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ABSTRACT

The new migration is being viewed as a turnaround in more than numbers alone. Given the motivations which underlie the trend, migrant characteristics, and the types of destinations migrants are choosing, it has been suggested that one of the new migration's inevitable impacts will be on the future growth and development of rural areas. This research addresses several aspects of the growth and development issue among recent metropolitan origin migrants to fast growing rural counties of the Midwest. It documents migrants' and rural residents' perception of and sentiments toward population growth. It then goes on to detail differences between the pro- and anti-growth advocates on several development alternatives.

The data show that the metropolitan origin migrants, and rural residents are well aware of the population growth taking place in their areas, and that they are strongly pro-growth in their expressed sentiments. Detailed comparisons of migrants with pro- and anti-growth sentiments reveal that they view growth as "good" or "bad" for quite different sets of reasons—the anti-growth respondents fearing the crowding and social consequences of who might move in, and the proponents of growth citing the economic potential of increased population. Additional comparisons between the two groups on sentiments toward alternative development options show that points of view vary across issues. Anti-growth respondents are generally more conservative toward future development but they are by no means monolithic in their views. The findings are discussed against the background of speculation that the new migration will eventually lead to conflict and controversy over growth and development issues in rural areas.
INTRODUCTION

The recent population turnaround has fueled speculation on the impact migrants will have on the rural areas in which they relocate. Given the types of individuals and households leaving urban areas for rural destinations, and their motivations, it is being suggested that one of the more salient impacts will be on future growth, and the nature of that growth, in the rural areas in which migrants take up residence. There is uncertainty, however, about the nature of their impact. The growth issue is generally framed in the context of whether younger higher socioeconomic status migrants, who originated in large urban areas will be receptive to future growth and change in the rural areas in which they relocate, or whether, out of concern for preserving the amenities of their new residences, they will be opposed to any and all types of future growth.

Research on the "new migration" has begun to provide the rationale for expecting clashes on growth issues between urban origin newcomers and rural residents, but in terms of documentation it has done little more than provide inferences based on selected case studies—generally in scenic areas and rural-urban fringe communities—in which controversies over growth have arisen. Local conflicts, controversies and problems in such areas are currently being cast as some of the inevitable consequences of the new migration. There have been few attempts, however, to document systematically immigrants' perspectives on growth in more typical rural growth settings to assess whether their views are different than those of rural residents, and to determine whether their perspectives extend beyond the population growth issue to encompass the broader issue of the types of
development which might be preferred. And, finally, there has been a notable absence of effort to provide an explanation of why there should be an opposition to growth among newcomers. Speculative hunches abound, but efforts to tie growth sentiments to the new migration itself have not been forthcoming.

The present paper, which draws on survey data obtained from recent metropolitan-origin migrants and residents in fast-growing rural areas of the Midwest, addresses various aspects of the growth issue. It documents first, migrants' and residents' perspectives on growth. Second, it examines differences among migrants in their views on the types of development which might be acceptable. And third, it focuses on some of the underlying bases for growth and no-growth sentiments.

BACKGROUND

For decades metropolitan areas have been growing faster than, and at the expense of, nonmetropolitan areas. The decade of the 70's, however, has been marked by a unique counterrtrend: a reversal in the movement of people from rural to urban areas in virtually all regions of the country. Nonmetropolitan areas are now growing faster than the metropolitan areas, and migration from cities has exceeded migration to cities throughout the decade. This trend, which various analyses have established, has been described as a "population turnaround" or "the new migration."

The influx of metropolitan-origin migrants into rural areas is being viewed as more than a demographic turnaround. Cultural impacts are being predicted as well. Discussions of presumed cultural impact hinge on three important discoveries about the trend. First, the inmigrant stream is made up of individuals who are different from the residents of the rural areas experiencing growth. Metropolitan-origin migrants are in general
of higher socioeconomic status, and younger, than rural residents. Second, it has also been firmly established that metropolitan-origin migrants are motivated to a large extent by quality of life or environmental concerns, which for different segments of the stream translate into a variety of reasons for leaving urban areas: going "back to the land," escaping problems of big-city life, living in areas with scenic amenities or in small communities with a slower pace of living, or being nearer friends and family (Williams and Sofranko, 1979). By and large, this particular migration stream has been characterized by a distinct set of broad, non-economic, non-employment motivations. In this respect the new migrants are unlike earlier rural-to-urban migrants, and for this reason the current turnaround is being referred to as an "unanticipated trend" with possible cultural ramifications. And, third, metropolitan-origin inmigrants are demonstrating a preference for the more rural types of residences in their destination areas--in the countryside and in unincorporated areas (Zelinsky, 1976).

