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Abstract

WENDELL DUANE WESSMAN

Under the supervision of Professor Robert M. Dimit

Attitudinal differences among youth related to community structure and growth status were studied, using as subjects the high school seniors from the public schools in three selected communities.

Variations in attitudes were measured by an attitudinal and personal data questionnaire, which included an adaptation of the Twenty Statements Test and a sociometric device. The latter was used to establish groupings, which enabled comparisons to be made of responses to selected questionnaire items by respondents both within and among the sample communities.

The participating communities were matched on: (a) population in 1940, (b) status as a county seat town, and (c) geographical base. The particular structure of each community was determined by identifying the reputational leaders, and interviewing them with open-ended questions. The data obtained indicated that the communities could be considered as having similar structures, and they were so classified in a typology of communities developed with this study.
Distinctions related to growth status were made on the following bases: (a) the growing community showed a population increase of five per cent or more between 1940 and 1960; (b) the stable community had a population in 1960 that was within five per cent of its 1940 census; and (c) the declining community decreased in population by at least five per cent during this period.

Thus, the core of the study focused on two independent variables--community structure and growth status--and a dependent variable--attitudinal differences among youth. However, growth status was also considered as a dependent variable.

The hypotheses tested that related to the independent variables stated that attitudinal differences among youth are a function of differential experiences with success within a given community (or structure) rather than: (a) related to different community structures, or (b) related to community growth status.

The hypothesis treating growth status as a dependent variable stated that there were ecological and socioeconomic differences related to community growth status. It was observed that the growing community (a) was the county seat town in the larger county, (b) was more centrally located within the county, (c) was served by more adequate highways and railroad facilities, and (d) was more favorably located with reference to other shopping centers.
The findings indicated differences in attitudes regarding self, as measured by Twenty Statements Test items (statements by the respondents which begin, "I am . . ."), between the sociometrically identified stars and isolates that were significant at the one percent level. However, the data also indicated that significant differences existed between communities. This suggested that there was a two-dimensional basis of differentiation: within the communities, the stars (the subjects identified by their classmates as most popular, as having done most for the class and/or school, or as most likely to succeed in the post high school years), reflected proportionately more positive attitudes than the other respondents; among communities, respondents in the growing community reflected more positive attitudes than respondents in the stable and declining communities.

Other variables found related to success experiences of youth, in order of importance, were: (a) level of parental education; (b) estimate of family income; (c) intellectual ability; and (d) residence readily accessible to the center of a community. The relative importance of the above was seen to vary with the degree to which a community structure was oriented toward assisting youth in achieving successful experiences.
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INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The research reported in this paper explored possible relationships between selected characteristics of three rural communities and the attitudes held by their youth. The community characteristics selected for study were (a) structure and (b) growth status (experience with reference to population size). The attitudes examined were those which the subjects had developed with reference (a) to their classmates and themselves, and (b) to business, religion, recreation, and the family.

In addition to the public concern with the alienation of youth, the so-called generation gap, several studies provided direction and motivation for this research. The first of these was a report to Congress which stated that greater accomplishments in the reversal of juvenile delinquency trends could be expected if, among other approaches,

a much greater attempt than at present is made to discover exactly how our society is structured, organized, and operated, and what this portends for the everyday life of youth (including delinquent youth) in specific segments of the society, and for their ambitions, values, and sense of self-worth.1

Although the report cited above sought to deal with juvenile delinquency, its causes and cure, its motivating influence herein was to stimulate a desire to know more about the impact of the structure, organization, and operation of specific segments of our society on the everyday life of their youth (their ambitions, values, and sense of self-worth).

Another study, "The Effects of and Adjustment to Social Change in South Dakota Communities,"\(^1\) contributed to the delineation of this research in several ways. First, identification with it guided the selection of the segments of society to be studied, namely, rural communities. Secondly, its emphasis on changes in size and population characteristics suggested that growth status might be related to the attitudes expressed by youth in rural communities. Among its listed objectives was that of determining changes in "size and population characteristics of rural communities in the North Central Region, and to assess the forces associated with these changes."\(^2\) Finally, its emphasis on "field studies in a sample of communities undergoing growth; a sample of communities undergoing decline; and a semi-control sample of communities which are remaining relatively stable,"\(^3\) suggested that attitudinal differences among communities as well as within communities might be examined.

