

ESS 525

Social Impact Assessment of Forced Relocation  
of Rural Populations Resulting From  
Planned Land-Use Change

Ted L. Napier

Associate Professor  
The Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology  
The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and  
The Ohio State University

November, 1975

Social Impact Assessment of Forced Relocation  
of Rural Populations Resulting From  
Planned Land-Use Change

Ted L. Napier<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to provide a synthesis of several research efforts conducted by the author, which were designed to assess the social-psychological response of directly affected groups to forced relocation of resident population due to planned change. The change producing forces operating in all cases discussed were initiated exogenous to the affected groups. Representatives of the larger social system employed eminent domain norms to secure private properties, and changed the use of the procured properties. Lands formally used for production agriculture were used to create lakes and a transportation research center.

Findings from the two basically different types of development projects will be discussed. The first portion of the paper is devoted to the discussion of the data generated from a study of four watershed projects using quasi-experimental design. The second portion of the paper consists of a discussion of the social impact of the transportation research center project upon a directly affected group. The latter section of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the finding from a restudy of one of the watershed projects. The final segment is a synthesis of the findings from the studies which will focus attention upon the similarities in the responses of affected groups to exogenous change.

---

<sup>1</sup>Associate professor of sociology in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and the Ohio State University.

## The Development of Non-Metropolitan Areas

Rural areas of the state of Ohio and the nation have been experiencing very rapid socio-environmental change as a direct result of societal commitment to rural development.<sup>2</sup> The primary goal of rural development activities is to increase the socio-economic viability of non-metropolitan community groups and/or regions. The commitment to planned change has resulted in the proliferation of numerous development projects which often necessitate state acquisition of extensive land acreage from private landowners. Such development projects have numerous sociological implications for the directly affected people. Families which have been in residence in the directly affected community for many years may be required to relocate their homes and/or farm operations. Relocation produces community and individual social costs but seldom are these social costs considered in the decision making process relative to determining whether or not a project will be implemented.

The magnitude of land acquisition is an important variable in the determination of the disruptive influence of rural development efforts. Some planned change programs require relatively little land acquisition and no displacement of people. Other types of projects necessitate the acquisition of several thousand acres of land and the physical displacement of many people.

Small scale land acquisition is often associated with projects such as sewage treatment facilities, school and airport construction, and rural industrial parks. Large scale projects such as highway construction, water impoundments, recreation site development, and large experimental areas require the

---

<sup>2</sup>Rural development is defined as planned social change in non-metropolitan areas which is designed to increase a societal group's ability to achieve collective goals.

acquisition of many acres of contiguous land. While small scale projects usually have relatively little negative impact due to forced relocation of population, large scale projects have been shown to have extensive social impact due to physical displacement (Napier: 1971, 1972, 1974, 1975a; Burdge and Ludtke: 1970; Smith, Hogg, and Reagan: 1971; Wilkinson: 1966; and others).

Small scale projects can be constructed in nearly all communities but such is not the case for large scale projects. Rural (less dense) areas are the logical sites for the development of large scale projects.<sup>3</sup> This assertion is predicated upon the major parameters for decision-making relative to such projects which are degree of disruptive influence and economic cost (technical construction feasibility is assumed). Relatively few people are displaced if rural areas are selected as site locations for large scale projects as compared to highly populated urban areas. The economic cost of urban properties, even on the rural fringe as compared with areas further removed from the suburbs, is also an important consideration for site location. These parameters of decision making suggest that rural areas in relative close proximity to urban communities, which have development potential, will be subject to continual pressure for development. The fringe community groups should also expect concomitant rapid social change once the development occurs.

The only means of reducing the disruptive consequences of planned change for directly affected groups is through social impact evaluation research since relatively little knowledge exists today.

Interestingly, development groups continue to plan and implement projects as though social consequences were known. Such agencies are often acutely

---

<sup>3</sup>All of the development projects discussed in this paper are classified as large scale since each necessitated acquisition of several thousand acres. Each of the projects resulted in the relocation of approximately twenty-five percent of the resident population within the interaction framework of the rural community.

aware of the impact of a planned project upon some obscure species of fish or flower but social groups are of little consequence. Perhaps it will be necessary for man to be added to the endangered species before good empirical social impact assessment will be forthcoming.

Many factors must be considered in the decision making process relative to the implementation of a rural development project that has potential negative consequences for directly affected groups. Primary research emphasis for decision making to date has been placed upon cost-benefit analyses, environmental impact and the structural feasibility of projects. Social impact assessment of planned change has received very little attention. While much interest has been generated for the inclusion of social impact statements in planned change programs, the social evaluations usually consist of a cursory overview of existing social situations, brief histories of groups and descriptions of "unique" cultural factors. Such reports are relatively useless in evaluating what the probable sociological or social-psychological impact will be for a directly affected group. Evaluative research on a longitudinal basis or the use of quasi-experimental design offer considerable promise of providing insight into social impact assessment of planned socio-environmental change (Napier; 1975b).

