

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION AND
INVOLVEMENT PATTERNS OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

By

DORIS J. ASTLE

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1975

OCT 23 1975

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION AND
INVOLVEMENT PATTERNS OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Thesis Approved:

George E. Bequith, Jr.

Thesis Adviser

H. Kiser

R. M. Hynson Jr.

N. N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

923461

PREFACE

The author wishes to express appreciation to Dr. George Edward Arquitt, Jr. for his assistance and patience while serving as major adviser in the development of this research. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Kenneth J. Kiser and Dr. Lawrence M. Hynson for their assistance with the research and manuscript.

Appreciation is expressed to Terry Bixler for his very generous assistance with computer programming.

A special thank you is extended to those members of the Faculty who completed the questionnaire instrument which provided the basis for this research. I also want to thank those members of the Faculty Council who supported the research instrument.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Implications of Literature	17
Hypotheses	18
III. METHODOLOGY	20
The Sample	20
Procedure	21
The Questionnaire	22
Operational Definitions	24
IV. FINDINGS	30
Findings Under Hypotheses	30
Recapitulation	52
Findings Not Related to Hypotheses	55
V. CONCLUSION	66
Major Limitations of Study	70
Suggestions for Future Research	72
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
APPENDIX A - RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	77
APPENDIX B - LETTERS	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Loadings of the 15-Cosmopolitan-Local Items of Part II on Four Rotated Factors.	26
II. t-Scores of the 15 Cosmopolitan-Local Items of Part II	27
III. Length of Residence Compared with Community Orientation Score.	31
IV. Community Orientation Score Compared with Community Knowledge.	32
V. Community Orientation Score Compared with Occupations of Closest Friends	32
VI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Knowledge of Local Political Representatives	34
VII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Knowledge of Three Current Issues.	34
VIII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Seeking Public Office.	35
IX. Community Orientation Score Compared with Holding a Public Post.	36
X. Community Orientation Score Compared with Local Campaign Activities.	37
XI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Attendance at Last Precinct Meeting.	37
XII. Community Orientation Score Compared with City Commission Attendance	38
XIII. Community Orientation Score Compared with City Commission Attendance by Cable Television	39
XIV. Community Orientation Score Compared with Planning Commission Attendance	40

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
XV. Community Orientation Score Compared with Attendance at City Agency Meetings Other Than City Commission or Planning Commission.	41
XVI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Voting in Last State Election	42
XVII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Voting in Last State Primary.	42
XVIII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Voting Frequency	43
XIX. Community Orientation Score Compared with Frequency of Contacts with City Regarding Community Problems	44
XX. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential for Seeking Public Office.	45
XXI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential for Accepting Active Appointed Post or Position with City	46
XXII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential Involvement in Local Campaign Activities	46
XXIII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential Participation in a Community Cultural Group	47
XXIV. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential Participation in a Non-Religious Community Welfare Agency	47
XXV. Community Orientation Score Compared with Potential Participation in Public Discussion Groups Concerning Community Issues	48
XXVI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in Local Non-Professional Organizations.	49
XXVII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in Professional Organizations	50

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
XXVIII. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in Local Professional Organizations.	50
XXIX. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in State Professional Organizations.	51
XXX. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in Regional Professional Organizations.	51
XXXI. Community Orientation Score Compared with Membership in National Professional Organizations.	52
XXXII. Father's Education Level Compared with Respondent's Community Orientation	57
XXXIII. Mother's Education Level Compared with Respondent's Community Orientation	57
XXXIV. Years Spent in Cities of 500,000 + Compared with Community Orientation.	58
XXXV. Faculty Position Compared with Community Orientation Score.	58
XXXVI. Children in Stillwater Schools Compared with Community Orientation	59
XXXVII. Family Income Compared with Community Orientation Score.	59
XXXVIII. Number of Places Lived Compared with Community Orientation.	60
XXXIX. Political Affiliation Compared with Community Orientation Score.	60
XL. Age Compared with Community Orientation Score.	61
XLI. Marital Status Compared with Community Orientation Score.	62
XLII. Mobility Compared with Community Orientation Score.	63

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
XLIII. Education Compared with Community Orientation Score.	64
XLIV. Closest Friends of the Same Sex Compared with Community Orientation Score	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Patterns of community orientation vary considerably from community to community and within any one community. It is the objective of this study to observe these community orientation differences and correlate them to community related behavioral patterns.

Warren¹ makes the following statement about the influence of locale on the individual:

People's lives and their behavior are significantly influenced by their propinquity. Living together in close physical proximity calls for social structures and social functions which sustain life in the locality and provide the satisfactions which people seek. By living in the same geographical area, even in today's conditions of rapid transportation, people must share common local institutions and facilities. They have a common interest in the local schools, stores, sources of employment, churches, and other institutions and services whose availability to individuals in their own locality is a part of the total pattern of American society. The intertwining of their lives on a locality basis, even in these days of specialized interests, urban anonymity, and depersonalization, provides an important social reality...

It has been shown, however, that even within a common geographical area with necessary sharing of institutions and facilities there is still variance of identification with the local community and interaction

¹Roland Warren, The Community in America (Chicago, 1963), p. 9.

within the community. Warren² says that there is a variation concerning the extent of "psychological identification with a common locality." A strong sense of local identification is apparent in some communities; and the local inhabitants consider the community as an important reference group. He then states that there are also communities whose inhabitants relate little to one another, there is little sense of community as a significant social group, and a sense of "belonging" to the community is not apparent. He goes on to suggest that a barrier to effectiveness of possible action at the community level may be attributed to this lack of identification with the community. One factor which he says may foster this lack of identification with the community is the knowledge that one is not going to remain in the community and therefore "...is not likely to favor civic participation..."³ This is controlled to a limited degree in the study at hand since only tenured professors are included in the sample. Warren believes that our communities are in a state of transition with increasing orientation toward extra-community systems and a decrease in community cohesion and autonomy.

A possible result of differentiation of interests and association is a shift in social participation from locality to special interests. The individual often looks away from the immediate locality for association with others from different localities on the basis of these specific interests. They participate in specialized and differentiated aspects of the larger culture. He does say, however,

²Ibid.

³Ibid, p. 18.

that involvement in extra community systems does not preclude being a part of the local community.⁴

Merton⁵ has distinguished between two types of community orientation, the local and the cosmopolitan. The local is oriented more toward the immediate community; whereas the cosmopolitan is oriented more toward the larger society. Goldberg⁶ and Glaser⁷ suggest that it would be more accurate to refer to a local-cosmopolitan continuum than to two distinct types. In either case, whether two distinct groups or a continuum, meaningful categorization is possible.

This study focuses on the community orientation patterns of university professors and on several behavioral patterns which appear to be related to these patterns of community orientation.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Robert K. Merton, "Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials," Social Theory and Social Structure (London, 1957), pp. 387-420.

⁶Louis C. Goldberg, Frank Baker, and Albert H. Rubenstein, "Local-Cosmopolitan: Unidimensional or Multidimensional?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (May, 1965), pp. 704-710.

⁷Barney G. Glaser, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Scientist," Organizational Scientists: Their Professional Careers (Indianapolis, 1964), pp. 15-30.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Merton's article "Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials"¹ presents an explanatory study concerned with mass communications in patterns of interpersonal influence. It is based on interviews with 86 men and women of diverse social and economic strata of "Rovere". The bulk of his paper was spent in the analysis of types of influential persons which he called "local" and "cosmopolitan." The 86 persons interviewed were asked to identify people who exerted significant influence on them in various forms of social interaction. The 86 informants mentioned a total of 379 persons who had exerted influence on them, thirty of these were subsequently interviewed. These interviews were centered on their relations within the town. Some responded wholly in terms of the local situation, while others made frequent reference to situations outside Rovere.

The major criterion in distinguishing between local and cosmopolitan types (patterns) lies in the orientations of individuals toward the community of Rovere. Merton describes the local in the following way:

The localite largely confines his interests to this community. Rovere is essentially his world. Devoting little thought or energy to the Great Society, he is

¹Merton, pp. 387-420.

preoccupied with local problems, to the virtual exclusion of the national and international scene. He is, strictly speaking, a parochial.²

And he describes the cosmopolitan as follows:

He has some interest in Rovere and must, of course, maintain a minimum of relations within the community since he, too, exerts influence there. But he is also oriented significantly to the world outside Rovere, and regards himself as an integral part of that world. He resides in Rovere but lives in the Great Society.³

Of thirty influentials interviewed fourteen were judged to be cosmopolitans and sixteen as locals. Merton found that the locals were typically born in Rovere while the cosmopolitans were more mobile and had lived in many communities throughout the country. Cosmopolitans did not feel rooted in Rovere and felt they could advance their careers elsewhere. Locals tend to be interested in meeting large numbers of people, but cosmopolitans are more interested in the quality of relationships and not the number even when occupation level is held constant.

Cosmopolitans tend to belong to a greater number of organizations than locals, as well as different types of organizations. They tend to favor organizations in which they can exercise their skills and knowledge rather than make social contacts.

Differences were also reflected in public office-holding with the locals holding political posts such as street commissioner or mayor. Cosmopolitans were, however, more often in public positions which were

²Ibid, p. 393.

³Ibid.

not just political but allowed them to use their special skills and knowledge such as the Board of Education.

Merton indicates that differences in cosmopolitan and local influentials are not determined merely by education or occupation level. However, cosmopolitans have more formal education and occupy a greater number of professional occupations. In his comparison of the professionals their characteristic differences persisted with even the same types of education and occupations.

In the areas of mass communications behavior differed considerably. Cosmopolitans tended to read more magazines than the locals, as well as considerably different types of magazines. The cosmopolitans were more likely to read a newsmagazine directed toward the larger society. Also, significant differences were found in radio news commentator preferences. Cosmopolitans were found to prefer analytical commentators and locals to prefer those who forego analysis and personalize the news.

In a study by Goldberg, et al.⁴ they were concerned primarily with whether or not local and cosmopolitan orientations could be considered as bipolar. Their determinations were based on ratings researchers and managers in an industrial research and development laboratory gave to thirty-six criteria evaluating the worth of research ideas. Eighty-one of ninety-four (86 percent) managers and professionals completed the questionnaire. They found that these personnel (taken as representative of the total professional and managerial work force of the laboratory) did not choose between organizational and professional rewards but rather that they varied in the

⁴Goldberg, pp. 704-710.

degree to which they sought personal gratifications. These gratifications might be derived from the organization or the profession. As a result local and cosmopolitan, as indicated in this study, should be considered as other than bipolars.

Dobriner⁵ has developed a scale based on Merton's substantive findings in an attempt to measure local-cosmopolitan tendencies. The scale is a ten-item Likert-type scale. After the pre-test the scale was presented to a sample of 275 Huntington Village, Long Island, New York residents. This village was selected because it contained two distinct population groups, oldtimers and new suburbanites. Localism was expected of the oldtimers and cosmopolitan orientation was expected of the new suburbanites. The suburban group scored lower than the villagers, indicating that the suburbanites were more cosmopolitan than the oldtimers.

In an attempt to determine if this was due to length of residence only or if other factors might be involved a political-economic conservatism scale was included in the questionnaire. This scale indicated little change in the political-economic liberalism or conservatism between the two groups indicating that the local-cosmopolitan continuum constitutes a different dimension of the persons than liberal-conservative predispositions. Suburbanites had higher incomes, greater education and more prestige occupations than the villagers.