\(^{1}\)A State project contributing to the North Central Regional Project, NC-80, "Community Adjustment to Social Change in the North Central Region."

\(^{2}\)Ibid.

\(^{3}\)Ibid.
The emphases selected out of the two above-mentioned studies were combined to constitute the research topic: attitudinal differences among youth related to community structure and growth status.\(^1\)

This study sought to examine two independent variables—community structure and growth status—and a dependent variable—attitudinal differences among youth. Of the two independent variables, community structure and growth status, the former—community structure—was considered more difficult to relate to attitudinal differences among youth in this study. The reason for this was that rural communities, located in the same general area and matched on several criteria, were not expected to differ markedly in structure. Therefore, location of subjects within a particular community structure was expected to relate more directly to attitudes expressed among youth than a similar location in the structures of different communities. It was assumed that the other independent variable—growth status—could be readily and directly related to attitudinal differences among youth. Therefore, it was decided to consider it as a dependent (as well as independent) variable in an attempt to discover what independent variables, if any, may be related to growth status.

\(^1\)Initially, the phrase "developing concept of self" was employed; it was replaced with "attitudinal differences" when the former appeared to suggest the process whereby the concept of self is developed rather than the product as the latter can be observed at a specific point in time.
Objectives of the Study

Two broad objectives were established as guide lines for this research:

1. To ascertain whether there were observable ecological, demographic, and socio-economic differences between communities that were related to community structure and/or growth status; and

2. To ascertain whether there were attitudinal differences among youth within and among communities that were differentiated on the basis of community structure and/or growth status.

In pursuing the first objective, selection of a sample of communities was projected on the basis of growth status: one undergoing decline, another undergoing growth, and a third experiencing relative stability. These communities were then to be compared on a number of variables, as has been suggested above.

To ascertain whether there were attitudinal differences among youth within and among communities that were differentiated on the basis of community structure and/or growth status, the following plans were developed. First, a device was formulated whereby groups would be established within communities on the bases of popularity among and evaluation by classmates. Second, another instrument was employed by means of which attitudinal differences among youth would be observed.¹

¹Both of these instruments have been described in greater detail later in this report.
Definition of Terms

The basic terms and/or concepts used in this research were defined as follows:

1. Youth, as used in this study, referred to the members of the Class of 1967 in the public high school in each of the sample communities.

2. Community was defined as the geographical area and interaction encompassed by the high school district boundaries identified with the county seat towns included in this study.

3. Community structure was defined as the particular network of interaction patterns identifiable in the particular community at a given point in time. The observed community structure was considered to be supportive of the dominant values and interests of the community.

4. Community growth status simply denoted the experience of a community with reference to population numbers. A loss of population between 1940 and 1960 in excess of five per cent, as calculated from U. S. Census data, constituted a growth status referred to as a declining community; a similar percentage increase during this period was the criterion for a growing community; and a community within five per cent of its 1940 population in 1960 was considered to be a stable community.

5. Attitudinal differences was used to denote observable variations among the respondents in the attitudes and feelings which they had developed with reference: (a) to their classmates
and themselves; and (b) to their communities and institutions such as the school, government, business, religion, recreation, and the family.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In that a review of literature failed to produce any studies identical or similar to the one discussed in this paper, the literature cited herein consists of two types considered relevant to the development of a background for this research.

On the Self and Similar Concepts

The first type of study included in this review of literature focused on the development of attitudes toward the self, as well as other concepts similar in meaning.¹ The reviews that follow have not been arranged in order of any presumed importance.