Most large scale development projects are initiated to serve the collective interests of large numbers of people such as a region or state but the social costs are seldom evenly distributed. Directly affected groups must bear a disproportionate share of the negative aspects of regional development projects. The economic costs of the projects are distributed among numerous people (often these projects are funded from collective sources--Federal--for example) but the disruptive social consequences of planned change are usually confined to the local group. It is essential that development agencies which are formulating

and implementing large scale projects become much better informed of the social impact of exogenous change within rural community groups. Regional benefit at the expense of local groups raises an equity question which is seldom addressed in project justification.

#### Rural Development and Community Change

Social change<sup>4</sup> is a constant phenomenon in our society which affects community groups in many different ways. Frequently social change forces are produced in a manner that the community group experiencing the change can easily accommodate the resulting disruptions. Changes can be introduced into an established group and produce extensive modifications in the existing social system to the point that social instability will emerge. While change is inevitable within any social group (Hobbs, 1971:4), the rapidity with which the change-producing forces are introduced is a significant factor in the explanation of the response of affected community members. Berelson and Steiner (1967) contend that adjustment to change is much easier if the changes are gradual so that the various social components of a group have time to accommodate them.

When rapid social change is introduced into a relatively stable social system, the adaptation of the systemic components may be relatively slow thus producing a temporarily unstructured situation. When the change is exogenously introduced, the potential for alienation and social fragmentation is compounded since affected group members may believe that the changes taking place are beyond their control and a feeling of powerlessness may result. This suggests that external social change forces which have potential negative impact will be perceived negatively by affected groups and the social cost of the changes will be high among affected group members.

---

<sup>4</sup>Social change is a process through which a social system is modified in terms of structure and function (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971:7) and is long lasting (Hobbs, 1971).

Social change does not inevitably lead to social disruption and conflict. Berelson and Steiner (1967) and Bertrand (1966) have observed that social change which is perceived to have desirable effects for the group will tend to be accepted and relatively rapid adjustment should be anticipated.

If a rural social system (community) is assumed to have achieved some type of equilibrium<sup>5</sup>, then change which is introduced by exogenous forces will have a higher probability of creating unstructured situations than endogeneous change since the existing social structure may not be formulated in such a manner to accommodate the external change. To achieve another relatively structured social state, readjustment of certain aspects of the social system is necessary. While the social system is operating in the unstructured situation, the potential exists for social maladjustment and personal alienation to emerge among the affected group members. Local residents may perceive themselves to be powerless to control the changes taking place within their community and believe that the changed community is unable to satisfy perceived needs relative to social relationships, interaction patterns, and services.

The affected group members' attitudes toward the changing community and the stimulus for the change (the development project) should reflect the impact of the change upon the group. If the changes are perceived as being negative for the group then negative attitudes toward the community and the source of the disruption should be identifiable among affected group members. If the consequences of the change producing stimulus are perceived as being beneficial then positive attitudes should be observed. In essence, the theory suggest that when a group is "confronted" (Bertrand, 1966; Napier, 1971, 1972, 1974; Wright, 1974) with rapid change which has potential negative consequences for

---

<sup>5</sup>Dynamic equilibrium exists when "the rate of change in a social system is commensurate with the system's ability to cope with it" (Rogers and Burdge, 1972:13). Disequilibrium exists when "the rate of change is too rapid to permit the social system to adjust" (Ibid.).

the group, the members of the group will react to the disruptive forces by developing negative perceptions about the changed community and the change producing stimulus.

#### The Research Situation

Certain types of development programs have a higher probability of disrupting community groups than others. Large scale projects have the highest probability since some established interaction patterns will be destroyed due to out-migration of long term residents, new cultural definitions may be introduced into the group by new in-migrants (Greer, 1962), existing services may be rendered inadequate due to demands of the changing client group, and numerous other factors contribute to significant changes being introduced into the group.

The exogenous stimulus which was applied to the study communities was forced relocation of population due to the establishment of large scale rural development projects within the interaction boundaries of the communities.<sup>6</sup> The communities were exposed to the following disruptive influences which should produce considerable change within the group:

1. Land acquisition by the state from private landowners,
2. Relocation and out-migration of long-term residents,
3. In-migration of temporary (construction workers) and permanent residents,
4. Changing use patterns of existing services and institutions,
5. Land use modification,
6. Relocation of highways and cemeteries, and
7. Changing occupation structure.

---

<sup>6</sup>Community is defined from an interaction perspective relative to collective identification (Munch and Campbell, 1963).



It was hypothesized that these changes would bring about a confrontation (conflict) between the existing social order in the directly affected communities and the change producing forces. It was reasoned that the externally induced changes would modify the existing social situation as a result of outside influence (Greer, 1962) which would result in the development of negative perceptions of the changing community situation among the affected group members. It was theorized that the change agent and the development project would be perceived negatively by the affected community group since the project and the external change agent were responsible for bringing about the modifications taking place within the community.

In essence, it was hypothesized that the affected group would develop negative attitudes toward the project, the development agency, the changed community and the acquisition of private lands for rural development projects.