A cross tabulation of age, sex and incomes failed to indicate that these variables were highly associated with local or cosmopolitan

⁵William M. Dobriner, "Local and Cosmopolitan As Contemporary Suburban Character Types," The Suburban Community (New York, 1958), pp. 132-143.

orientation. Education, however, was found to be significantly related to the local-cosmopolitan, a direct scale with cosmopolitans being more highly educated. This study further indicates that villagers of certain ethnic or religious statuses of the out-group might not be able to develop a local orientation because of their inability to totally identify with the local community.

Sykes⁶ was concerned with variances in distribution of community knowledge. He drew a random sample of 213 white, male principal wage-earners from the Plainfield, New Jersey City Directory. Plainfield is a suburb of metropolitan New York and was, therefore, expected to contain populations of two distinct orientations, those directed toward the local community and those directed toward the metropolis "as a surrogate of the Great Society."⁷ A questionnaire was administered composed of three parts. One part was to test knowledge of the community; one concerned income, occupation, and length of residence; and the third dealt with political participation. Sykes found a positive relationship between amount of community knowledge and income, between amount of community knowledge and level of education, and between occupational status and community knowledge. The proportion of knowledgeable increased with length of residence and was greater among home owners than renters. An inverse relationship was found between community knowledge and mobility. However, a reversal was evident when the researcher included only those who had lived in the community at least ten years. Mobility within the community was

⁶Gresham M. Sykes, "The Differential Distribution of Community Knowledge," Social Forces, 29 (May, 1951), pp. 376-382.

⁷Ibid.

associated with a high level of community knowledge. Active political participation tended to be associated with a higher level of community knowledge. In summary, he found that those persons possessing a high level of community knowledge were "tied to the community by a multitude of bonds."⁸ And the person directed away from the community had a low level of community knowledge.

Glaser⁹ is concerned with the scientists' professional or organizational orientation. He suggests that the highly motivated scientists are both cosmopolitan and local oriented. They are oriented toward the organization and the profession. Glaser has suggested that cosmopolitan and local can be two dimensions of the same person and that this person does not have to be one or the other. But he adds that both views are accurate and applicable specifically to the particular organizational situation being analyzed. A congruence of goals (organizational and professional) foster the existence of both types within the same scientist.

Gouldner¹⁰ distinguished between manifest (consensually regarded as relevant) and latent (regarded as irrelevant, inappropriate to consider or illegitimate to take into account by group members) social roles. He further categorized these latent social roles as local and cosmopolitan. Gouldner purported that the expert was more likely to

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Glaser, pp. 15-30.

¹⁰ Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles I and II," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 3 (December, 1957), pp. 281-306 and Vol. 2, No. 4 (December, 1957), pp. 444-480.

be oriented to an outer reference group for recognition and acceptance.

Bentz¹¹ divided a city college faculty into two groups, those publishing much and those publishing little or none. A larger number of publications was taken as an index of an outer reference group orientation. Heavy publishers did not emphasize the importance of their own college department.

These cases suggest three variables important to analyzing latent identities in organizations: (1) loyalty to the employing organization; (2) commitment to professional skills; and (3) reference group orientations. He proceeded to identify two latent organizational identities:

(1) Cosmopolitans: those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer reference group orientation.¹²

(2) Locals: those high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation.¹³

These are regarded as latent because they involve criteria not totally institutionalized for classifying people.

Gouldner conducted a study at a small, private liberal arts college. He assumed positive a correlation between high organizational loyalty, low commitment to specialized skills, and the use of an inner reference group orientation to indicate the locals. Low organizational loyalty, high commitment to specialized skills, and use

¹¹Ibid, p. 289. Also Vernon J. Bentz, "A Study of Leadership in a Liberal Arts College " (Columbus, Ohio: 1950).

¹²Gouldner, p. 290.

¹³Ibid.

of an outer reference group orientation indicated cosmopolitans. His sample was drawn from a college catalog listing teaching and administrative faculty and supplemented by a list of new faculty members. All were interviewed except the clerical or secretarial personnel for a total sample of 125. Schedules were designed to test each of the three variables listed above. The three variables were found to be related in the predicted ways. Eleven differences between cosmopolitans and locals were listed. Gouldner found that a tendency was exhibited for influence to increase steadily as one moved from cosmopolitan to local except with extreme locals who manifested a sharp decline in influence.

A degree-of-participation index was applied to determine any variance in participation between the two types. Gouldner found that extreme locals tended to participate more than extreme cosmopolitans, but the intermediates participated more than either of the extremes. A scale was constructed for rule tropism resulting in the finding that locals tended to be higher on rule tropism than cosmopolitans regardless of degree of influence. Considering just locals, only those with low influence were more disposed to rule tropism. The cosmopolitans, however, seemed unaffected by variations in influence. Gouldner suggests four types of locals and two types of cosmopolitans rather than only two opposite types.

Reissman¹⁴ attempted to determine the conceived social role of civil servants. He used a ten percent stratified random sample (705 cases) of the seven thousand civil employees of the State. Strata were

¹⁴Leonard Reissman, "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, 27 (1949), pp. 305-310.

based on salary and place of contact (office or community). Three criteria were applied to these cases: evidence of successful completion of a course of college work, evidence of contact with the public, and those whose office headquarters were in the capitol city were selected. Thus, the study was narrowed to a universe of 263 cases, focusing mainly on those charged with the interpretation and administration of policies handed down by the state legislature. Stenographic and clerical workers were omitted. It was found that the subjects exhibited allegiance to their jobs but also to professional organizations, to particular groups, and to other social units within the community. He identified four types of bureaucrats. One of these was the functional bureaucrat who was oriented toward groups outside his employing organization and concerned with being recognized by professional peers elsewhere. These were less prone to loyalty to the employing organization, displayed greater job commitment, and an outer reference group orientation.

Thielbar¹⁵ points out that although the terms local and cosmopolitan are well established in sociology and frequently used, their usage is often vague. He discussed the problem of "whether localism and cosmopolitanism constitute social types which can be contrasted in terms of measured variation on a single dimension, the combination of extreme scores on several dimensions, or whether localism and cosmopolitanism themselves constitute distinct dimensions."¹⁶ Another

¹⁵Gerald Thielbar, "Localism-Cosmopolitanism: Prolegomenon to a Theory of Social Participation," Sociological Quarterly, 11 (1970), pp. 243-254.

¹⁶Ibid.

problem he suggested is that while the meaning of localism is derived from a specific locality "cosmopolitanism lacks a referent more precise than the larger society."¹⁷ This brings forth the problem of those who do not have local roots but at the same time are not cosmopolitan. As examples he listed Appalachians in Chicago, military personnel, itinerants, missionaries, and the organization person.

When Thielbar considered the treatment of local-cosmopolitan as a single global dimension (based on an investigation of academicians), he determined that, as with social class, a multidimensional approach is preferred. He concluded that it is logical that some units of social participation are encompassed by larger ones and therefore localism-cosmopolitanism can be reduced to a single dimension; "but all forms of social involvement, either those included in previous studies of localism-cosmopolitanism, or potentially analyzable in these terms cannot be so reduced."¹⁸

Thielbar suggested that a scale of participation as an ordinal measure might be useful. And since units of social participation are contained in larger units a unidimension may be analyzed. He said that a single continuum, however, will certainly not contain all forms of social participation.

In a study designed to disclose information concerning social participation Axelrod¹⁹ found that the extent of participation in formal groups varies according to the amount of education, family head's

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 249.

¹⁹ Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 13-18.

occupation, and family income. Higher incomes were associated with a greater probability of membership and higher activity. Also participation is directly related to income. And families whose head is in a white-collar occupation are more likely to belong to a formal group.

All levels except the upper level on points of social status, income and education were more likely to get together frequently (a few times a month) with relatives than any other informal group. And the upper strata is more likely to associate with friends firstly and secondly with relatives followed by neighbors and co-workers respectively. This upper strata, however, was a small group according to Axelrod.

Dye²⁰ was concerned with local-cosmopolitan as they relate to political issues. He suggested that local or cosmopolitan attitudes are more than the internalization of dominant modes of social relations. He distributed a public opinion questionnaire to a random sample consisting of 340 residents and 105 elected public officials in sixteen suburban municipalities in the Philadelphia metropolitan area. The return from officials was 49.5 percent of the sample. Upper social ranked communities (based on occupational and educational characteristics of community) had a return of 48 percent, middle social ranked communities had a return of 32.7 percent and the lower 25.9 percent.

He concluded that localism was inversely related to status; political leaders were more localistic than their constituents; and locals opposed government support of mass transit. Cosmopolitans

²⁰Thomas R. Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics," Social Forces, 41 (March, 1963), pp. 239-246.

opposed discriminatory zoning for economic purposes whereas locals approved such zoning.

Erbe²¹ points out that in a population the higher the degree of alienation, the lower the level of political participation. He is here using Seeman's²² and Dean's²³ definitions of alienation which refers to "feelings of powerlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation, self-estrangement, frustration, enragement, despair, and all other feelings that somehow indicate that an individual is not in complete harmony with his social and cultural surroundings."²⁴ Therefore, in applying his findings to the concepts cosmopolitan and local, it would be expected that the non-locals since not identifying with the immediate social and cultural surroundings would be less concerned with local political participation.

Rose²⁵ hypothesized that nonparticipants are anomic. The greater the degree of participation in organized activity, the greater the opportunity to internalize meanings and values of the culture. His study findings were based on mailed questionnaires to 533 migrant workers in Minneapolis. One-hundred-thirty-seven were returned by mail

²¹William Erbe, "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration," American Sociological Review, 29 (1964), pp. 198-215.

²²Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 783-799.

²³Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), pp. 753-758.

²⁴Erbe, p. 199.

²⁵Arnold M. Rose, "Attitudinal Correlates of Social Participation," Social Forces, 37 (March, 1959), pp. 202-206.

and 80 by interviews for a 41 percent response. Seventeen attitude items were analyzed. It was concluded that a person's degree of anomie is positively related to the extent to which social participation has been limited. It was also found that number of organizational affiliations was more closely related to one's self-concept than number of friends reported. His study is limited in that it is based not on an objective measure but on the basis of what these respondents reported.

A study conducted by Fanelli²⁶ concerning extensiveness of an individual's communication contacts indicated that communication contacts seemed to be a function of one's relationship to the community. His sample was taken from a town of 5000 population and consisted of 318 white adults of whom 304 (96 percent) were interviewed and then determined to be high or low communicators based on frequency of communications about community problems. One hundred high communicators were identified as were 204 low communicators. It was found that high communicators were more likely to be strongly identified with the community. It was also found that high communicators were more likely to be active participants in community affairs than low communicators.

Keller in The Urban Neighborhood²⁷ mentions Merton's two character types and suggests that some effort has been made to classify people according to types which might have a bearing on neighboring behavior. In her concluding remarks she listed factors affecting neighboring among which was character type according to community orientation.

²⁶Alexander Fanelli, "Extensiveness of Communication Contacts and Perceptions of the Community," American Sociological Review, 21 (August, 1956), pp. 439-445.

²⁷Suzanne Keller, The Urban Neighborhood: A Sociological Perspective (New York, 1968).

Manis²⁸ revealed that of 266 social scientists employed in an academic setting community service was generally held in rather low esteem. When asked to rate themselves in comparison with others in their field concerning extent of interest in civic affairs, the following results were obtained: 7 percent much greater than average, 12 percent slightly greater than average, 24 percent above average, 30 percent slightly less than average, and 25 percent much less than average.

Implications of Literature

The literature suggests that people do in fact differ according to attachment to and identification with the community in which they reside. These differences range from a strong local identification to no identification with the local community but rather with the larger society. And it is further suggested that perhaps there are many degrees of variance in identification rather than merely two distinct types as suggested by some of the studies.