The "Looking-Glass Self"

The oldest study reviewed was initially copyrighted in 1902. Authored by Charles Horton Cooley, it defined the social self as "simply any idea, or system of ideas, drawn from the communicative life, that the mind cherishes as its own."² The process by means of

¹Erik Erikson wrote, "It has not escaped the reader that the term identity covers much of what has been called the self by a variety of workers, be it in the form of a self-concept . . ., a self system . . ., or in that of fluctuating self experiences described by . . . others." Identity and Anxiety, Maurice Stein, Arthur Vidich, and David White, eds. (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 73.

which the self-idea was communicated to the mind was seen to consist of three principal elements: "the imagination of our person to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification." ¹

The product of that process was called the "reflected or looking-glass self," a product of "constructive imagination working with the materials which social experience supplies." ²

Many of Cooley's ideas were developed from observations which he made of his children (M, daughter; R, son) as they developed the ability to differentiate between "I", "me", "my", and "mine". In his discussion of various dimensions of the "I", Cooley stated that "the group self or 'we' is simply an 'I' which includes other persons;" i.e., an extension of the "I". ³ Egotism, in contrast, was viewed as a lack in human nature, a preoccupation with a narrow "I".

Several conditions were deemed necessary for the development of a healthy self, the first of which was that of a mature prenatal development. In the postnatal period, persons were viewed as needing to understand and believe in themselves—the more completely the better. Furthermore, Cooley considered hero-worship to be important in the development of the self, especially during the plastic period of youth. However,

if youth is the period of hero-worship, so also is it true that hero-worship, more than anything else, perhaps, gives one the

¹Ibid., p. 184. ²Ibid., p. 242. ³Ibid., p. 209.
sense of youth. To admire, to expand oneself, to forget the rut, to have a sense of newness and life and hope is to feel young at any time of life.¹

The "I" and the "Me"

A second classic study reviewed, perhaps more widely known than the above, also attempted to explain "the conduct of the individual in terms of the organized conduct of the social group, rather than to account for the organized conduct of social groups in terms of separate individuals belonging to it." This book, not actually published by its author, George Herbert Mead, consists of lectures recorded by his students and edited by Charles Morris.² It is divided into three main subdivisions: mind, self, and society.

In the first of the above-mentioned sections, mind was presented as arising out of social interaction, and was defined as "that mechanism of control over meaning," made possible by language in the human individual.³ Although the mind has its focus in the individual human organism, it was seen essentially as a social phenomenon. The process by means of which the mind comes into being was viewed as consisting of experiences in which the individual was involved, of which he was conscious, and to which his adjustment was modified or refined by his awareness of it.

¹Ibid., p. 314.
³Ibid., p. 133.
The self was presented as something which is nonexistent at birth, "but arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to that process as a whole and to other individuals within that process." The basic characteristic of the self was identified as its being an object to itself, which distinguished it from other objects and from the body.

The process by means of which the full development of the self is realized was seen as consisting of two general stages. In the first, the individual organized "the particular attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward one another in specific social acts in which he participates with them;" the second stage consisted of the "organization of the social attitudes of the generalized other or the social group as a whole" to which the individual belongs. Thus, one had to be a member of a community to become a self.

The individual possesses a self only in relation to the selves of the other members of his social group; and the structure of his self expresses or reflects the general behavior pattern of this social group to which he belongs, just as does the structure of the self of every other individual belonging to this social group.

The essence of the self, as we have said, is cognitive: it lies in the internalized conversation of gestures which constitutes thinking, or in terms of which thought or reflection proceeds. And hence the origin and foundation of the self, like those of thinking, are social.

---

1 Ibid., p. 135.  
2 Ibid., p. 158.  
3 Ibid., p. 164.  
4 Ibid., p. 173.
The contribution to a knowledge of self for which Mead may best be remembered is the distinction he made between the "I" and the "me", which he did as follows:

The "I" is the response of the organism to the attitudes of the others; the "me" is the organized set of attitudes which one himself assumes. Thus, Mead defined the "me" as the self one is aware of in a given situation, and the "I" as the action of the self within a given social context. These two, the "I" and the "me" as they appear in our experiences, he considered to constitute the personality, as well as phases of the self.

The concluding section of the book consisted of a discussion of society, which was viewed as requiring minds and selves to exist. In turn, Mead argued that society's individual members would not possess minds and selves "if these had not arisen or emerged out of the human social process in its lower stages of development." Thus, the developments of mind, self, and society were presented as interrelated and concurrent processes.

