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ABSTRACT

Rapid population growth in rural areas surrounding U.S. urban centers can have a variety of social impacts on communities. This can include disruption of local social networks, a decline in community attachment, and lower engagement of citizens in collective problem solving activities. This study reports findings from field research and a survey of residents (N=670) in eight contiguous townships and three municipalities in a rural region adjacent to an Ohio metropolitan area of over one million residents. The bivariate and multivariate analysis examines differences in local interaction and participation in community improvement activities by new and longtime resident status. We also focus on the relationship between community attachment, the embeddedness of residents in local networks and residents engagement in the community. The findings have implications for rural community development professionals interested in helping rural communities manage local change.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Residential, retail and business development in areas further away from core metropolitan areas has resulted in substantial population growth in some rural areas. This growth and development has spurred local and regional debates about the benefits and costs of growth (see Berton, 1995; Lacayo, 1999; Crenson, 2000; Columbus Dispatch, 1996). Many of these debates relate to school funding, property taxes, police and fire protection, road construction and maintenance, and sewage disposal. These physical costs of population growth and development can be quite visible and often involve formal public deliberation processes to manage these changes, but there can be other less visible costs or consequences of growth and development.

Cortese (1982) suggests that during periods of rapid growth there can be an overemphasis on infrastructure (a physical reality) and an underappreciation of the social impacts of rapid growth (see also Jobes, 2000). During periods of social or community change, patterns of interaction can change from one form to another and the focus on physical infrastructure development does not recognize the need to cope with or adjust to social changes. Cortese (1982) admits it is often easier to measure infrastructure needs associated with population growth, but it is the social aspects related to growth that pose
the more complex questions. He suggests that it is not the mere increase in people to an area that poses problems, but rather the diversity of people to an area that is most critical for its long-term well-being.

**Study Purpose**

The focus of this thesis is on community attachment and engagement in an Ohio exurban region. Exurban areas contain elements of both urban and rural and may be useful places to explore the social impacts of growth. These impacts can include disruption of local social networks, lower community engagement among newcomers, and lower engagement of citizens in collective problem solving activities. The purpose of examining these social issues is not to judge the changes as either positive or negative, but to identify community development needs, as well as opportunities for responding to community social change. This chapter will provide the context in which the study of community attachment and engagement was conducted.

**Setting**


United States historic population trends mirror those occurring in Ohio. Analyzing this data sets the stage for understanding state-level population trends. Demographic trends in the United States for the 1950 to 1998 period have shown a
number of different patterns of population growth and have sometimes surprised demographers (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). A helpful concept for exploring U.S. population trends is the metropolitan area. The Bureau of the Census first distinguished between nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties in 1950 (Bureau of the Census, 1980; Frey, 1990). The underlying concept of a metropolitan area is that of a geographic area consisting of a large population nucleus together with adjacent counties having a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus (Bureau of the Census, 1989). According to this classification, nonmetropolitan counties are those outside of the boundaries of metropolitan areas with no city of more than 50,000 residents, while metropolitan counties are those with a central city greater than 50,000 persons. According to Hart (1995) and others (Fugui, 1995), it has been all too common to assume that metropolitan is synonymous with urban – when in fact it is not. Hart (1995) asserts that in 1990, 43 percent of the rural population in the United States lived in metropolitan areas, while 37 percent of the nonmetropolitan population lived in urban places.


Metropolitan areas emerged as the dominant pattern of settlement during the 1950s and 60s, with an urbanized center, along with a fringe of suburban communities providing retail and residential services and an associated outlying area, which was
essentially rural, but with social and economic ties to the central city (Heimlich and Brooks, 1989). This dominant pattern of settlement led to the distinction between nonmetropolitan and metropolitan areas. During this period, approximately 56 percent of the population lived in metropolitan areas (Bureau of the Census, 1980), while the remainder lived in nonmetropolitan areas.


The 1960 Census renamed the Metropolitan Areas to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs). In 1983 SMSA’s were renamed Metropolitan Statistical Areas (Frey, 1990). Metropolitan areas continued to grow during the 1960 – 1970 period, growing by 16.6 percent compared to 6.8 percent for nonmetropolitan areas. The majority of this growth occurred in areas outside of central cities. Metropolitan areas accounted for 63 percent of the population in the United States in 1970 (Bureau of the Census, 1980).


In contrast to previous decades, nonmetropolitan America grew more rapidly in the 1970-80 period than metropolitan areas. Up until this period, nonmetropolitan areas had consistently experienced a relative decline in population compared to metropolitan areas. During the 1970s growth occurred not only in nonmetropolitan counties adjacent
to metropolitan counties, but also in nonadjacent nonmetropolitan counties, although the growth was greater in adjacent counties. This trend is referred to in the literature as the nonmetropolitan turnaround (Fugitt, 1985; Fugitt, 1995; Kim, 1983; Frey, 1990). For the first time in 150 years, nonmetropolitan population growth exceeded that of metropolitan areas (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). According to Frey (1990), about 80 percent of nonmetropolitan counties gained population in the 1970s.

Explanations for this turnaround are abundant in the literature and several are noteworthy. Period, regional restructuring, and deconcentration are three leading factors that have been identified as contributing to the turnaround. The first two explanations continue to view the historic pattern of urbanization as a continuing trend, while the deconcentration explanation views the 1970s U.S. pattern of population growth as a shift away from the historic pattern of increasing urbanization.

Period explanations view the 1970s as a temporary reversal of the long-term trend toward urban and metro growth (Frey, 1990). During this period, economic and demographic circumstances caused population to slow or decline in metro areas (Frey, 1990). Also, the recession of 1973-1975 resulted in economic restructuring which led to disinvestment in manufacturing in large industrial cities (Frey, 1990), while, smaller metropolitan areas enjoyed the benefits of extractive industrial development due to the OPEC induced energy crisis of 1973 (Frey, 1990). Extractive industrial development also gave rise to manufacturing jobs in smaller cities and towns (see also Kim, 1983),
primarily in the Southwest, Mountain West and Appalachia. Along with
deindustrialization, there was also a rural recreational boom. This boom lasted well into
the 1980s and consisted of population growth primarily in nonmetropolitan counties
specializing in resort and recreational activities (Frey, 1990). Besides the recreational
boom, large numbers of people entered their retirement years during this period and
chose to live in nonmetropolitan areas (Frey, 1990).

The second explanation for the turnaround of the 1970s is regional restructuring.
The regional restructuring perspective views the economic dislocations
(deindustrialization) of the 1970s as a step toward a new geography of metropolitan
growth (Frey, 1990). The historic pattern of urbanization is still viewed as continuing,
but metropolitan growth is occurring in different geographic regions than in the past and
for different reasons (Frey, 1990). There are winners and losers in terms of growth.
Growing areas will be successful in redirecting their economies toward advanced service
delivery, high tech research and development, and recreation and leisure-time activities.
Metro areas unable to shift from industrial production to post-industrial production
experienced population decline (Frey, 1990).

Deconcentration is a third explanation for the 1970s population turnaround. This
perspective views the 1970s as a fundamental break with the past. This view purports
that the 1970s lifted barriers that prevented people from living where they preferred.
Preferences play a significant role in this perspective, as well as the deconcentration of
employment from largely urban areas to more rural locations. Public policies related to improved infrastructure and infrastructure spending, as well as improvements in communications and information technologies contribute to growth outside of the urban boundaries of metropolitan areas.

The new settlement pattern that emerged during the 1970s, with increased settlement beyond the metropolitan fringe led to a redefinition of the metropolitan classification. To account for this new pattern of settlement, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas were renamed as Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and redefined following the 1980 Census (Heimlich and Brooks, 1989). The criteria designating MSAs and urbanized areas were relaxed to include more of the developed areas being settled beyond the urban core. Changes in the MSA definition resulted in significant changes in metropolitan area population. The liberalization of definitions result in MSAs that are essentially less urban than existed using previous definitions. Fringe counties adjacent to core metropolitan counties with essentially rural characteristics were frequently included as part of a metropolitan area.


By the 1980s the nonmetropolitan turnaround came to a halt (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). Factors contributing to the end of the turnaround were the farm debt crises, a increase in oil prices, downsizing of rural manufacturing and a modest
urban revival (Population Reference Bureau, 1999; Fuguit, 1995; Frey, 1990). During the period between 1980 and 1990, only 45 percent of nonmetropolitan counties gained population (Population Reference Bureau, 1999).

Despite the economic impact on nonmetropolitan America during the 1980s, some areas did grow. The nonmetropolitan counties capitalizing on resort and recreation were the fastest growing nonmetropolitan counties during the 1980s (Frey, 1990). And, after 1983, the fringe counties adjacent to the suburbs of large metropolitan areas with commuting ties to the city also experienced a continual revival (Frey, 1990).

1990 Population Trends

In the 1990s many nonmetropolitan areas once again experienced growth in what has become known as the “rural rebound.” A key element responsible for the rural rebound is migration (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). The rebound is characterized by more people moving from urban to rural areas as fewer rural people choose to leave these areas (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). Deconcentrated settlement patterns is a common feature of this growth with people moving from more densely settled places into less densely settled places (Population Reference Bureau, 1999). From 1990 to 1998, an estimated growth of 7.1 percent occurred in the nonmetropolitan population. While the turnaround occurred all over the United States, the rebound gains occurred everywhere except the Mississippi Delta and the Great Plains. Despite the growth in nonmetropolitan
America during this period, metropolitan areas continued to grow at a faster rate than nonmetropolitan areas. They grew an estimated 9.1 percent between 1990 and 1998 (Population Reference Bureau, 1999).

**Ohio Population Trends**

Ohio population patterns mirror those of the United States described above. Focusing on Ohio, between 1970 and 1998 Ohio’s population has grown 41 percent. For 1970 to 1990, metropolitan counties experienced five percent population growth, while nonmetropolitan counties experienced ten percent population growth (Table 1.1). Metropolitan counties in Ohio during the 1950s and 1960s had higher rates of population growth than nonmetropolitan counties. In the 1970s, Ohio’s metropolitan areas experienced modest population loss (.3 percent), while nonmetropolitan counties grew by 9.6 percent. During the 1980s, both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas experienced an increase in population change of less than one percent. For the 1990s, population change estimates show nonmetropolitan Ohio counties percent population growth as double the increase in metropolitan counties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Nonmetropolitan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,820,841</td>
<td>1,831,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>8,790,877</td>
<td>2,879,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8,826,069</td>
<td>2,021,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Ohio Population by Metropolitan Character

As previously mentioned, metropolitan areas contain rural populations, so it is helpful to look more closely at the rate of growth in more rural parts of metropolitan areas. As of the last census, Ohio has 15 metropolitan areas encompassing 39 counties and 44.8 percent of the state’s land area (Sharp and Winland, 1999). The remaining counties are designated as nonmetropolitan counties (49) and encompass 55.6 percent of the land area. Metropolitan counties can be further broken down as either core counties or fringe counties (Sharp and Winland, 1999). Core counties contain the metropolitan
areas largest city or at least 50 percent of the county’s population is part of the central city’s urbanized area. A smaller proportion of fringe metropolitan counties’ population is closely tied to the central counties. Ohio has 18 core metropolitan counties, seven of which are considered large core and 11 small core and 21 fringe metropolitan counties (12 of which are large core fringe and nine are small core fringe).

Both large and small core metropolitan counties experienced similar growth rates from 1950 to 1970, but their populations have declined or remained stable since 1970. In the 1950 to 1960 period both large and small core counties grew by at least 22 percent and during the 1960 to 1970 period they grew by at least nine percent. By 1970 though both had population decline of at least one percent. The fringe counties of the largest metropolitan areas have consistently grown every decade since 1950, while the fringe counties of smaller metropolitan areas peaked in the 1980s and dropped off in the early 1990s. In 1950, the 12 fringe counties of the largest metro areas contained 6.5 percent of Ohio’s total population. By 1990, these 12 counties contained 10.5 percent of Ohio’s total population.