#### The Evolution of Negative Perceptions About Planned Change Projects

People should develop a feeling of powerlessness<sup>7</sup> if they internalize a belief that a proposed action will have a negative impact upon them but are unable to prevent the potentially harmful action from taking place. A person may exhibit the feeling of powerlessness by withdrawing from the group and becoming a social isolate. The person may elect to confine his/her personal frustrations to himself/herself and remain a functional part of the group or may elect to exhibit his/her feelings overtly by some type of conflict oriented activity (overt resistance to the change producing forces). The person may also exhibit frustrations with the negatively defined situation by resorting to combinations of each of these alternatives.

---

<sup>7</sup>Powerlessness is a concept used to denote a lack of control in decision-making and self-determination in one's own actions-

The personal estrangement of community members may be of relatively little concern to a community group if the proportion of the population experiencing such feelings is very small, assuming that a non-conflict oriented perspective is operative within the minority group. There are severe consequences, however, for a community group if a large proportion of the group members become alienated. A situation which all social groups must attempt to avoid is estrangement of community members to the point that little social cohesiveness is operative among group members since these factors are important in achieving and maintaining cooperative efforts. Without collective efforts a community group will be greatly constrained in what it may achieve relative to group goals.<sup>8</sup>

The potential always exists for members of a group experiencing rapid change, which is exogenously generated, to become estranged from each other and collectively from other groups. The community as a collectivity is commissioned to protect certain rights of its members and if the collective community (often representatives of the group) is unable to fulfill this role, then the people may become estranged from the leadership which has proved to be unable to perform the designated role. This is especially true if the change is exogenously generated and imposed upon the group and if the change is perceived as having potentially severe negative consequences for the group. The people, in essence, are powerless to prevent the potentially harmful change from being implemented.

Concomitant with the feeling of powerlessness is the potential for the emergence of negative self perceptions when change is imposed upon a group. If people have little influence in terms of controlling their own destiny, then the perception of personal worth should also be negatively affected. If action

---

<sup>8</sup>It is recognized that conflict situations exist within community groups where interest groups are in competition for some scarce resource but it is also recognized that from time to time the special interest groups must cooperate to achieve collective goals.

is taken which a person is unable to influence, even though he/she may be aware that the action will result in negative consequences for them, then the potential exists that the person's self concept will reflect this perceived lack of power.

Another concept often associated with alienation is anomie which is primarily related to the social consequences of change. Anomie (normlessness) exists when a social system is changed to the point that existing behavioral patterns and social structure are subject to extensive modification to the point that unstructured situations emerge. Established definitions are challenged and people are unable to determine the appropriate behavioral patterns to use as their role model (patterns of behavior or rules to follow).

While a completely anomic state is only a theoretical possibility, some degree of normative confusion will exist in any rapid change situation. When significant exogenous change forces are operative, it is argued that numerous structural and normative changes will result due to the changing occupation structure, modification of the population composition, and other change producing factors. The changing normative patterns should result in the development of partially unstructured situations for the residents of affected community groups. The restructured cultural definitions and reformulated patterns of behavior may not be acceptable to some people and result in personal estrangement for a portion of the group. The end product of the operation of the above mentioned concepts is often termed "alienation" (Srole, 1956: Seeman, 1959: Meier and Bell, 1959: Nettler, 1967: Napier, 1972: Wright, 1972). If people become personally estranged from their reference group, the group's leadership, perceive themselves to be of little personal worth and see little consensus among the group members, then they are defined as alienated.

### Alienation and Rural Development

The procurement of private properties for certain types of development projects through the use of eminent domain is an excellent example of the relative lack of decision making power by local groups. Decisions are often made by groups exogenous to the community which will have significant impact upon the local group. People are often relocated, new physical structures are built, land use may be drastically altered and numerous other secondary effects may be noted, but local groups often have relatively little involvement in the development efforts even in the final stages of program implementation.

There are logical reasons for excluding local groups from early participation in the decision making process and program development since land speculation may bid up the price of needed properties to the point that economic feasibility is questionable. To prevent undue land speculation, the development agencies frequently elect to make development decisions without involvement of local people who will be directly affected by the development efforts. Mobilization of local resistance to projects is another motivating factor for noninvolvement of directly affected groups. Organized resistance to development efforts would be more often encountered if local groups were involved or informed at the inception of project planning. Organization of resistance groups requires considerable time and is most easily avoided by not informing the local people until the final stages of program implementation.

There are, however, socio-political costs associated with the noninvolvement of directly affected groups in the decision making process for large scale development projects. The people in communities selected for development may perceive the development efforts as being imposed upon them and feel powerless to determine their own future. Under these conditions the potential exists for

for alienation to emerge among affected residents and the probability of social resistance to the change efforts would be compounded.

It is argued that such situations existed within the communities studied and the major hypothesis for testing was as follows: Individuals within communities subject to development action which requires extensive land acquisition and forced relocation of population will exhibit higher degrees of community alienation than nonaffected community groups.

While all members of the community group which is experiencing development activity requiring relocation of population should be affected to some greater or lesser degree, the greatest negative impact should occur within the relocated portion of the group. The relocated segment of the affected group should be subject to all of the potentially alienating factors mentioned above with the additional burden of physical relocation of homes and farm operations. It is therefore hypothesized that: The relocated portion of the affected group will exhibit significantly more alienation than nonrelocated people.