There is also evidence of behavioral differences associated with cosmopolitan-local tendencies. It is not yet understood if the behavior is more likely to be the result of one's community orientation or vice versa or if there are yet further variables to be considered. However, many studies do find a relationship between orientation and behavior toward community involvement of certain types.

The research reviewed concentrates primarily on groups other than

²⁸Jerome G. Manis, "A Quantitative Note on the Academic Role," American Sociological Review, 16 (1951), pp. 837-839.

university professors. Merton²⁹ has indicated that education and occupation are not the determinants in differences exhibited by locals and cosmopolitans. Dobriner³⁰, however, concluded that education only had a direct relation with cosmopolitanism. By utilizing a sample of university professors these variables will be controlled to a considerable degree. Career stability will also be controlled to a greater degree since the professors making up the sample are tenured.

As suggested by Thielbar³¹ localism-cosmopolitanism constitute useful variables in conceptualizing social participation, and through a multi-dimensional approach to analysis of social participation "a more complete description of social participation and theories about such participation in complex social arrangements can be attained."³²

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses have been developed based on the literature reviewed:

- One: Local community orientation will increase with length of residence in the community.
- Two: Community knowledge will be directly related to local community orientation and inversely related to cosmopolitan orientation.
- Three: Professors exhibiting cosmopolitan tendencies will be more likely to associate with other professors than with persons of other professions.
- Four: Knowledge of local politics and political matters will be positively related to local orientation.

²⁹Merton, pp. 387-420.

³⁰Dobriner, pp. 132-143.

³¹Thielbar, pp. 243-254.

³²Ibid, p. 252.

- Five: Involvement in local community political activity will be directly related to local orientation.
- Six: Involvement in local government activities will be directly related to local orientation.
- Seven: University professors displaying local community orientation tendencies will more frequently make contacts for solving local community problems than will those displaying cosmopolitan tendencies.
- Eight: Locals will display greater potential active involvement in local government, community service, and local cultural activities than will cosmopolitans.
- Nine: Cosmopolitans will display greater involvement in non-local professional organizations; whereas locals will be more involved in local professional organizations and local community organizations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

The sample used in this study was randomly drawn from a list of all Oklahoma State University tenured professors as of September 1, 1975. This list was provided through the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs of the University.

Oklahoma State University has a total of 600 tenured professors, six of whom are located in Oklahoma City. Those in Oklahoma City were omitted and the universe narrowed to 594 persons from which the sample was drawn. The list of 594 persons was then taken through a process of stratification whereby full, associate, and assistant professors were placed on separate, alphabetized lists. Every other person on each of these lists was selected and these were then placed on a single list. The single list was in the order of full professors followed immediately by associate professors and then assistant professors, all remaining alphabetized within their categories. This list contains 297 of the 594 professors at Oklahoma State University and represents 50 percent of each group of professors and therefore a total sample representing 50 percent of tenured professors. The list included 145 (48.8 percent) full professors, 119 (40.1 percent) associate professors, and 33 (11.1 percent) assistant professors. These were then assigned identification

numbers 001 through 297 in the order they appeared on the single composite list. The identification numbers were for purposes of follow-ups if necessary and not for the purpose of associating personal information with individuals.

After mailing it was determined that twenty-two persons mailed questionnaires were on leave, sabbatical, stationed outside of Stillwater, or no longer at Oklahoma State. Thus the sample was narrowed to 275. One-hundred-twenty-one completed questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 44 percent. A second mailing was not made due to criticisms raised by a few members of the University faculty.

Of those persons responding 88.43 percent (107) were male and 11.57 (14) female. Sixty-two (51.24 percent) were full professors, forty-six (38.02 percent) associate professors, and thirteen (10.74 percent) assistant professors. Of the full professors 42.8 percent completed questionnaires, 38.7 percent of the associate professors and 39.4 percent of the assistant professors in the sample completed the questionnaire instrument.

Procedure

A letter of introduction was mailed to each of the subjects introducing the study and its purposes. They were also told how and why their names were selected and were assured that their identity would be protected with information being released in statistical form so that no individual would be singled out. Those persons who were assigned odd identification numbers were mailed a questionnaire and asked to complete it and return it by mail. Those who were assigned an

even identification number were asked to complete the questionnaire and consent to an interview. Copies of the questionnaire and interview schedule are attached in Appendix A and copies of the two letters are in Appendix B.

The Questionnaire

This study made use of a three-part questionnaire and a schedule to obtain information which was utilized to distinguish certain community orientations of university professors at Oklahoma State University and further to measure and type community involvement and interaction which may be associated with these orientations toward the local geographical community of Stillwater, Oklahoma. Copies of the proposed questionnaire and schedule are included in Appendix A as indicated above.

Part I of the questionnaire is a personal history section. It contains such information as occupational position, sex, age, marital status, length of residence, income, et cetera. (See pages 78 through 82 in Appendix A).

Part II is to measure community orientation and is based in part on a similar instrument developed by Dobriner.¹ The first ten items are from Dobriner² and item thirteen is from Dye.³ Other items were developed for this particular study. The statements in this portion of the questionnaire are based primarily on the substantive findings of

¹Dobriner, pp. 132-143.

²Ibid.

³Dye, p. 241.

Merton's Rovere study.⁴ Part II consists of fifteen statements about the local, national, and international scenes. Subjects were asked to respond to each statement using the responses strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. A score was determined for each respondent by assigning five points to each strongly agree, four points for each agree, three for each undecided, two for each disagree, and one for each strongly disagree. A cumulative score was then determined representing the respondent's position on the orientation continuum. This score was determined using 14 of the 15 statements making up Part II of the questionnaire instrument. Statement two of Part II was eliminated following factor analysis and t-tests. These processes will be discussed under the Method section below. The lowest point accumulation possible is 14 if all items are responded to and the highest is 70 representing the possible range of distribution. However, the lowest score reported was 19 and the highest 63 representing the actual response range. A cumulative score of 47-63 represents a local identification, 39-46 represents a score that is neither strongly local nor cosmopolitan, and 19-38 represents a cosmopolitan identification. (Refer to pages 83 through 84 of Appendix A).

Part III of the questionnaire is used to determine certain behavioral characteristics and community knowledge. It includes certain questions to determine knowledge of the community in general and persons associated with local political activities and positions serving the community. It also includes items to determine voting behavior and involvement in local government among others. (Refer to pages 84 through 89 of Appendix A).

⁴Merton, pp. 387-420.

Operational Definitions

Community Orientation: The respondent's community orientation was determined by summing scores on the Likert-type scale composing Part II of the questionnaire (refer to pages 83 through 84 of Appendix A) after these items had been taken through factor analysis and t-score determined for each of the fifteen items to determine internal reliability.

The factor analysis of the correlation matrix for the fifteen items was formed by the scores of 121 respondents on the items. The loadings on rotated factor matrix of the fifteen items were such that Items 6, 11, 14 and 15 loaded higher than .64 on Factor I. Items 1, 3, and 10 loaded higher than .61 on Factor II. Items 4, 5, 7, and 12 loaded higher than -.59 on Factor III and Items 8 and 9 loaded higher than .76 on Factor IV. Item 2 loaded only at -.40311 on Factor II and Item 13 loaded at .36663 on Factor III. Thus only Items 2 and 13 loaded at less than .59.

Underlying factors for those items loading highly together seem to be as outlined herein. Factor I appears to be correlated with personal variables relating to family and self in the community of Stillwater. Factor II is characterized by a comparison of national and international matters to the community of Stillwater. Factor III is related to items concerning interpersonal and organizational relations. Factor IV is not easily identifiable since one of the two items concerns the importance of the local newspaper and the second item concerns the importance of the local community to America as opposed to big cities to America.

Item analysis was then made using t-scores by evaluating the

upper and lower quartiles of respondents on each of the fifteen items. The purpose of this test is for internal reliability based on differentiation between the high and low groups. Loadings and amount of common variances accounted for on the four factors is found in Table I; and t-scores for each item are found in Table II. Since item two did not load as highly as other items on factor analysis and had an insignificant t-score, it was omitted from the cumulative cosmopolitan-local score and not considered in analysis.

Length of Residence: To test hypothesis one (length of residence within the community will be directly related to local community orientation) length of residence was simply determined by the number of years each respondent had lived in Stillwater. This information was obtained by question 6 in Part I of the questionnaire. (Refer to Appendix A, page 78).

Community Knowledge: Hypothesis two (community knowledge will be directly related to local community orientation and inversely related to cosmopolitan tendencies) was tested by respondent's scores on questions dealing with such things as general community knowledge, and knowledge of local influential persons. Questions one and two (a), (b), (c), and (d) of Part III of the questionnaire are the basis for testing this hypothesis and are found on page 85 of Appendix A. Score on questions one and two (a), (b), (c), and (d) was determined by simply adding the number of correct responses.

Association: Hypothesis three (professionals exhibiting cosmopolitan tendencies will be more likely to associate with professional peers than with persons of other professions) was tested using information concerning percentage of friends which were of same profession.

TABLE I
LOADINGS OF THE 15 COSMOPOLITAN-LOCAL
ITEMS OF PART II ON FOUR
ROTATED FACTORS

ITEM	COMMUNALITY	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III	FACTOR IV
1	0.73993	-0.00045	-0.85312	0.09444	-0.05645
2	0.30343	-0.29716	-0.40311	-0.20907	0.09446
3	0.65167	0.22355	-0.69890	0.00503	0.33647
4	0.49631	0.13053	-0.00195	0.69211	-0.01587
5	0.43611	0.01425	-0.01331	0.59741	0.28076
6	0.76582	0.86293	-0.01409	0.07652	0.12294
7	0.41523	0.02547	0.01881	0.63830	0.08247
8	0.64426	0.21079	-0.11547	0.07703	0.76195
9	0.65951	0.13852	-0.03004	0.07921	0.79571
10	0.55301	0.23599	-0.61972	0.33291	0.04528
11	0.42230	0.64481	-0.07610	0.02398	-0.01249
12	0.42811	0.16179	-0.14748	0.61474	-0.04765
13	0.27945	-0.01636	-0.16947	0.36663	0.34065
14	0.66062	0.69677	-0.09992	0.19468	0.35671
15	0.75121	0.84213	-0.04744	0.09963	0.17280
COMMON VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR BY FACTORS:					
	8.20697	2.65703 (32.38%)	1.84630 (22.50%)	1.98561 (24.19%)	1.71803 (20.93%)

TABLE II
 t-SCORES OF THE 15 COSMOPOLITAN-LOCAL
 ITEMS OF PART II

ITEM	t-SCORE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
15	7.5678	.001
6	6.3847	.001
3	6.2802	.001
14	6.0508	.001
9	5.6360	.001
10	5.5168	.001
13	4.6309	.001
5	4.5324	.001
11	4.2301	.001
4	4.0676	.001
12	3.6746	.001
1	3.1344	.001
8	3.0612	.01
7	2.9095	.02
2	.5949	insignificant

120 D.F.

Question eleven of Part I of the questionnaire was used to obtain this information. (Refer to page 80 of Appendix A).

Political Knowledge: Hypothesis four (knowledge of local politics and political matters will be directly related to local community orientation) was tested by questions two (e) through two (t) and three of Part III. This portion consists of questions concerning local political figures and knowledge of three current issues of importance to the community. A score was determined on two (e) through (t) by summing the correct responses and on three by the number of correct responses. (Refer to page 85 of Appendix A).