Large metropolitan fringe county growth suggests substantial growth in rural metropolitan populations. Ohio’s rural and urban population by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan character for the 1970-1990 period is shown in Table 1.2.\(^1\) For every

\(^1\) The Census Bureau definition of urban comprises all territory, population and housing units in urbanized areas, plus those in places of 2,500 or more persons outside of urbanized areas. Rural is everything else (Lavin, 1996).
census taken since 1970 a larger share of the rural population is located in metropolitan areas. For the 1970 census, nearly 60 percent of the rural population lived in a metropolitan area,\(^2\) with slight declines for the 1980 and 1990 censuses. Despite declining rural metropolitan populations, the majority of rural populations still live in metropolitan areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmetro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmetro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,086,802</td>
<td></td>
<td>744,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,254,975</td>
<td></td>
<td>751,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,277,978</td>
<td></td>
<td>743,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Ohio's Rural and Urban Population By Metropolitan Character

*The Exurbs and Exurbanization*

With a majority of Ohio's rural population living in metropolitan areas it may be helpful to consider what these areas are like in further detail. Numerous concepts or terms have been proposed for describing areas these areas that are neither entirely urban nor entirely rural according to historic sensibilities. A more common reference is the

\(^2\)According to the 1990 Census definition of a Metropolitan Area.
urban/rural fringe. Despite its prevalence, it has rarely been defined and is rather vague in what is meant by the term. The term exurbs has emerged as a potentially useful concept for understanding rural metropolitan regions. The earliest known work on the exurbs is The Exurbanites by Auguste Spectorksy written in 1955 (Patel, 1980). Spectorksy’s definition of the exurbs (and its derivatives – exurban and exurbanite) is the journey of the exurbanite out and away from the city, in a wistful search for roots, for the realization of a dream, for a home. This work distinguishes exurbanites from urbanites, suburbanites and ruralites. The exurbs differ from the suburbs in that they are outside the city and exurban homes are widely spaced apart. Nelson (1992) a leading scholar of exurban change characterizes the exurbs as having low population density, small local populations in small towns and unincorporated places and may include relatively large rural subdivisions (Nelson, 1992). Exurbs virtually have no substantial local employment, due to many residents commuting to nearby urban centers. This type of land development has often been referred to as “sprawl,” or an unorganized scattering of homes and businesses across the landscape with no apparent focal point (Lamb, 1983).

Exurbanization refers to the process whereby rural residential development is largely, although not exclusively, an outward movement of suburban and urban households maintaining jobs in the urban/suburban setting and typically, undergoing gradual urbanization (Davis, Nelson and Dueker, 1994; Lamb, 1983). Nelson (1992) identifies several factors that may contribute to exurbanization. The first factor
stimulating exurban growth, also noted as a factor in explaining nonmetropolitan growth in the 1970s and 1990s, is the decentralization of employment. The availability of land, lower land and development costs, the outward extension of services, and the continued development of highways circling central cities and suburbs contribute to the decentralization of employment. Also, the outward shift of jobs to the suburban employment ring of metropolitan areas results in more rural places within a reasonable commuting distance of employment centers.

In addition to retail and commercial development in suburban areas, more manufacturing firms are choosing to locate in exurban landscapes and may contribute to exurbanization. Davis (1992) identifies two factors contributing to the decentralization of manufacturing. The first factor is changing plant design which require greater land – something not easily available in central cities. The second factor is transportation costs. Transportation costs for both labor and freight have become cheaper with more extensive transportation networks. The highway system has increased the supply of suitable manufacturing sites. Furthermore, Nelson and Sawicki (1990) found that more than 60 percent of the shift in manufacturing employment can be attributed to location of manufacturing in exurban locations.

Nelson (1992) suggests the latent desire of Americans for the Jeffersonian rural lifestyle also is driving exurban residential development. Numerous studies have documented the preference for a less urban lifestyle (see also, Zuiches, 1981; Kim, 1983).
Davis et. al. (1994) in their article, “What do we know about exurbanites” characterized the preferences and attributes of exurban residents. They found exurbanites prefer rural amenities and large lots despite longer drives to work. Thus, exurbanites are trading off longer commutes to jobs for more space and other rural amenities. Advancements in technology and transportation allow more of the urban and suburban workforce to make the decision to live in the exurbs.

Public policies have also encouraged exurban development. For example, new construction is favored over rehabilitation or redevelopment of blighted or vacant urban land, highways are favored over public transportation, and growing areas are favored over depressed areas (Davis, 1992). Zoning laws also contribute to exurban development. Exurban areas, according to Davis (1992) typically have less restrictions on land use than either urban or suburban areas, although public opinions on many of these policies are beginning to change.

*Exurban Physical Changes: Challenges and Responses*

The challenges associated with the physical changes in the exurbs are well documented in the popular press and the literature. One of the challenges facing local governments is how to provide the level of services and infrastructure wanted or needed with limited funds. Certain land uses within a community generate greater levels of revenue than other types of land uses (Kelsey, 1996). Low-density development,
characteristic of exurban development, often increases the cost of government services (Longman, 1998). With low-density development, sewer lines must be extended longer distances, fire protection must be expanded, and more schools are necessary. Exurban roadways may also require improvements to manage increased traffic. Transportation improvements are also a physical challenge related to exurban growth.

Another physical impact is the conversion of land to residential uses in exurban areas. The conversion of farmland to suburban and exurban development in the United States has been estimated by the American Farmland Trust as 50 acres an hour (Longman, 1998). As a way to manage the loss of farmland and the conversion of agricultural lands, several strategies have been adopted. The purchase of development rights (PDRs) is another response to changing agricultural land use. PDRs commonly are voluntary, state funded programs offered to farmers in exchange for restricting the development of their farmland (Daniels, 1991). Agricultural districting and right to farm laws are another way in which exurban areas are managing land use change. Agricultural districts protect farms from eminent domain takings and adjacent nonfarm development (American Farmland Trust, 1990; Lyttle, 1999). Right to farm laws protect farmers from nuisance suits or provide new property owners with disclosure notices (American Farmland Trust, 1990).

An increasingly popular response to managing the physical landscape in exurban areas is land use planning. Formulated in the 1920s with the U.S. Department of
Commerce's Standard City Planning and Zoning Enabling Acts, land use planning, was originally intended for urban areas, but with population growth and industrial development, exurban areas are increasingly turning to planning and zoning as a tool to manage the physical challenges associated with growth (Garkovich, 1982; Salkin, 2000). According to Katz and Bradley (1999), "land use planning allows communities to prepare for growth in a way that avoids deadlock and preserves public resources." Land use planning was not a particular concern until the 1970s and 1980s in the United States when legislation establishing statewide planning and growth management programs were enacted, as well as a significant number of planning and zoning laws (Salkin, 2000). By the 1990s, though, there was increasing interest in the relationship between land use planning and issues like agricultural land preservation or economic development (Salkin, 2000).

Traditional land use planning has recently given way to the idea of smart growth. Smart growth is premised on the idea that housing, transportation, economic development and the environment are not isolated issues (Salkin, 2000). Smart growth is more holistic in its approach than traditional land use planning because it recognizes that housing and job markets, transportation systems and environmental impacts are interdependent and are regional issues requiring coordinated response among diverse governmental agencies (Salkin, 2000).
Community in the Exurbs: Relatively Unexplored

As described above, there is a wide breadth of literature describing the physical impacts of growth in exurban areas and ways to manage these impacts. Less is known about the social changes occurring in the exurbs, as well as simply the exurban experience of community. A central motivation of this thesis is to look at the social and community dimensions of exurban life, particularly the extent to which community attachment and engagement are related to length of residence. The influx of newcomers into exurban areas may be disruptive to existing longtime resident’s attachment and engagement in community affairs. Another issue is whether or not new residents are feeling attached to the community and becoming engaged in community affairs. As exurban communities struggle to deal with the challenges associated with growth, the involvement of all residents in the community is important. Examination of the factors associated with engagement in the exurbs may make it easier to identify means of effectively engaging all residents in community affairs.
CHAPTER 2

THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Community and rural sociologists have long concerned themselves with the effects of mass society on rural communities. The effects of mass society on places that are neither entirely rural nor entirely urban have been relatively unexplored. Exurban areas, like boomtown areas are comprised of a diversity of residents and are constantly undergoing change. It seems natural that community might be strained in these areas because of the influx of newcomers and the concomitant changes. This chapter will provide a review of the literature on what is meant by community and what constitutes a community. I will then discuss the concern over the loss of community in relation to population growth and development. The effects of growth and development on social relationships will be discussed with particular reference to rapid growth or boomtowns and the relationship between new and longtime residents. Community attachment or the “sense of belonging to a place,” along with the factors associated with community attachment and engagement will be discussed. The concept of social capital will be introduced and implications of social capital’s existence for community development will be emphasized.
What is Community?

Americans celebrate and hold dear the idea of the community, but rarely do they reflect on what this means or what constitutes a community. In sociology several different definitions and uses of the concept of community have been developed. According to Hillery (1955), Lyon (1987) and Poplin (1972), there is an absence of agreement beyond the fact that community involves people. One central idea is that social interaction is an essential aspect of community, while others suggest the community is analytically separate from social interaction. This view holds that the community is to be found primarily in the local territory or within a specific geographical area (see Lyon, 1987). In his classic review of the community literature, Hillery (1955) found that over two thirds of the definitions of community he analyzed had social interaction, area and a common tie or ties as part of community life. These three elements were central to the community. He also found that if the concept of area was excluded from the definition, interaction and common ties jointly accounted for more than three-quarters of the community definitions.

Is the Community Lost?

Despite attempts to define community, a common concern since the industrial revolution has been the loss of community due to technological and social change (Wellman, 1999). It was assumed that the shift to more mobile, market societies would
disconnect individuals from traditional society. Community theorists have long examined the effect of urbanization on human relationships. Tönnies, an early community sociologist, contrasted the types of human relationships appearing in typical extended families or rural villages (*Gemeinschaft*) with those found in modern capitalist states (*Gesellschaft*) (Lyon, 1987; Theodori and Luloff, 2000). As ideal types, *Gemeinschaft* is characterized, as relationships or community attachments based on natural will, including, sentiments, tradition, and common bonds as primary characteristics. The basis of this natural will is the family or working and living in a shared place (Lyon, 1987). A strong identification with the community exists in *Gemeinschaft* relationships. *Gemeinschaft* relationships are primarily dense interconnections composed mainly of kin and neighbors (Wellman, 1999). In contrast, *Gesellschaft* is based on rational will, including a strong identification with the individual as opposed to the community. *Gesellschaft* relationships are less emotional with affective neutrality and legalism as key components (Lyon, 1987). *Gesellschaft* relationships are more sparsely knit and composed primarily of friends and acquaintances.

Borrowing from Tönnies, the Chicago School later emphasized *Gesellschaft* relationships with their human ecology perspective (Lyon, 1987). Their studies primarily looked at the process of invasion and succession in urban areas. This perspective identifies three “ecological” variables – population size, density and heterogeneity.
responsible for more *Gesellschaft-like* relationships. With greater population size, density and heterogeneity, it was proposed that there would be a breakdown in primary group ties and decreasing community attachment (England and Albrecht, 1984; Theodori and Luloff, 2000). It is important to note that although there was concern that relationships were becoming more *Gesellschaft* – there was very little empirical evidence confirming if population size and density did in fact alter social relationships.

By the 1960s, despite early widespread theoretical concern over the loss of community, it became clear that countless cases did not conform to the loss of community argument. From this perspective, the ideas of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* are ideal types and do not exist purely in reality. Communities fall somewhere in between (Lyon, 1987). And, if communities lie somewhere on the continuum between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, the types can co-exist or communities can have attributes of both - meaning that technological and social changes do not necessarily result in a total loss of community.