The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life

A concern with the response called out in others was the focus of Goffman's contribution to man's understanding of himself. He employed the metaphor of the theatrical performance, and viewed

\[1^\text{Ibid., p. 175.} \quad 2^\text{Ibid., p. 192.} \quad 3^\text{Ibid.} \quad 4^\text{Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959).}\]
The Problem of Identity

Whereas the studies reviewed thus far have been rather general, the literature reviewed in this section were more specifically focused on changes in the concept of self which have been associated with adolescence. One such study by a psychoanalyst was concerned with man in mid-twentieth century America, "with his changing character, with the loss of his old identity, and with his search for a new one."¹ Identity was defined as

a coherent sense of self. It depends upon the awareness that one's endeavors and one's life make sense, that they are meaningful in the context in which life is lived . . . . It is a sense of wholeness, of integration, of knowing what is right and wrong and of being able to choose.²

Insofar as the study focused on youth, Wheelis contended that the questions of adolescence receive no final answers, but neither can they be ignored. The questions are: "Who am I?" "Where am I going?" "What is the meaning of life?" However, he did observe that a person growing up in a small American town in the previous century lived in a relatively homogeneous society, in which the contemporary manners and morals were generally accepted without question. "They provided the basis for the sense of identity. They defined—not one way of life among many—but the way of life, the right way. Following this way of life insured basic security."³

²Ibid., p. 19.
³Ibid., p. 92.
the total performance area as consisting of three regions: a "front region where a particular performance is or may be in progress;" a back region "where action occurs that is related to the performance;" and "the outside" which consists of "all places other than the two already identified."\(^1\) The back region was seen as being a place wherein the actor(s) could relax, prepare for a performance, or from which they might receive cues helpful to the front performance.

Although Goffman identified many dimensions of the total performance, the particular insight which was considered especially meaningful to an understanding of the self was his projection of the individual presenting himself as he wished to appear. If the performance were convincing, the actor's concept of self as presented was reinforced; if not, the actor was faced with the necessity of revising the concept of self presented so as to make it more credible. Thus, Goffman seemed to stress the conscious efforts of the individual to shape his public image (impression management and dramaturgics), while Cooley placed the emphasis on the degree to which the imagined evaluation of one by others was the dominant factor. In comparison, Mead also placed a stronger emphasis on the spontaneous process whereby the individual becomes aware of the "I" and the "me".

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 134-135.
The Problem of Identity

Whereas the studies reviewed thus far have been rather
general, the literature reviewed in this section were more specif­
ically focused on changes in the concept of self which have been
associated with adolescence. One such study by a psychonanalyst was
concerned with man in mid-twentieth century America, "with his
changing character, with the loss of his old identity, and with his
search for a new one." ¹ Identity was defined as

a coherent sense of self. It depends upon the awareness that
one's endeavors and one's life make sense, that they are
meaningful in the context in which life is lived . . . . It
is a sense of wholeness, of integration, of knowing what is
right and wrong and of being able to choose.²

Insofar as the study focused on youth, Wheelis contended
that the questions of adolescence receive no final answers, but
neither can they be ignored. The questions are: "Who am I?"
"Where am I going?" "What is the meaning of life?" However, he did
observe that a person growing up in a small American town in the
previous century lived in a relatively homogeneous society, in which
the contemporary manners and morals were generally accepted without
question. "They provided the basis for the sense of identity. They
defined—not one way of life among many—but the way of life, the
right way. Following this way of life insured basic security."³

¹Allen Wheelis, The Quest for Identity (New York: W. W.
²Ibid., p. 19.
³Ibid., p. 92.
In contrast, he viewed the village society of today as replaced by mass society, in which the existence of heterogeneous mores requires that one select a way of life among many even though conformity thereto fails to provide security. "The approval of others becomes essential."¹ This reliance on external sources of authority was viewed as being acquired and as stressing adjustment. And adjustment in a rapidly changing culture was viewed as resulting in a loss of the sense of self. "Not knowing what he stands for, he does not know who he is."²

