ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING IN THE NORTHEAST: A REPLICATION AND EXTENSION

_____

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

Sam Houston State University

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

_____

by

Kaitlin M. Grant

May, 2017

ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING IN THE NORTHEAST: A REPLICATION AND EXTENSION

by

Kaitlin M. Grant

_____

APPROVED:

Gene Theodori, PhD
Committee Director

Michael Fortunato, PhD
Committee Co-Director

Karen Douglas, PhD
Committee Member

Abbey Zink, PhD
Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

Grant, Kaitlin M., *Economic restructuring in the Northeast: A replication and extension.* Master of Arts (Sociology), May, 2017, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

This study examines economic restructuring in the northeastern United States from 1990-2010 in counties of twelve northeastern states. Building upon a previous study by Kreahling, Smith, and Luloff (1996), the purpose of this study is to determine the changing effects on employment, poverty, and population within each county due to the economic restructuring within northeast counties. It is hypothesized that those counties that have continued the transition into professional and service--related occupations have had increases in population and employment and a decrease in poverty. Furthermore, this study surveyed county leaders to gain their perspective on changes to their county's economic structure over the last twenty years. It is hypothesized that local county leaders' answers on the survey will be parallel to the census data results when it relates to changes in poverty, employment, and population.

KEY WORDS: Economic restructuring, Economy, Industry, United States, Sam Houston State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The economic structure in the United States is dynamic. The primary leading economic structure of the United States has transitioned from extractive industries to manufacturing to service industries in the 40 years following the mid 1900's. The economic structure continues to change today from service to professional and technological industries. Educational and health services, specifically, are a dominating force within industries in the Northeastern United States where the current study takes place.

A large-scale change in the structure of the economy is also referred to as economic restructuring (Goe and Shanahan 1991). For example, from 1950-1990, the United States saw a transition from an agricultural--based economy to a manufacturing based economy and finally to a service--based economy (Kreahling, Smith, and Luloff 1996). Service--based includes wholesale and retail trade, entertainment and recreational services, educational services, and health-related services (Kreahling et al. 1996). Economic restructuring can affect employment and population growth or decline on a local level due to the shift in the type of economy that dominates during a specific period of time.

The leading industry in an area can determine the economic and population structure of families living in the Northeast and elsewhere. In turn, as families adjust to economic transitions, poverty and employment levels are continuously fluctuating. As previous research (Albrecht and Albrecht 2007; Kreahling et al.1996) has pointed out, different industries have distinct structures of employment, requiring differing types of

education and new workplace relationships. As the economic structure in the United States went from manufacturing to service, those skilled in labor did not always meet the requirements of an education for more service-based employment. Changing wages, structure and skill levels create alterations in employment and population.

As technology and education advance in the world, counties are seeing dramatic shifts in their landscapes and population. From 1950-1990 alone, the United States saw changes from agriculture and extractive industries dominating the countryside to manufacturing jobs increasing all over cities and towns and finally to service based industries taking the place of declining factory positions.

Since the early to mid-1900's, as technology advanced, the first major change in economic restructuring began. New equipment and advancements allowed small farms to increase in size and created a large agricultural industry in the United States. After World War II, jobs in the United States became increasingly involved in manufacturing and the nation became greatly industrialized. Finally, in the late 1900's, manufacturing began to move overseas and the United States became increasingly focused on the service industry.

As all of the major changes in the economy took place, researchers began to focus on studying the economic restructuring of metropolitan areas (Albrecht and Albrecht 2007). As our economy continues to transform, it is vital to see how the landscape is changing. Can rural areas maintain a stable economy? What areas are suffering from loss of employment during economic restructuring? How can areas thrive as new technology and industries become available? These are some questions that can be answered when studying the changing economic structure of our country.

The purpose of the current study is to compare poverty, employment, and population from 1990- 2010 in Northeast counties to determine how restructuring periods affected these counties. An additional purpose of this study is to discover local leaders' thoughts on the effects of economic restructuring on their county from 1990-2010 and ideas on how to navigate future restructuring for improvement within their county.

Previous Study of Economic Restructuring

Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Economic Restructuring. Economic restructuring research in the United States began with studying only metropolitan counties and it is still common to focus on urban areas today. In the 1990's, Galster, Mincy, and Tobin's (1997) study on economic restructuring research is one that focused on metropolitan areas. The researchers compared the economic restructuring in metropolitan areas with the changing poverty rates in these areas. The researchers referred to the metropolitan statistical area to determine metropolitan areas they used in their study. They also referenced data from the U.S. Census Bureau to address their central research question, whether black neighborhoods have suffered from economic restructuring because they are located in metropolitan areas with high levels of restructuring or because they are more vulnerable than white neighborhoods regardless of the level of restructuring.

Their results showed that higher rates of restructuring resulted in higher levels of poverty, with black neighborhoods experiencing a higher growth in poverty rates on average (Galster et al. 1997). This study is included in the literature review because it focused on a socioeconomic variable (i.e., poverty) during economic restructuring. While

the proposed study will focus on both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, socioeconomic variables such as poverty will be assessed.

Research on economic restructuring eventually extended into rural areas as well. Extending research into nonmetropolitan areas was an important turn in the study of economic restructuring. The socioeconomic variables within metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties vary and each type can have very different outcomes during economic restructuring. One example of variation between nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties is economic diversification. The local economies in metropolitan areas were once heavily dependent on the manufacturing industry to maintain the economy. When manufacturing moved overseas, it was very easy for these cities to experience rapid economic decline. As we move forward in technology, industries in metropolitan areas are becoming diverse and can rely on that diversification for long term economic stability. This diversification within metropolitan areas is a factor that most nonmetropolitan areas cannot yet possess, as population and resources are more limited in nonmetropolitan areas than metropolitan areas.

Gayle Smutny's (2002) study is an example of how the field has extended the research on economic restructuring to rural areas in the United States. Smutny examined economic restructuring in the state of Idaho using counties as the unit of analysis. County level data were collected examining population change, farm and agricultural change, total employment change, recreation/tourism- related employment change, and high technology employment change (Smutny 2002). The last two variables were gathered because previous studies had determined that growth occurs in nonmetropolitan counties that are close to metropolitan areas and in counties that have high amenity resources in

tourism and recreation. Smutny analyzed differential impacts on economic restructuring in Idaho counties and found that some counties experienced complex economic and demographic changes in the 1990's while some remained stagnant (2002). Those counties that grew tended to have a higher amount of amenity resources and technological advances than those counties that did not.

This study is limited to only one state and represents a complex range of variables that may have affected the growth and change of counties within Idaho. While this study is limited to Idaho, it demonstrated that advancements within industries and keeping up with economic restructuring created better growth and change than counties that did not advance during restructuring.