More recent research focusing on what accounts for the movement from more *Gemeinschaft* relations to more *Gesellschaft* relations has documented a variety of factors accounting for the degree of *Gemeinschaft* or *Gesellschaft*, not just the ecological variables described above. In their study of residents of English communities, Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) found that length of residence influenced more *gemeinschaft* relationships than population size and density. This study was significant because it was
one of the first to empirically test what factors were responsible for community attachment. It led to an array of studies in different localities with different population sizes and densities.

In addition to the research on community attachment, flowing from the mass society literature, another vein of rural community study is the interactional approach. Wilkinson’s interactional approach (1979) has three components – bonds, local territory and community action. The first component is that an elemental bond occurs during social interactions and most commonly during interactions that “embody and express mutual interests in the common life of a local population” (Wilkinson, 1999 p. 12). The interactions producing this bond affect future behavior in ways that are purposeful and volitional (Wilkinson, 1999). Community from this perspective is seen as being natural and ubiquitous and it occurs in interactions, which people engage in almost all of the time. Community exists despite whether or not it is celebrated and affects subsequent social actions that follow its emergence. From this perspective Gesellschaft and Gemeinschaft can be simultaneous. All types of relations natural for people to engage in are evident in community (even adversarial relationships) and if interaction is suppressed, community can be limited. The elemental bond developing with the interactional community is much more specific than Tönnies’ Gemeinschaft ideal type. Gemeinschaft or relationships based on natural will occur mainly in direct and continuing contacts.
among people who share a local territory. These bonds can be recognized and celebrated by the local population and can often lead to collective action.

The second component of the interactional approach is that the local territory is where the search for community must begin. It assumes that people everywhere live together in a particular place – a local settlement. And, the local settlement is a by-product of social interaction. Social interaction shapes and maintains a local settlement or territory as a community or as Jobes (2000) says, “social life occurs in the context of the physical environment.” Community actions, the third component of Wilkinson’s approach to community, are those efforts of local residents that address community issues associated with the use of a particular area (Wilkinson, 1999). The manifestation of community in a locality can be measured by the frequency and inclusiveness of community action, according to Wilkinson (1999). So, if people in a locality do not interact, collective identity and collective action are unlikely to develop. And, according to Cottrell (1983) participation in community affairs is an indispensable element of community competence because by getting involved, people commit themselves to the community and help identify goals and ways of reaching them.
Community Attachment (Social Bonds and Sentiments)

While Wilkinson’s interactional approach to community moves the community literature forward, a much wider focus in community sociology has been on community attachment, which emerged from the mass society literature and focuses on the persistence of community. Community attachment has become one way in which sociologists have investigated the “sense of belonging to a place” (Theodori and Luloff, 2000). Being attached to a community means that social bonds exists. Social bonds consist of friendships, visiting patterns and business ties within a community (Greisman, 1980). Community attachment also consists of the more affective feelings people have toward their community. Whether or not they feel at home in the community and whether or not they would feel sorry to leave their community are examples of affective feelings toward the community (Theodori and Luloff, 2000). Others (Goudy, 1990 and Stinner et. al., 1990) view community attachment as multidimensional employing involvement, amity and sentiment. Recently, social scientists have questioned the relationship between bonds and the affective and have moved to have just the affective feelings as indicators of attachment (Liu et. al., 1998) and the bonds as predictors of the affective feelings. It is presumed by community sociologists that these bonds and
feelings have particular significance for the level of community cohesion and the ability of the community to act in the interests of the collectivity, but the community attachment literature in general has not tested these assumptions. Community attachment is important, according to Israel et. al. (2001) because social psychological investment in the community can be a resource that facilitates mobilization to address issues of common interest and concern.

Generally two models of local community attachment are identified in the literature. The models are derivatives of the early debates between competing theorists in the early Chicago school of urban sociology interested in identifying the factors responsible for local social bonds and community sentiments or community attachments (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). On one side of the debate are those who believe the community has become lost or has declined because of urbanization and industrialization (Lyon, 1987; Wellman and Leighton, 1979). Lyon (1987) emphasizes that the decline, relevance and identification with the local territory is related to the decline in Gemeinschaft relationships and that both reinforce each other and both are symptoms of mass society. On the other side of the debate are those who do not feel the community has been lost, but rather persists. This view argues that neighborhood and kinship solidarities continue to flourish in industrial bureaucratic social systems (Wellman and Leighton, 1979).
The first model of community attachment is the linear development model or the “social disruption” hypothesis. A general premise of the disruption hypothesis is that during periods of social change, patterns of interaction among community residents change sometimes resulting in more impersonal relationships (Cortese, 1982). Rooted in the ideas of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft introduced by Tönnies, this model assumes that the primary exogenous factors influencing social behaviors are linear increases in population size and density (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Sampson, 1988; Krannich and Greider, 1984; England and Albrecht, 1984). It is argued that urbanization and industrialization alter the essential character of society from one based on communal attachments to one based on less familial attachments. As the population of a place increases and the density of the area expands, community attachment and participation are lessened or there is a “loss of community” (Hunter, 1975; England and Albrecht, 1984).

The competing model of local community is premised on the idea that the local community is a social construction that has its own life cycle (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Sampson, 1988). This view, called the systemic model, asserts that the local community is a complex on-going system of networks and ties (England and Albrecht, 1984). These ties are assumed to develop in all communities despite their complexity. Unlike the disruption hypothesis, this view does not see population growth as the determining factor of “disruption” (England and Albrecht, 1984). The factor most
important in influencing community behavior and attitudes in this model is length of residence (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Goudy, 1990).

Length of residence, according to Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), is a central and crucial factor in the development of kinship and friendship bonds. For rural areas especially, the length of time spent in the community appears to be one of the key components to integration into the local social system (Smith and Krannich, 2000). From the systemic model’s perspective, community is found by focusing on local social networks and these social networks exhibit different intensities depending on a person’s socio-economic status and stage in the life-cycle (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974).

Five independent studies by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974); Sampson (1988); Stinner et. al. (1990); Goudy (1990); and Brown (1993) support the positive relationship between length of residence and community attachment. The first of such studies by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) found that length of residence was positively related to local friendship ties, community sentiment and participation in the local community. Sampson (1988), in his study of 238 British localities, found that residential stability had a large direct effect on local friendship networks at both ends of the urban-rural continuum. Stinner et. al. (1990), in their study of nonmetropolitan Utah residents, found some support for length of residence influencing community involvement, but it was conditioned by community size.
They, like Goudy (1990), also found that social bonds are positively related to sentiments about the local community. Sentiments address the perceptual or affective attachment to the community (Stinner et. al., 1990). Brown’s findings (1993) also found positive relationships between the systemic model variables and community attachment and satisfaction, but he also added economic behavioral and attitude indicators which when added to the model additional variance was explained for everything except social interaction. The addition of the economic behavioral and attitude indicators had greater explanatory power for satisfaction than for attachment.

Besides length of residence, analysts have included other independent variables to explain community attachment, such as population size, population density, social class and stage in the life-cycle. Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), in an effort to compare the linear and systemic models examined community size and population density (ecological factors). They hypothesized that these two variables, important for the linear model, would not be significantly related to community attachment (Goudy, 1990). They placed the communities under investigation on the rural-urban continuum to determine size, while density was determined using persons per acre. In their study, they found that population density did not have a statistically significantly relationship with any of the social bond measures and was related to only one of the sentiment variables (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Goudy, 1990). In terms of population size, it was only significant for
one measure of social bonds and for smaller urban areas (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Goudy, 1990).

In sum, there are two perspectives in the community attachment literature. The first perspective suggests that population size and density are the primary factors that influence how people feel toward their community. It is expected that as communities become larger, people will not be as attached to their community because they will not know as many people. The other perspective suggests that the local community is made up of complex on-going networks and ties and these exist despite urbanization. Length of residence is the most important factor affecting community attachments and sentiments, according to this perspective. This perspective anticipates that longtime residents will feel more attached to their community than new residents because they have lived in the community longer.

**Social Capital**

While attachment has been a dominant item of inquiry in community sociology, social capital has emerged as a new central focus. Its popularity may be the result of being linked with community outcomes, such as well-being and engagement, which community attachment research has generally not examined. Social capital is a logical extension of earlier community work, such as Wilkinson’s interactional community. Bourdieu (1986) was one of the first to identify social capital and distinguish it from
other forms of capital. The concept received additional widespread attention when Robert Putnam reported in 1995 that civic engagement had declined sharply in America since World War II and that more and more Americans were “bowling alone.” This seminal article sparked a flurry of debate on the importance of social capital, what comprises it and how to build it.

The social capital literature recognizes that how a community is socially organized has implications for both the community and individual well being. It is generally acknowledged that localities with high community social capital will have higher levels or extensive civic engagement (Israel et. al., 2001). This literature suggests that communities with high social capacity (or social capital) can successfully identify problems and needs, achieve workable consensus on goals and priorities and agree on how to pursue goals and cooperate to achieve goals (Mattesich and Monsey, 1997; Ryan et. al., 1995; Ladd, 1998). In short, its presence increases the capacity for action and facilitates the production of some good (Paxton, 1999; Israel et. al., 2001).

Putnam (1995) defines social capital as the “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.” There are two definitional components of social capital. The first component is social networks. Social capital inheres in people’s relationships with others (Falk and Kilpatrick, 2000; Coleman, 1988). And, it is believed that the structure of relationships can facilitate or inhibit action and access to resources (Israel et. al., 2001).
Communities with high social capital have extensive civic engagement and patterns of mutual support (Israel et. al., 2001; Putnam, 1993). All social relations, according to Coleman (1988) facilitate some form of social capital. Civic engagement leads to greater levels of social integration and political involvement and the benefits of this engagement include better community institutions; building of community trust; deviance control and activism to increase community well-being (Gutmann and Pullum, 1999). Another feature of social capital is that it is productive (Coleman, 1988). It brings into existence certain outcomes that might not be achievable without its presence. He also asserts that dense networks of social exchange often have the norm of generalized reciprocity and posits that the density of such networks in a community has an effect on the ability of its citizens to cooperate for mutual benefit. According to Flora et. al. (1997) networks within communities should be diverse linking groups with different characteristics. Interacting with others different from yourself or who move in different circles provides information that otherwise would not have been gained if these “weak ties” did not exist (Granovetter, 1973).

Trust is the second component of social capital (Falk and Kilpatrick, 2000; Putnam, 1993; Coleman, 1990). Trust, according to Coleman (1990) is integral to developing a system of action because action is governed by social norms, rules and obligations. Building on Coleman’s early ideas about trust, Putnam (1993) suggests that social trust arises out of the norm of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement. He
identifies a form of reciprocity, generalized reciprocity, that is a continuing relationship of exchange that is at any given time unrequited or imbalanced, but involves mutual expectations that a benefit granted now should be repaid in the future. Trust is necessary for cooperation and lubricates cooperation, according to Putnam (1993). Putnam (1993) posits that the greater the level of trust within a community, the greater the likelihood of cooperation.

Given the potential benefits of social capital to communities, building social capital has become a focus of some literature. Wilson (1997) suggests that shaping interpersonal trust, feelings of belonging and responsibility and civic engagement are critical to building social capital or community social capacity. Mattesich and Monsey (1997) describe social capital as the “glue that holds society together” and without it efforts to increase well-being are futile and will not be achievable.