Consequences of The New Migration

The fact that metropolitan-origin inmigrants are different from rural residents, have placed a high priority on amenities in their migration decisions, and are locating predominantly in small places and countryside residences has suggested a variety of second-order consequences for the rural areas in which they relocate. The trend is said to represent potential strains as well as gains to the rural areas experiencing heavy immigration. While it may bring in persons with new skills and perspectives, and generate new economic opportunities, it may also bring in people who are at variance with the resident population: individuals with new ideas and demands, who may become advocates of change, alter the
existing stratification system, provide contrasting life styles, and who have vastly different conceptions of the "good life" (Schwarzweller, 1979: 15-16). Already case studies have emerged which suggest that social, political, and economic impacts are inevitable.

An Oregon community, for example, is reported to have problems approving school budgets when traditional leadership is challenged by newcomers (Hennigh, 1978). Controversy over land-use had emerged as a problem in a scenic area in Wyoming (Cockerham and Blevins, 1977), while a California study (Sokolow, 1970) points to several problems resulting from newcomers resettling in more remote rural areas. At the other end of the nation, a study of migrants to rural areas in Maine (Ploch, 1978) points to one of the benefits of newcomers— the enrichment of local cultural resources as young, highly educated individuals and families bring new ideas and their energies to rural growth areas. Graber (1974) has shown in a small Colorado community that urban-origin newcomers are in the forefront of various preservation efforts in the area. Other examples could be cited (see Schwarzweller, 1979), some pointing out the burdens associated with the new migration, while others highlight the benefits. The general point which these recent case studies have attempted to establish is that newcomers are carriers of preferences for a particular type of social organization, have a different set of attitudes, and different conceptions of what is appropriate and desirable for the areas in which they relocate. As Schwarzweller has pointed out, they bring "certain needs, competencies, and resources and, of course, their own ideas about the good life... (sometimes quite convinced that the rates of population growth and economic development should be slowed)" (1979:16). A related point being established in these studies is that, apart from
being carriers of a different vision, newcomers will impose their expectations on their new surroundings by conveying them to others, and thus little by little, by direct intervention and in hundreds of subtle ways patterns shift and expectations in rural areas are altered (Small Town, 1978:3).

There is reason to suspect, however, that many of these early case studies have not adequately addressed the question of what impacts, if any, the new migrants are having on the future growth and development of rural areas. As we have indicated, these studies have been centered in rather select scenic areas, but, moreover, they have not always attempted to differentiate urban-origin newcomers from other types of newcomers. In other words, there has been no systematic effort to relate differences in growth sentiments and development preferences among newcomers to the new migration itself. The failures to focus research on more typical growth areas, and to specifically identify urban-origin newcomers, have left open the possibility that in the more general case the presumed impacts of migrants on the future growth and development of rural areas may be overstated and the impacts being attributed to urban newcomers may be misplaced.

DATA SOURCE

The data presented here are part of a large project that was designed to address, across a broad geographical base, many of the questions being raised by the metropolitan to nonmetropolitan migration trend (Sofranko and Williams, 1980). The research consisted of a telephone survey of migrants into the 75 high net immigration nonmetropolitan counties (rates of 10% or greater, 1970-75) of the North Central Region.2/ Within each
of these counties a systematic sample of households was obtained from 1977 telephone listings and matched against the appropriate 1970 directories. This procedure, designed to maximize the probability of obtaining an immigrant on any given call, yielded two strata: expected resident (matched) households, and expected migrant (unmatched) households.