Political Involvement: Hypothesis five (involvement in local community political activity will be directly related to local community orientation tendencies) was tested utilizing questions four, six, eight, and sixteen of Part III of the questionnaire. These questions deal with such items as ever having held political office, post or appointment and involvement in campaign activities. (Refer to pages 86 through 87 of Appendix A).

Government Involvement: Hypothesis six (involvement in local government activities will be directly related to local community orientation tendencies) was tested by utilizing questions seventeen through twenty-five of Part III of the questionnaire. (Refer to pages 88 through 89 of Appendix A). These questions deal with such matters as attendance at city commission meetings, planning and other agency meetings, and voting patterns.

Community Problem Solving: Hypothesis seven (university professors displaying local community orientation tendencies will be more frequently involved in solving local community problems

than will those displaying cosmopolitan tendencies) was tested with responses to questions twenty-seven and twenty-eight of Part III of the questionnaire. These questions determine if the respondent ever contacts community officials concerning community problems and if so, how frequently. (Refer to page 89 of Appendix A).

Potential Involvement: Hypothesis eight (locals will display greater potential active involvement in local government, community service, and local cultural activities than will cosmopolitans) was tested by utilizing questions five, seven, nine, eleven, thirteen, and fifteen of Part III of the questionnaire. These questions ask about the likelihood of participation in such activities as campaigns, cultural groups, community welfare agencies, et cetera. (Refer to pages 86 through 87 of Appendix A).

Organizational Involvement: Hypothesis nine (cosmopolitans will display greater involvement in non-local professional organizations; whereas locals will be more involved in local professional organizations and local community organizations) was tested on the basis of responses to questions twelve and thirteen of Part I. (Refer to pages 81 through 82 of Appendix A). These questions ask the respondents to list all non-professional and professional organizations and to indicate if the professional organizations are local, state, regional, or national.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter attempts to outline findings which were found to exist when applying the methodology outlined above to the research hypotheses. This chapter will cover those variables tested under the hypotheses, a restatement of findings, and will also contain the results of applying community orientation to certain other variables not related to the stated hypotheses.

Findings Under Hypotheses

Hypothesis One states that there will be a difference in community orientation based on length of residence with one's community orientation score increasing with length of residence. Gamma¹ for the table produced is equal to .31 indicating a moderate association between length of residence and identification with the local community of Stillwater by Oklahoma State University Professors in the sample. The findings yielded a chi-square of 6.92 with four degrees of freedom. This chi-square is not significant at the .05 level and therefore not sufficient to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis. The findings upon which this conclusion is based are found in Table III.

¹For purposes of this study the strength of gamma will be according to the following: a negligible association will be through .10; weak .11 - .29; moderate .30 - .49; strong .50+.

TABLE III
 LENGTH OF RESIDENCE COMPARED WITH
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN YEARS			ROW TOTALS
	1-9	10-18	20+	
19-38	21 (44.7%)	12 (32.4%)	7 (18.9%)	40
39-46	19 (40.4%)	19 (51.4%)	20 (54.1%)	58
47-63	7 (14.9%)	6 (16.2%)	10 (27.0%)	23

$$X^2 = 6.92 \quad 4 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .250 \quad \gamma = .31$$

Hypothesis Two indicates a direct relationship between community knowledge and localism. The data yielded a chi-square of 13.38 which was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 significance level and therefore accept the research hypothesis. Also, a gamma of .54 was determined indicating a fairly strong direct relationship between community knowledge and localism. The distribution on which these findings are based is found in Table IV.

Hypothesis Three indicates that professors with lower scores on the cosmopolitan-local measure, in other words the cosmopolitans, will more often name professors or teachers as closest friends. However, when asked about the occupations of their three closest friends the results did not strongly support this view. As seen in Table V 50 percent indicated none or one of the three closest friends as being professors; 30.51 percent indicated two; and 19.49 percent indicated

TABLE IV
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED
 WITH COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE

COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE SCORE	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-4	27 (67.5%)	24 (41.4%)	5 (21.7%)	56
5-7	13 (32.5%)	34 (58.6%)	18 (78.3%)	65
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$\chi^2 = 13.38$ 2 D.F. $p < .005$ $\gamma = .54$

TABLE V
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 OCCUPATIONS OF CLOSEST FRIENDS

NUMBER OF FRIENDS WHO ARE TEACHERS OR PROFESSORS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-1	18 (47.4%)	28 (49.1%)	13 (56.5%)	59
2	15 (39.5%)	16 (28.1%)	5 (21.7%)	36
3	5 (13.1%)	13 (22.8%)	5 (21.7%)	23
	<u>38</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>118</u>

$\chi^2 = 4.11$ 4 D.F. $p < .500$ $\gamma = .05$

that all three closest friends are professors. Chi-square for this distribution was only 4.11 with four degrees of freedom and is not a sufficient chi-square to reject the null hypothesis. Gamma disclosed a very negligible direct association of .05.

Hypothesis Four indicates a direct relationship between localism and local political knowledge. This was tested based on knowledge of local political representatives and knowledge of three current issues of importance to the community.

Table VI indicates scores and correct responses concerning knowledge of local political representatives. A chi-square of 12.67 with six degrees of freedom was determined and was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 significance level indicating a relationship between community orientation and community knowledge. Gamma for this distribution is .32 indicating a moderate relationship between localism and political knowledge.

However, this association did not persist when it came to knowledge of current issues. When asked to outline the current status of three community issues the distribution in Table VII was found. Chi-square is 5.89 and, therefore, not sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 significance level. Thus, no significant relationship was found to exist in the universe between knowledge of current issues and community orientation. Association within the sample was also found to be virtually absent.

Hypothesis Five says that locals will more likely participate in local political activity than will the non-locals. This is determined on the basis of four items: ever having sought public office, ever having held a public post, ever having been involved in local campaign activities, and attendance at the last precinct meeting.

TABLE VI
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH KNOWLEDGE
 OF LOCAL POLITICAL REPRESENTATIVES

KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL POLITICAL REPRESENTATIVES (No. correct responses)	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-5	7 (17.5%)	6 (10.3%)	2 (8.7%)	15
6-7	12 (30.0%)	12 (20.7%)	1 (4.3%)	25
8-9	9 (22.5%)	22 (37.9%)	6 (26.1%)	37
10-14	12 (30.0%)	18 (31.0%)	14 (60.9%)	44
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$\chi^2 = 12.67$ 6 D.F. $p < .048$ $\gamma = .32$

TABLE VII
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 KNOWLEDGE OF THREE CURRENT ISSUES

NUMBER OF ISSUES OF WHICH KNOWLEDGEABLE	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0	8 (20.0%)	11 (19.0%)	2 (8.7%)	21
1	7 (17.5%)	7 (12.1%)	6 (26.1%)	20
2	17 (42.5%)	26 (44.8%)	13 (56.5%)	56
3	8 (20.0%)	14 (24.1%)	2 (8.7%)	24
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$\chi^2 = 5.89$ 6 D.F. $p < .437$ $\gamma = .04$

The first item considered is whether or not the respondents have ever sought public office in Stillwater. The results indicated that only two people out of 121 had ever sought public office. The distribution is such that a chi-square test would not be appropriate. Gamma for the distribution is .10 indicating a very negligible association. Table VIII contains the distribution.

TABLE VIII
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
SEEKING PUBLIC OFFICE

EVER SOUGHT PUBLIC OFFICE	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
No	39 (97.5%)	58 (100 %)	22 (95.7%)	119
Yes	1 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	2
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

gamma = .10

The second item considered is whether or not the respondents have ever held a public post in Stillwater. A chi-square of 1.67 was determined which was not sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 significance level. We, therefore, cannot accept the research hypothesis on this item. Gamma for this distribution is equal to .27 indicating a weak association in the sample, in agreement with the

research hypothesis. The response distribution for this variable is found in Table IX.

TABLE IX
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
HOLDING A PUBLIC POST

EVER HELD A PUBLIC POST	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
No	36 (90.0%)	50 (86.2%)	18 (78.3%)	104
Yes	4 (10.0%)	8 (13.8%)	5 (21.7%)	17
	40	58	23	121

$$X^2 = 1.67 \quad 2 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .436 \quad \text{gamma} = .27$$

The third item concerned active involvement in local campaign activities and it was expected that locals would be more active. However, a chi-square of 1.05 resulted which was not great enough to reject the null hypothesis and confirm the research hypothesis at the .05 significance level. Gamma is equal to .16 indicating a weak association between localism and activity in local campaign activities. The distribution for this variable is found in Table X.

Table XI contains the response distribution to item four which is whether or not respondent attended the last precinct meeting. This distribution was such that chi-square was not appropriate. Gamma for this sample distribution is .53 indicating a fairly strong

direct association between localism and attendance at the last precinct meeting.

TABLE X
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
LOCAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

EVER INVOLVED IN LOCAL CAMPAIGNS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
No	24 (60.0%)	30 (51.7%)	11 (47.8%)	65
Yes	16 (40.0%)	28 (48.3%)	12 (52.2%)	56
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$X^2 = 1.05$ 2 D.F. $p < .598$ $\gamma = .16$

TABLE XI
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
ATTENDANCE AT LAST PRECINCT MEETING

ATTENDANCE AT LAST PRECINCT MEETING	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTAL
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
No	40 (100%)	54 (94.7%)	22 (95.7%)	116
Yes	0 (0%)	3 (5.3%)	1 (4.3%)	4
	<u>40</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>120</u>

$\gamma = .53$

Hypothesis Six states that involvement in local government activities will be directly related to local community orientation. The validity of this is tested with several variables as outlined below.

Table XII shows the distribution of responses according to community orientation when asked about attendance at city commission meetings. According to the research hypothesis there should be a direct relation between attendance and localism. This could not be substantiated, however, on the basis of chi-square. Chi-square for this distribution is only 4.08 which is not great enough to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis at the .05 level. Gamma, however, is equal to .28 indicating a weak association.

TABLE XII
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
CITY COMMISSION ATTENDANCE

CITY COMMISSION ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Never	25 (64.1%)	26 (44.8%)	10 (43.5%)	61
Ever	14 (35.9%)	32 (55.2%)	13 (56.5%)	59
	<u>39</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>120</u>

$X^2 = 4.08$ 2 D.F. $p < .250$ $\text{gamma} = .28$

The next variable tested under hypothesis six was watching city commission meetings on cable television according to community orientation. In order to accept the research hypothesis that there is a direct association between attendance and localism a chi-square of 9.49 at the .05 level is necessary; however, chi-square here is only 8.73 so the null hypothesis cannot be rejected in favor of the research hypothesis. Association in the sample was determined by gamma to be .40 indicating a moderate direct association between localism and watching city commission meetings on cable television. The distribution for this variable is found in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
CITY COMMISSION ATTENDANCE BY
CABLE TELEVISION

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY AT COMMISSION MEETINGS BY CABLE TV	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Never	30 (76.9%)	31 (53.4%)	10 (43.5%)	71
Less Than Once a Month	6 (15.4%)	17 (29.3%)	7 (30.4%)	30
Once a Month or More	3 (7.7%)	10 (17.2%)	6 (26.1%)	19
	<u>39</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>120</u>

$$X^2 = 8.73 \quad 4 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .100 \quad \text{gamma} = .40$$

The third variable tested under hypothesis six was attendance at city planning meetings based on community orientation. Table XIV contains the response distribution from which chi-square was determined to be only .61 which was not great enough to reject the null hypothesis and accept the hypothesis at the .05 level. Gamma produced was only .09 for a very negligible association.