**Rapid Growth and Development on Well-Being**

While many researchers and practitioners are focusing on how to build community social capital, some literature alludes to the ways community social capital might be adversely impacted. One such body of literature examines the impacts of growth in “boomtowns,” areas that experienced energy resource development, emerged in the 1970s. As Freudenburg (1982) notes in the early 1970s the general public started to consider possible community impacts associated with growth. Before the 1970s,
growth was primarily viewed as a positive community development policy. It was assumed that growth meant increased employment and economic opportunities (Krahnich and Greider, 1984). These assumptions were challenged during the 1970s when energy developments led to rapid growth in some rural areas and obvious negative impacts emerged. Social scientists began to realize that although there are benefits to growth, there can also be negative consequences. Jobes (2000) suggests that the most undesirable aspect of boomtown growth is the way people treat each other or the relationships amongst people. He mentions specifically that old-timers from predevelopment phases often ignored or were critical of newcomers and excluded them from community affairs.

Several points from this literature may be useful for anticipating the impacts of growth on social capital in exurban areas. A focal point of the early boomtown studies is the idea of social disruption. Social disorganization occurs when individuals, groups and institutions are not interacting according to culturally shared expectations and this can often result in conflict as communities respond to rapid growth (Cortese, 1982). Disruption affects all levels of society. Community cohesion, the positive and sustained acting out of human relationships, is particularly susceptible to disruption (Greisman, 1980; Wilkinson, 1984). Local relationships are also compromised by residential instability according to Israel et. al. (2001) which in turn may affect the social capital available to community members because the opportunities to develop relationships that help to coordinate community activities may be fewer. The social disruption hypothesis
asserts that with rapid growth you can expect to see deteriorated personal well being, individual distress, and social malaise (Krannich and Greider, 1984). The disruption period though, is often temporary because adaptation to local changes occurs over time (England and Albrecht, 1984).

In an early boomtown study, Gold (1974) observed that rapid growth was associated with a weakening of neighborly ties and rural community social structure. He also found a sense of powerlessness among existing local residents to respond to the changes associated with the growth. Other early studies looking at objective indicators like local unemployment rates, income and educational levels noted increases in crime and deviance (Dixon, 1978), as well as adverse mental health effects due to growth (Dixon, 1978; Freudenburg, 1982).

Later boomtown studies focusing on subjective indicators do not entirely support the disruption hypothesis, but do suggest a greater tendency for disruptive outcomes like deterioration in community satisfaction levels and community attachment (Krannich and Cramer, 1993). Krannich and Greider (1984) in their comparison of boomtown residents and nonboomtown residents on well-being indicators found a substantive and statistically important difference between the two groups on subjective indicators of well-being (feeling at home in community and feeling accepted in the community) suggesting boomtown residents had lower perceived integration into the local community. These studies have consistently found reduced levels of community satisfaction, integration and
attachment. They have also consistently concluded that growth impacts the quality of services provided within the community, the social ties of the residents, and the degree to which residents are involved in the community (England and Albrecht, 1984). Later boomtown studies also showed how the existence of social organization and networks helped to mediate or ameliorate the effects of rapid population growth (Krannich and Cramer, 1993). Knowing the effects of population growth helped communities plan and manage change.

In sum, the rapid growth literature focuses on both the physical and social impacts of growth on rural communities. It alludes to how social capital might be impacted in exurban areas by describing the disruption often accompanying population growth. While the rapid growth literature identifies the problems of growth, the social capital literature emphasizes the productive capacity of social networks and trust for communities. This literature suggests that communities with high levels of social capital may be better able to manage change than those with lower levels of social capital.

**Primary Hypotheses and Model**

The purpose of this research is to test the factors affecting community attachment and collective engagement in an exurban region. Of particular significance for this research is whether or not community attachment exists in the exurbs and whether or not it affects levels of engagement in the community. This question is topical because there
are a growing number of exurban areas with a diversity of residents who may have varying degrees of attachment to their place of residence. The qualities of an exurban area would suggest that newcomers may not be as involved or as interested in local community affairs as longtime residents and this may have implications for the community’s overall ability to deal with the challenges associated with population growth and development. It is also topical because of increasing recognition that the way communities are socially organized has implications for overall community and individual well-being. The social capital literature suggests that localities experiencing growth and change may lead to fewer opportunities for residents to develop relationships that help to coordinate community activities and build social capital. It is also logical to assume that if people are not interacting with each other then community engagement or action will be lower.

Specifically, this research seeks to identify what factors contribute to community attachment in an exurban community and what factors contribute to civic engagement. Based on the theoretical discussion provided in this chapter, several hypotheses will be tested. Figure 2.1 illustrates a model summarizing the hypothesized relationships. The following pages describe the central hypotheses, whereas chapter 3 includes a summary of the central hypotheses and the hypotheses related to the control and ecological variables.
Figure 2.1: Proposed Model of Primary Hypothesized Relationships
Hypothesis #1

The first hypothesis is related to the relationship between length of residence and community attachment and engagement. As described previously, one of the primary focuses of the community sociology literature has been trying to comprehend the impacts of mass society on the local community. The exurbs are a relatively new settlement pattern and often the site of conflict (see chapter one for a discussion on the physical challenges) and provide a good setting to test the “mass society” thesis, particularly the idea that length of residence is a strong predictor of community attachment. It is hypothesized that the influx of a large number of newcomers into the exurbs will result in length of residence having a strong, positive relationship to community attachment. Based on the earlier discussion of community attachment, it is also anticipated that length of residence will be positively associated with community engagement. Meaning not only is it expected that newcomers will be less attached to the community, they will also be less engaged in the community.

Hypothesis #2

The second hypothesis is directed at community sociology more than understanding the exurbs. This hypothesis relates to the failure of the community attachment literature to link attachment with community outcomes. The focus of the community attachment literature has been predominantly on explaining the factors
associated or responsible for community attachment rather than trying to predict its relationship to community action or engagement. It is hypothesized that community attachment will be positively related to community engagement. The more affective individuals feel toward their community, the more active they will be in community affairs. This hypothesis also allows comparisons between attachment and social capital in terms of their impact on community engagement.

**Hypothesis #3**

The third hypothesis centers around the importance of social capital and questions of how to build capacity to manage change in the exurbs. It also provides a way to assess the relative importance of social capital versus community attachment on community outcomes. The first component of this hypothesis is that social capital will be positively associated with community attachment net the effect of length of residence. The more embedded individuals are in the community through social networks and the more trust they place in the community, the more affective their feelings will be toward the community. The second component of this hypothesis is that social capital will be positively associated with community engagement. People more embedded in the community through networks and place trust in the community will be more involved in the community.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

To test the proposed hypotheses data are from a community survey conducted in the Fall of 2000. The survey was part of a study of the social impacts of rural in-migration on agriculture and communities at the rural/urban interface funded by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and the Swank Program for Rural-Urban Policy. This chapter will describe the procedure for selecting the study site, along with how survey respondent households were selected. Also included in this chapter is how each of the independent and dependent variables is operationalized.

Study Site Selection

Several criteria for selecting the study site were considered. The first criteria was the study site had to be located in a nonurban area adjacent to a large urban area. It was also necessary for the study site to have multiple geopolitical jurisdictions approximating a regional pie around a core urban area and there had to be a diversity of agricultural operations, especially livestock production. The site also had to be experiencing observable growth and development. Figure 3.1 shows the geographical location of the
study site. Table 3.1 shows the population and change data for each of the townships and municipalities studied.

Northwest Licking county as whole has grown 45 percent since 1970. All of the townships in Northwest Licking county have grown since 1970 with the 1970 – 1980 period being the decade of most growth. The townships as a whole have grown much faster than the region. Since 1970, the townships’ population have grown 74 percent. The 1970 to 1980 and the 1990 to 2000 periods have had the most growth, with some townships growing more than 30 percent. The fastest growing township for the most recent decade is Bennington Township, while the slowest growing township is Monroe Township. While the townships as a whole have consistently grown, the villages have a more varied pattern of growth. All of the villages in Northwest Licking county during the 1970 to 1980 period lost population. Since 1970, the only period that villages have grown in Northwest Licking county is the 1980 – 1990 period, otherwise the villages as a whole in the region have lost population.³

³ The 2000 Census reports that the Village of Alexandria has lost 383 persons and this raises some questions and concerns related to boundary changes, reporting error and undercounting.
Figure 3.1: Geographic Location of Study Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennington Township</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Township</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Township</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Village</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Township</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Township</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKean Township</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Township</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown Village</td>
<td>3208</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>3242</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans Township</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Village</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>-383</td>
<td>-81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NW Licking Co.</td>
<td>11958</td>
<td>14517</td>
<td>16685</td>
<td>17365</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Townships in NW Licking Co</td>
<td>7707</td>
<td>10426</td>
<td>11557</td>
<td>13428</td>
<td>2719</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Villages in NW Licking Co</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>4128</td>
<td>3937</td>
<td>-160</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-197</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

To test the proposed hypotheses, data from a mail survey of residents is used. There were two components of the data collection, field research and a mail survey. As part of this study, community leaders, farmers and residents were interviewed between February and June of 2000. These 33 interviews elicited accounts of recent community history and changes associated with growth and change with a special focus on agricultural operators’ challenges and adjustment strategies to increased nonfarm residential development. Field research also consisted of reviewing local historical documents and newspapers.

The information gleaned from the interviews and field research helped to guide the formulation of the community-wide survey of local residents (Appendix). A sample was taken of every third residential household listed in a 1999 Dickman Directory serving the study area. The Dickman Directory is a criss-cross directory compiled annually and primarily used by businesses. It is compiled from a variety of sources, which include but is not limited to the local phone book, courthouse records, car registrations and home ownership listings. It differs from the phone book in that it is much more inclusive since it does not rely only on people who have a phone number. To
insure that respondents were located in the study area, an initial asked respondents to identify the name of the village or township in which they currently reside. Individuals who did not name a township or village in the study area were omitted from the analysis (Table 3.2 shows the distribution of survey respondents by community). A modified Total Design Method was used for survey data collection with an initial survey, a reminder postcard and two replacement surveys. The cover letter indicated the preferred (randomly chosen) adult household respondent’s sex if there was more than one adult respondent. To maintain confidentiality, respondents were asked to return their survey in the self-addressed postage paid envelope provided by the research team. Each survey was coded with an identification number that corresponded to each respondent’s household. This technique allowed the research team to track who had returned the questionnaires, while at the same time maintaining confidentiality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township / Village</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Village</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington Township</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Township</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Township</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Village</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Township</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown Village</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Township</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKean Township</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Township</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans Township</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Distribution of survey respondents by study area

The original sample included 1806 households. Due to incomplete or bad addresses, 141 surveys were returned undeliverable. Sixty-six were returned as no longer living in the study area. Eight hundred and twenty-three usable questionnaires were returned from 1573 households in the study area resulting in a 52% response rate. One-hundred and fifty-three cases were missing at least one data item of interest in this analysis, so 670 cases are utilized in this analysis.
Sample Limitations

There are some limitations to this study as a result of sampling issues. The 48 percent nonresponse may be a limitation of the data due to nonrespondents differing from respondents. Another limitation of the sample is that the Dickman Directory was approximately six months old when the sample was selected, so residents living in the area six months or less may not have been included in the sample frame. The final limitation is related to coverage error. The Dickman Directory did not include all of the residents in Hartford Township because some addresses had a different zip code associated with a post office in an adjoining county, which was not included in the directory from which the sample was drawn. The exclusion of cases with missing values might also be a problem.