Within this survey population of households, three respondent types were interviewed in the spring and early summer of 1977: (1) continuous residents (since 1970) of the high growth counties; (2) metropolitan-origin migrants who had moved in since April, 1970. Heads of households were the primary respondents, although spouses were interviewed after several unsuccessful attempts to contact the household head. Only persons who reported their location at the time of the interview as their usual place of residence were interviewed, thus eliminating seasonal or temporary residents. The present paper is based primarily on data from the metropolitan origin migrants ($N = 415$). In addition, limited data from the sample of continuous residents ($N = 359$) are introduced to provide a context for analysis of urban migrants' views on growth issues.

**ANALYSIS**

The data presented in the following sections is intended to address several broad questions. The first and most fundamental question is whether metropolitan origin immigrants settling in a wide range of rural settings in the entire North Central Region give evidence of the kind of "gangplank" reaction which others have noted (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976:88; cf. also Ploch, 1978:301). The issue here is whether they view a continuing influx of newcomers as a threat to the amenities they sought when they, the "early arrivals," made the move.
A closely related question is whether long-term residents have views on growth that are substantially different from those of the migrants. Conflict, or the potential for conflict, is likely to be high if different segments of the population have opposing views on the fundamental question of population growth.

Against the background of migrants' views on population growth and migrant-resident comparisons, a second set of questions relating to specific types of development will be explored. Metropolitan origin migrants, whatever their general position on population increase in their new residential settings, are not all cut from the same "bolt of cloth." Some types of growth or local development may be viewed with favor while others may be opposed. Some migrants, those in early adulthood, may favor a type of development not viewed with favor by older migrants, for example. The point here is that population growth, and more broadly, development, in a given community are complex matters. Any potential for conflict is likely to be articulated on particular growth related issues, such as school expansion, and views will differ depending on the centrality of the particular issue to different kinds of people. The existing literature has led to inferences that views on growth and development issues are more monolithic than may be the case. Thus, a fairly detailed analysis of views on particular growth-related questions and some of the reasons for and likely antecedents of those views may be helpful in tempering or verifying the prevailing impressions created by previous research.

Migrants' and Residents' Views on Population Growth

Contrary to expectations, metropolitan origin migrants moving into
the most rapidly growing rural counties of the North Central Region are not opposed to population increase, but are rather strongly pro-growth in their expressed sentiments. In addition, it is fair to say that their positive sentiments toward population increase are fully shared by long-term rural residents in the growth counties. Migrants and residents alike seem to speak with one voice, expressing positive sentiments toward the recent population increase.

Documentation for the preceding statements can be summarized here briefly because it has been detailed in the Sofranko and Williams (1980: especially Chapter 6) report referred to previously (cf. also Voss and Fuguitt, 1979). First, the vast majority of the metropolitan origin migrants interviewed, as well as the long-term residents, were aware of the population increase taking place in the counties in which they were living. Close to 90 percent of the respondents in each category, migrants as well as residents, were aware of growth in their counties. The fact that some 10 percent were not cognizant of growth could stem from a lack of perceptivity on their part, but more likely stems from the fact that their immediate setting may well have been stable or declining while the county as a whole was increasing. In any case, by far the majority of respondents were aware of population growth. Second, and more directly to the point, they were favorable to that growth. Setting aside the relatively few who did not perceive their counties as increasing in population, in response to a direct question only 11 percent of the migrants from metropolitan areas said that the increase was "bad." A very similar proportion of the long-term residents, 12 percent, were in this sense opposed to growth.
Positive sentiments toward population increases which had taken place up to the time of the interview, in early 1977, are not necessarily indicative of views on future growth, however. It is entirely possible, and even likely, that a density threshold exists in peoples' minds and that a "gangplank" reaction might occur when that threshold is reached. Data from the present study can only be interpreted to mean that any such threshold has not yet been reached in the rural growth counties of the North Central Region. To illustrate the preceding point, 73 percent of all metropolitan origin migrant respondents gave a favorable response to the statement "Elected officials of your community should try to attract new residents to the area." The statement depicts an aggressive stance toward future growth. It was supported by a strong majority of the migrants, as indicated above, and by an almost identical proportion of rural residents (74 percent). The regional data thus indicate solid support for recent population growth, including a continued growth, and they also indicate that migrants and long-term residents are not at odds concerning population increase.