TABLE XIV
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
PLANNING COMMISSION ATTENDANCE

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Never	32 (82.1%)	44 (75.9%)	18 (78.3%)	94
Less Than Once a Month	7 (17.9%)	14 (24.1%)	5 (21.7%)	26
	<u>39</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>120</u>

$X^2 = .61$ 2 D.F. $p < .750$ $\text{gamma} = .09$

The fourth variable considered with community orientation under hypothesis six was attendance at meetings of city agencies other than the city commission or planning commission. Hereagain, chi-square was not great enough to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis at the .05 level. Also, gamma failed to indicate an association in the sample. The distribution for this comparison is found in Table XV.

TABLE XV
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 ATTENDANCE AT CITY AGENCY MEETINGS
 OTHER THAN CITY COMMISSION OR
 PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTENDANCE AT OTHER AGENCY MEETINGS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
No	34 (87.2%)	51 (89.5%)	20 (87.0%)	105
Yes	5 (12.8%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (13.0%)	14
	39	57	23	119

$$\chi^2 = .52 \quad 2 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .900 \quad \text{gamma} = -.02$$

The fifth variable considered with community orientation concerning government related activities is whether or not respondents voted in the last state election. Due to cell distribution chi-square was not appropriate. Gamma for this sample is .71 for a fairly strong direct association between localism and whether or not one voted in the state election. Table XVI contains this distribution. Due to the limited distribution in voting the middle group and the local group were combined for calculations.

This same procedure was then applied to voting in the last state primary. However, in this test the null hypothesis could not be rejected in favor of the research hypothesis. Gamma equals .38 for a moderate association in the sample. This distribution is found in Table XVII.

TABLE XVI
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 VOTING IN LAST STATE ELECTION

VOTED IN LAST STATE ELECTION	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE		ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-63	
No	5 (12.8%)	2 (2.5%)	7
Yes	34 (87.2%)	79 (97.5%)	113
	<u>39</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>120</u>

gamma = .71

TABLE XVII
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 VOTING IN LAST STATE PRIMARY

VOTED IN LAST STATE PRIMARY	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE		ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	
No	5 (12.8%)	5 (6.2%)	10
yes	34 (87.2%)	75 (93.8%)	109
	<u>39</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>119</u>

$X^2 = 1.47$ 1 D.F. $p < .250$ gamma = .38

And the final variable considered with community orientation under research hypothesis six concerns frequency of voting. Under the research hypothesis it should be expected that the frequency of voting would be directly related to localism. However, chi-square was not great enough to accept the research hypothesis. Gamma is equal to .34 indicating a moderate direct association in the sample. Table XVIII contains the distribution.

TABLE XVIII
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
VOTING FREQUENCY

NUMBER OF TIMES VOTED OF FIVE POSSIBLE TIMES	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-3	8 (20.0%)	3 (5.3%)	2 (8.7%)	13
4	11 (27.5%)	15 (26.3%)	3 (13.0%)	29
5	21 (52.5%)	29 (68.4%)	18 (78.3%)	78
	<u>40</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>120</u>

$\chi^2 = 7.99$ 4 D.F. $p < .100$ gamma = .34

Hypothesis Seven stated that locals would be more frequently concerned with notifying city officials of community problems. However, upon analysis it was found that no significant difference existed

between locals and cosmopolitans on this point. Chi-square for the table below was found to be only 5.09 and not significant at the .05 level. Gamma for the sample distribution is .17 indicating a weak direct association. Table XIX contains the distribution.

TABLE XIX
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
FREQUENCY OF CONTACTS WITH CITY
REGARDING COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

FREQUENCY OF CONTACTS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Never	14 (35.9%)	10 (17.5%)	4 (18.2%)	28
Less Than Once a Year	12 (30.8%)	23 (40.4%)	9 (40.9%)	44
Once a Year	6 (15.4%)	9 (15.8%)	4 (18.2%)	19
More Than Once a Year	7 (17.9%)	15 (26.3%)	5 (22.7%)	27
	39	57	22	118

$$X^2 = 5.09 \quad 6 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .750 \quad \text{gamma} = .17$$

Six variables were tested under research hypothesis eight which predicted a difference in potential community involvement. However, none of the six tests produced a chi-square great enough to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis. Tables XX, XXI,

XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXV below contain the sample distributions tested under this hypothesis. The greatest association ($\gamma = .38$) was found to exist between potential participation in a non-religious community welfare agency with the locals more likely to participate. Although weak, all six associations were direct in the sample. Due to the very small cells that resulted on potential for seeking office, community orientation scores were collapsed creating cosmopolitan and non-cosmopolitan groups. Persons scoring in the middle group on community orientation and those classed as locals have been combined due to the small distributions. Also due to small cells chi-square was not considered appropriate and therefore not utilized.

TABLE XX
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
POTENTIAL FOR SEEKING PUBLIC OFFICE

POTENTIAL FOR SEEKING PUBLIC OFFICE	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE		ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-63	
Unlikely	34 (85.0%)	67 (82.7%)	101
Undecided	5 (12.5%)	11 (13.6%)	16
Likely	1 (2.5%)	3 (3.7%)	4
	<u>40</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>121</u>

$\gamma = .09$

TABLE XXI

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
POTENTIAL FOR ACCEPTING ACTIVE
APPOINTED POST OR POSITION
WITH CITY

POTENTIAL FOR ACCEPTING ACTIVE APPOINTED POST OR POSITION WITH CITY	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Unlikely	23 (57.5%)	25 (43.1%)	7 (30.4%)	55
Undecided	12 (30.0%)	16 (27.6%)	9 (39.1%)	37
Likely	5 (12.5%)	17 (29.3%)	7 (30.4%)	29
	40	58	23	121

$\chi^2 = 6.50$ 4 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = .29$

TABLE XXII

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN LOCAL
CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN LOCAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Unlikely	22 (55.0%)	20 (34.5%)	11 (47.8%)	53
Undecided	6 (15.0%)	13 (22.4%)	1 (4.3%)	20
Likely	12 (30.0%)	25 (43.1%)	11 (47.8%)	48
	40	58	23	121

$\chi^2 = 7.22$ 4 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = .18$

TABLE XXIII
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN A
 COMMUNITY CULTURAL GROUP

POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN A COMMUNITY CULTURAL GROUP	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Unlikely	19 (47.5%)	19 (32.8%)	7 (30.4%)	45
Undecided	9 (22.5%)	14 (24.1%)	6 (26.1%)	29
Likely	12 (30.0%)	25 (43.1%)	10 (43.5%)	47
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$X^2 = 3.02$ 4 D.F. $p < .750$ $\text{gamma} = .20$

TABLE XXIV
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN A
 NON-RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY
 WELFARE AGENCY

POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN A NON-RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY WELFARE AGENCY	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Unlikely	13 (32.5%)	8 (13.8%)	2 (8.7%)	23
Undecided	10 (25.0%)	8 (13.8%)	5 (21.7%)	23
Likely	17 (42.5%)	42 (72.4%)	16 (69.6%)	75
	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>121</u>

$X^2 = 11.30$ 4 D.F. $p < .025$ $\text{gamma} = .38$

TABLE XXV
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC
 DISCUSSION GROUPS CONCERNING
 COMMUNITY ISSUES

POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION GROUPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
Unlikely	9 (22.5%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (13.0%)	18
Undecided	8 (20.0%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (17.4%)	18
Likely	23 (57.5%)	45 (78.9%)	16 (69.6%)	84
	40	57	23	120

$$X^2 = 5.38 \quad 4 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .500 \quad \text{gamma} = .23$$

Hypothesis nine purports that cosmopolitans will be more likely involved in non-local professional organizations. This was tested on the basis of membership in national professional organizations, regional professional organizations, state professional organizations, local professional organizations, number of professional organizations in general, and membership in non-professional organizations. The null hypotheses could be rejected in favor of the research hypothesis on none except local professional organizations for which a chi-square of 10.00 was determined and was great enough to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level indicating that there is association between community orientation and membership in local professional organizations with locals more likely than non-locals to join local professional

organizations. Gamma was moderate at .37. Variables tested under hypothesis nine are below in Tables XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, and XXXI.

TABLE XXVI
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
MEMBERSHIP IN LOCAL NON-PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF LOCAL NON-PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF WHICH MEMBER	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
1-2	26 (66.7%)	31 (54.4%)	10 (43.5%)	67
3-4	10 (25.6%)	16 (28.1%)	7 (30.4%)	33
5+	3 (7.7%)	10 (17.5%)	6 (26.1%)	19
	<u>39</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>119</u>

$\chi^2 = 4.97$ 4 D.F. $p < .500$ gamma = .28

TABLE XXVII

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-2	9 (23.1%)	13 (23.2%)	4 (17.4%)	26
3	10 (25.6%)	16 (28.6%)	4 (17.4%)	30
4-5	10 (25.6%)	20 (35.7%)	11 (47.8%)	41
6+	10 (25.6%)	7 (12.5%)	4 (17.4%)	21
	39	56	23	118

$\chi^2 = 5.39$ 6 D.F. $p < .500$ $\gamma = .02$

TABLE XXVIII

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
MEMBERSHIP IN LOCAL PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF LOCAL PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0	33 (80.5%)	34 (61.8%)	13 (59.1%)	80
1	8 (19.5%)	14 (25.5%)	4 (18.2%)	26
2-3	0 (0.0%)	7 (12.7%)	5 (22.7%)	12
	41	55	22	118

$\chi^2 = 10.00$ 4 D.F. $p < .050$ $\gamma = .37$

TABLE XXIX

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
MEMBERSHIP IN STATE PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF STATE PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0	19 (48.7%)	24 (42.9%)	6 (26.1%)	49
1	14 (35.9%)	22 (39.3%)	6 (26.1%)	42
2	3 (7.7%)	5 (8.9%)	6 (26.1%)	14
3-6	3 (7.7%)	5 (8.9%)	5 (21.7%)	13
	<u>39</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>118</u>

$X^2 = 10.55$ 6 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = .28$

TABLE XXX

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
MEMBERSHIP IN REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0	20 (51.3%)	30 (53.6%)	17 (73.9%)	67
1-4	19 (48.7%)	26 (46.4%)	6 (26.1%)	51
	<u>39</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>118</u>

$X^2 = 3.47$ 2 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = -.24$

TABLE XXXI
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE COMPARED WITH
 MEMBERSHIP IN NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL
 ORGANIZATIONS

NUMBER OF NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
0-1	8 (20.5%)	10 (17.9%)	3 (13.0%)	21
2	11 (28.2%)	19 (33.9%)	7 (30.4%)	37
3	8 (20.5%)	14 (25.0%)	8 (34.8%)	30
4+	12 (30.8%)	13 (23.2%)	5 (21.7%)	30
	39	56	23	118

$$\chi^2 = 2.5 \quad 6 \text{ D.F.} \quad p < .900 \quad \text{gamma} = .01$$

Recapitulation

The following paragraphs are to provide a brief restatement of findings related to variables under the hypotheses.

First, there is evidence provided that those persons defined as locals and tending toward localism are more knowledgeable of the local community and local political representatives. However, there was not a significant difference between locals and cosmopolitans concerning knowledge of three community issues current at the time of testing.

Second, association with other professors was found to be virtually unrelated to one's identification with the local community.

When considering only those persons definitely local or cosmopolitan chi-square was still not significant and gamma was only $-.02$ indicating no relationship.

The relationship between community orientation and whether or not respondents had ever sought public office was non-existent. Only two professors (1.6 percent) had ever sought public office in Stillwater. However, a weak association (.27) was found between community orientation and ever having held a public post in Stillwater. Seventeen persons (14 percent), eight (6.6 percent) of whom were classed as neither strongly cosmopolitan nor strongly local, reported having served on a public post.