#### A Test of Theory Using Watershed Affected Groups

A study was initiated to evaluate the merits of the theory. In 1970, four communities which had been "developed" for watershed purposes were selected for evaluation. Two of the communities selected were located in West Virginia and two in Ohio. Since cross sectional data were the only possible means of data collection, a quasi-experimental design was used.<sup>9</sup> Two of the community groups (one in Ohio and one in West Virginia) were in the initial stages of social

---

<sup>9</sup>For an extensive review of the theory, findings and methodology, see Ted L. Napier, "An Analysis of The Social Impact of Water Resource Development and Subsequent Forced Relocation of Population Upon Rural Community Groups: An Attitudinal Study." October, 1975. Research Bulletin Number 1080, The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Wooster, Ohio.

disruption while the physical displacement of people had been completed in the remaining two communities (one was chosen from each state). Two base groups (control groups) were carefully selected to provide a mechanism for comparative analyses. A nonaffected control group was chosen from each state to prevent possible biasing due to potential subcultural differences.

Data were collected from respondents chosen at random in each of the communities using a structured questionnaire and personal interviews of adult residents. The scales used to measure perceptions toward various aspects of the community were demonstrated to have excellent reliability.<sup>10</sup>

A total of 60 interviews were taken from each affected group and approximately 50 from each of the control groups. Analysis of variance, regression and path analysis were used to analyze the data.

The findings basically demonstrated that the stimulus of exogenous development efforts in the form of lake construction and forced displacement of residents did not result in the estrangement of local people from the restructured community (Napier 1971, 1972). These findings initially appeared to be illogical given the theoretical underpinnings of the hypotheses and the articulated negative statements made by the affected group members. The affected people observed that many negative factors were operating within their affected community as a result of the development project and the external change agency's activities but maintained very positive attitudes toward the changing community. While the affected people exhibited a positive attitude toward their respective communities, they simultaneously voiced strong opposition and concern about the lake projects. Unstructured questions revealed that the projects were perceived as having significant negative impact upon the group. The displaced

---

<sup>10</sup>The measurement instruments and reliability coefficients are available for inspection in Napier 1971, 1975a. The reliability coefficients generated from the data using item analysis demonstrated that the scales had high reproduceability.

people, for example, tended to believe that they were not treated fairly during the conduct of the land procurement by the state. The displaced people felt that they were not compensated adequately for the disruption of moving their homes and farms and could never be compensated in economic terms for the separation from friends and neighbors. The people voiced opposition to the use of cherished homesites or family farms as recreation sites for urban dwellers and even more resistance to the use of the land as a basin for a lake. The people were attached emotionally to the land and resented the state using eminent domain norms to take lands for what they considered to be nonessential development efforts.

The theory which had been formulated and briefly stated above tended to collapse under empirical test relative to the dependent variable (alienation) chosen for analysis. The independent variables chosen for investigation explained about 63 percent of the variance in the alienation scores but the alienation scores tended to be skewed strongly toward positive attitudes (non-alienation). The expected personal alienation of affected group members did not materialize.

It should be noted that a path model developed from theory and subjected to empirical test with the water resource data proved to be excellent. The model which was developed from the above mentioned theory with slight modifications was demonstrated to be mathematically sound and theoretically logical (Napier, 1975a).

The basic conclusion from the first study was that the stimulus did not result in the disintegration of the social relationships within the affected groups. Apparently the people within the water resource affected groups still perceived the social relationships within the changed communities as being supportive and desirable. Fragmentation of the existing social order did not occur within any of the community groups.

The inconsistencies of the articulated position of the affected people and the results of the structured instruments posed a most intriguing research question. Why would people feel negative about the development project the project implementation agency while maintaining a very positive attitude about their changed community? After considerable thought the slow realization began to emerge that perhaps the dependent variable should be modified. In essence, it was possible that the wrong dependent variable had been chosen for analysis. The theory was logical and tended to approximate theoretical closure but did not apply to alienation since the phenomenon was not identifiable to any significant degree among the affected group members. The amount of variance explained in alienation was significant but contrary to the anticipated direction. This could be interpreted as indirect theoretical validation but in the opposite direction (explanation of nonalienation).

Data from the unstructured questions were studied carefully and two new scales were constructed which measured attitude toward land acquisition and the development project. The major concepts used to operationalize the land procurement scale were: perceived fairness of the development activity, adequacy of payment for procured properties, treatment by land acquisition agents, willingness to sacrifice for advancement of the group, adequacy of information provided about the project and adequacy of time allocated for relocation. The scale measuring attitude toward the project was operationalized in terms of: perceived local benefit to be derived from the project, provision of jobs to local people as a result of the project, the potential for community progress as a result of the project, environmental degradation, and justification of capital expenditures for the project.

The newly constructed measurement devices were pretested and proved to be



excellent attitude scales. A study was organized to gain further insight into why the theory had tended to be of relative little use in the prediction of affected group response to exogenous change. An area in central Ohio which had been disrupted by a major transportation center was selected for study.