Economic Restructuring through Socioeconomic Variables. Economic restructuring can also be looked at through specific variables such as population changes (Kuzmetra, Rizva, Jeroscenkova, and Jermolajeva 2015). In this 2015 study on the Latvian countryside, researchers focused on population changes during geographical and social restructuring. Kuzmetra et al. (2015) used comparative analysis and synthesis to study municipalities in the area from 2000-2011. They also reviewed farm changes over the eleven year period and how they influenced structural changes of rural population. Out of seven municipalities, four saw decreases in their total population by more than 25%, but surprisingly two increased in population despite the generally decline of farming in the Latvian countryside (Kuzmetra et al. 2015). While the researchers demonstrated population changes in rural population with decline of agriculture as a dominant industry, population change is just one measure of change during economic

restructuring. There are other important factors that need to be studied in order to understand the total impact of economic restructuring.

Poverty. One study in 1998 analyzed poverty changes during transition periods of restructuring. Nelson (1998) found that between 1970 and 1990, Ohio's city and suburb social systems were disrupted by the restructuring from manufacturing to service sector employment. Nelson (1998) hypothesized that loss of manufacturing jobs created an increase of family poverty and that cities would suffer the most from these losses. It was also hypothesized that poverty would be alleviated when service sector jobs were gained.

Nelson obtained county and city data and analyzed the effect of manufacturing and service-industry reliance on the percentage of poor families using cross-sectional OLS regression models for each year (1998). While results supported both hypotheses, it was found that long term increases in service sector employment created increases in family poverty. This study confirms that Ohio went through economic restructuring during 1970-1990 and that family poverty was effected by the transformation. Nelson's study was limited to only poverty as a socioeconomic variable and did not acknowledge additional variables that may have undergone change during economic restructuring.

Employment. A common variable in measuring economic restructuring is employment loss and growth. Goe and Shanahan (1991) hypothesized that the Midwest was disproportionately impacted by economic restructuring in the manufacturing sector. They also hypothesized that metropolitan areas that are highly dependent on manufacturing have a strong potential for experiencing socio-economic disruptions due to industrial decline and restructuring.

The researchers used time-series data and their results indicated that the East North Central region and Mountain regions were the most negatively affected by economic restructuring. Their second hypothesis was supported- they found that 63% of industrial-based metropolitan areas suffered loss of employment in manufacturing at a rate of four times greater than the rest of the nation from 1970-1985. The industrial-based metropolitan areas experienced little success in restructuring their economy during this time period. While this study provided an indication of which regions suffered most during the economic restructuring from manufacturing to service industries, it focused just on deindustrialization and employment growth and only measured data until 1985.

Metropolitan versus Nonmetropolitan. Economic restructuring can also have a major impact on population and on the socioeconomic well-being of rural and urban areas. Researchers have studied the geographical changes taking places during economic restructuring as well as the socioeconomic consequences that result.

Albrecht and Albrecht (2007) compared economic restructuring in both nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties, rather than focusing on only one or the other. Albrecht and Albrecht (2007) looked at the demographic and socioeconomic outcomes of economic restructuring from an agricultural to industrial to post-industrial society. More importantly, Albrecht and Albrecht (2007) extended on previous literature by comparing different types of service jobs, since the sector ranges from high end to low skill jobs. Using the Census population and housing data, Albrecht and Albrecht (2007) looked at economic restructuring in counties as well as poverty, population, and income changes in 1980 and 2000. They then used regression models to compare those variables between nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties.

Albrecht and Albrecht (2007) found that increases in service sector employment were greater in metropolitan communities than in nonmetropolitan communities. They also found that smaller minority populations and those with more resources had greater increases in the service sector. Their socioeconomic and demographic findings indicated that an increase in service employment resulted in a reduction of poverty and higher population and income growth.

Extension of Previous Literature

Kreahling, Smith, and Luloff's 1996 study on economic restructuring in the nonmetropolitan northeast is the most relevant previous literature to review. My proposed study is inspired by their previous research. The purpose of their study was to discover how the northeast transitioned through economic changes. Additionally, they wanted to know how economic restructuring from extractive to manufacturing to service-based industries changed county population, employment and poverty.

Kreahling et al. (1996) analyzed economic restructuring in 177 nonmetropolitan counties within eleven northeast states. Their study gathered data from 1950-1990 and they organized these data for every ten years. First, they looked at general employment trends in each county and then separated employment by industry. They further explained their findings by displaying the dominant specialization within each county. This allowed them to know which county suffered or thrived during economic restructuring based on changes in industry specialization.

Additionally, their study (Kreahling et al. 1996) examined population changes, income changes, and poverty changes within each county during the forty year time period. Their data were collected from the U.S. Census and were organized in both table

and figure format. Their results indicated that counties that remained manufacturing-specialized were most likely to suffer a downturn in employment, income, and population as well as an increase in poverty. The opposite was true for those that advanced to service-based industries, with those counties seeing a rise in population, income, employment and a small decrease in poverty. Their study implicated that shifts to service-based economic structure appeared to have positive effects on nonmetropolitan areas in the northeast. This study expands on their results as well as adds new insights to economic restructuring.

A Fresh Perspective

Studies on economic restructuring are heavily based on populations and consequences of restructuring such as changes in employment and poverty levels. While studying the results of economic restructuring on different socioeconomic variables is extremely important, achieving a local perspective on economic restructuring is necessary to truly makes positive changes within a population. Local leaders have the ability to encourage change and create policies that influence the outcome of counties during economic changes.

There are not enough studies within the literature that have focused on the perspective that local level economic leaders have on economic restructuring. The first part of this study involves following previous research models by using county level data to understand changes in economic restructuring and consequences of it on employment, poverty and population. For a new perspective in researching economic restructuring, a survey was sent to 339 local county leaders to gather data on their thoughts of local economic change. This fresh perspective provided insights into how local leaders viewed

their county before and after an economic restructuring phase. Additionally, local leaders gave their opinion on the best development strategy during restructuring.

Many studies on economic restructuring are objective and quantitative. While keeping an objective view as a researcher is important, true changes within a population often come from subjective views and opinions from leaders and residents within a county or studied population.

Why is the subjective view of individuals important to study? Local leaders are in a position to create ideas and policies that can have an effect on their local economy. How leaders perceive what is happening in their county in relation to the variables being studied affects the action they take on them. The William Thomas theorem explains this phenomena.

The William Thomas Theorem is the idea that "individuals make decisions in situations based on their interpretation of the situation, whether that interpretation is correct or not" (Goar 2015: 1). An individual's perceptions shapes his or her actions. How local leaders perceive and think about their county shape how they act on different policies and ideas. If a local leader is repeatedly witnessing reports of crime within the county in a short amount of time, he or she might come to the conclusion that there is a high level of crime in the area whether it is true or not. This may directly affect the decisions and policies they attempt to create for their community. Part two of this study will look deeper into this theory and concept of local leaders' thoughts and ideas.

Part one. The first part of this study determines whether employment, poverty, and population within northeast counties are positively or negatively impacted by the economic restructuring from 1990-2010. This part is an extension of a study that ended in

1990 (Kreahling et al. 1996). The most recent data will determine whether or not the results found in the previous literature still hold true; that is, counties that transitioned into leading industries during restructuring saw a rise in population, income, employment and a small decrease in poverty. It will allow us to understand how economic restructuring is changing an area of the United States for the last twenty years (1990 to 2010). It is important to look at these data for a county's own economic stability and security within the Northeast during a time of economic restructuring. Extending this study and comparing that data with a survey to local leaders was intended to increase local awareness within counties of whether they are negatively or positively affected by economic restructuring, which is continuously occurring.