Several factors may help to explain the apparent discrepancy between the regional data and the inferences drawn from earlier case studies. First, and most important, is the fact that the regional data are drawn from 75 growth counties containing a large number of small communities. The case study literature has understandably focused on communities which were experiencing problems (Graber, 1974; Hennigh, 1978; Cockerham and Blevins, 1977) i.e., the communities were selected for study precisely because there was evidence of growth-related problems. The regional data, however, suggest that more typical growth areas may well not be experiencing such problems. Second, as Voss and
Fuguit (1979:210) point out, the "gangplank" hypothesis receives at least some of its support from studies of rural growth communities within commuting distance of larger population centers (Graber, 1974). The regional sample, in contrast, is drawn from relatively more remote rural counties, and few of the respondents in the study commute to larger centers to work. They cannot look to nearby centers for either jobs or services while taking a preservationist stance with respect to the small communities in which they live. Third, and finally, many of the rural counties that are experiencing a rebirth by way of immigration had of course lost population for decades prior to the 1970's. Chronic population losses and the adjustments made necessary by such losses have received widespread attention. It should be no surprise then that an unexpected surge of growth seems to be greeted with a "Booster's Club" type of enthusiasm. Population increase may well be perceived as the solution to local problems, rather than as a source of new problems, at least in the short run.

The regional data indicate strong support for population growth among recent metropolitan origin migrants and rural residents alike, and provide no evidence of either a "gangplank" reaction among these migrants or opposing views on growth between the migrants and residents. It remains true, however, that metropolitan origin migrants are a diverse lot. A small minority are opposed to growth and the majority may well disagree on more specific growth-related issues. A more detailed analysis of growth sentiments among metropolitan origin migrants is presented in the following section.
Reasons for Migrants' Views on Growth

Migrants of metropolitan origin were asked whether they were aware of population increase in their new counties of residence, as was indicated previously. In addition to questions on perception of growth and the desirability or undesirability of growth migrants and residents were asked a follow-up question on why they viewed it as good or bad. The pattern of responses to this question is presented in Table 1.

Most metropolitan origin migrants viewed recent population increase as good, and though a variety of reasons were given in support of that view, those reasons seem to be of two main types (Table 1). The general theme of "economic development" can serve to summarize the first five types of responses shown in the left hand panel of Table 1. Growth is perceived as good because it is thought to increase the tax base, increase local business volume, provide more job opportunities and actual jobs. Though employment motivations were not the dominant theme leading to migration for these respondents, the data presented in Table 1 suggest that economic development in the rural growth counties in which they are relocating is by no means unimportant. The only response given by the "growth is good" majority that does not obviously fit the economic development theme is that growth "brings people with new ideas" (item 6, lower left, Table 1). What the nature of such new ideas may be was not pursued but the response seems to be consistent with the kind of cultural enrichment noted by Ploch (1978).

Responses detailing the nature of anti-growth sentiments among the relatively few metropolitan origin migrants who viewed population increase as "bad" are described in the right-hand panel of Table 1. Two
main points can be made about the nature of their anti-growth sentiments. First, their reasons are not polar opposite of the pro-growth reasons. Anti-growth sentiments are not necessarily arguments against economic development. Turning then to the second point, what the anti-growth sentiments do seem to denote is a concern about overcrowding and the kinds of "undesirable" people who may be viewed as responsible for such overcrowding. One cannot rule out the possibility that there is some support among the recent immigrants for the kinds of exclusionary restrictions (e.g., minimum lot sizes) that have marked some urban "no-growth" policies (White, 1978).

Additional analysis (not shown) that were undertaken to determine how the pro-growth and anti-growth respondents differ, and thus to provide some understanding of the bases of these different perspectives indicate that metropolitan origin migrants with anti-growth views are significantly younger and more likely than the pro-growth majority to be living on farms, but not necessarily farming. Farm residence is consistent with a concern for low population density. In terms of other socioeconomic characteristics, however, there is little difference between the pro- and anti-growth categories. The anti-growth respondents have slightly more education and slightly more income than the pro-growth respondents on average, but none of the differences are statistically significant. There is little evidence here that the negative reaction to growth stems from being better off and therefore having less to gain from growth (Lewis and Albrecht, 1977). Nor do present data contain evidence that anti-growth respondents have made financial sacrifices by moving from metropolitan areas and are now attempting to conserve gains they may have made in residential satisfaction. The anti-growth
respondents are slightly more likely to have *gained in* income since making the move than pro-growth respondents, but, again, the differences are not statistically significant.