Operationalization of Dependent Variables

Community Attachment

Community attachment and community engagement are the dependent variables used in this analysis. Community attachment is defined as the sense of belonging to a place. For this research the affective feelings toward a particular place are used as indicators of community attachment (see Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). Like Weitz (1983), this analysis will not use the traditional scale used for community attachment because having an interest in the future of the community seems to be very different from
feeling at home in the community. People may be attached, yet have no interest in the future of the community. The affective feelings toward the community were summed to form an index ranging from two to nine. The respondents’ responses to whether or not they felt at home in the community (with response categories of “yes, definitely,” “yes, somewhat,” “no, not much,” and “no, definitely not”) and if they had to move away from their community, how sorry or pleased would they be to leave (with response categories of “very sorry to leave,” “somewhat sorry to leave,” “It wouldn’t make any difference one way or the other,” “somewhat pleased to leave,” and “very pleased to leave.”) comprised the scale. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability score of .63 consistent with Weitz’s (1983) alpha of .63.

**Community Engagement**

The other dependent variable in this study is community engagement. Community engagement is a measure of activeness in the community and its affairs. According to Weitz (1983) most scales developed to measure social participation ask respondents to list all the clubs and organizations to which one belongs, the number of meetings attended and whether one has served on a committee or board and held office. Four objective questions on the questionnaire asked respondents to identify whether or not they had participated in a community improvement project, attended a local meeting, belonged to a group or held a public office or served on a government board in the community. Rather than using a single indicator of engagement, a count was taken of the
number of activities each respondent had participated in the community. Logically, it makes sense that the more activities a person reported affirmatively, the more involved a person might be. The last item included in the scale was a subjective indicator asking respondents, “In general, how would you describe your level of involvement in local community activities and events?” The following were the response categories: Very active, somewhat active, not very active and not at all active. These responses were recoded into the dichotomous categories of “active” and “not active.” The community engagement scale has a range from zero to five.

Operationalization of Independent Variables

The first section of analysis seeks to approximate the systemic model of community attachment, while the second section seeks to test the factors most closely associated with community engagement. In doing so, several independent variables are expected to be associated with community attachment and engagement. The independent variables used in this study are length of residence and two measures of social capital, networks and trust, as well as several ecological factors (community size and township status). The control variables expected to be associated with community attachment and engagement are categorized as stage in life-cycle (age, sex, and presence of children under 18 in the household) and socio-economic status (educational level and home ownership). While the theoretical importance of these variables has already been
discussed in chapter two, the operational definitions and hypotheses for each of the variables are presented below.

**Length of Residence**

The duration of time a person spends living in the community is a key factor responsible for more affective feelings of attachment to the community (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Smith and Krannich, 2000). Length of residence was measured by asking respondents how long they have lived in Northwest Licking County in years. **It is hypothesized that the influx of a large number of newcomers into the exurbs will result in length of residence having a strong, positive relationship to community attachment.**

Based on earlier discussions of community attachment, it is also anticipated that length of residence will be positively associated with community engagement. Meaning not only is it expected that newcomers will be less attached to the community, they will also be less engaged in the community. **It is hypothesized that length of residence will be positively associated with community engagement.**

**Social Capital**

Two measures of social capital are operationalized with both expected to be positively related to community attachment and community engagement. Often considered a component of community attachment, networks in this analysis are
considered separate from community attachment and are treated as something that might affect feelings of attachment (Goudy, 1990; Sampson, 1988). Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) found that local attachments are likely to persist as a function of personal ties. To measure networks a scale was created. Three items were included: “About what proportion of the adults living in your village or township do you know by name?” (response categories were all of them coded as five, most of them coded as four, about half of them coded as three, less than half of them coded as two and none or very few of them coded as one); “About what proportion of all your close personal adult friends live in Northwest Licking County?” (response categories were all of them live here coded as six, most of them live here coded as five, about one-half of them live here coded as four, less than one-half of them live here coded as three, none of them live here coded as two and I really have no close personal friends coded as one); “About what proportion of your adult relatives and in-laws (other than very distantly related persons) live in Northwest Licking County?” (response categories were all of them live here coded as six, most of them live here coded as five, about one-half of them live here coded as four, less than one-half of them live here coded as three, none of them live here coded as two, and I have no living relatives or in-laws coded as one). The responses were summed to form an index ranging from 3 to 15. The bivariate correlations among these were strong indicating the possibility of creating a scale (DeVellis, 1991). A similar scale has been used by Ryan et al. (1995) in their study of the importance of social capital and obtained
an alpha reliability of .61. The scale reliability for this component of social capital is .64.⁴

Trust, the second component of social capital was measured using responses to two items on a 5-point semantic differential scale. The numbers in between 5 and 1 indicate degrees of the respective items. Respondents were asked to circle the number on the scale which best described their community. The first item hostile was at one end of the scale coded as a five and supportive was at the other end of the scale with a score of one. The second item, not trusting was at one end of the second scale and coded as five and not trusting was at the other end of the scale coded as one. A composite score was derived for these two items with a Cronbach’s alpha of .74. Scores ranged from 2 to 10. It is hypothesized that social capital will be positively associated with community attachment net the effect of length of residence. It is also hypothesized that social capital will be associated with community engagement.

⁴ Cronbach’s alpha was used to test for reliability of the scale or to see how consistent each person’s responses were to the choices in the scale. According to DeVellis (1991) this scale may be marginally acceptable because the alpha reliability is only .64. The most desirable alphas are between .65 and .90.
Ecological Factors

Two variables in this analysis account for the ecological factors. The first variable, township versus village is used to determine differences between those living in open-country areas (townships) compared to those living in villages. Townships in Ohio are a unit of local government, which provide a variety of governmental and administrative services including zoning, police and fire protection and waste disposal (OTA Web site). Residents from townships were dummy coded as one, while those living in villages were coded as zero. It is hypothesized that residents living in townships will have lower levels of community attachment. It is also hypothesized that township residents will be less involved in the community than village residents.

One of the main hypotheses of the mass society literature described earlier is that community attachments are attenuated as communities grow in size. To distinguish between community sizes in the study area, the townships and municipalities were divided into three categories based on their respective combined 2000 population. Table 3.3 shows the designations. One township and municipality was categorized as a large community (population = 5523) coded as three, three townships were categorized as medium-sized communities (population ranging from 1516 – 2841) and coded as two and the remainder smaller communities (population ranging from 1073 – 1290) coded as one. It is hypothesized that communities with larger populations will have lower levels of
community attachment. It is also hypothesized that communities with larger populations will be less engaged in community affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large (3000+)</th>
<th>Medium (1500 to 2999)</th>
<th>Small (0 to 1499)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Community size categories based on 2000 population, NW Licking County
Control Variables

Several control variables are included in this analysis to test the effects of length of residence and social capital on community attachment and community engagement net the effect of these controls.

Stage in life-cycle

Several analysts have looked at the influence of respondent attributes on attachment and engagement. Respondents were asked their age in years as of their last birthday. Age has been employed in previous research on community attachment as a measure of life-cycle stage (see Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974) and was found to be positively related to community attachment. It is expected that age will be positively associated with community attachment.

Stinner et. al. (1990) argue that age alone does not capture the other roles occupied by persons that can affect levels of attachment and engagement. Significant work has been done on the effects of life-cycle changes on involvement (see Rotolo, 2000; Knoke and Thomson, 1977). With each life cycle transition comes a different set of social obligations and circumstances affecting involvement. This literature suggests that there are several roles in particular that might affect community engagement. Respondents were asked their current marital status. Marriage, according to Rotolo (2000) affects membership in community organizations and consequently the development and the composition of social networks. It is expected that married people
will be more involved in community affairs than unmarried people. The effect of marriage on involvement is also different for men than it is for women. Women tend to have kin-focused activities and ties (see Wellman, 1999) which restrict affiliational opportunities, whereas the networks of men encourage affiliation. **It is expected that women will be less involved in community activities than men.**

The presence of children is another life-cycle event that may be related to community involvement. Respondents were asked the number of children present in the household under 18. Research findings have concluded that parenthood increases participation in voluntary associations (Rotolo, 2000). Again, there are differential effects on men and women because typically, the majority of childbearing and reproduction tasks fall on women. The age of children in the household also may affect parental involvement rates. Individuals with younger children tend to have higher participation rates (Rotolo, 2000). **It is expected that individuals with children under 18 in the household will be more engaged in the community than individuals without children under 18 in the household.**


Socioeconomic Status

Education is one of the indicators of socio-economic status used in this research. Respondents were asked to identify their highest level of formal education attained from the following categories: “Less than 9th grade,” “9th to 12th grade, no diploma,” “High school graduate (including equivalency),” “Some college, no degree,” “Associate degree,” “Bachelors degree,” and finally, “Graduate or profesional degree.” Educational levels ranged from one to seven. In general, studies focusing on community participation have shown that individuals with higher socioeconomic status are more involved in the community (Weitz, 1983). For example, Rank and Voss (1982) found socioeconomic status to be positively related to community participation. Socioeconomic status was also positively correlated with community attachment (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). It is expected that individuals with higher levels of education will be more involved in the community. It is also expected that individuals with higher levels of education will be more attached to the community.

Home ownership, another indicator of socioeconomic status is also positively related to community interaction (Stinner et. al., 1990). For this study, respondents were

---

5 Income was not used because of the high incidence of missing data.
asked whether or not they owned their own home, rented their own home or had some other arrangement. Responses ranged from 1 to 3. Owners of homes are more apt to be committed to their communities and neighborhoods and they will seek out neighbors and know them by name (Fischer, 1982). It is expected that home ownership will be positively associated with community attachment. It is also expected that home ownership will be positively associated with community engagement.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Community attachment and community engagement in this thesis are proposed to be the outcome of individual statuses, ecological factors and social capital. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the sample, provide a comparison between new and longtime residents and analyze the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Descriptive Findings

Several items on the questionnaire asked respondents background attributes such as age, length of residence, education, whether or not children were present and their marital status. Table 4.1 provides a summary of these responses.

About 51 percent of the sample was female and 47 percent were male. The mean age of respondents was 50 years with a standard deviation of 13.3 years, which indicates there is some variation among residents in terms of their age. A little over a third of the respondents were high school graduates (36%) and about 56 percent have pursued higher education in some way with 32 percent attaining at least an associate’s degree. Almost three-quarters of the respondents were currently married (73%). The mean number of children under 18 in the household was .69 with a standard deviation of 1.05. Average
length of residence in the study area was 24.5 years with a standard deviation of 18 years indicating the existence of both new and longtime residents in the study area. The majority of respondents owned their own homes (88.2%). About half of the respondents in the study area were categorized as living in a medium sized place with the remaining living in places with either smaller or larger populations. Three quarters of the respondents lived in a township, while the remainder lived in one of the villages.

Table 4.2 shows the descriptive statistics for the social capital indicators. While the mean for the networks scale was slightly higher than the mean for the trust scale (means = 8.6 and 7.4 respectively), the respondents indicated relatively high levels of social capital. While most of the means for the indicators of networks are high, the proportion of adults known by name is slightly lower than the other two indicators of networks.

In conclusion, Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show that there are both new and longtime residents in this exurban region with a majority of them living in a medium sized place (based on population). And, both indicators of social capital are relatively high for the region.

Table 4.3 shows the descriptive statistics for the dependent variables. Overall community attachment is very high in the region with a mean score of 7.9. Most residents feel at home in the community and would be sorry to leave the community. Community engagement on the other hand is not as high. In comparison to the other
indicators of community engagement, respondents generally describe their level of involvement much higher than what it seems their actual behavior indicates. As for the objective indicators of community engagement, respondents are more likely to attend a meeting than to hold public office, participate in a community improvement project or belong to at least one organization.

In sum, community attachment is quite high in this exurban region, whereas community engagement appears to be quite low. Respondents describe their level of involvement in community affairs as a lot higher than their actual behavior indicates.