#### Displacement For Research Purposes

The situation within a farming community in central Ohio was ideal for further exploration into the problems evaluated in the first theoretical model. The State of Ohio employing eminent domain norms had secured approximately 8,100 acres of primarily agricultural lands for the development of a transportation research center. The impacted area had experienced: dislocation of resident population, temporary expansion due to construction workers, permanent population growth especially by high status people, service adequacy was changed due to increased demand and numerous other changes had been introduced into the community group. The dislocated people had been resettled at the time of the study and the social structure had been reformulated and was relatively stable. The composition of the group continued to be modified over time. Most of the displaced people relocated in close proximity to their original home and remained within the interaction boundaries of the community group to which they belonged prior to the development activities. This pattern of resettlement was also observed in the water resource displacement.<sup>11</sup>

The same methodology was used in the second study which had been employed in the first water resource study. A control group of approximately 50 people

---

<sup>11</sup>Given the fixed supply of land and the increased demand by the displaced people, the available properties were bid upward resulting in economic sacrifice for the relocated people who wished to remain within their own community boundaries. While the displaced people probably received a fair market price for their properties (most indicated this was true), the inflated price for land created economic problems for those wishing to stay since they were required to pay higher prices for the same quality land of similar size.

was taken from a comparable non-affected community group while seventy-two affected people were interviewed within the restructured community (the reader must be constantly aware that the communities studied are small--500-1,000 people--therefore, the samples must not necessarily be large. The two scales measuring attitude toward land acquisition and attitude toward the project were not administered to the sample drawn from the base group because such development had not occurred within the community and the people within the nonaffected groups would have been unable to respond to the questions. The purpose of the base group was to have a group to which the community related variables could be compared.

The community related variables were basically the same as those used in the watershed study but more refined. The item analysis reliability coefficients revealed the community and project related scales to be excellent (Napier and Wright, 1974). Some of the scale items from the water resource study were eliminated and the scales reduced in size without loss of differentiating power.

The findings relative to the community related variables revealed few significant differences between the nonaffected base group and the disrupted community group. The development affected study group tended to be slightly less satisfied with services provided to them than the base group (some services were disrupted for a short period of time and new demands were being made upon existing services) but both groups were basically neither positive nor negative relative to this variable. The two groups were both committed to social change but the development affected group was less committed than the nonaffected base group (the affected group wanted more stability). The affected group members exhibited a significantly higher degree of identification with

community members than the base group. This was contrary to the expectations derived from theory. Both the affected and base groups were highly identified with their own respective community groups since their respective mean scale scores on this factor indicated high degrees of identification. The external stimulus of planned development apparently enhanced group identity within the affected group. There were no differences in terms of alienation which was anticipated from the previous research. In essence, the findings from the watershed study were basically reproduced in the transportation affected group relative to the community related variables.

The data from the two development project related variables, however, proved to be consistent with the research expectations. The people tended to be quite negative about the development project and toward land acquisition for planned development activities. The hypothesis that the relocated people would be significantly more negative than the nonrelocated group was also validated.

The basic conclusions derived from the study were that the community related variables were not severely affected by the development efforts within the community. Negative attitudes were observed among the affected people and the negative perceptions were directed toward the project and the use of eminent domain norms to secure private property for the construction of public and quasi-goods of the type evaluated. The negativism toward both project related variables was very high among the relocated group which is consistent with the reformulated theory.

The data suggest that further development efforts of a similar nature within the study area will probably be met with considerable resistance especially among the people to be relocated. This is predicated upon the assumption that the same land acquisition procedures would be used by the

development agency and the magnitude of the impact upon the group would be basically the same.

In essence, the findings from the transportation research center study basically repudiated the commonly held position that rural development projects that require extensive land acquisition and forced displacement of population will result in significant fragmentation of the social relationships within the affected groups. The findings revealed some significant differences among the groups studied but the differences tended to be differences in degrees of positivism rather than basically polarized positive-negative positions on the community related variables measured. The project related variables revealed that the affected group held very negative perceptions about the project. The directly affected groups did not support the land acquisition policies and procedures used to secure the properties needed for the construction of the research center. The relocated group was very negative toward the project related variables which would suggest that some significant social problems were created for the displaced group which were not being evaluated effectively by the community related variables. It is highly probable that the negative consequences for the displaced people were associated with more personal social-psychological phenomena rather than related to community factors.

The attitudes toward the research center were quite negative and pervasive. The affected group apparently did not anticipate that many advantages would be brought to the community as a direct result of the project. It is possible that the people may be reacting to the disruption in the context of the lack of perceived positive impact upon the group. The regional development project imposed considerable inconveniences upon the group as a result of social disruption without compensation in the form of immediate positive benefits for the affected group.

Water Resource Evaluation:  
A Longitudinal Analysis

The research findings from the watershed and the transportation research efforts provided useful information relative to social impact assessment but were still inconclusive relative to the explanation of project negativism among directly affected groups. New research questions continued to be formulated which provided additional impetus for the expansion of the knowledge base relative to social impact evaluation.