Involvement in local campaign activities based on community orientation was not found to be highly significant although only 40 percent of those neither strongly cosmopolitan nor local, and 52.2 percent of the locals reported having been actively involved in local campaign activities.

None of those forty persons categorized as cosmopolitan attended the last precinct meeting, whereas 5.3 percent of those classed in the middle did and 4.3 percent of the locals attended.

Locals attended city commission meetings in person more frequently than did cosmopolitans (56.5 percent and 35.9 percent respectively ever attended). While only 23.1 percent of the cosmopolitans ever watch city commission meetings on cable television, 56.5 percent of the locals do so. Planning commission meetings are attended by 17.9 percent of the cosmopolitans and 21.7 percent of the locals.

Whether or not respondents voted in the last state election was found to be significant indicating greater likelihood of the locals

than cosmopolitans voting at the state level. However, of those categorized in the middle as neither strongly cosmopolitan nor local (58 with scores of 39 to 46), 100 percent voted in the last state election. And of those with scores of 39 to 63 it was found that 97.5 percent voted in the last state election compared to 87.2 percent of the cosmopolitans. This percentage difference may be an overstatement of the difference due to the fact that approximately twice as many cases fall into the group with scores of at least 39 than in the group with scores of less than 39. Very little difference was found between cosmopolitans and locals in the last state primary election; hereagain, however, those in the middle had a greater percentage voting. Of five possible elections a moderate association was found with 78.3 percent of the locals voting in all five elections, 68.4 percent of the middle group, and only 5.3 percent of the cosmopolitans. When considering those voting in at least four elections, 32.8 percent of the cosmopolitans compared to 94.7 percent of the middle group and 91.3 percent of the locals voted in at least four elections of five.

It was found that 35.9 percent of the cosmopolitans had never contacted the city regarding a problem, 17.5 percent of the middle had never, and 18.2 percent of the locals had never done so.

Of the cosmopolitans 33.3 percent belong to at least three local non-professional organizations, 45.6 percent of the middle group, and 56.5 percent of the locals do. Locals displayed greater membership in local professional organizations than did cosmopolitans or those in the middle group. This was also the case with state professional organizations. However, cosmopolitans listed more regional professional memberships than did locals and only negligible differences were noted at the national level.

When asked about potential involvement in local activities, none of the cosmopolitans reported that it was very likely that they would seek public office whereas 4.3 percent of the locals so reported. None of the cosmopolitans indicated that it was very likely they would accept an active appointed post or position with the city (12.5 percent reported likely) and 5.2 percent of locals reported that it was very likely (6.9 percent reported likely). Only 30 percent of the cosmopolitans reported that it was likely or very likely they would be actively involved in a local campaign whereas 47.8 percent of the locals so reported.

Thirty percent of the cosmopolitans reported that it was likely or very likely that they would participate in a community cultural group and 43.5 percent of the locals so reported. One of the greatest differences found was on the basis of potential involvement in a non-religious community welfare agency. Forty-two and one-half percent of the cosmopolitans reported that it was likely or very likely that they would participate, 32.5 percent unlikely or very unlikely. And 69.5 percent of the locals reported likely or very likely compared to 8.7 percent who reported unlikely or very unlikely.

Finally, those in the middle group showed greater potential participation in public discussion groups concerning community issues than did the cosmopolitans or locals.

Findings Not Related to Hypotheses

Many variables were tested which were not formally related to the hypotheses. Included among these were parents' education levels, number of years spent in metropolitan urban areas, faculty position,

number of children in Stillwater public school, family income, number of places lived, political affiliation, age, marital status, mobility, education and one question concerning friends.

Variables Unrelated to Community Orientation: Parents' education levels were not found to be significantly related to community orientation. It is interesting to note, however, that father's education level was more significantly related than mother's. Other variables determined to be insignificantly related were number of years respondents have lived in metropolitan areas of at least 500,000 population, faculty position, number of children in Stillwater schools, income, number of places lived, and political affiliation. Tables XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, and XXXIX contain these distributions.

TABLE XXXII
 FATHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL COMPARED
 WITH RESPONDENT'S COMMUNITY
 ORIENTATION

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	FATHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL			ROW TOTALS
	LESS THAN HI SCHOOL GRADUATE	HI SCHOOL GRADUATE	COLLEGE GRADUATE	
19-38	19 (30.1%)	10 (30.3%)	10 (41.7%)	39
39-46	28 (44.4%)	17 (51.5%)	13 (54.2%)	58
47-63	16 (25.4%)	6 (18.2%)	1 (4.2%)	23
	<u>63</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>120</u>

$\chi^2 = 5.32$ 4 D.F. $p < .500$ $\gamma = -.22$

TABLE XXXIII
 MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL COMPARED
 WITH RESPONDENT'S COMMUNITY
 ORIENTATION

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL			ROW TOTALS
	LESS THAN HI SCHOOL GRADUATE	HI SCHOOL GRADUATE	COLLEGE GRADUATE	
19-38	16 (32.7%)	15 (30.6%)	8 (38.1%)	39
39-46	21 (42.9%)	26 (53.1%)	10 (47.6%)	57
47-63	12 (24.5%)	8 (16.3%)	3 (14.3%)	23
	<u>49</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>119</u>

$\chi^2 = 1.96$ 4 D.F. $p < .750$ $\gamma = -.10$

TABLE XXXIV
YEARS SPENT IN CITIES OF 500,000 +
COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY
ORIENTATION

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	YEARS IN LARGE CITY			ROW TOTALS
	0	1-5	6 +	
19-38	9 (22.5%)	16 (38.1%)	10 (34.5%)	35
39-46	20 (50.0%)	19 (45.2%)	15 (51.7%)	54
47-63	11 (27.5%)	7 (16.7%)	4 (13.8%)	22
	<u>40</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>111</u>

$\chi^2 = 3.79$ 4 D.F. $p < .500$ $\gamma = -.21$

TABLE XXXV
FACULTY POSITION COMPARED WITH
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION
SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	FACULTY POSITION		ROW TOTALS
	LESS THAN FULL PROFESSOR	FULL PROFESSOR	
19-38	21 (35.6%)	19 (30.6%)	40
39-46	27 (45.8%)	31 (50.0%)	58
47-63	11 (18.6%)	12 (19.4%)	23
	<u>59</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>121</u>

$\chi^2 = .34$ 2 D.F. $p < .900$ $\gamma = .07$

TABLE XXXVI

CHILDREN IN STILLWATER SCHOOLS
 COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY
 ORIENTATION

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	CHILDREN IN STILLWATER SCHOOLS		ROW TOTALS
	NO	YES	
19-38	16 (30.2%)	22 (32.4%)	38
39-46	25 (47.2%)	33 (48.5%)	58
47-63	12 (22.6%)	13 (19.1%)	25
	<u>53</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>121</u>

$X^2 = .24$ 2 D.F. $p < .975$ $\gamma = .07$

TABLE XXXVII

FAMILY INCOME COMPARED WITH
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION
 SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	FAMILY INCOME			ROW TOTALS
	20,000	20-24,999	25,000 +	
19-38	11 (40.7%)	15 (34.1%)	12 (27.3%)	38
39-46	8 (29.6%)	23 (52.3%)	24 (54.5%)	55
47-63	8 (29.6%)	6 (13.6%)	8 (18.2%)	22
	<u>27</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>115</u>

$X^2 = 5.68$ 4 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = .05$

TABLE XXXVIII
 NUMBER OF PLACES LIVED COMPARED
 WITH COMMUNITY ORIENTATION

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	NUMBER OF PLACES			ROW TOTALS
	0-5	6-10	11 +	
19-38	7 (30.4%)	21 (28.0%)	7 (46.7%)	35
39-46	10 (43.5%)	40 (53.3%)	6 (40.0%)	56
47-63	6 (26.1%)	14 (18.7%)	2 (13.3%)	22
	<u>23</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>113</u>

$\chi^2 = 2.90$ 4 D.F. $p < .750$ $\gamma = -.17$

TABLE XXXIX
 POLITICAL AFFILIATION COMPARED WITH
 COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	POLITICAL AFFILIATION		ROW TOTALS
	REPUBLICAN	DEMOCRAT	
19-38	12 (30.0%)	22 (30.6%)	34
39-46	16 (40.0%)	40 (55.6%)	56
47-63	12 (30.0%)	10 (13.9%)	22
	<u>40</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>112</u>

$\chi^2 = 4.64$ 2 D.F. $p < .250$ $\gamma = -.18$

Variables Related to Community Orientation: Variables tested which appear to be related to community orientation are age, education, marital status, and mobility. Looking at Table XL it can be seen that age and community orientation are very closely related with a chi-square of 13.37 significant at the .05 level and gamma equal to .34 with older persons more likely to identify locally.

TABLE XL
AGE COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY
ORIENTATION SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	AGE				ROW TOTALS
	31-39	40-49	50-59	60-65	
19-38	13 (48.2%)	12 (31.6%)	14 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	39
39-46	12 (44.4%)	19 (50.0%)	20 (47.6%)	7 (53.8%)	58
47-62	2 (7.4%)	7 (18.4%)	8 (19.0%)	6 (46.2%)	23
	27	38	42	13	120

$X^2 = 13.37$ 6 D.F. $p < .050$ gamma = .34

Marital status and community orientation also are significantly related. The distribution in Table XLI reflects a chi-square of 8.61 and is significantly related at the .005 level. Gamma was .70 with married persons more likely to identify locally.

In Table XLI the category single refers to those persons who have never been married, are divorced or widowed. The community orientation categories 39-46 and 47-63 were combined into one group due to the small cells which resulted when considering them separately.

TABLE XLI

MARITAL STATUS COMPARED WITH
COMMUNITY ORIENTATION
SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	MARITAL STATUS		ROW TOTALS
19-38	9 (69.2%)	31 (28.7%)	40
39-63	4 (30.8%)	77 (71.3%)	81
	<u>13</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>121</u>

$\chi^2 = 8.61$ 1 D.F. $p < .005$ gamma = .70

Mobility was found to be significantly related with community orientation as shown in Table XLIII. Chi-square was found to be 13.14 significant at the .025 level. Gamma was .33. Mobility was determined on the basis of age divided by number of places lived; therefore controlling for age differences. The less mobile persons were found to be more local.

TABLE XLIII
MOBILITY COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY
ORIENTATION SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	MOBILITY (age/places)			ROW TOTALS
	2-5	6-8	9+	
19-38	15 (45.4%)	16 (27.1%)	4 (19.0%)	35
39-46	13 (39.4%)	35 (59.3%)	8 (38.1%)	56
47-63	5 (15.2%)	8 (13.6%)	9 (42.9%)	22
	<u>33</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>113</u>

$\chi^2 = 13.14$ 4 D.F. $p < .025$ gamma = .33

Education was also found to be significantly related to community orientation with those persons holding a doctorate degree being less local than those persons with less than a doctorate degree. This

distribution is shown in Table XLIII. Chi-square is 8.86 with a probability of less than .025 and gamma is equal to .48.

TABLE XLIII
EDUCATION COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY
ORIENTATION SCORE

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE	EDUCATION		ROW TOTALS
	DOCTORATE	LESS THAN DOCTORATE	
19-38	36 (36.4%)	4 (18.2%)	40
39-46	49 (49.5%)	9 (40.9%)	58
47-63	14 (14.1%)	9 (40.9%)	23
	<u>99</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>121</u>

$X^2 = 8.86$ 2 D.F. $p < .025$ gamma = .48

It was also found that cosmopolitans were more likely to list closest friends of the opposite sex than were locals. Chi-square for the distribution is 12.0 which is significant at the .005 level and gamma for the sample is .58. Table XLIV contains the distribution for number of closest friends of the same sex listed by each respondent compared with community orientation.