**Bivariate Analyses**

Table 4.4 presents the bivariate correlations among all of the measures described in chapter three. The bivariate correlations provide some support for the expected relationships indicated by the hypotheses. Length of residence is positively associated with both community attachment and community engagement, although the relationship is much stronger with attachment. The strongest positive association with community attachment are the social capital indicators, trust (.451) and social networks (.388). The social capital indicators are also positively correlated with community engagement. Social networks have the strongest positive relationship to community engagement. Community attachment is also positively associated with people’s engagement in the community. None of the independent variables have strong correlations amongst themselves suggesting that multicollinearity is not a problem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables/Ecological Factors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of residence</strong></td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school, no diploma</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children under 18 in home</strong></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home ownership</strong></td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller population (0-1499)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium population (1500-2999)</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger population (3000+)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics for Control Variables and Ecological Factors (N=670)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIO-CAPITAL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networks / Social Bonds (Alpha = .65)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of adults known by name</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all close personal friends</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of adult relatives and in-laws</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust (Alpha = .75)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics for Social Capital Indicators (N=670)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Attachment (Alpha = .63)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home in the community</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry to leave</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively Involved</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Meeting</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Public Office</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement Project</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs to at least one organization</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fire, service or school)</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables (N=670)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks and Social Bonds</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Under 18 in Home</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Category</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township / Municipality</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** N = 670

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)
New Versus Longtime Resident Comparisons

In an effort to explore the differences between new and longtime residents on the dependent and independent variables comparison of means is included. It is included to provide additional insight for the subsequent multivariate analysis and because the strong correlations between length of residence and the dependent variables necessitates examining closer the differences between new and longtime residents. For this analysis, length of residence is broken into two categories – newcomers and longtime residents. Newcomers are those that have lived in the community less than or equal to 10 years. Longtime residents are those that have lived in the community more than 10 years. This criteria is used because 10 years allows for sufficient acquaintance with the community to facilitate informed participation in the local community (see Graber, 1974; Smith and Krannich, 2000).

Comparison of Means

Part of this analysis is to identify whether or not there is a significant difference between new and longtime residents on the independent and dependent variables. A t-test was performed to determine whether or not the differences between new and longtime residents were significant. Tables 4.5 and 4.6 present the comparison of independent and dependent variable means by newcomer and longtime resident categories.
Control Variables

There is a significant difference between newcomers and longtime residents on the following characteristics: age, length of residence, presence of children under 18 in the household, and educational levels. On average, newcomers are younger than longtime residents and they have more children under 18 living in their households. Longtime residents have lived in the community much longer than newcomers. This difference is quite significant when you compare the average number of years longtime residents have lived in the community is 32.6 years and newcomers is only 6 years. Newcomers tend to be more educated in the study area than longtime residents, although the difference is not too great.

Social Capital

Newcomers on average are significantly less embedded in the community through social networks than longtime residents. On all the measures of social networks, there is a significant difference between the two groups. In particular, it appears that longtime residents have many more relatives living in the community than newcomers. There is also a significant difference between the two groups on the overall trust component of social capital. Overall, there is a significant difference between the two groups, but when the indicators of trust are analyzed, only one indicator is significant – whether or not respondents viewed the community as being supportive or not supportive. The difference
between new and longtime residents as to whether or not they felt the community was trusting was not significant. The difference on this indicator may not be significant because newcomers have not lived in the community long enough to make this assessment, since trust is often built over time and can be one of the outcomes of social networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newcomer</th>
<th>Longtime Resident</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pearson Chi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital - Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of adults known by name</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-11.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all close personal friends</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-8.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of adult relatives and in-laws</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-7.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital - Trust</strong></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-9.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-2.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-3.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrusting</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-23.8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>-5.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-23.8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>6.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 in household</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant difference at .05 level

Table 4.5: Comparison of Independent Variable Means by Newcomer/Longtime Status
Community Attachment

Both newcomers and longtime residents reported somewhat high levels of community attachment (newcomers: mean = 7.5; longtime residents: mean = 8.1). Longtime residents though report higher levels of attachment and the difference is significant.

Community Engagement

Longtime residents report slightly higher levels of community engagement (mean = 1.6) than newcomers (1.1). There is a significant difference between new and longtime residents level of community engagement. There is not a significant difference between new and longtime residents in terms of attending local or regional meetings, but longtime residents do belong to more organizations, participate in community projects, and hold public office or serve on a governmental board more often than newcomers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newcomer</th>
<th>Longtime</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pearson Chi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home in the community</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-6.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry to leave</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-7.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of involvement</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>14.6*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended local or regional govt meeting</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs to a group or organization</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community improvement project</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held public office or service on government board</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>15.6*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant difference at .05 level

Table 4.6: Comparison of Dependent Variable Means by Newcomer/Longtime Resident

Summary of New and Longtime Resident Differences

In summary, based on the comparison of means for both new and longtime residents, several points are worthy of mention. There are significant differences between the groups in terms of how attached they are to their community, how engaged they are in the community and their levels of social capital. These differences suggest the need to develop and strengthen the social capital of newcomers.
Multivariate Analyses

To test the hypotheses identified in Chapter two, multivariate analysis was conducted. Table 4.7 presents the results of the multivariate analyses. The first model examines the relationship between community attachment, length of residence and social capital. The second model examines the relationship between community engagement and social capital and community attachment.

Model 1

The first model supports the notion that social capital or the existence of networks and trust may influence a person’s affective feelings toward their community. For the social capital indicators, the strongest association is trust, followed by social networks. None of the ecological factors or individual statuses are significantly associated with community attachment. Especially noteworthy, is the effect of length of residence on community attachment in this model is not significant, despite a statistically significant relationship between social capital and length of residence. About 28 percent of the variance in community attachment can be explained by the independent variables in this model.
Model 2

Model 2 presents the regression analysis with community engagement as the dependent variable. Being female is negatively associated with community engagement. This finding is consistent with others who report that women typically have many roles and these roles often do not allow time for becoming involved in activities outside of family life (see Wellman, 1999; Stuart and Van Es, 1978). It is also consistent with the idea that women's low participation in community affairs is a result of the way the recruitment to activities and in particular political arenas functions in most communities (Stuart and Van Es, 1978). It is thought that women do not have the same access routes as men to become involved. On the other hand, having children under 18 in the home is positively associated with community engagement. This finding is consistent with the idea that the presence of children is one way people express and define their interests in local community affairs (Stuart and Van Es, 1978). Those with higher levels of education are also more actively engaged in the community. This finding is consistent with others who purport that people of higher socio-economic status have more at stake in the community and participate in community affairs to protect their interests (Ladewig and McCann, 1980). Only one component of social capital is associated with community engagement. Social networks are positively associated with community engagement. Community attachment is not significantly associated with community engagement.6

---

6 Weitz (1983) found a significant weak relationship between community attachment and social participation.
About 23 percent of the variance in community engagement is explained by the independent variables in Model 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Model 1 Community Attachment</th>
<th>Model 2 Community Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)*</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(00)</td>
<td>(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 in the home</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(043)</td>
<td>(053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(06)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Capital Measures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Networks</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>(03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Attachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R-square                         | 28                           | 23                           |
| S.E.E                             | 1.0                          | 1.2                          |
| Model F-value                     | 24.3*                       | 16.7*                        |

* all items significant at the .05 level (one-tailed t-test), " Unstandardized coefficients, " standard errors

Table 4.7: Results of Multivariate Model (N=670)
Discussion of Primary Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1

The first hypothesis that length of residence is an important factor in relationship to community attachment and engagement has mixed support. The bivariate analysis shows a strong relationship between length of residence and community attachment. However, in the multivariate analysis, length of residence is not significant net the effects of social capital. The same is true for the relationship between length of residence and community engagement. The bivariate correlations indicate a positive moderate relationship between length of residence and community engagement, but in the multivariate model length of residence is not significantly related to community engagement.

Based on the comparison of means for both new and longtime residents, several points are worthy of mention. There are significant differences between the groups in terms of how attached they are to their community and how engaged they are in the community. These differences identify the need to increase levels of social capital of newcomers, since the multivariate analyses suggests that it is social capital that is more closely associated with community attachment and engagement than any other factor in the models.
**Hypothesis #2**

The second hypothesis that community attachment will be associated with community engagement was not supported. Despite the strong positive association between community attachment and community engagement in the bivariate analysis, community attachment was not significantly associated with community engagement in Model 2. It appears that feeling attached to the community does not mean that people are necessarily involved in the community.

**Hypothesis #3**

The third hypothesis that social capital is related to community attachment and engagement also receives mixed support. In the bivariate analysis, both trust and social networks have strong positive relationships with community attachment and community engagement. In the multivariate analysis, both components of social capital (networks and trust) were significantly related to community attachment, while only networks were associated with community engagement. No relationship is found between trust in the community and community engagement.

**Summary of Findings**

In sum, the findings suggest that length of residence is not related to community attachment or engagement net the effects of social capital and other individual statuses. Furthermore, community attachment is not associated with community engagement.
However, social capital is related to community attachment, while only networks are associated with community engagement. Chapter five will discuss the findings in more depth as well as implications of the findings for exurban areas, community sociology and community development elaborated. Recommendations for future study will be provided.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this thesis several questions were posited in relation to how attached exurban residents are to their community and whether or not these attachments lead to more involvement in the community. Community engagement or action according to the interactional approach to community is the manifestation of community (Wilkinson, 1999). The disruption hypothesis suggests that rapid growth necessarily affects people’s sense of community, while the interactional approach suggests that community can persist despite growth as long as locality relevant action occurs. Previous theory and research provided insight on the types of relationships that could be expected. Specifically, length of residence is theoretically the most important factor associated with community attachment. Social capital was introduced as a factor that might account for both community attachment and engagement because its existence has been linked with positive community outcomes. A model was tested and the findings reported in chapter four. This chapter will summarize the findings and focus on the implications of the findings divided by topic and make suggestions for future research.
Summary of Findings

Length of Residence, Community Attachment and Engagement

Length of residence net the effect of social capital was not a significant factor in relationship to community attachment or engagement. This suggests length of residence in this analysis is not the most important factor related to community attachment or engagement, but rather the social capital indicators are. Feelings of trust and the number of people that are known in the community appear to be more important than length of residence in explaining community attachment, while social networks alone appear to be more important in explaining community engagement.

As for the relationship between length of residence and community engagement, this finding is not surprising. Although the expectation might be that the longer a person lives in the community, the more they will be engaged in the community, recent analyses of newcomer and longtime residents in communities experiencing growth has focused on longtime residents complacency with their community. While longtime residents are comfortable with the status quo, newcomers may become engaged in the community in an effort to improve it, stop growth and development or impact future change. Longtime residents may not feel the community needs improvement and consequently, longtime residents may not participate in community organizations as much.
Community Attachment and Community Engagement

Mentioned previously in chapter two, the community attachment literature has not looked at how affective feelings toward the community are related to levels of engagement in the community. It seems logical to think that these bonds and feelings could have particular significance for the level of community cohesion and the ability of the community to act in the interest of the collectivity, but the multivariate findings reveal that community attachment is not related to community engagement. Additional study of the causal ordering is necessary because perhaps community attachment is an outcome of community engagement.

Social Capital and Community Attachment

The predictive power of both trust and social networks in the multivariate analysis suggests that the existence of social capital has implications for individual feelings of attachment to the locality (Model 1). People that are more embedded in the community through social networks have greater affective feelings toward the community. The existence of community trust also corresponds with high levels of attachment. From a community development standpoint, the results indicate emphasis should be placed on building social capital if the goal is for residents more attached to their community.
Social Capital and Community Engagement

Social networks are found to be important predictors of community engagement. The more embedded people are in the community through social networks, the more involved they are in the community. Trust in the community was not significantly related to community engagement, which suggests that trust in the community is not one of the reasons people become involved in community affairs. Brehm and Rahn’s (1999) study on individual causes of social capital suggests that trust may be an outcome of community or civic engagement rather than a predictor of community engagement. Future analysts might want to investigate this relationship further. It might also be appropriate to explore actual community outcomes of collective action because trust may not lead people to become involved in the community, but may be important for solving community problems or cooperating for public good (see Putnam, 1993).