In order to replicate the basic elements of Kreahling et al.'s (1996) research, the present study focused on the Northeast. Those basic elements include comparing nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties within the same states they looked at and studying the variables of employment, poverty and population. While most of the current study does reflect parts of the previous study, there are some differences. Data were taken from multiple sources. Data for 1990 were taken from DataFerrett database from the U.S. Census and 2010 data were taken from the U.S. Census. In addition, industries were separated into a more recent reflection of the 2010 industry categories (NAICS codes as opposed to the SIC codes used in the previous study), separating the service-based economy of Kreahling et al.'s (1996) study into separate categories and combining more agricultural based services into one. The way industry categories are organized has changed, but the new scheme still contains those industries examined in the original study.

It felt important in this study to include information on both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, rather than just focusing most of the attention on nonmetropolitan counties as Kreahling et al. (1996) did in their study. Specific nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties were both effected from 1990 to 2010 and studying both were important for being able to survey both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan county leaders. Metropolitan and nonmetropolitan definitions are explained below in the methods section.

It is hypothesized that those counties who transitioned into professional and service-related occupations had increases in population, income and employment and a decrease in poverty.

Part Two. The second part of this study offers local level insight into economic restructuring. While most studies focus on how counties transition and the socioeconomic effects of the transition, this study additionally includes local leaders' perspectives on economic restructuring. Creating this perspective provides insight into whether local county leaders' thoughts are parallel to what is actually resulting in their county due to economic restructuring.

Individuals within counties look to their local leaders for decisions and support. Local leaders can make significant changes and improvements within their county. Leaders invest time, action, and thought on the economy because it holds meaning to them as part of their job. It is therefore imperative that local leaders are aware of how their county's population, employment, and poverty are maintained during economic restructuring.

While leaders have the power to create policies and encourage change, the entire community help elect those leaders and are involved in that change. During the analysis of part two of the study, it was found that community played an important role in local leader's survey answers.

In this study, community will be defined as "persons in social interaction within a geographic area and having one or more additional common ties" (Hillery 1955: 111). Our community in this study consists of county leaders and the rest of the population within that particular geographic area (county) who have common goals for their community.

The second part of this study, therefore, asks questions about the economy but also questions leaders on their community and how they can create better changes for their community during economic restructuring.

It is hypothesized in part two of the study that local county leaders' answers on the survey will be parallel to the census data results when it relates to changes in poverty, employment, and population.

CHAPTER II

Economic Restructuring from 1990-2010

In keeping with the elements and extension of Kreahling et al.'s previous study (1996), this study includes 12 states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia.

There are 299 counties total and each county is divided into metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties, using the 2010 urban-rural continuum codes from the United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2013). According to their website, the ERS distinguishes metropolitan counties by "population size of their metro area and nonmetropolitan counties by degree of urbanization and adjacency to a metro area" (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2013). The counties are divided by a code (1-9) as follows:

Metropolitan Counties

1 = Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more

2 = Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population

3 = Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population

Nonmetropolitan Counties

4 = Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area

5 = Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area

6 = Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area

7 = Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area

8 = Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area

9 = Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area

The number of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan northeast counties used in this study by these codes are presented in Table 1. There are 173 Metropolitan Counties that account for 57.8% of counties being assessed in the current study. The remaining 126 Nonmetropolitan counties account for 42.2% of counties studied.

Table 1. Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties: Rural Continuum Codes

Rural-Urban Continuum Codes	**Number of Counties**	**Percent of Counties**
Metropolitan Counties		
1 = Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more	80	26.80%
2 = Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population	50	16.70%
3 = Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population	43	14.30%
Nonmetropolitan Counties		
4 = Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area	31	10.40%
5 = Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area	3	1.00%
6 = Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area	45	15.10%
7 = Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area	26	8.70%
8 = Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area	13	4.30%
9 = Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area	8	2.70%
Total number of counties (n= 299)	299	100.0%

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service 2010

Overall, metropolitan counties have a population of around 250,000 to 1 million, but counties with less than 250,000 that are considered to be part of the metropolitan area are also considered in that category. Nonmetropolitan areas with a population of 20,000

or more but are adjacent to a metro area are considered nonmetropolitan. Also included in nonmetropolitan are counties with a population of 20,000 or fewer.

Employment Trends

Total employment trends within counties were observed before breaking them down by industry. This allowed the study of general increase or decrease in overall employment among non-metro and metro counties within the Northeastern United States, which may or may not have been caused by overall restructuring changes. The general trends were then compared with industry employment trends.

Total employment trends in the Northeast counties are recorded in Table 2.

Table 2. General Employment Change

Time Period		**Mean Change**	**Counties Above Mean**	**Counties Below Mean**
1990-2010	Nonmetro	8.74% (n= 126)	46.8% (n =59)	53.2% (n= 67)
	Metro	16.32% (n=173)	38.7% (n= 67)	61.3% (n= 106)
	All	13.13% (n= 299)	42.8% (n = 128)	57.2% (n = 171)

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics 1990, 2010

All counties experienced a growth in employment from 1990-2010, with 13.13% mean change in employment. About 128 counties (42.8%) had a growth above the average and 171 counties (57.2%) were below the average for all counties.

Nonmetropolitan counties experienced an overall employment mean change of 8.74%, with 46.8% of counties above the mean change and 53.2% of counties below the mean change of employment. Metropolitan counties experienced a higher mean change of 16.32%, with 38.7% of counties above the average growth and 61.3% of counties below.

Industry Employment Trends

Table 3 shows that employment manufacturing decreased dramatically as a leading industry in the last twenty years, while education and health services grew, becoming the dominant industry in many counties that previously held manufacturing as the leading industry (35.2 % mean change). This was the most common trend when looking at industry data from 1990 to 2010. Similar to manufacturing, agriculture continued to see a decline, which was a predicted trend given previously in the 1950-1970 year industry decline. Agriculture experienced a percent change of -86.2% from 1990-2010. There was also a growth trend in professional services, as we can start to see a slight increase in 2010 compared to 1990.

Another interesting find was the entertainment industry. In 1990, only 368,191 individuals were in the art, entertainment and recreation industry while in 2010 there were 2,529,604 individuals within the industry, with a percent change of 85.4%. While the entertainment industry was not a leading industry in all but one state, there was definite growth in the industry overall.