The analysis of reasons for migrants' sentiments toward growth has demonstrated that they view population growth in their new rural settings as either good or bad for quite different sets of reasons, and additional analyses indicate that the pro-growth and anti-growth groups don't differentiate nicely on commonly used socioeconomic measures.

To this point the analyses have conveyed the notion that there is a general receptivity among recent migrants toward current and future population growth in their destination areas. A small, anti-growth minority has been identified, however, which views growth as being undesirable, and primarily because of the social effects which are perceived as accompanying increased numbers of people. What remains to be seen is whether these migrants' perspectives on population growth reflect their views on broader development and change issues as well. The basic question here, and which is taken up in detail in the next section, is whether the pro- and anti-growth stances migrants have taken extend beyond the population growth issue to encompass other issues or policies which imply change or development.

Some Contrasts in Perspectives on Growth and Development Policies

The pro- and anti-growth categories of migrant respondents characterized in the preceding section were used also to contrast views on acceptable alternative forms of growth and development. This comparison is based on responses to the question: "Elected officials of your community should try to..." do each of the things listed in Table 2. Respondents
were asked to give "yes" or "no" answers and the proportion of respondents giving the indicated answer is presented in the table.

It is clear from Table 2 that the metropolitan-origin migrants with pro-growth sentiments also favor public action to foster economic development and further population growth by any and all means listed. Tourism and recreation should be encouraged, the business district ought to be developed, factories should not be discouraged from locating in their areas, and efforts to attract new residents should be encouraged. Given the nature of the question ("Elected officials should...") there is evidence here of more than an open-door policy stance; the pro-growth respondents favor efforts to entice people and business through the open door.

The anti-growth sentiment is much less easy to characterize than the pro-growth sentiment, however (see Table 2). Only one of the questions—whether public officials should try to attract new residents—elicits a strong negative stance. However, almost 30 percent of the anti-growth contingent do favor official initiatives to attract new people, a finding that is consistent with the earlier inference that anti-growth sentiments may be more of a concern about the kinds of people who might settle in rural areas than a solid opposition to population increase as such. Even with respect to the composition of a future migrant stream, however, it is worthy of note that a slight majority, 56 percent, of the anti-growth respondents favor attracting new factories, which could bring in the types of persons they might define as less than desirable.

On all other questions the anti-growth respondents take what is essentially a pro-growth, or, more accurately, a pro-development, stance.
They are however, significantly less receptive to these alternatives than the pro-growth group.

To summarize the findings in Table 2, there are differences between the pro-growth and anti-growth respondents in their views on what public officials should do to promote development and growth. What has been labelled here as an anti-growth category of respondents is less solidly in favor of public initiatives to promote growth and development than the "Booster's Club" majority. Opposition to particular initiatives reduces to quite small proportions of metropolitan-origin migrants, however. While the size of the minority varies with the issue at hand, there is little evidence in the data presented thus far of widespread opposition to growth and development and little basis for concluding that controversy over these types of issues should be expected in most of the rapidly growing rural areas of the North Central Region. There are, of course, the possibilities that opposition may form over time or that a small minority will mobilize a larger segment of the population, but these clearly go beyond the limits of the present data.

Finally, the data presented in Table 3 take questions related to development policy one step further. Respondents were asked to react to the question of whether local taxes should be increased to expand or improve specific services in their localities. Service improvement is obviously related to economic development and population change but the issues involved are not identical. Different aspects of a more general improvement/development process are being examined. The migrants are coming from large urban centers and settling in small, rural places and unincorporated areas. One would thus expect that they have different conceptions of the types and quality of services that should be provided
locally, and perhaps a greater receptivity toward improvements that would bring the new residence more in line with what they experienced previously. On the other hand, the focus of the question on tax increases to accomplish a specific expansion of services should be consistent with a distinction between respondents who wish to preserve the status quo, and are thus by inference anti-growth, and those who not only favor change but indicate willingness to bear the cost of change. The response patterns of the pro-growth and anti-growth categories of respondents are presented for comparison in Table 3.