Study Limitations

There are limitations of this study. One limitation is that this study is only measures social conditions at one point in time. The study is unable to assess whether there was a decline in longtime residents attachment as a result of growth. Longitudinal data would provide a better estimate of the effects of growth and development on rural and exurban communities. Another limitation is that the study area may not have ever had strong levels of community engagement. The study is not able to assess past levels
of attachment or engagement. Another limitation is not being able to compare the findings with other study areas to assess whether this area is indeed high or low in initial levels of community attachment and community engagement.

**Study Implications**

**Implications for Exurban Areas**

Length of residence, net the effect of other factors, is not significantly related to community attachment or community engagement in the exurbs. This suggests that it is not simply length of residence that determines how residents feel about the community or their level of involvement in the community. This finding is important because it suggests that “newness” may be overstated as the source of differences between new and longtime residents. There are many ways that newcomers differ from longtime residents in this study area, such as family status and education, which appear to play a more important role than length of residence in predicting community attachment and engagement. Smith and Krannich (2000) arrive at a similar conclusion in their study of differences amongst new and longtime residents, finding many similarities and points of agreement between new and longtime residents.

The newcomer / longtime resident distinction, though is still relevant for a number of reasons. First, some of the unique attributes and experiences that newcomers bring to the community can be a resource in assisting the community to act (Flora and Flora, 1988). For example, having newcomers with higher levels of education can be an
asset for exurban communities as they bring new knowledge or unique talents to the community. Second, despite the multivariate findings, it is still important to identify ways to engage both newcomers and longtime residents in community affairs, and it may be that the strategies will be different for the two groups. Thirdly, although this analysis did not explore the factors contributing to the development of social capital, the comparison between new and longtime residents revealed that newcomers’ social networks were not as developed as longtime residents. This finding requires further examination to better understand the nature of the difference, as well as the possible opportunities to strengthen and build social networks among and between all residents.

**Implications for Community Sociology**

This analysis has several implications for community sociology. The community attachment literature has focused primarily on factors related to community attachment and does not develop the argument beyond predicting community attachment. In addition, many policy makers feel that the lack of community attachment has severe consequences on communities (Liu et. al., 1998). This analysis points to the need for community sociologists to “get at” what is important about community attachment or the affective feelings people have toward their community. It was expected that community attachment would be positively related to community engagement, but this relationship was not significant. It is recommended that other community studies examine the role of affective feelings toward the community and to community outcomes because it seems
logical to assume that these feelings of attachment have an impact on community affairs, especially communities under growth pressures. Community sociology should also consider that community attachment may be an outcome of community engagement. As individuals become more involved in the community, they may feel more at home in the community. But even in this case, one must consider why this relationship matters, and worthy of study.

This study also points to the need for community sociologists to reconsider the relationship between social capital and community outcomes. This research implies that the focus of community sociology should be on social capital rather than on community attachment since it is related to community engagement. In particular, investigating the social networks of exurban residents may be prudent. The qualitative part of this study indicated that there are some networks that enable particular people to become involved in the community, while others hinder people from becoming involved. Specifically, some informants described the existence of a “good-ole boy” network that excludes residents and makes solving community problems more difficult. Further study is needed to better understand the ways in which social networks work to include or exclude particular groups.

*Implications for Community Development*

Community development according to Warren (1978) is a deliberate and sustained attempt to strengthen the horizontal ties of the community or according to
Wilkinson (1978) is the assumption that patterns of interaction can be stimulated where they do not occur naturally. With this in mind, one of the premises of this study was that the existence of social capital can be a resource for achieving desired community outcomes. According to the interactional perspective, community engagement is the manifestation of community. If social capital fosters community, than it is especially important for community development professionals in exurban areas to encourage (or stimulate) networking opportunities and assist in building diverse and inclusive networks. Garkovich (1989) describes this as the development of the community approach because by fostering interaction among residents community development professionals are also promoting cohesive and integrated communities.

The social capital literature has documented that communities with higher levels of social capital will fare better then those with lower levels of social capital. Again, this points to the necessity of exurban areas to develop new and existing social networks which may assist the community in better dealing with the challenges associated with growth, whether they are physical or social. In particular, linkages amongst diverse groups should be emphasized. By encouraging, initiating and supporting social networks community capacity may be improved, or at least the number of individuals acting on the communities’ behalf is increased. Although it is not known what the affective feelings bring in terms of outcomes to the community, by strengthening social capital it appears that community attachment may also be strengthened.
Community development takes on several roles and according to Wilkinson (1979), one of the roles of community development is to increase the opportunities to open and maintain channels of communication and cooperation among local groups. The multivariate analysis suggests that females are less engaged in the community than males and this may limit the community because the interests of females may not be accounted for in solving community problems. Because of their lower levels of engagement, women may not be accepted as leaders in this exurban region, which may restrict them from asserting local influence in community development (Wilkinson, 1991). Also, the inclusion of females in community affairs may bring new resources and ideas to the community that is otherwise not available.

There is also a significant relationship between those households with children under 18 and community engagement. This finding suggests that older residents may not be as involved in the community as younger or middle-aged residents. While this finding is not surprising, it suggests that the interests of older residents in the region may not be met if they are not engaged in the community. And, the community may not be tapping the knowledge, skills and other resources of older residents as best it could. In fact, a retired couple interviewed for the study mentioned that once their kids had graduated from school it seemed like they no longer had as much of a stake in the community and lost touch with much of what was going on in the community. Another respondent seemed quite irritated that the schools were given so much attention in the region and
other activities were not given as much focus. To bring older residents into the local network structure, more opportunities or institutions might need to be developed in the area.

More educated people are also more active in the community. This finding is consistent with literature that purports that individuals with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to participate in community affairs (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Stinner et. al., 1990). While it may be difficult to increase educational levels, this finding suggests the possibility of stratification in community affairs. This type of stratification may limit the community in knowing the needs of persons of lower socio-economic status, as well as limit access to these nonparticipants potential contribution for community betterment.

In summary, the existence of social capital is related to both community attachment and engagement. Building or investing in social networks among residents in exurban areas seems to be a prudent community development strategy. This is not to say that encouraging networks always leads to consensus, but rather that it provides an opportunity for all voices to be heard in the community and it expands the resources available to solve future complex problems. It may also assist in building trust among diverse interests, which helps to mediate the “transaction” costs associated with community development (see Flora, 1998; Ryan et. al., 1995). As exurban communities
become more trusting, they may be able to rely less on formal deliberation processes to solve their problems and begin to work together to for community betterment.

Future Research Needs

Based on the findings and literature presented there are several recommendations for future research. Exurban regions as a whole have not been studied much. The rate of growth and change can covary within exurban regions – areas closer to the metropolitan area may experience more acute changes than those further away from the metropolitan area. Future research needs to examine the differences in community attachment, social capital and engagement across several exurban regions to identify whether there are differences in social and community change. Proximity to the metropolitan area may help explain differences between areas within exurban regions, as well as the rate of growth in the particular region. These differences may have implications specifically related to agricultural viability and regional planning.

Additional research needs to be conducted on the social disruption hypothesis in exurban areas. The findings of existing literature on disruption is inconclusive and there appears to be little agreement on the consequences of growth and development on rural communities. In terms of this analysis, the multivariate analysis suggests there are no difference between new and longtime residents net the other controls in terms of levels of attachment, social capital and engagement, but the bivariate and descriptive statistics
suggest that independent of other factors there are differences between the groups. Future research needs to address the causal factors responsible for lower levels of attachment, social capital (networks) and engagement amongst newcomers. And, future research needs to identify the implications of the differences between the two groups. While attention needs to be given to understanding the problems arising from differences between new and longtime residents, future research may also want to investigate the positive impacts of these differences. Just because the two groups vary in levels of social capital does not necessarily mean that the differences are bad. Newcomers may have social capital associated with other places, which could be used to solve some local community problems (see Granovetter’s discussion on the strength of weak ties).

Perhaps most importantly, additional research should focus on how to enhance social interaction opportunities within exurban communities. This point is especially noteworthy for exurban communities because residents often live in the exurbs, but work in the nearby urban area. Most of their time is spent outside of the community making building social capital difficult. Community development professionals have identified local organizations as one way to foster social capital or capacity, but because it takes time to organize people it is often not used as a community development strategy because of the time factor (Garkovich, 1989). However, the field research component of this project suggests existing exurban organizations such as churches can be useful organizations in creating and maintaining social capital (see also, Liu et. al., 1998;
Coleman, 1988; Cortese, 1982). Others suggest neighborhood associations (Garkovich, 1989) as being a good way to stimulate interactional involvement because the issues pertaining to neighborhoods bring a diverse range of actors together who have a common interest in maintaining the neighborhood. Although sparse neighborhood density and limited township identity make community building at the neighborhood level difficult.

Others maintain that public spaces are important for building social capital. The idea is that communities need gathering places or places where daily interaction occurs (Sharp, 1998). These spaces allow community members to come together informally and catch up on community news with other residents and to build a rapport with other residents. Examples of public spaces are parks, community centers, libraries, and restaurants. A good example of a public space that is missed in a part of the study area is the local post office. Residents of one part of the study region used to have to go to the post office to get their mail, but every resident has their own mailbox now and the mail is delivered to their home. Consequently, a long-standing opportunity to interact with other residents informally no longer exists.

Future research should focus on how social capital is built in exurban regions. For example, is it an outcome of community engagement or is it a temporal process whereby residents build it unknowingly just by living in one place over time? According to Warner (1999), if network building is not expected to produce social, economic or cultural returns, then the efforts to build it will not be considered useful. This point is
well taken and suggests that the benefits of building social capital should be emphasized in community development. In addition, the nature of social networks should be explored further, particularly the notion that social networks can exclude people from participating in community action or what some term “the dark side of social capital” (Warner, 1999; Schulman and Anderson, 1999).

In conclusion, utilizing an interactional approach to community has shown that it is the quality of networks and interaction that matter and not the size of the community in determining attachment and engagement. Because exurban areas are often the site of conflict over growth and have problems, which require collective action, this analysis demonstrates the importance of social capital to help manage these problems. It is the quality of networks that make a difference in community engagement or action rather than the affective feelings toward the community. While most community sociologists have focused on community attachment, this analysis concludes that the focus should be shifted to social capital. Social capital was associated with both community attachment and community engagement. Community attachment on the other hand, was not related to community engagement. By building new or improving existing community social capital, exurban areas may be better able to manage current and future growth and development.
1. What is your overall satisfaction with your current employment (circle your answer)?

   1. Very satisfied
   2. Somewhat satisfied
   3. Somewhat dissatisfied
   4. Very dissatisfied

M. If presently married, what is your spouse's present employment status?

   1. Employed or self-employed on a full-time basis
   2. Employed or self-employed on a part-time basis
   3. Retired
   4. Full-time homemaker
   5. Student
   6. Unemployed

Please list either primary occupation

   Occupation ____________________________

   Community where employed ____________________________

   Miles traveled to work (one-way) ____________________________

   List second occupation (if any) ____________________________

N. What was your approximate gross household income from all sources, before taxes, for 1999?

   1. $9,999 or less
   2. $10,000 - $19,999
   3. $20,000 - $29,999
   4. $30,000 - $39,999
   5. $40,000 - $49,999
   6. $50,000 - $59,999
   7. $60,000 - $74,999
   8. $75,000 or more

Thanks for your cooperation!!
If you have any additional comments, please use the back cover.
### D. How important are the following factors in your decision to live where you currently live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of congestion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Close to relatives/laws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friendliness of people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close to job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affordable housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Low housing density</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Close to nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Safe area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Strong school system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Low cost of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rural character</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Low crime rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?  