Retail saw a slight decrease with a percent change of -31.28%. Construction stayed relatively the same throughout the 20 year period, with just the slightest increase. A complete list of employment changes by industry can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. Employment Change by Industry

Industry	1990	2010	Percent Change
Manufacturing	4,676,588	2,703,217	-73%
Retail	4,411,389	3,342,346	-31.98%
Education, Heath, and Social Services	5,098,177	7,846,604	35.02%
Agriculture, Fishing, Mining	479,964	257,688	-86.2%
Construction	1,660,631	1,777,556	6.58%
Entertainment and Recreational	368,191	2,529,604	85.4%
Professional Services	2,097,819	3,381,334	38%
Total counties (n=299)			

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates 2010; DataFerrett Summary File 3 1990

Industry Specialization by County

To further understand the changing economic structure within the northeast from 1990-2010, industry specialization by county is reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Industry Specialization by County 1990 and 2010

Leading Industry in Counties	1990		2010	
Manufacturing	141 *77 **64	47.2%	4 ** 4	1.3%
Retail	46 *32 **14	15.4%	0	0%

(continued)

Leading Industry in Counties	**1990**		**2010**	
Education, Heath, and Social Services	109 *63 **46	36.5%	290 *170 **120	97%
Agriculture, Fishing, Mining	1 **1	.3%	0	0%
Construction	2 *1 **1	.7%	1 *1	.3%
Entertainment and Recreational	0	0%	2 *2	.7%
Professional Services	0	0%	2 *1 *1	.7%
Total counties (n=299)	299	100%	299	100%

Note:*Metropolitan, ** Nonmetropolitan
Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates 2010; DataFerrett Summary File 3 1990

If the first row in the table is used as an example for employment change by industry, it is understood that manufacturing was the leading industry in 141 counties (47.2%) in 1990. There were 77 metropolitan counties and 64 nonmetropolitan counties whose leading industry was manufacturing. In 2010, manufacturing dropped as a leading industry in many counties and was only the top industry in 4 nonmetropolitan counties (1.3%).

Education, health, and social services saw an opposite trend from 1990 to 2010. In 1990, it was a leading industry in only 109 counties (36.5%). Education and health was the lead industry in 63 metropolitan counties and 46 nonmetropolitan counties. In 2010 it

became the leading industry in 290 counties or 97% of the total studied area, leading in 170 metropolitan counties and 120 nonmetropolitan counties.

Retail and Agriculture, Fishing, and Mining did not lead as an industry in any county by 2010, while professional services appeared for the first time in 2010, albeit in only two counties.

Change in Poverty and Population: Nonmetropolitan versus Metropolitan

Poverty was one of three variables examined in this study since employment rate can directly affect fluctuations in family poverty. It is also included because as previous studies have indicated, it is a factor that is changed when economic restructuring occurs. In this case, poverty was calculated using individuals in poverty rather than families in poverty. Poverty was calculated in this way due to accessibility of 1990 Census data. Although the 2010 data had both individual and families in poverty, the only available online data for poverty through the census data was individuals in poverty. While families in poverty is more commonly used to understand poverty in the United States, studying poverty via individuals gives a realistic view on how many people were below the poverty line from 1990 to 2010 in the northeastern United States. Table 5 depicts the percentage of individuals in poverty in all northeastern counties within the study and also separates poverty by nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties.

Overall, poverty levels changed very little within northeastern counties with a percent change of only 2.86% increase in poverty. If we separate counties into nonmetropolitan and metropolitan, we can notice a difference in changing poverty levels from 1990- 2010. Nonmetropolitan counties actually experienced a decrease in poverty

from 1990 to 2010 with a percent change of -3.5%. Metropolitan counties on the other hand experienced an overall increase in poverty by almost 10% (9.67%).

Table 5. Change in Poverty: Metropolitan Vs Nonmetropolitan

Time Period		1990	2010	Percent Change
1990-2010	Nonmetro	15.03%	14.50%	-3.5%
	Metro	10.34%	11.34%	9.6%
	All	12.31%	12.67%	2.9%

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates 2010; U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service: Poverty Rates 1990

When looking at the poverty changes, metropolitan counties had an increase in poverty rates, while nonmetropolitan counties had a decrease in overall poverty rates. There could be several reasons for this, including the population changes within the county. Therefore, the next variable to look at would be the overall population changes of the Northeastern counties in Table 6.

Table 6. Population Changes from 1990-2010

Time Period		1990	2010	Percent Change
1990-2010	Nonmetro	5,385,171	4,549,817	-0.16%
	Metro	52,665,171	46,675,239	-0.11%
	All	58,050,342	51,225,056	-0.12%

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates 2010; DataFerrett Summary File 3 1990

The study actually found a slight decrease in most county population from 1990 to 2010. The census data briefing, however, shows that the Northeast experienced a slight

increase of 5.5% from 1990 to 2000 and another slight increase of 3.2 from 2000 to 2010 (Perry and Mackun 2001; Mackun and Wilson 2011). When looking at population growth in this study, only 36 counties accounted for almost all population growth in the northeast, while the remaining 263 counties lost population. Only 8 of those counties that gained population were in nonmetropolitan areas. This may account for a difference in the study findings and an overall Northeastern population increase.

Results

The census data were analyzed using simple linear regression models. Service sector change was compared with all three variables. There was no significance between change in economic sectors and change in poverty. There was also no significance found between change in economic industries and change in employment. Finally, there was no significance found between change in economic industry and change in population. The original hypothesis was rejected, H_a: $R^2 \neq 0$. Change in service sectors, in this case, the massive move to the education and health industry, was not the driver of increases or decreases in poverty, employment, or population.

To further analyze what might be the driver of these changes, an additional linear regression model was conducted for change in service sector based on the rural-urban continuum codes (how urban a county is). The results were significant ($F(1, 297) = 6.184$, $p < .013$), with an R^2 of .020. The change in service sector increased .545 for every category closer to urbanization; therefore for every two categories closer a county is to urbanization, service sector change doubles. As a county is considered more urban or metropolitan, their service sector growth doubles. Urbanization, therefore, is directly correlated to growth in economic industries.

The rural-continuum code was then compared to all three variables (poverty, employment, and population). It was found that the relationship between poverty and level of urbanization was significant ($F (1, 297) = 44.333$, $p < .000$), with an R^2 of .130. For one category closer to urbanization, poverty change decreased -3.820. The more urban a county is considered, the less of a change in poverty was seen. The R^2 for poverty was .130, stating that urbanization accounted for 13 percent of variance in change in poverty.

The relationship between employment and level of urbanization was significant ($F (1, 297) = 6.664$, $p < .010$), with an R^2 of .022. Every unit closer to urbanization, employment change decreased by -1.230. Finally, the relationship between population change and the level of urbanization was also significant ($F (1, 297) = 5.215$, $p < .023$), with an R^2 of .018. For every one unit closer to urbanization, population change decreased by -.726.The more urban a county is, the less population change. When looking at R^2 for employment and population comparisons to the rural-continuum code, urbanization is a predictor, albeit only accounting for about 2 percent of the variance. The same was true for the effect of urbanization of service sector change. Still, it is a significant driver in change of all three variables. Overall, all three hypotheses were not rejected, H_a: $R^2 \neq 0$. In all three cases, level of urbanization was a predictor in employment, population, and poverty change. The regression findings are listed below in table 7.