While quasi-experimental designs are most useful in the assessment of social impact when cross-sectional data are used, such designs are subject to the limitation of the equivalency assumptions which must be made relative to the groups being compared. It is possible, if not probable, that groups to be compared are not completely equivalent prior to the introduction of the stimulus to one of the groups (Napier, 1975b). The best method for determining the impact of any change is longitudinal research which was used in a follow-up evaluation of one of the first water resource affected groups.

Given that the theoretical perspective offered earlier had been basically repudiated relative to the explanation of community alienation (it was useful and quite good in the explanation of nonalienation), the theory was reconstructed using attitudes toward the project as the major dependent variable to be explained. The theory was basically the same but the emphasis of the theory was upon the explanation of attitudes toward the development project.

A community was selected for restudy from the first water resource research groups. The community selected for longitudinal research had been in the initial stages of land acquisition at the time of the first water resource study but had been basically restructured at the time of the second study (the time frame between studies was four years).

The data gathering instruments used at time 1 were modified and employed at time two.<sup>12</sup> The same sampling technique was employed at both time periods (modified systematic sampling see Napier, 1975b) for the nonrelocated portion of the affected group. All of the relocated people which could be identified within the delineated interaction boundaries of the community were included in the study.<sup>13</sup> A total of 89 families were represented in the study. The data were collected using a drop-off-pick-up-later technique (Napier, 1975b) which has produced excellent results as a methodological technique when research funds have been limited as in this case. The measurement devices were again subject to empirical test using the restudy data and were demonstrated to be excellent measurement instruments (Napier and Wright, 1975).

The findings demonstrated beyond question that community related factors were not adversely affected by the exogenous changes introduced into the community. Comparison of the data sets, for the two time periods, revealed that the restructured community group exhibited more positive attitudes toward their changed community than were exhibited at time one (during the initial stages of disruption). The restructured group appeared to have stronger personal commitments to the other members of the group after the restructuring had taken place. From a conflict perspective this would appear logical since threat from outside forces should serve to bring the group closer together in terms of group cohesiveness and common identity.

---

<sup>12</sup>Some items were deleted in the scales at time 2 and the data from time 1 were modified to make the scales comparable.

<sup>13</sup>Of the approximately 90 families relocated by the impoundment project only 19 families could be located within the delineated boundaries as they were established in 1970. Many of the relocated families resettled within the county but were outside the community boundaries and did not consider themselves to be part of the affected group any longer.

The restructured (time 2) group was more integrated (nonalienated) than the time 1 (initial disruption period) group. The time 2 group was also more satisfied with community services. As was noted in the transportation study, traditionalism (less commitment to social change) tended to be higher for the study group at time 2.

The data for the community related variables indicated that few differences existed between the relocated groups when compared at time 1 and time 2. The greatest change in attitudes occurred within the nonrelocated groups over time. Comparison of the nonrelocated portion of the samples for the community related variables indicated that the restudy group (time 2) was more integrated (less degrees of alienation noted), more highly identified with other group members, more satisfied with services and more traditionalistic (wanted more stability).

The analysis of the data relative to the development project necessitated cross-sectional comparison since attitudes toward the project were not evaluated at time one using structural attitude scales. Basic socio-economic, demographic, and community related variables as well as the scale scores on the attitude toward land acquisition were regressed against the scale scores on the attitude toward the development project scale. The findings demonstrated that the community related variables were not important factors in the explanation of negativism toward the development project. A surprising finding was that relocated status was not significantly related to any of the variables (variable was treated as a dummy variable in the regression analysis). Both relocated and nonrelocated people were negative toward the project so relocation status could not operate as a good explanatory variable.

The two significant factors which explained approximately 72% of the variance in the attitude of the people toward the development project in order

of step-wise entry were: attitude toward land acquisition (66% of the variance explained) and traditionalism (added 6% to the variance explained). Both of these factors were related in the expected direction. As negativism toward land acquisition and traditionalism (commitment to stability) increased, there was a concomitant increment in negativism toward the project. The individual characteristics such as age, length of residence and so forth were not significantly related to the perceptions held toward the project.

#### Summary of The Study Findings

This series of studies clearly indicates that planned land use change and subsequent forced displacement of people did not result in a fragmented social system but in fact may have served to enhance the social cohesiveness of the group. Community groups which had been disrupted by large scale development projects necessitating acquisition of extensive land acreage did not exhibit negative attitudes toward the community.

The longitudinal research component of the study series added several new dimensions to the previous efforts. The longitudinal research demonstrated that the restructured community group was more cohesive and positive about their community than in the initial stages of project implementation. There are several possible reasons for the emergence of more positive attitudes after the project has been implemented and restructuring has been basically completed. One possible explanation for the emergence of more positive attitudes toward the community would be a collective response to an outside threat which would tend to bond people closer together and facilitate the formation of "community feelings". If the people feared outside development and perceived the development project as having potential negative consequences for the group, then a strong motivating force for collective action could emerge which would require



close cooperation and cohesiveness among group members. The lake project was perceived in a very negative manner and a "grass-roots" political pressure group emerged to oppose new development efforts in the area. This suggests that collective resistance to external development was operating and would partially explain the increased cohesiveness of the group members.

