towards newcomers is of primary theoretical and practical importance. From a theoretical perspective it is important because a series of hypotheses which were derived from various perspectives were tested. Of particular significance is the broad hypothesis that because of the various pressures associated with rapid growth, attitudes towards newcomers should be more negative in rapidly growing communities than in moderately growing communities. The study is of practical importance because of its implications regarding the general response of long-term residents towards newcomers and potential for conflicts between the two groups. The analysis of subgroups might be of specific use for policy formulations in determining educational or other types of programs aimed at ameliorating the potential for conflict between the groups.
The data for the analysis consists of survey data gathered from adults in five moderate growth communities and two rapid growth communities in Utah. The measure of perception regarding the effect of newcomers was ascertained by the following question: "Do you feel the new people moving into this community are having a good or bad effect on this community?" The respondent could also select a "no effect" category. Seven attributes of respondents were cross tabulated with the response to the question with rate of population growth employed as the control variable. The attributes were: 1) length of residence, 2) age, 3) sex, 4) religious preference, 5) income, 6) proportion of family living nearby, and 7) proportion of friends living in the community. In addition to testing hypothesis that respondents in rapidly growing communities are more likely to feel newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those in moderate growth communities, a series of hypotheses regarding differences between subgroups (defined on the basis of these attributes) within the communities were formulated and tested.

The key findings of the thesis was that residents in rapidly growing communities are more likely to perceive the effect of newcomers as being bad than residents of moderate growth communities. Thus, the broad hypothesis of the study was supported. This finding is consistent with the literature which indicates that rapid growth causes problems and suggests that long-term residents associate the problems with newcomers. It should be noted that the percentage feeling the effect of newcomers was good was very similar for rapidly and moderately growing communities, 60 percent and 57 percent, respectively. This suggests that newcomers are less likely to be greeted with
hostilities in moderately growing communities and it seems reasonable
to assume that the lower levels of negative feelings about their
impact would make their general absorption into the community easier.

Brief attention was given to examining the perceptions of newcomers as well as long-term residents with the use of the length of residence variable. The differences between long-term and short-term residents were not statistically significantly different. The most noteworthy finding regarding length of residence was that the percentage of long-term residents in rapidly growing communities feeling that the impact of newcomers was bad was considerably higher than in the moderately growing communities. The differences between newcomers across the community growth rates were slight. This also suggests that the rate of growth influences perceptions of newcomers since it would be the long-term residents who would view the changes resulting from the rapid growth. The perception of newcomers, while important, seems more likely to be based on other criteria. These findings were consistent with the decision to focus the analysis on the perception of long-term residents.

The six following hypotheses regarding the relationship between socio-economic attributes of the long-term residents and their perception of newcomers were tested.

1. Among the long-term residents, females will be more likely than males to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community.

2. Long-term residents who are senior citizens (60 years old or more) will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than will other age groups.
3. Long-term residents of the dominant religion will be more likely to feel that newcomers have a bad effect on the community than those of other religious preferences.

4. Long-term nonmetropolitan community residents with a smaller proportion of their family living near or in their community are more likely to feel the newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those with a larger proportion of family living nearby.

5. Long-term residents with a smaller proportion of their friends living in the same community are more likely to believe that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community than those with a larger proportion of friends living in the community.

6. Long-term residents in the lower income group ($7,999 annual income or less) will be more likely to feel that newcomers are having a bad effect on the community in comparison to other income groups.

None of the differences between the subgroupings for the respective attributes were statistically significant in both moderate and rapidly growing communities. Furthermore, only one hypothesis was supported with respect to differences between groups within the rapidly growing communities. None of the hypotheses were supported when differences were examined between groups within moderately growing communities. Within the moderately growing communities statistically significant differences were found between income groups, but they were not in the direction of the hypothesis.