Table 7. Rural-Urban Level on Service Sector, Employment, Population and Poverty

Source	B	SE	β	t	p
Service Sector	.545	.219	.143	2.487	.013
Employment	-1.230	.476	-.148	-2.167	.010
Population	-.726	.318	-.131	-2.284	.023
Poverty	-3.820	.574	-.360	-6.658	.000

Source: SPSS Data Output

Hypothesis Conclusion and Summary

The first hypothesis in the study, "counties that have continued the transition into professional and service related occupations have had increases in population and employment and decreases in poverty" was not supported. This conclusion was found because as shown in the results above, the transition into service related occupations was not the driver for increases or decreases in population, employment, or poverty. In this case, it is irrelevant whether moves to education and health industry caused increases in population and employment and a decrease in poverty since the change in service sector industry had no significant effect on positive or negative changes in employment, poverty, and population. The level of urbanization, or whether a county was metropolitan or nonmetropolitan in this study, was responsible for the level of changes in employment, poverty, and population.

To summarize, industry did not determine growth or decline in any category. Urbanization was the factor in determining the growth or decline in all variables. The more urban a county was, the higher the growth rate of the education and health industry. The more urban a county was, the less of a change in poverty rate, population levels and

the change in employment. Urban areas saw a growth in the service sector industry and less of a fluctuation in their poverty rates, population levels, and employment rates. Urban counties, therefore, saw more a stability in their socioeconomic variables while retaining a larger growth rate in the service sector industry.

CHAPTER III

A New Perspective of Economic Restructuring

For the second part of the study, a seventeen question survey link was emailed to local county leaders in each state. The questions given within the survey are intended to help leaders reflect on their thoughts on economic restructuring in their county over the last twenty years. After examining data results, possible adjustments and improvements can be assessed within counties to prepare for future changes.

Participants

Local county leaders were randomly selected from available website county lists after counties went through systematic sampling. For each state, counties were separated into metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties. Two of the counties chosen saw little change in economic restructuring and held the same top industry from 1990 to 2010. The other two counties chosen were counties that saw a change within the highest industry from 1990 to 2010; for example, these counties went from manufacturing in 1990 to health and education in 2010. Counties that fell within each these categories were chosen at random. Local county leaders within each county were collected through government and official town websites.

For those states that did not have official county level government, a county was chosen and then two towns from within the county were randomly selected. The town government leaders were then contacted rather than county leaders. Two different towns with the county were chosen to attempt to keep out any bias view from only one town when answering questions about economic restructuring within the county. In addition,

one metropolitan county and one nonmetropolitan county were chosen for each category to keep with the trend of metropolitan versus nonmetropolitan counties.

Overall, 339 county and town leaders were contacted to take the survey. They were contacted via email which contained a survey link to complete the survey through Survey Monkey. In each county or town, a variety of department leaders were chosen to survey. The departments were kept as consistent as possible throughout each county. County leaders in the following departments were contacted: economic development, the county clerk or administrator, select board, community development, housing, environmental development, and human resources or services. They were again contacted two weeks later through a one-time reminder about taking the survey to increase response rate.

Finally, due to a low response rate (N= 60), county and town leaders were then contacted individually through email again two weeks later.

Survey

The survey consisted of seventeen questions ranging from closed- ended questions to open-ended questions. An example of a close-ended question in the survey is "On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is "not at all" and 5 is "very much," how much has your economy changed during economic restructuring? An example of an open ended-question is "When it comes to shaping the economic future of your county, are there any groups, demographics, or populations in your county whose voice has not been heard loudly enough?" The survey also contained a final section for additional comments and questions. A full copy of the survey can be found at the end of this paper under the Appendices.

Results

Out of 339 participants, 60 responded and agreed to participate in the survey. 51 participants went on to complete most of the survey. While this is not a significant number of responses for results to be generalized to the greater population, there were some interesting findings.

At the beginning of the survey, participants (n=51) answered how long they have resided in their current county and how long they have been in their current position. Time in county ranged from six months to over fifty years. Length of time in current position ranged from a few months to four plus years. The survey then moved on to the topic of economic restructuring, beginning with whether participants were familiar with the concept. A total of 41.18% (n= 21) county leaders were moderately familiar with economic restructuring, while a combined 45.10% (n= 23) were only slightly or somewhat familiar with the concept. Two county leaders stated that they were not familiar at all and 13.73% (n= 7) stated that they were extremely familiar with restructuring.

Out of 51 responses, all saw a change in their overall economy during the 1990-2010 restructuring period, with 45.10% (n= 23) of responses giving a 3 out 5 on how extreme changes were that took place. Out of those responses, 48% (n= 24) believed that the change in their economy was neutral, while a remaining 36% (n= 18) of people responded that the county's change was negative and a remaining 16% (n= 8) believed economic restructuring led to a more positive change within their county's economy.

Drivers of Economic Transformation. After establishing how respondents felt about their last 20 years of economic restructuring, they responded to the question asking

what the drivers of the transformation may have been. Loss of manufacturing jobs, globalization, and market forces were among the most popular comments for negative drivers of the economic transformation. Small businesses and town educators were considered positive drivers and a lack of coordinated economic development effort on behalf of the state or county were considered negative drivers. Tourism was mentioned by two different respondents for a positive driver of their county's transformation.

Participants also answered whether a single event may have sparked the economic transformation within their county. About 67% of participants answered no, that they could not think of a single event. The other 33% all mentioned the closing of manufacturers within their area, the loss of young people, and increasing technology as major events that created a change. While most answered that the event was not positive, a few mentioned technology and the creation of jobs through new employment as a positive event that caused a transformation within their county.

The Role of County Leaders. In response to the questions "Have county leaders played a reactive or proactive role during economic restructuring?" seventeen participants (40.48%) responded that county leaders played a reactive role or reacted to the changes being imposed on them involuntarily. About eleven participants (26.19%) stated that county leaders had a more proactive role within economic restructuring, being actively involved in controlling change. The remaining 33.33% stated that county leaders played a more neutral role during economic restructuring.

It was surprising to find in the question of the roles of county leaders that 73.81% of county leaders thought their peers or they themselves played a proactive or neutral role during economic restructuring. Economic leaders have the chance to be proactive and

make changes to help their economy adjust to restructuring at a local level. The next step when it comes to further exploring this question would be how local leaders can be proactive during this time.

Socioeconomic Variables. In addition to basic economic restructuring questions, participants answered questions about the quality of life and socioeconomic issues within each county. In this study, quality of life is defined as "a condition that is perceived by residents and translated by them into varying degrees of a sense of well-being" (Wish 1986 in Furuseth and Walcott 1990: par. 3). Wish's definition of the quality of life is generalized to be something that is perceived by the people experiencing it and is subjectively marked. Included in Furuseth and Walcott (1990) concept of quality of life is employment, educational opportunities, environmental health and public accommodations, which fits this current study's concept of quality of life well.

When asked about overall quality of life within each county, 45.23% of participants somewhat agreed that the overall quality of life did improve within their counties, while 30.95% disagreed that there was an improvement in their county and 23.81% remained neutral. More than half of participants, therefore, stated that they did not think the overall quality of life in their county had improved over the last twenty years.

Economic, environmental and social well-being were also addressed within the survey. For economic well-being, almost 38.46% of participants saw an increase, 43.59% saw a decrease and 17.95% believed that the economic well-being within their county stayed the same. Environmentally, 46.15% saw an increase of well-being, 17.95% saw a decrease within environmental well-being during economic restructuring, and 35.9%

stated that there was no change. Finally, for social well-being, 33.33% saw an increase, 38.46% saw a decrease, and 28.21% saw no significant change in social well-being within their county.