Another possible explanation for the emergence of stronger positive community attitudes among the restructured community members is associated with the experience of the affected people with the project. If the people discovered that their perceptions about the potential negative consequences of the project established during the project implementation stages were unfounded, then the attitudes would be expected to be more positive at a later time.

An interesting question is why were the nonrelocated people in the longitudinal study more positive about the social relationships of the community during the second time period than during the initial stages of program implementation? It is hypothesized that anticipated negative consequences of the project for the social group were not realized. That is not to say the people believed the project would benefit the local community. The data indicate that the local people were quite negative about the project in terms of local benefit which would be derived from the lake. The initial concern of the nonrelocated people may be a partial function of alternatives made available to them. The nonrelocated people had no guarantee for sale of land and would have assumed all economic costs of moving had they elected to leave. The social unrest due to the development efforts generated uncertainties within the group which applied to all of those who remained within the affected community. The nonrelocated people were not as "free" to move as the relocated group. In this regard, the nonrelocated people were subject to the uncertainties of the

project impact as well as the limited alternative of relocation should the emerging interaction patterns within the restructured community be perceived as negative. The increasingly positive attitudes toward the community and social relationships could be explained in the context of the above position, if the community situation after the development efforts was not so radically modified as was first feared (anxieties over a fragmented social group were not realized). The operation of political awareness and group action combined with a realization that the community would not be destroyed would function to enhance social cohesion and community identity.

The regression findings are quite interesting in light of the above discussion. The major factor in the explanation of attitudes toward the project was attitude toward land acquisition. The concepts forming the construct termed land acquisition were primarily oriented toward project implementation procedures employed by the development agency during the initial stages of project implementation. The findings revealed that as land acquisition attitudes became negative there was a strong tendency for attitudes toward the project to become negative. Since the community related variables tended to be less significantly related to attitudes toward the project, one may conclude that perceptions of the community are not closely associated with planned change programs initiated by groups external to the group. In essence, people will maintain positive feelings about the social relationships within their community even when the physical structure and social composition are changed by external forces. This would suggest that perceptions of the functional nature of the community are separate from acceptance or rejection of planned development projects. It is concluded that implementation procedures used in planned change programs should be more closely evaluated as potential predictive factors in the explanation of attitudes toward projects necessitating land acquisition by

the state. Research to date tends to indicate that implementation strategies are the key factors in the explanation of negative attitudes among affected people.

#### Action Recommendations

The findings from this series of evaluative research efforts suggest that agencies interested in increasing the acceptance of projects and mitigating the negative consequences for affected groups should examine project implementation procedures. Particular review should be made of land acquisition policies since this variable was shown to be the most significant factor in the explanation of attitudes toward the project. The land acquisition scale data revealed that the respondents believed: that they were not receiving fair and equitable treatment from the land procurement agents, that more time was necessary to secure new housing, that a financial burden was placed upon them as a result of the projects, and that it was unjust to use eminent domain norms for rural development purposes.

A concern of the study groups was prompt payment for lands to be taken for development purposes. It is important that all affected people receive fair and prompt payment for acquired lands so that the process of resettlement can be achieved with dispatch. Emphasis should be placed upon all people and not only those who resort to legal channels to secure larger payments. Research in other types of development projects, which employ eminent domain norms to secure properties, indicates that individuals who resort to legal means often secure larger payments than those who accept what is offered (Hallberg and Flinchbaugh, 1968).

The lack of definitive time periods for project implementation may have severe impact upon affected people. Research (Ludtke and Burdge, 1970) has shown that people anticipating forced relocation of population due to water

resource development often do not maintain their properties in the best possible condition. If there are lengthy time delays between first knowledge of the possible impending move and actual land procurement, then landholders are placed in an unduely stressful situation since they are uncertain whether or not to improve their homes and farms. In the second water resource study, the people indicated that they had been aware for some time that a major impoundment was being considered for construction in their area but were uncertain as to the specific location of the lake project and when the project construction would be initiated. Local residents noted that a high degree of uncertainty was present relative to the starting date of land procurement and some sentiment existed that the project would never be constructed. The end product of these and other project related uncertainties was the reluctance on the part of the landowners to invest in the improvement of buildings and other properties. Appraised value of properties would be less under such conditions.

The development agency should attempt to avoid the potential problems of an extended period of uncertainty relative to the development project. Rumors about large scale projects tend to spread rapidly, and the effects of unfounded rumors may be difficult to counteract. Burdge and Ludtke (1970), for example, found that preconceived ideas about the consequences of the project influenced to some extent the affected individuals' response to the project.

Other research efforts support the position that past experience with development consequences affects attitudes toward further changes. A positive experience with planned change should result in the development of positive attitudes toward further change while negative experiences should result in the emergence of resistance to additional development efforts. The implication for development agencies is that they should be especially concerned with the response of local residents to initial development efforts. An initial negative

experience may make further development activity extremely difficult if not impossible.

While large development agencies may not be concerned about further development in a particular local community (there are many other development sites), the initial development experience of local groups will have an impact in the future. Given the growing concern of many people for the establishment of symbiotic relationships between existing socio-cultural situations and planned natural resource development, agencies which have been commissioned to develop for the "common good", will increasingly have attention focused upon their efforts. With the extensive communication systems now available, negative development experiences in one area will have consequences for the development agency when it attempts to initiate comparable projects in other areas.