The statistically significant differences between subgroups within the rapidly growing communities was between Mormons and non-Mormons. This seems to be associated with findings in other research which shows non-Mormons make up a larger percentage of the immigrants
to rapidly growing communities. Since the religious structure has been important in the Utah setting this could be threatening this structure. The elevated percentage from moderate to rapidly growing communities of Mormons perceiving the effect of newcomers as being bad while the increase in the proportion of non-Mormons feeling that newcomers are having a good effect would reflect their views of such population composition changes in the community. The significance of this finding is further noted by the fact that non-Mormons were the only subgroup across all of the subgroupings on the six attributes who had a smaller percentage feeling the effect of newcomers was bad in rapidly growing communities than in moderately growing communities.

Perhaps the most important evidence that rate of population growth influences the long-term residents' perception of newcomers is that, except for non-Mormons, the percentage of each subgroup feeling that the effect of newcomers was bad was highest in rapidly growing communities. This indicates that the pressures associated with rapid growth are generally perceived across a wide variety of subgroups. The particular exception, the non-Mormons, suggests that in particular cases a subgroup might perceive the changes as beneficial and to view the overall process of growth, including the newcomers, more positively.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This project looks at communities that range in population size from 1,800 to 6,300. It would be interesting to find out what the perceived effect of newcomers is in communities that are larger in population but still have comparable population growth rates. Would
the large population base have a diluting effect on the attitude of residents? Would the residents be more sensitized to the newcomers? If the communities did respond differently, how would that response differ?

The history of the community's growth patterns is also important when analyzing the attitude of residents. This study examined the community's growth pattern for the previous five years. But how would different growth patterns affect the attitude of residents? After the broader project was completed, many communities in this study experienced the "bust" that normally follows the "boom" associated with energy development projects. These same communities are presently experiencing population growth once again. How will these events influence the residents' perceived effect of newcomers? This question may be answered by a follow-up to the broader study. The follow-up study was done in the spring of 1979. All the data has yet to be analyzed, but this longitudinal study design may contribute understanding to the condition that influences residents' attitude toward newcomers and the characteristics of residents that aid in determining residents' attitude.

The residents of the rural communities in this study are predominantly Mormon. If the religious composition of the community became more homogeneous or heterogeneous, how would this influence the finding?

The newcomer's attitude is very important. Therefore, it is felt that a study of newcomers' attitude toward newcomers would be of valuable contribution to the science. How do the attitudes of newcomers and long-term residents differ (if they do)?
A shortcoming of this study is that rapid growth communities are geographically located near each other, but are quite a distance from all of the moderate growth communities. For this reason, the differences in responses between the moderate and rapid growth communities may be attributed to a regional effect, and not to population growth rate as this study has assumed. Further research should be aware of such conditions and attempt to avoid them.

This study examines the long-term residents' attitude toward newcomers. Oftentimes, attitudes are not translated into behavior or action. To find out if the attitude toward newcomers does lead to actual behavior, a study could examine how well newcomers actually integrate into the community. This can, in part, be examined by looking at the newcomer's involvement in community affairs, committees, organizations, and/or church attendance.

In such a study if attitude variables, such as perceptions of newcomers, were related to behavior, a better understanding of the integration of newcomers into the communities would be provided. Such studies are crucial for the development of policies for coping with the resurgence of growth in nonmetropolitan areas.
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Table 9. Characteristics of Long-Term Residents and Newcomers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long-Term Residents</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-59</td>
<td>67.4 (431)</td>
<td>91.8 (258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>37.6 (260)</td>
<td>8.2 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.3 (290)</td>
<td>40.7 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.7 (396)</td>
<td>59.3 (166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>56.1 (369)</td>
<td>39.1 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or more</td>
<td>43.9 (289)</td>
<td>60.9 (168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-7,999</td>
<td>30.7 (212)</td>
<td>22.4 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000 to 15,999</td>
<td>40.8 (282)</td>
<td>51.2 (144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000+</td>
<td>28.5 (197)</td>
<td>26.3 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>78.4 (542)</td>
<td>60.5 (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mormon</td>
<td>21.6 (149)</td>
<td>39.5 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives, business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management, administrative, clerical and sales, skilled</td>
<td>37.2 (257)</td>
<td>45.9 (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manual, semi-skilled, unskilled</td>
<td>62.8 (434)</td>
<td>54.1 (152)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>