Rate of employment also can see great changes during economic restructuring. In this survey, 33.33% of respondents saw rates of employment increase within their county, while 35.9% saw a decrease in rates of employment, and 30.77% believed that rates stayed the same. The majority of response was that they were not satisfied with rates of employment (68.42%), while the remaining 31.58% stated that they were satisfied with employment within their county.

The final socioeconomic data involved rates of poverty. A total of 42.10% of participants saw an increase in poverty within their county while 44.74% believed the poverty levels stayed the same. Only 13.16% of participants saw a decrease in poverty within their county.

Population. Changing economic structures often involve fluctuations in the economy, employment, and poverty levels. Population is also an important variable to address. For example, when agriculture became almost obsolete as a leading industry, many people were moving to the cities to work in manufacturing plants. Due to this economic change, the United States saw a large increase in city living and the number of people within close proximity of each other and a decrease in the population living in rural areas.

From 1990- 2010, 37.50% of participants believed that their population increased or greatly increased. The same number (37.50%) believed that their population remained

steady within the twenty year period. The remaining 25% stated that their population decreased.

Open Ended Questions

The end of the survey involved open-ended questions which will each be reviewed and summarized in the following paragraphs.

Future Changes. Participants answered the question, "Describe any changes would you like to see in your county's economy over the next five years?" Multiple participants suggested that manufacturing would help their county's economy over the next five years. Although manufacturing has declined in the Northeast due to globalization efforts, manufacturing is still strong in the minds of people within the county as a positive change to future employment.

Others have called for other ways forward, expressing that a production of skilled and high tech jobs as opposed to service jobs could help move the economy forward. Along with the production of skilled jobs, participants mentioned the need to attract young people to the area to increase population and employment. One participant stated that providing art and culture in the area would help attract younger employers. Another participant even suggested a model to follow:

> A move towards an economic gardening model that supports tech growth and high wage positions in industries with low impact on environment and infrastructure. Schools and communities more coordinated in this support model. Stronger retention of emerging workforce; coordinated tourism initiative for the first time.

While this is a broad statement of an overall model, it encompasses suggestions of multiple participants. It seems that many local leaders are thinking in a similar way and

finding the right fit for each county would be a future step in creating easier transitions in future economy changes.

Finally, topics such as affordable housing, public transport, and energy conservation were mentioned. As all of these topics are a discussion nationally, they are also a local focus. The question remains on how best to approach these obstacles to create positive changes within each county.

Development Strategies. Participants had ideas for future development strategies that were particular to their county. They answered the question, "What do you believe is the best development strategy for county success during economic transitioning?"

Almost all participants mentioned increasing funds to public schools, job training, good infrastructure, and alternate energy as future development strategies. Attracting new businesses and professions was also mentioned as a strategy for county success during economic restructuring.

The answer that stood out in the data was the comment of the need for local businesses, economic staff, citizens and levels of government all working together towards future strategies. The next question discussed in the paper links this idea with another- whose voice is not being heard?

Can You Hear Me? The final open-ended question on the survey was "When it comes to shaping the economic future of your county, are there any groups, demographics, or populations in your county whose voice has not been heard loudly enough?" A common answer included young people, but many mentioned the lack of connections between groups.

There were also statements that suggested balancing power and strategies and different levels of government working together. Participants even mentioned split parties within the local and national government who were no longer looking at their county or country as a whole. The lack of working together and participating economic changes seemed to be the most common theme in open-ended questions and perhaps the most important one. As national and even local government become split on what they think is best for the county, there could be a lack of growth and well-being within counties, as we saw in the census data with poverty and population growth.

Hypothesis Results

The hypothesis for part two "county leaders answers on the survey will be parallel to the census data results in part one of the study" was not supported. It was surprising to find that participant's answers were not parallel to the census data. Most participants stated the opposite of what actually occurred in their county when it came to changes in employment, poverty, and population. The question now is why this occurred and what needs to be done to help county leaders with awareness and communication on what can be done to transition counties during an economic change.

CHAPTER IV

Comparing the Data: Looking to the Future

This final chapter consists of a quick summary of data comparison between census data and survey data. Most importantly, this chapter examines what the survey data tell us and where to look for further guidance and research of local leaders and economic restructuring.

The first variable that was compared in this study was employment. When looking at census data, 202 counties out of 299 (69%) experienced an increase and 70 out of 299 counties (23) experienced a decrease in employment. The remaining 8% percent of counties did not see a change in employment. Only 12 out of 39 participants (30.8%) stated that they thought their county experienced an increase. Another 35.9% stated their county experienced a decrease in employment and 33% of participants saw no change in employment. When comparing the two sets of data, the most obvious challenge is the number of participants and the number of counties. It is hard to compare 299 counties with only 39 responses for employment. The sample is very small and would be hard to generalize to the greater population.

While poverty and population saw a similar mismatch in comparing data, it was decided that studying the 37 participants who completed all answers to the three variables (poverty, employment, and population) with their individual counties results would be more sensible. The results in this comparison were similar to the larger comparison, with the majority of participants thinking the opposite of what the census data demonstrated as we will see in the results below.

Overall, only 10 out of 37 (27%) participants answered the same as the data when it came to employment, with 27 out of 37 (73%) believing their employment decreased when it actually increased and increased when it actually decreased. The same was shown for poverty, with 70% stating the opposite of what the census data demonstrates. Finally, 62% thought their population had increased when the opposite was true and 38% had the same answer that the census data demonstrates.

Furthermore, nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties in the responses were compared. There were a total of 22 metropolitan counties and 15 nonmetropolitan counties. Neither type of county answered more accurately than the other and very few participants (5%) were on target with what had happened to their employment, population, and poverty within their county.

Discussion

What Can Local Leaders Do For The Future? Further Studies. The second part of the study found that participants' answers on their county are not equivalent to what census data reports on levels of employment, poverty, and population. The outcome is interesting given the fact that county leaders have the authority to create policies and manipulate outcomes that are related to all three variables in this study. The next question would be why local leaders seemed to have a different view of their local economy than the data actually suggests. The Thomas Theorem mentioned in Chapter one of this study as well as our findings in part one of this study may accommodate for some of the reason as to why the survey answers do not yield the same results as the census data.

First, much of what participants are feeling could be due to the effects of urbanization rather than actual economic restructuring that is taking place within

counties. If a participant is in a county that is considered urban, the changes in service sector were greater, which may influence the idea that changes in the economy are creating greater poverty or changes in employment rather than the effects of urbanization itself. Overall, however, urbanization accounted for only part of the change in socioeconomic factors. There are other variables that are creating changes. This study did not discover what those variables are. Instead, the second part of the study focused on a more subjective outlook to economic restructuring and what local county leaders believed were created these changes which we summarized in chapter three.

As mentioned earlier in chapter three, county leaders have ideas to improve local level employment and poverty. Resources and working together are necessary tools in reaching those goals and may be lacking according to respondents answers. Multiple participants brought up the highly fragmented communication between leaders of different levels. One participant responded as follows:

> Despite my bias toward the left, I think the fact that our legislature is overwhelmingly dominated by democrats is a problem for our state. We need more balance in the legislature to help insure real and meaningful discussion of the issues facing us.