It is clear from the proportions shown in Table 3 that majority sentiment is not in favor of tax increases for service improvements among either pro-growth or anti-growth respondents. Tax increases are rarely popular. The only exception to the dominant disagreement with the hypothetical tax increase proposition is the slight majority of pro-growth respondents who indicate agreement with the statement that tax increases should be increased to improve medical facilities. Pro-growth respondents are on average older than those in the anti-growth category and one might suppose that self-interest among the older in-migrants, for example, would argue for improvement of medical facilities. The foregoing supposition receives no support at all, however, from responses to the question concerning services for senior citizens. Thirty-eight percent of the pro-growth respondents agree to tax increases for service improvement for the elderly, well short of a majority, and forty-seven percent of younger anti-growth respondents agree to such an increase. Self-interest explanations would predict disproportionate support among the pro-growth respondents because they would presumably have more to gain (see Wilson and Banfield, 1964), in
addition to the fact that they generally support both population growth and other development efforts.

In general, the self-interest interpretation of the pattern of responses in Table 3 does not seem to be fruitful. Pro- and anti-growth respondents differ slightly on most relevant characteristics and differ significantly on only age and farm residence, as was noted earlier. The older, pro-growth respondents might be expected to disagree with most tax increase proposals because of income limitations, and while the dominant sentiment among all respondents runs in that direction, the data in Table 3 indicate at times more support on the pro-growth side and at times less support. There are, however, too many inconsistencies to detect a uniform pattern. Self-interest might "explain", for example, a more favorable posture toward school improvement among the younger, anti-growth respondents, but we have already noted on the other hand the discrepancy with respect to support for services directed to senior citizens. In addition, disproportionate farm residence among the anti-growth respondents might be expected to generate favor for road improvement, the last item in Table 3, but that is not the case. Again, there are too many inconsistencies.

A more subtle interpretation of the patterns of responses shown in Table 3 may shed some light on the potential for controversy on growth-related issues. Careful scrutiny of the proportions of pro- and anti-growth respondents taking extreme positions on the several propositions in Table 3 will support the following generalization: anti-growth respondents are more likely to take an extreme position. They are more likely to "strongly agree" with two of the six propositions listed in the Table. At the same time are more likely to "strongly disagree" with all six, suggesting a rather pronounced anti-taxing or anti-improvement
stance among a small segment of the anti-growth respondents. If one argues that a proclivity for extreme positions represents a polarization of views on issues, then it may be that anti-growth views, though stemming from a small minority, carry within them the seeds of controversy. The preceding interpretation must be regarded as tenuous, however, because the pattern described is subtle. Considerably more research would have to be done to permit the inference that the extreme views of very small minorities can help to account for controversy in rural growth situations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Does the influx of metropolitan-origin migrants to rural areas bring with it a reaction against further population growth and the potential for controversy and conflict over growth issues? Case studies of problem situations to the contrary, the data reported here from an entire region permit only a resounding "no" in answer to the question. Metropolitan-origin migrants in rural growth counties of the North Central Region seem to be strongly in favor of recent population growth, including the possibility of additional future growth, and their apparent enthusiasm seems to be shared also by long-term rural residents in those same areas.

It is entirely possible that a legacy of population losses in past decades provides support for the majority view that growth is good, at least at this point in time. Careful monitoring of the "new migration" would provide an early warning of arrival at a density threshold, and resultant change in growth sentiment, should it occur. Similarly, particular communities are undoubtedly being affected differently by the migrant flow and further case studies should be useful in detailing the impacts and local responses. At present, however, the dominant pattern of sentiment is clearly in favor of growth.
Efforts to analyze the substance of majority pro-growth and minority anti-growth sentiments permit the general inference that such sentiments among migrants are clearly not monolithic. Points of view vary across issues, as one might expect. Economic development, with implications for improving the local tax base and enhancing the availability of goods and services is viewed quite favorably, whether population growth, as such, is favored or not. Anti-growth sentiments may hinge on concern about the characteristics and qualifications of additional migrants rather than on sheer numbers, but present data are far from conclusive on that count.

However plausible it seems that pro-growth and anti-growth sentiments would vary with particular group interests, traceable to the characteristics of those holding particular views, the regional data did not support such an interpretation. Respondents in the pro-growth and anti-growth categories were in fact not distinctively different on most characteristics, and on those on which they were, their positions on issues did not correspond to what one would assume to be a self-interest orientation.