TABLE XLIV
 CLOSEST FRIENDS OF THE SAME SEX COMPARED
 WITH COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE

NUMBER OF CLOSEST FRIENDS OF SAME SEX LISTED	COMMUNITY ORIENTATION SCORE			ROW TOTALS
	19-38	39-46	47-63	
1-2	17 (44.7%)	11 (19.3%)	2 (8.7%)	30
3	21 (55.3%)	46 (80.7%)	21 (91.3%)	88
	<u>38</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>118</u>

$\chi^2 = 12.0$ 2 D.F. $p < .005$ gamma = .58

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Local community identification by tenured professors at Oklahoma State University appears to be a function of age, marital status, education, and most significantly tendency toward mobility. Those persons considered to be locals are more knowledgeable of the community in general, of major community personnel and political representatives, are more likely to vote in state elections, and more often list closest friends of the same sex.

In this study age was shown to be significantly related to community orientation. This does not support Dobriner's findings which failed to show an association between age and community orientation.¹ Of those persons ages 31-39 only 7.4 percent are clearly local, whereas of those ages 40 through 59 18.8 percent are locals. However, looking at those aged 60 through 65 46.2 percent are clearly local whereas none are clearly cosmopolitan. Ours is a youth oriented culture with great emphasis on success and accomplishment while young. It is suggested here that those persons in the more youthful group (31-39) are not yet accepting of their current status as long-term. To the contrary those aged 60 through 65 have reached and passed their career peaks and it is very likely that the local community and local

¹Dobriner, pp. 132-143.

contacts have become a more dominant focal point in their lives.

Although marital status was not of concern in the reviewed literature, it was found in this research that community orientation and marital status are significantly related. Married persons were much more likely to be identified as locals than were those not married. This is possibly a result of greater interest in the community related to increased use of community institutions and facilities. The family unit not only allows but often requires a great deal more involvement in local activity.

The findings are consistent with those of Merton² with the exception of relation of community orientation to level of education. He suggested that education was not a major causal factor of localism even though cosmopolitanism was associated with slightly greater education. However, in this study it is apparent that a significant difference does exist between those with and those without a doctorate degree. Dobriner³ also found that education had a direct relationship to cosmopolitanism. Dye⁴ provided evidence to support this position. He found that localism was inversely related to status, based on occupation and education. The lack of a doctorate degree generally decreases chances of mobility in the "academic marketplace" and therefore encourages focus at the local level.

In this study it was found that tendency toward mobility was most

²Merton, pp. 387-420.

³Dobriner, pp. 132-143.

⁴Dye, pp. 239-246.

significantly related to community orientation. Merton⁵ has provided evidence which supports this finding. Rose⁶ touched on this in the sense that his study reviewed in this paper concerned involvement of migrant workers who did not greatly internalize meanings and values of the surrounding culture. It is reasonable to think of migrant workers as more mobile and view the conclusion of Rose as being in agreement with the conclusion at hand that the more mobile persons are less likely to identify locally.

Because of limited time spent in a given locale it is reasonable to assume that participation and therefore involvement and identification would also be limited. A lessening tendency toward mobility might be a prerequisite to developing a more local community orientation. It cannot be firmly stated that one's past mobility is a reflection of one's present aspiration to move but it can be suggested that mobility is more likely because of a pattern already set. This is particularly true among the middle-aged individual. If this person has been highly mobile in the past and has lived in places for fairly short periods of time this person has had little opportunity to develop tendencies toward local community orientation. However, if one experiences a shrinking of options to be mobile one might very well resign self to residential permanency and narrow one's focus to the local community.

The decrease in opportunities for mobility could have its base in numerous changes both personal and societal. It is reasonable to

⁵Merton, pp. 387-420.

⁶Rose, pp. 202-206.

assume that these change-related variables would be related to age, marital status, value changes, and education. It can also be seen that these variables are very often interrelated. Among societal changes is the current state of our economy which is greatly reflected in the severe limitation on employment opportunities with decreased numbers of positions available and limited opportunity for advancement. Hereagain, this could be influential in forming one's orientation toward the local community through its limiting effects.

It was found that community knowledge is directly related to community orientation. Locals are considerably more knowledgeable than cosmopolitans. This conclusion was also drawn by Sykes⁷ who reported that community knowledge was less in the person directed away from the community than those directed toward the community. It was found in this study that the locals have a much greater knowledge of local political representatives than do cosmopolitans. This finding is also further supported by the findings of Sykes.

Voting patterns were not significantly different except with those voting in the last state election in which significantly more locals voted. The only explanation offered by this author is that the locals see state government as very important to the local community. The state is the governing body which allows the total unit to become a legal entity and has considerable say concerning what can be done at the local level. Further their employer, Oklahoma State University, is a state supported institution heavily dependent on state government (legislature) which exercises great control over

⁷Sykes, pp. 376-382.

university expenditures and therefore is of considerable economic importance to the local community.

Another interesting finding is that locals are less likely to report friends of the opposite sex than are cosmopolitans. However, since as reported above localism is directly related to marital status it may very well be that those listing friends of the opposite sex who are cosmopolitans are also from the single group and likely to list companions of a dating relationship.

In developing a profile of the local this study provides evidence for suggesting that the local is more likely an older married person less likely to have a doctorate degree and has not lived in a great many places. This person could be expected to display greater knowledge not only of the community in general but also of major community personnel political representatives. It should be kept in mind that this profile is an ideal type, an abstraction.

Major Limitations of Study

This study is greatly limited due to some inherent methodological problems. It is directed at determining community orientation based on what the respondents report. What one reports may be very different from what is.

The measurement of involvement patterns is greatly limited since the responses will very likely be based solely on memory and involve estimations and collapsing. An example of this is illustrated in one item asking respondents to list all places ever lived and length of residence at each place. Further, questions concerning potential involvement are necessarily purely speculative.

Perhaps the greatest weakness is the 44 percent response rate. This is considered a very respectable rate on a first mailing and not really uncommon for a final sample. However, it is believed that a second mailing could have provided a great enough difference in the response rate to eliminate a great deal of response bias.

A second mailing was not made due to negative responses registered with the Faculty Council of Oklahoma State University. By the time the matter had been acted on there was not time for a second mailing and there would be no continuity between the two response groups. The very few complaints registered indicated that the research instrument was too long and too personal. However, most of those the author talked with indicated that it took only about thirty minutes to complete the instrument. The following is directly from the May 13, 1975 Faculty Council Meeting Agenda of Oklahoma State University:

Proposed University Policy on Distribution of Questionnaires: _____ said that the committee had recently received a letter from a faculty member protesting a questionnaire asking for data to be used in a masters' thesis by a graduate student. The questionnaire was, in the faculty member's opinion, too long, asked some rather personal questions, and in addition was sent without obtaining prior permission from the faculty members. _____ said the faculty committee had discussed the questionnaire with the department head and determined that no overall departmental policy governing this type of questionnaire exists, however, the one in question was approved by the student's committee before it was sent out. The committee feels that perhaps there should be an overall university policy, but brought the matter to the Council for information and an expression of opinion before pursuing the subject any further.

Vice President _____ said that this had been called to his attention a few weeks ago, and discussed with the deans of the colleges. The decision was that each dean would implement appropriate procedures to minimize such problems, and if the deans could not solve the problem, then perhaps the Faculty Council should work on it.

_____ commented that the circulation of questionnaires is not limited to graduate students, pointing out that a number of undergraduate students also do this, and in addition many people in the community are surveyed on market research, political opinion polls, etc., and it is not only a matter concerning the University.

After discussion, _____ said he might, in consultation with _____, name a University-wide ad hoc committee to work out guidelines on this problem.

The questionnaire referred to in the above statement is the instrument used in this research. Such a reaction was, to say the least, unanticipated by the researcher. In analyzing the statement as recorded in the Faculty Council Agenda one is impressed with the obvious questioning of the value of social research and with the suggestion to eliminate or limit it severely. Such a move would greatly hinder much of the research presently being carried out by social scientists.

In addition to this problem, approximately twenty-five of those persons who were told that the instrument would be picked up could not be reached by telephone for arranging an appointment.

Suggestions for Future Research

The research published and the research at hand have provided evidence of characteristics which make up a local or a cosmopolitan orientation. However, it is suggested here that research should be done on the particular traits of these orientation types. It would be valuable to know if age is closely associated with localism because as one grows and matures values are redefined and interpersonal relations become more important than professional relations; or is it perhaps with age that one accepts one's "station in life" and views the larger society as out of reach.

Also, concerning marital status, since more people are obviously involved than self, is the local actually devoted to the local community or bound into it because of family?

Perhaps less education is associated with localism because national involvement in professional organizations and so forth is limited to or dominated by those with doctorate degrees. Also, movement within the "academic marketplace" usually requires that an individual have a doctorate degree. They might simply resign themselves to a situation of immobility and adapt accordingly.

This writer believes that further research on these variables in relation to community orientation patterns could be meaningful. This research should be carried out by means of extensive interviews due to the fact that a questionnaire is too easily dismissed.

The fourteen items used to determine community orientation in this study are very valuable and could very easily be used for future research in association with the earlier discussed significantly related variables. Ideally, a panel survey or case study approach might be used. This would be time consuming but valuable in that responses could be obtained over an extended period of time allowing the researcher to observe changes in community orientation as changes take place in age, marriage, and education.

It might also prove valuable to take those items making up Factor I (identified as personal variables relating to family and self in the community) on factor analysis and utilizing this score when considering those variables which have been found herein to be related to community orientation. Also, this could be done with Factors II (a comparison of national and international matters to the

local community) and III (identified as related to interpersonal and organizational relations). Little value, however, is seen in applying this method to Factor IV since it was not clearly identifiable.

It might also be worthwhile to consider the three levels of professors (assistant, associate, and full) separately in relation to the significant variables as found in this study. Due to age expectations and accomplishments no doubt differences would exist.

Further research concerning community orientations of community residents is needed to expand and clarify our general knowledge of the social phenomenon, community. Without a clear understanding of the individual residents' relationship or orientation to the local community little can be said about the aggregate phenomenon.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axelrod, Morris. "Urban Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 13-18.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Dobriner, William M. The Suburban Community. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review, 26 (October, 1961), pp. 753-758.
- Dye, Thomas R. "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics." Social Forces, 41 (March, 1963), pp. 239-246.
- Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Erbe, William. "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration." American Sociological Review, 29 (1964), pp. 198-215.
- Fanelli, Alexander. "Extensiveness of Communication Contacts and Perceptions of the Community." American Sociological Review, 21 (August, 1956), pp. 439-445.
- Glaser, Barney G. Organizational Scientists: Their Professional Careers. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.
- Goldberg, Louis G., Frank Baker, and Albert H. Rubenstein. "Local-Cosmopolitan: Unidimensional or Multidimensional?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (May, 1965), pp. 704-710.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - I." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (December, 1957), pp. 281-305.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - II." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (December, 1957), pp. 444-480.
- Keller, Suzanne. The Urban Neighborhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. "The People's Choice." Sociological Research I, by Matilda White Riley. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963, pp. 361-381.
- Manis, Jerome G. "A Quantitative Note on the Academic Role." American Sociological Review, 16 (1951), pp. 837-839.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.
- Reissman, Leonard. "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy." Social Forces, 27 (1949), pp. 305-310.
- Riley, Matilda White. Sociological Research II. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.
- Rose, Arnold M. "Attitudinal Correlates of Social Participation." Social Forces, 37 (March, 1959), pp. 202-206.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 783-799.
- Sykes, Gresham M. "The Differential Distribution of Community Knowledge." Social Forces, 29 (May, 1951), pp. 276-382.
- Thielbar, Gerald. "Localism-Cosmopolitanism: Prolegomenon to a Theory of Social Participation." Sociological Quarterly, 11 (1970), pp. 243-254.
- Warren, Roland. Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION STUDY

Thank you very much for taking the time from your busy schedule to complete this questionnaire. Instructions will precede each part.