As seen in the United States public election of 2016, united may be a difficult concept to find in today's world. As the world continues to change and grow, it is becoming harder for smaller levels of government to be heard, to control what is happening around them and to gain resources to make local changes. The same pattern is demonstrated on the national level with globalization and trade and it may be the same on the local level. In review of the idea of community from chapter one, the answer to

create positive changes and well- being locally may lie partly in the concept of community.

Different levels of government working together, balancing strategies and power, involving young people and attracting them to the area are all concepts that involve the work of different communities communicating and interacting with each other. Local leaders may have the power to bring together fragmented groups and different ideas into negotiations and positive changes for their communities. The power of local communities can create major changes. Local leaders also have the power to rally voices that are not heard loudly enough to create involvement from those groups furthering the power of communities in positive change. Further research on different communities within economic restructuring and how to create unity during change needs to be done to answer some of the questions that resulted from this study.

Again, local leaders have both the power and resources to create small changes within their county or town. While economic restructuring usually takes place on a national level, different areas respond uniquely to the changes. In addition to community, perception also drives action. The example below provides the idea that subjective opinions matter and can shape future policies from those who have power.

Some counties in the northeast suffered a loss of manufacturing and a decline in population and employment while other counties actually experienced an increase in population and employment due to successful a transition into education and health industry. Even with an overall increase in employment in some counties, participants felt as though they are losing young people in their area, they are not satisfied with

employment and are still struggling with poverty. What may be causing this difference in opinion from what is actually happening within the counties?

The Thomas theorem discussed in chapter one, that perception drives ideas and actions, could hold some answers. For example, one participant reported loss of manufacturing within the county. When asked about changes in employment, the participant stated that the employment had decreased. In fact, the employment in that county increased with a mean change of 7%, an increase of 17,254 employees. The participant also stated that poverty had increased when in fact the poverty level went from 7.5 to 5.7, a decrease with a mean change of -24%. So in fact, while the loss of major manufacturing plants created the perception that employment went down and poverty increased, the county employment still continued to rise and poverty in the county actually decreased overall.

While economic changes can be influenced by numerous variables, this study has demonstrated that a shift to urbanization, a lack of united community, and perception of local leaders all have an influence on how a county responds to economic restructuring. Additional research on a larger scale needs to be done in order to derive further conclusions what this study has introduced.

Limitations

Although this research approached a new way to look at changes in the economy, there were some major limitations in the study. First and foremost, the low response rate of the survey created a specific view of what local county leaders think about their county and what the future needs to bring for a smoother economic transition during restructuring. In the future, given a longer period of time for further inquiries to local

leaders or being able to interview them at a more local level may result in different answers as opposed to a short online survey.

Even with the low response rate, however, we can see that difference between what is actually happening and what local leaders are perceiving, whether they have years of experience or are newly appointed. There was no difference between rural leaders and city leaders nor was there any specific pattern when it came to industry, most likely due to the fact that 97% of the northeast has moved to education and health as their leading industry. Even so, we see differences among poverty, employment, and population depending on the county. This could be due to the level of urbanization of a county. The more urban the county is was found to create changes in employment, poverty, and population. Further research needs to be done in order to achieve what additional factors are causing changes in employment, poverty, and population within Northeastern counties.

Conclusion

The goal of this study was to determine how economic restructuring influences socioeconomic factors such as poverty, employment, and population. The study also had a goal of discovering local leaders' thoughts and ideas on how their county fared during restructuring and what they might change in the future for a different outcome.

First, this study introduced a conversation on what is part of the cause of the shift in employment, poverty, and population change within the Northeast from 1990-2010. While the study began look at the structure of service sectors as the driving force in socioeconomic changes in the Northeast, it was found that urbanization is partly

responsible instead. There are other factors driving these changes, however, that is a topic for future studies.

Additionally, this study found that community played an important role in economic restructuring. Many local leaders felt that when individuals with different roles worked together, there was better outcomes for their county. Many participants voiced that fragmented groups or different levels of government failing to work together were a negative influence on economic restructuring.

Finally, the idea that local leaders may be developing ideas and creating policies based on their perceptions (see the Thomas Theorem, Chapter 1) is more important now than ever in our current United States local communities. It is also important for our local communities. Technology plays a vital role in how individuals see the world today, with an endless source of media outlets to influence how an individual perceives something. In addition, the more an individual is exposed to hearing certain ideas, the more believable they become.

While this study was small, it was still powerful in determining that many local leaders' answers were not parallel to what actually was happening in their economy. In fact, while some believed their economy had worsened overtime, their economy actually improved. While there are many limitations mentioned above, this study brought to light an important idea that perceptions can be powerful in shaping an individual's ideas and actions.

The subjective ideas of an individual does matter when studying changes like economic restructuring or environmental policies or any other matter of fact change that is occurring. Subjective study in this example does need to be explored because the ideas

of individuals who have the power to create changes, in economic restructuring for example, are creating policies that are shaping the socioeconomic status of their counties and communities.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, Don E. and Carol M. Albrecht. 2007. "Economic Restructuring and Socioeconomic Outcomes in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties." *Electronic Journal of Sociology* 1-21.

DataFerrett. 2016. 1990 Summary File 3. Retrieved (https://dataferrett.census.gov/).

Furuseth, Owen J. and Wayne A. Walcott. 1990. "Defining Quality of Life in North Carolina." *Social Science Journal* 27(1): 75-93.

Galster, George, Ronald Mincy, and Mitchell Tobin. 1997. "The Disparate Racial Neighborhood Impacts of Metropolitan Economic Restructuring." *Urban Affairs Review* 32(6): 797-824.

Goar, H. 2015. "Thomas Theorem." *Research Starters: Sociology.* Retrieved March 1, 2016 (http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.shsu.edu/).

Goe, W. Richard and James L. Shanahan. 1991. "Patterns of Economic Restructuring in Industrial-Based Metropolitan Areas." *Urban Studies* 28(4): 559-576.

Hillery, George A. Jr. 1955. "Definitions of Community Areas of Agreement." *Rural Sociology* 20: 111-123.

Kaufman, Harold F. 1959. "Toward an Interactional Conception of Community." *Social Forces* 38(1): 8–17.

Kreahling, Kathleen, Stephen Smith, and A. E. Luloff. 1996. *Economic Restructuring in the Nonmetropolitan Northeast: Adaptation to Transitions.* University Park, PA: Penn State University.

Mackun, Paul J. and Steven Wilson. March 2011. "Population Distribution and Change." *U.S. Census Briefs,* Retrieved (https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/ briefs/c2010br-01.pdf).

Nelson, Amy L. 1998. "The Effect of Economic Restructuring on Family Poverty in the Industrial Heartland, 1970-1990." *Sociological Focus* 31(2): 201-216.

Perry, Marc J. and Paul J. Mackun. 2001. "Population Change and Distribution." *U.S. Census Briefs*. Retrieved (http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-2.pdf).