The regional data do suggest, however, that those who take an anti-growth position are more inclined to adopt extreme postures on issues, regardless of the substances of the issue at stake. The potential for controversy over growth might be enhanced by the articulation of opposing positions and consequent polarization of views. Such an interpretation at present data must be regarded as tentative, though it would seem to suggest a fruitful topic for further research.

The dominant inference from the regional data analyzed here would not argue for giving priority to research on growth sentiments as reasons for
controversy and conflict on growth-related issues. It is clear that much more research is called for before it is possible to generalize from experiences in select community case studies that controversy and/or conflict over growth issues are concomitants of the new migration and especially of inimigrants' sentiments. The research will have to focus, as we have argued, on a broader range of rural settings, and it will have to approach community conflict and controversy in a more rigorous and systematic manner. Much of the research to date has been inclined toward linking newcomers' sentiments on growth and development to the emergence of controversy on these issues. There are, however, other sources of strain in rural areas which have generated controversies long before the population turnaround occurred, and other strains which newcomers introduce, regardless of where they originate. The point here is simply that much more will have to be taken into account in future research before it is possible to argue convincingly that metropolitan-origin immigrants' sentiments on growth issues will have an impact on the future course of rural development, or that their views are the source of recent controversies. There seems to be widespread agreement among immigrants that growth is good. The "gangplank" hypothesis does not seem to be viable in a general sense. This is not to argue, however, that researchers ignore the urban-to-rural migration process. That the "new migration" itself was unexpected should serve as sufficient warning that the conventional wisdom of the day can easily fall into disrepute.
2. The North Central region consists of the 12 states from North Dakota at its northwestern extreme south to Kansas, from Kansas east to Ohio, and the northern states between Ohio and North Dakota.

3. Almost 55% of the anti-growth respondents are 35 and under, compared with 35% in that age category for the pro-growth respondents. At the other end of the age range, 35.9 percent of the pro-growth respondents are age 55 and over compared with only 16.7 percent of the anti-growth respondents. In terms of farm residence, almost a third (32%) of the anti-growth respondents were living on farms, compared with 21 percent for the pro-growth respondents.
Table 1. Metropolitan Origin Migrants' Reasons for Viewing Population Growth as Either "Good" or "Bad."*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons given for viewing population growth as &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>Pro-Growth [N = 307]</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reasons given for viewing population growth as &quot;bad&quot;</th>
<th>Anti-Growth [N = 44]</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. More tax money available</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Raises taxes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More money spent in area</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Factories/businesses leave</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brings more investment</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Raises unemployment</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More factories and business</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Overcrowds area</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More jobs available</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Brings undesirable people</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total sample of metropolitan migrants (N=415) is reduced here by omitting those who were not aware of growth, and those who were aware but viewed such growth as "neither good nor bad." What remains are the relatively "pure" groupings of respondents who recognized the growth taking place and gave an unequivocal response to the good/bad question. Respondents were permitted to give more than one response thus the percentages shown add up to more than 100 percent.
Table 3. Metropolitan Origin Migrants' Views on Tax Increases to Improve Local Services, Classified by Sentiment Toward Population Growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to question: &quot;Local taxes should be increased to...&quot;</th>
<th>Sentiment Toward Population Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve schools in the area?*</td>
<td>...percent...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build parks and playgrounds?*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get better medical facilities?*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve security and police protection?*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better services and facilities for senior citizens?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve roads in the area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-square tests, with 3 degrees of freedom, show that distributions for the indicated variables could not have occurred by chance, at P < .05.
Table 2. Metropolitan Origin Migrants' Views on Selected Development Alternatives, Classified by Sentiment Toward Population Growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to question:</th>
<th>Sentiment Toward Population Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Elected officials in your community should try to...&quot;</td>
<td>Pro-Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep new factories out? &quot;No&quot;</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attract tourists and promote recreation? &quot;Yes&quot;</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop the business district of your community &quot;Yes&quot;</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attract new residents to the area? &quot;Yes&quot;</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between the categories are not due to chance by chi-square test with 1 degree of freedom; probability of chance occurrence less than .01.
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