### I. How many of the persons in your household are under the age of 18?  

### J. Your highest level of formal education attained?

1. Less than 9th grade
2. 9th to 12th grade, no diploma
3. High school graduate (includes equivalency)
4. Some college, no degree
5. Associate degree
6. Bachelor's degree
7. Graduate or professional degree

### K. Your present employment status?

1. Employed or self-employed on a full-time basis
2. Employed or self-employed on a part-time basis
3. Retired
4. Full-time homemaker
5. Student
6. Unemployed

Please list your primary occupation:

**Occupation:**

Community where employed:

Miles traveled to work (one-way):

List second occupation (if any):
III. Attitudes About Your Community and Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For the following statements, indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE by circling the appropriate numbers. For questions related to your specific community, refer to the village or township within which you reside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When something needs to get done in this community, the whole community usually gets behind it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Population growth and development in this community is negatively affecting the quality of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community clubs and organizations are interested in what is best for all residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neighbors do not care as much about the community as long-time residents do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The people and organizations of this community are quick to respond when problems arise requiring action.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This community is well organized for solving its problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If you don't look out for yourself, no one else in this community will.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This community is losing its rural character.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Residents in this community are receptive to new residents taking leadership positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What will probably happen when you decide to retire or quit farming?
   a. Sell to a developer:  
   b. Sell to another farmer:  
   c. A relative (son, daughter, son-in-law) will take over the operation:  
   d. Don't know:  
   e. Other (please specify): ____________________________

7. Approximately how many houses are at risk of collapse due to forest fires?  
   ________ houses

7. Of those houses, how many of them do you know at least one household member?  
   ________

8. Please indicate what crops you currently grow on your farm.
   a. Cash grain:  
   b. Fruits and vegetables:  
   c. Nursery or greenhouse production:  
   d. Hay or pasture:  
   e. Other:  

9. Please indicate what livestock you raise on your farm. If yes, indicate the approximate number of each you raise in your facilities (breed and sales combined).
   a. Beef cattle:  
   b. Hog and pigs:  
   c. Poultry:  
   d. Milk cows:  
   e. Sheep:  
   f. Horses:  

10. What proportion of your total agricultural sales in 1999 came from sales directly to consumers?  
    ________ %
IV. Social Networks, Community Attachment and Sentiments

A. About what proportion of the adults living in your village or township do you know by name?
1. None or very few of them
2. Less than half of them
3. About half of them
4. Most of them
5. All of them

B. About what proportion of all your close personal adult friends live in Northwest Licking County?
1. I really have no close personal friends
2. None of them live here
3. Less than one-half of them live here
4. About one-half of them live here
5. Most of them live here
6. All of them live here

C. About what proportion of your adult relatives and in-laws (other than very distantly related persons) live in Northwest Licking County?
1. I have no living relatives or in-laws
2. None of them live here
3. Less than one-half of them live here
4. About one-half of them live here
5. Most of them live here
6. All of them live here

D. How often do you see or meet with the following types of people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>More than once a month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends from the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected official or community leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New resident (5 years or less)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtime resident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Did your household have any agricultural sales in 1999?

IF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAD NO AGRICULTURAL SALES IN 1999, PLEASE SKIP TO PAGE 14.

The remaining questions on this page and the next page are to be answered by those respondents living in a household with agricultural sales. If the household member responding to this survey is not the primary farm operator, please assist the state of the primary farm operator in answering the following questions.

1. In the past five years, what will likely happen to the following aspects of your farm operation in comparison to this year? If certain practices do not exist, please indicate not applicable.

   - [Increase] Yes
   - [Remain the Same] No
   - [Decrease] Not Applicable

a. Farmland Owned
b. Farmland Rented
c. Livestock Sold
d. Capital Improvements to buildings
e. Sale of products directly to consumers
f. Proportion of household income from agriculture

2. In the past five years how have the following aspects of your farm operation changed in comparison to the years prior to 1999? If certain practices do not exist, please indicate not applicable.

   - [Increased] Yes
   - [Remain the Same] No
   - [Decreased] Not Applicable

a. Farmland Owned
b. Farmland Rented
c. Livestock Sold
d. Capital Improvements to buildings
e. Sale of products directly to consumers
f. Proportion of household income from agriculture
V. Describing Your Community

A. Imagine a scale for each pair of words listed below. For the first pair, 1 on the scale indicates totally friendly and 5 indicates totally unfriendly. The numbers in between (2, 3, and 4) are degrees of friendliness. For each pair of words, please circle one number which best describes your community.

- Friendly
- Unfriendly
- Supportive
- Hostile
- Rural
- Urban
- Trusting
- Not Trusting
- Well-behaved
- Run Down

B. Please circle the number between 1 and 5 that best describes your attitude to the following questions.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being dissatisfied and 5 being satisfied, how satisfied are you with living in your community?

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and 5 being well, how well do you fit in your community?

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being nothing and 5 being everything, how much do you have in common with most of the people in your community?

VI. Organization and Group Memberships

A. Are you or have you recently been involved in local community affairs? (Check yes or no)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Held a public office or served on a government board or committee in your community in the last five years?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contacted a local government official about an issue in the last two years?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attended a local or regional government meeting in the last two years? (city council, planning and zoning commission, rural}urus, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Have you participated in a community improvement project in the last two years (such as a volunteer or fund-raising effort)?

1. Yes
2. No

C. How many hours on average do you ordinarily spend, in a normal month, attending or taking part in any kind of organized or planned group activity or event (not associated with work) that involves other members of your community?

1. Less than 1 hour per month
2. 1 to 4 hours per month
3. 5 to 10 hours per month
4. More than 10 hours per month

D. Do you belong to any of the following kinds of groups?

1. Service or fraternal organization (such as Lions, Kiwanis, Eastern Star) Yes No
2. Volunteer Emergency or Fire Service Yes No
3. Recreational group (softball, bowling, card clubs, etc.) Yes No
4. School support group (PTO, PTA, Boosters) Yes No
5. Political organization Yes No
6. Church or church-related group Yes No
7. Other: ___________________________ Yes No
VII. Farming in Northeast Licking County

A. Please indicate whether you or a member of your household has ever had any of the following experiences:

1. Have you ever traveled or visited a farm operation near where you live?
   Yes 1  No 2

2. Have you assisted a neighboring farmer with a farm-related task?
   Yes 1  No 2

3. Have you expressed a concern or complained about a farm practice considered offensive?
   Yes 1  No 2

4. Have you asked a farmer to change or delay farm work near your residence?
   Yes 1  No 2

B. Overall, how would you rate your experience of living near or amidst working farms?
1. Very positive
2. Positive
3. Mix of positive and negative
4. Negative
5. Very negative

C. To what extent have you experienced the following types of inconveniences or possible annoyances associated with agriculture?

- Dust:
  - Frequently 1  
  - Sometimes 2  
  - Rarely 3  
  - Never 4

- Flies:
  - Frequently 1  
  - Sometimes 2  
  - Rarely 3  
  - Never 4

- Farm-related traffic congestion:
  - Frequently 1  
  - Sometimes 2  
  - Rarely 3  
  - Never 4

- Livestock odors:
  - Frequently 1  
  - Sometimes 2  
  - Rarely 3  
  - Never 4

- Other:
  - Frequently 1  
  - Sometimes 2  
  - Rarely 3  
  - Never 4

D. Have you had any negative experiences associated with agriculture in the area in which you live?
   - Yes, please describe: ___________________________________________________________

   - No

E. In general, would you say you feel “at home” in your community?
   1. Yes, definitely
   2. Yes, somewhat
   3. No, not much
   4. No, definitely not

F. In general, how would you describe your level of involvement in local community activities and events?
   1. Very active
   2. Somewhat active
   3. Not very active
   4. Not at all active

G. How interested are you in knowing what goes on in your community?
   1. Very interested
   2. Somewhat interested
   3. Neither interested nor disinterested
   4. Not interested

H. Overall the past few years would you say that your community, in general, has become more or less desirable as a place to live?
   1. More desirable
   2. Less desirable
   3. Stayed about the same

I. Suppose that for some reason you had to move away from your community, how sorry or pleased would you be to leave?
   1. Very sorry to leave
   2. Somewhat sorry to leave
   3. It wouldn’t make any difference one way or the other
   4. Somewhat pleased to leave
   5. Very pleased to leave

J. If any of the property around your residence is farmland, do you know at least one of the farmers who farm this land?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don’t have any farm land adjoining my residence
   4. I own the farm land next to my residence
3. Please indicate whether the following are a severe problem, a modest problem, or not a problem for the viability of your farm operation during the next five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Not a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Low prices for agricultural products.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Access to suppliers and/or marketing outlets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Availability of farmland to expand farm operations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Population growth and development near your farm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Traffic congestion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Difficulty of handling by-chemicals near residential areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Neighbor concerns about fieldwork.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Neighbor concern about livestock.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which of the following "good neighbor" practices do you engage in, and do you think it is in reducing concerns or complaints of nonfarm neighbors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you done this?</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Moved equipment during low traffic periods</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Held an open house or party for nonfarm neighbors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Worked around nonfarm neighbors activities when timing when doing fieldwork</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sought out and met nonfarm neighbors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Built farm facility away from nonfarm neighbors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. For the following statements, indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE by circling the appropriate numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 1. Overall, farming positively contributes to the quality of life in my community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The siting of large, confined animal feeding operations in rural areas is a threat to rural quality of life.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If you choose to live in the country, you must be willing to accept some of the potential annoyances associated with agriculture (i.e., odors on the road, livestock odors, dust).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This region's most productive farmland should be preserved for agriculture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There should be increased regulation of agriculture to better protect the rural environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Farmers should do whatever is necessary to have a profitable business, regardless of what their neighbors think.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There should be limits on where residential development can occur in the country to protect local farmland.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The farmers in my neighborhood are sensitive to the concerns of nonfarm neighbors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I trust the farmers in my community to be wise and protect the local environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many more years do you expect to continue farming? _______ years
VIII. Background Questions

Finally, we need to ask a few questions about your background and experience. This information, as with all information provided in this survey, will be used for statistical analysis only and will remain strictly confidential.

A. Your age (as of last birthday)? _______ years

B. Your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

C. What is your current marital status? (circle one)
   1. Married
   2. Divorced/Separated
   3. Never married
   4. Widowed

D. How long have you lived in Northwest Licking County? _______ years

E. Do you own or rent your current residence? (circle one)
   1. Own
   2. Rent
   3. Have some other arrangement

F. If your household is engaged in farming, how many acres are operated, owned and rented from someone else?
   1. Operate: _______
   2. Own: _______
   3. Rent from someone else: _______

G. If your household is engaged in farming, what were your gross farm sales in 1999? (circle one)
   1. Less than $1,000
   2. $1,000 to $9,999
   3. $10,000 to $99,999
   4. $99,999 to $240,999
   5. $250,000 and above

D. Please rate the overall quality of services and facilities in your local area.

   1. Very good
   2. Good
   3. Fair
   4. Poor
   5. Don’t know

C. Do you stay MOSTLY IN NORTHWEST LICKING COUNTY (Johnstown, Cleves, Homer, Alexandria, Uhrichsville and surrounding townships) to acquire the following services, or do you go MOSTLY OUTSIDE OF NORTHWEST LICKING COUNTY?

   Please circle the appropriate numbers for each of the services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mostly In NW Licking County</th>
<th>Mostly Outside NW Licking County</th>
<th>Do Not Use/Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Medical care (primary physician)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Shopping for daily needs (groceries, gas, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Shopping for “big ticket” items</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Recreation/Entertainment (movies, dining, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. How would you rate the overall quality of GOVERNMENT services in your local area?

   1. Very good
   2. Good
   3. Fair
   4. Poor
   5. Don’t know
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