Smutny, Gayla. 2002. "Patterns of Growth and Change: Depicting the Impacts of Restructuring in Idaho." *Professional Geographer* 54(3): 438-453.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2010. "American Community Survey 1 and 5 Year Estimates." Retrieved (http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/ jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk).

U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service. 1990. "Poverty Rates: County Level Data Sets." Retrieved (https://data.ers.usda.gov/ reports.aspx?ID=14843).

U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service. 2016. "Rural Urban Continuum Codes." Retrieved (https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-continuum-codes.aspx).

Wish, Naomi Bailin. 1986. "Are We Really Measuring the Quality of Life? Well-Being Has Subjective Dimensions, As Well As Objective Ones." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 45: 93-99.

APPENDIX A

Economic Restructuring Survey

Economic restructuring during 1990-2010:

1. How long have you lived in the county? Years _____ Months _____

2. How long have you been in your current position? Years _____ Months _____

The following questions are based on economic restructuring:

Economic restructuring is a large-scale change in the economy. For example, from 1950-1990, the United States transitioned from an agricultural based economy to a manufacturing based economy and finally to a service based economy. Economic restructuring can affect employment and population growth/decline on a local level due to these economic shifts.

3. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely unfamiliar and 5 is extremely familiar, how would you assess your familiarity with the economic restructuring that occurred in your county between 1990 and 2010?

Extremely Unfamiliar----------Extremely Familiar
1 2 3 4 5

4. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is "not at all" and 5 is "very much", how much has your economy changed during economic restructuring?

Not at all ----------Very much
1 2 3 4 5

5. In your opinion, have changes to your local economy been positive, negative, or somewhere in between?

1 Very negative
2 Somewhat Negative
3 Somewhere in between positive and negative
4 Somewhat Positive
5 Very Positive

In your opinion, what are some positive changes that took place (if applicable)?

In your opinion, what are some negative changes that took place (if applicable)?

6. Who was/were the driver(s) of the transformation? (Please list any county organizations, groups, or individuals).

7. Can you pinpoint a single event that sparked the county's economic transformation?

If yes, what was the event?

8. Have county leaders played a proactive or reactive role during economic restructuring, and in what ways? "Proactive" means that the leaders anticipate and control the change, while "reactive" means they much react to changes being imposed on them involuntarily.

1 Very proactive
2 Somewhat proactive
3 Neutral
4 Somewhat reactive
5 Very reactive

Explain your position on ways county leaders played a proactive role or reactive role during economic restructuring:

9. In your opinion, has the quality of life improved in this community over the past several years?

1 Strongly disagree
2 Somewhat disagree
3 Neutral
4 Agree
5 Strongly Agree

10. How has the economic restructuring period affected the following aspects of well-being in the county in the past 20 years:

Economic well-being

1 Greatly Decreased
2 Decreased
3 Stayed the Same
4 Increased
5 Greatly Increased

Environmental well-being

1 Greatly Decreased
2 Decreased
3 Stayed the Same
4 Increased
5 Greatly Increased

Social well-being

1 Greatly Decreased
2 Decreased
3 Stayed the Same
4 Increased
5 Greatly Increased

11. How has this process affected rates of poverty?

1 Greatly Decreased
2 Decreased
3 Stayed the Same
4 Increased
5 Greatly Increased

12. How has this process affected rates of employment?

1 Greatly Decreased
2 Decreased
3 Stayed the Same
4 Increased
5 Greatly Increased

13. Are you satisfied with the current level of employment in the county?

    1 Yes
    2 No

14. Has your population increased, decreased, or stayed the same due to economic restructuring?

    1 Greatly Decreased
    2 Decreased
    3 Stayed the Same
    4 Increased
    5 Greatly Increased

15. Describe any changes would you like to see in your county's economy over the next five years?

16. What do you believe is the best development strategy for county success during economic transitioning?

17. When it comes to shaping the economic future of your county, are there any groups, demographics, or populations in your county whose voice has not been heard loudly enough?

Additional comments or questions:

APPENDIX B

Dear (insert county leader name):

I am writing you today to ask you for your help with an important research study that I am conducting as part of my Master's Thesis at Sam Houston State University. The primary purpose of this study is to ask leaders such as yourself about changes to your county's economic structure over the last twenty years.

The short questionnaire should take about 15-25 minutes to complete. You may skip specific items or terminate your participation at any time, but of course, I hope that you will answer every question. Furthermore, I welcome comments from you and have provided space for this at the end of the questionnaire. Please be aware that once you begin the survey, you must complete it in one sitting as you will not be able to save and come back to it at a later time. There is no cost for your participation, nor is there any compensation.

Your responses will be treated with complete confidentiality and are for research purposes only. The results of this research will be reported as statistical summaries with no individual identifiers. By selecting "I agree to participate in this survey" you indicate your consent for your responses to be included in the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration in responding to this questionnaire. If you have any questions about the study, please call me or email me. Please make sure you reference the survey number attached to your questionnaire in any correspondence with me. If you have any questions about your rights as a research

participant, please contact Sharla Miles in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Sam Houston State University.

Sincerely,

Kaitlin Grant

Graduate Student

Sam Houston State University

P.S. If you do not wish to participate or receive further mailings from me, please contact me either by email or by phone. Upon receipt of your email or telephone call, I will not send you any further notifications regarding this survey

VITA

Kaitlin Grant

Education

Sam Houston State University — M.A. Sociology
Huntsville, TX — 2014- Present
GPA: 4.0

Central Connecticut State University — B.A., Psychology
New Britain, CT — Overall GPA: 3.79
Psych GPA: 3.92

Research Experience

Grant, K. (May 2012). The negative consequences of felon disenfranchisement on minority communities. Honors Thesis. Advisor: John O'Connor.

O'Connor, J, Grant, K. & Dunn W. (In prep). Political opportunities for peace: the Irish republican movement and the end of northern Irelands 'troubles'.

Professional Experience

Sam Houston State University**,** *Graduate Assistant,* spring 2014-Spring 2015 Huntsville, TX

Cromwell Public Schools, *Substitute Teacher*, October 2015- June 2016 Cromwell, CT

Cornerstone School Allen, *Infant Teacher*, June 2014- October 2015 Allen, TX

Orientation Leader, fall 2011, fall 2012

Lead Orientation Leader, fall 2012

Peer Leader, Student Assistant for FYE (First Year Experience- Sociology), fall 2011, fall 2012

Peer-Reviewed Presentations

Grant, K., Campbell A. & Mealy, M. (March 2012). The impact of racial comedy on implicit bias and intergroup anxiety. Peer-reviewed poster presentation for a professional conference. Eastern Psychological Association Conference. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Campbell, A., Grant, K. & Mealy, M. (March 2012). The effect of comedy on perceived threat. Peer-reviewed undergraduate poster presentation for a professional conference. Eastern Psychological Association Conference. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Grant, K. & Campbell, A. (May 2012). The effect of racial humor on executive function. Peer-reviewed poster presentation at a regional professional conference. Connecticut State University System Psychology Day. New Haven, Connecticut.

Honors and Awards

CCSU Award for Outstanding Research, Spring 2012

Psychology Department, Academic Excellence Honors Award, Fall 2012- Spring 2013