PART I

PERSONAL

Place an X by the appropriate response on the following until further instruction.

1. Male
 Female
2. Full Professor
 Associate Professor
 Assistant Professor
3. What was your age on your last birthday? _____
4. Are you married? Yes No
Have you ever been married? Yes No
5. Do you have children? Yes No
If yes, how many? _____
What are their ages? _____
How many are in school in Stillwater? _____
6. To the nearest year how long have you lived in Stillwater?
_____ Years
7. Do you own, are you buying, or do you rent your home?
 Own
 Buying
 Renting
 Other (please specify) _____

10. Please check for your father and mother (or guardians) the appropriate response for their educational level.

	<u>Father</u>	<u>Mother</u>
Less than 8th grade	_____	_____
8th grade through high school (but not graduated)	_____	_____
High School Graduate	_____	_____
Some College Work	_____	_____
College Graduate	_____	_____
If a college graduate, please indicate the highest degree attained:	_____	_____

11. Please pick three persons whom you consider to be your closest friends and answer the questions below for each.

Friend 1:

Does this friend live in Stillwater? Yes No

Approximately how often do you see this person?

What is your friend's occupation? _____

What is your friend's sex? Female Male

Friend 2:

Does this friend live in Stillwater? Yes No

Approximately how often do you see this person?

What is your friend's occupation? _____

What is your friend's sex? Female Male

Friend 3:

Does this friend live in Stillwater? Yes No

Approximately how often do you see this person?

What is your friend's occupation? _____

What is your friend's sex? Female Male

12. This question is concerned with your organizational activities. In the space provided within the appropriate category please list any organizations in Stillwater of which you are a member. After the name of each organization, please answer the following questions in the provided space.

- (1) How many meetings have you attended in the past year?
- (2) How many committees are you on?
- (3) Are you an officer of the organization?

ORGANIZATION NAME	NO. MEETINGS PAST YEAR	NO. OF COMMITTEES	ARE YOU AN OFFICER
CHURCH:			
SOCIAL OR FRATERNAL:			
CIVIC:			
POLITICAL:			

ORGANIZATION NAME	NO. MEETINGS PAST YEAR	NO. OF COMMITTEES	ARE YOU AN OFFICER
SCHOOL RELATED:			
CULTURAL:			
OTHER:			

13. Please list in the space provided any professional organizations of which you are a member and indicate by an X in the appropriate place if it is local, regional, state, or national.

<u>Name of Organization</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Regional</u>	<u>National</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PART II

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION

Listed below are statements to which your personal response is desired. Please select the best of the five response choices to reflect your attitude or opinion concerning the statement. In each case please circle only one of the following responses:

SA for strongly agree
 A for agree
 U for undecided
 D for disagree
 SD for strongly disagree

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----|--|
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 1. National and international happenings are of less interest and importance to me than events that occur in Stillwater. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 2. Generally speaking, news commentators on radio or television who give personal interpretations of the news and human interest stories are more beneficial to me than commentators who just report the news. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 3. National and international events are important largely because of the way they affect Stillwater as a community. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 4. Many personal relationships and contacts with other people in the local community are essential to life today. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 5. The most rewarding organizations a person can belong to are local organizations serving local needs. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 6. Stillwater is one of the best communities in the United States for me and my family. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 7. Meeting and knowing many people is extremely important in establishing oneself in the community. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 8. The local community is more important to America than are big cities. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 9. Reading the Stillwater Newspress is extremely important in order to be informed. |

- SA A U D SD 10. News about Stillwater is generally more interesting to me than national and international news.
- SA A U D SD 11. My career as a professor can be advanced as well in Stillwater as any place else.
- SA A U D SD 12. I prefer local organizations in which I can meet new people rather than organizations in which I can use my special educational training.
- SA A U D SD 13. No doubt many newcomers to the community are capable people but when it comes to choosing a person for a responsible position in the community, I prefer a person whose family is well established in the community.
- SA A U D SD 14. Living in Stillwater I feel that I am a part of the community and that I belong here.
- SA A U D SD 15. Stillwater is the community in which I would like to spend the remainder of my life.

PART III

This part of the questionnaire is designed to determine your attitudes toward Stillwater and your knowledge of the community. Please do not feel that you should know the correct response for every question as this would be very unusual.

1. Please fill in what you believe to be the correct answer on the following questions.

How many public elementary schools are there in Stillwater? _____

How many middle schools are there? _____

How many fire stations in Stillwater? _____

2. Listed below are the names of persons who hold or have held positions in and for Stillwater. Please indicate each person's position beside each name in the space provided.

(a) Max Clary _____

(b) Hilary Driggs _____

- (c) Bill Simank _____
- (d) William Anderson _____
- (e) Betty Hanlon _____
- (f) Bill Thomas _____
- (g) Dan Wagner _____
- (h) John Duck _____
- (i) A. J. Schott _____
- (j) Roger McMillian _____
- (k) Larry Gish _____
- (l) Jean Hochhaus _____
- (m) Robert Murphy _____
- (n) Fred LeCrone _____
- (o) Ron Owens _____
- (p) Edna Spaulding _____
- (q) Linda Allensworth _____
- (r) Norman Moore _____
- (s) John Howard _____
- (t) Jack Stone _____

3. Listed below are brief titles of three issues which have recently been of concern to the community of Stillwater. In the space provided would you please indicate what you believe to be the present status of each issue.

Frontier Airlines Service to Stillwater. _____

Location of a New City Warehouse: _____

Housing and Community Development Act Grant Application: _____

Please place an X by the appropriate response for the questions listed below.

4. Have you ever sought public office of any kind in Stillwater?
- _____ Yes
- _____ No
5. Is it likely that you would ever run for a local public office?
- _____ Very likely
- _____ Likely
- _____ Don't know
- _____ Unlikely
- _____ Very unlikely
6. Have you ever held a public post or appointment in Stillwater?
(including government related committees, councils, and commissions)
- _____ Yes
- _____ No
7. Is it likely that you would accept an active appointed position with the City of Stillwater if one were offered?
- _____ Very likely
- _____ Likely
- _____ Don't know
- _____ Unlikely
- _____ Very unlikely
8. Have you ever been actively involved (in any way) in local campaign activities since living in Stillwater?
- _____ Yes
- _____ No
9. Is it likely that you will become involved in local campaign activities?
- _____ Very likely
- _____ Likely
- _____ Don't know
- _____ Unlikely
- _____ Very unlikely

10. Have you ever participated in a community cultural group (such as Town & Gown or the Sheerar Cultural and Heritage Center)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

11. Is it likely that you ever will participate in a community cultural group?

_____ Very likely

_____ Likely

_____ Don't know

_____ Unlikely

_____ Very unlikely

12. Have you ever participated in a non-religious community welfare agency (such as the United Fund)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

13. Is likely that you will ever actively participate in a non-religious community welfare agency?

_____ Very likely

_____ Likely

_____ Don't know

_____ Unlikely

_____ Very unlikely

14. Have you ever participated in a public discussion meeting concerning issues related to schools, hospitals, local government, or other agencies or problems?

_____ Yes

_____ No

15. Is it likely that you will ever participate in such a public discussion?

_____ Very likely

_____ Likely

_____ Don't know

_____ Unlikely

_____ Very unlikely

16. Did you attend the last precinct meeting which was held Monday, February 3, 1975?

Yes

No

17. How often do you attend city commission meetings in person?

Less than once a month

Once a month

2-3 times a month

Every week

Never

18. How often do you attend city commission meetings by cable television?

Never

Less than once a month

Once a month

2-3 times a month

Every week

19. How often do you attend planning commission meetings?

Never

Less than once a month

Once a month

2-3 times a month

Every week

20. Do you attend any meetings of agencies or committees of the city of Stillwater other than city commission or planning commission?

Yes; which ones? _____

No _____

21. Did you vote in the last city commissioners election held March 18, 1975?

Yes

No

22. Did you vote in the last county commissioners election held in 1974?

Yes

No

23. Did you vote in the last state election at which time Governor Boren and many other state officials were elected?
- _____ Yes
_____ No
24. Did you vote in the last state primary election held in the fall, 1974?
- _____ Yes
_____ No
25. Did you vote in the last presidential election held in 1972?
- _____ Yes
_____ No
26. What is your political affiliation?
- _____ Democrat
_____ Republican
_____ Independent
_____ Other (please specify) _____
27. Have you ever contacted a city or county official or agency concerning a community problem?
- _____ No
_____ Yes-----28. If yes, approximately how many times per year?
- _____ Less than once a year
_____ Once a year
_____ 2-3 times a year
_____ 4-6 times a year
_____ 7-10 times a year
_____ More than 10 times a year
29. What do you consider to be the most important problems currently facing the community of Stillwater? Beside each problem indicated, please fill in the name of the person you would be most likely to contact concerning the specified problem?
- | <u>Problem</u> | <u>Person You Would Contact</u> |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

INTERVIEW

COMMUNITY ORIENTATION STUDY

1. With reference to question 12 Part I of the questionnaire, if you could belong to only one of these organizations which one would it be? Why?

2. Generally speaking, do you encourage your family members to participate in local Stillwater organizations? _____

Why? _____

3. Do you like to be identified as a Stillwaterite?

_____ Yes; why do you feel this way? _____

_____ No; why not? _____

_____ Doesn't matter; why doesn't it matter? _____

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

Dear Professor:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Sociology and presently working on my master's thesis. My thesis is concerned with the attitudes of O.S.U. Professors toward the community of Stillwater and your name was randomly selected from a list of university professors to make up my sample.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which I would appreciate your completing and returning to me. Of course, any information secured for the study will be released in statistical form only and no individual will be singled out. I realize your time is quite valuable and do sincerely appreciate your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DORIS J. ASTLE
Department of Sociology

Dear Professor:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Sociology and presently working on my master's thesis. My thesis is concerned with the attitudes of O.S.U. professors toward the community of Stillwater and your name was randomly selected from a list of university professors to make up my sample.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which I would appreciate your completing. Of course, any information secured for the study will be released in statistical form only and no individual will be singled out. I would also appreciate the opportunity to come to your office and pick up the questionnaire at which time I would like to ask you three more questions about Stillwater. I will call within approximately one week to arrange an appointment.

I realize your time is quite valuable and thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DORIS J. ASTLE
Department of Sociology

VITA

Doris J. Astle

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: COMMUNITY ORIENTATION AND INVOLVEMENT PATTERNS OF UNIVERSITY
PROFESSORS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Shawnee, Oklahoma, February 18, 1948, the
child of Nelda Gwin Morris and Albert James Morris.

Education: Graduated from Perkins High School, Perkins, Oklahoma,
in May, 1966; received the Bachelor of Science degree in
Sociology from Oklahoma State University in 1974; completed
requirements for the Master of Science degree in July, 1975.

Professional Organizations: Alpha Kappa Delta National
Sociological Honor Society; Southwestern Sociological
Association.