The data from the longitudinal study revealed that a large recreation project has been effectively resisted to the point that an agency desiring to further "develop" the area has decided to locate the recreation project in another area. The group's experience with the lake project apparently contributed to the emergence of a local anti-development group which was organized primarily to stop further external development.

In summary, the studies revealed that rural development projects and subsequent population relocation did not result in the emergence of negative attitudes toward the social relationships in the affected groups. The studies revealed significant negative attitudes toward the land acquisition practices and development project which lead to the conclusion that attitudes associated with community relationships are less useful in the explanation of collective community responses to exogenous change than are commonly thought. More research emphasis should be placed upon implementation procedures employed by

development agencies such as an analysis of the social impact of different implementation strategies to gain insight into more acceptable project implementation procedures.

A major planning error was observed in the longitudinal study where a state development agency attempted to "follow-up" the lake project with subsequent land procurement for recreational development purposes. This development activity was met with vigorous opposition since the additional land procurement would have necessitated an additional relocation for some people who had moved from the basin area and resulted in further disruption of the group. Had the recreation project needs been included in the initial project proposal, the resistance would probably have been considerably reduced or nonexistent. This experience suggests that comprehensive and coordinated planning is essential among development agencies to reduce the problems a community group affected by large scale development efforts must overcome.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berelson, Bernard and Gary Steiner  
1967 Human Behavior, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Bertrand, Alvin L.  
1966 "The Emerging Rural South: A Region Under 'Confrontation' by Mass Society," Rural Sociology, Vol. 31, No. 4, 449-457.
- Burdge, Rable J. and Richard L. Ludtke  
1970 "Factors Affecting Relocation in Response to Reservoir Development," Lexington: University of Kentucky, Water Resource Institute, Research Report No. 29.
- Greer, Scott  
1962 The Emerging City, New York: The Free Press.
- Hallberg, M.C. and B. L. Flinchbaugh  
1968 "Analysis of Factors Associated With Property Holders Decision In Eminent Domain Proceedings," Research Publication Number 57, Institute For Research on Land and Water Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.
- Hobbs, Daryl J.  
1971 "Some Contemporary Sociological Perspectives Regarding Social Change," Published in Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development, edited by George Beal, Ronald Powers, and E. Walter Coward, Jr., The Iowa State University Press.
- Meier, Dorothy L. and Wendell Bell  
1959 "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, pp. 189-202.
- Munch, Peter and Robert Campbell  
1963 "Interaction and Collective Identification in a Rural Locality," Rural Sociology, Vol. 28, (March), pp. 18-34.
- Napier, Ted L.  
1971 "The Impact of Water Resource Development Upon Local Rural Communities: Adjustment Factors to Rapid Change," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University.
- Napier, Ted L.  
1972 "Social-Psychological Responses to Forced Relocation Due to Watershed Development," Urbana: American Water Resources Association, Water Resources Bulletin, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 784-794.

Napier, Ted L. and Cathy J. Wright

- 1974 "An Evaluation of Forced Relocation of Population Due to Rural Community Development," Wooster: The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Bulletin 1073.

Napier, Ted L. and Cathy J. Wright

- 1975 "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Attitudinal Response of Rural People to Natural Resource Development: A Case Study of the Impact of Water Resource Development," ESS 517. Being published as an Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center research bulletin.

Napier, Ted L.

- 1975a "An Analysis of the Social Impact of Water Resource Development and Subsequent Forced Relocation of Population Upon Rural Community Groups: An Attitudinal Study," Wooster: The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Research Bulletin 1080.

Napier, Ted L.

- 1975b "Assessing the Social Impact of Natural Resource Development: A Research Overview with Commentary About the Contemporary Uses of Research Methodologies," Paper presented at the Environmental Design Research Association 6, Lawrence, Kansas, April.

Nettler, Gwynn

- 1967 "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 32, (April) pp. 670-677.

Rogers, Everett M. and F. Floyd Shoemaker

- 1971 Communication of Innovations, New York: Free Press.

Rogers, Everett M. and Rabel J. Burdge

- 1972 Social Change in Rural Societies, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Seeman, Melvin

- 1959 "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, (December) pp. 783-791.

Smith, Courtland L., Thomas C. Hogg and Michael J. Reagan

- 1971 "Economic Development: Panacea or Perplexity For Rural Areas?" Rural Sociology, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 173-186.

Srole, Leo

- 1956 "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, pp. 709-716.



Wilkinson, Kenneth

1966 "Local Action and Acceptance of Watershed Development"  
Water Resource Research Institute, Mississippi State  
University, State College, Mississippi.

Wright, Cathy J.

1972 "The Correlates of Community Identification in a Rural  
Community Under Stress," M.S. Thesis, Columbus: The  
Ohio State University.

Wright, Cathy J.

1974 "A Longitudinal Analysis of Social-Psychological Response  
to Watershed Development in a Rural Ohio Community," Ph.D.  
dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University.