In summarizing the above, it was observed that Wheelis described the quest for identity as being much more difficult for youth today because of the current importance of the peer group, the decline in the significance of the family, and the rapidly changing world with its "collapse of values."³

Another scholar, who has contributed to an understanding of childhood and adolescence, employed "the term ego identity to denote certain comprehensive gains which the individual, at the end of adolescence, must have derived from all of his preadult experience in order to be ready for the tasks of adulthood."⁴ The adolescent process was considered to involve a psychological moratorium, which provided the individual an opportunity for experimentation as well as

¹Ibid.  ²Ibid., p. 129.  ³Ibid., p. 175.  
a niche in some section of his society; the latter served as a bridge between "what he was as a child and what he was about to become," and to "reconcile his conception of himself and his community's recognition of him." The psychosocial moratorium provided an opportunity "during which extremes of subjective experience, alternatives of ideological choice, and potentialities of realistic commitment can become the subject of social play and of joint mastery."¹

Erikson stressed the importance of the community's response to the adolescent's need to be recognized by those around him. He argued that any conclusion which holds the existence of an individual (ego) possible against or without a specifically human environment was senseless. He viewed the task facing psychoanalytic sociology as that of "conceptualizing man's environment as the persistent endeavor of the older and more adult egos to join in the organization effort of providing an integrated series of average expectable environments for the young egos."² The recognition granted the individual was seen to focus on more than achievement; the individual, Erikson stated, must be given "function and status as a person whose gradual growth and transformation make sense to those who begin to make sense to him."³

The process of ego identification was presented as a single concept within a wider conception of the human life cycle, and as a

¹Ibid., p. 85.  
²Ibid., p. 77.  
³Ibid., pp. 45-46.
process which began in childhood and continued throughout life. The total process—as he diagrammed it—consisted of eight stages (infancy, early childhood, play age, school age, adolescence, young adult, adulthood, and mature age), each of which was marked by specified developmental problems.

Erikson distinguished between ego identity and ego ideal. The former was "characterized by the more or less actually attained but forever to-be-revised sense of the reality of the self with social reality," while the latter (ego ideal) represented "a set of to-be-strived for but forever not-quite-attainable ideal goals for the self."

Furthermore, identity formation was interpreted by Erikson as having a self-aspect and an ego-aspect. The ego was seen as being a central organizing agency, while the self, ever-changing, was viewed as the awareness of the synthesis attained.

The Ever-Changing Self and Adolescence

The review of literature described above was followed by an evaluation of other studies which dealt with the problems facing youth during the adolescent period. Included in this group were two volumes of background and/or research papers by a number of authors.

1Ibid., p. 75.
Youth in Transition

The first of these volumes was edited by Sherif and Sherif, who also authored the opening chapter dealing with the "Problems of Youth in Transition." The problem of adolescence was described as that of reformulating the concept of self which has been developed during childhood.

The problem may be thought of fruitfully as the process of forming (and changing) conceptions about one's self relative to the many persons, objects, groups, institutions and values that constitute one's environment. Better still, these self-conceptions may be called attitudes, since they not only define denotive ties with aspects of the environment, but also imply their evaluation.

Several factors were viewed as complicating the redefinition of the self concept. Among the first of these were bodily and chemical changes, which were considered bewildering in themselves. To these was added the frustrating experience of spending years during which one may be "neither child or adult, girl or woman, boy or man, neither wholly dependent on adults nor wholly independent of them . . . . What he hears most is that he must postpone. He must wait." Being impatient with the interpretations and alternatives offered him by adults, youth were seen to gravitate toward age-mates, who were understanding in that they shared the same experiences. In contrast, the "youth cultures" which developed, the influences of

---


2Ibid., p. 3

3Ibid.
which may be either for good or evil, were viewed as being neither understood nor appreciated by adults.

Horrocks' contribution to the volume reiterated that "the prime business of growing up is the development of a self concept and the relating of that concept to both the inner and outer environment." He saw involved in this a generalized desire to assert oneself over the environment by construing it in accord with the self-concept that one has built, and even by bringing the environment to serve and nourish that self-concept. The adolescent's problem is that the process is reciprocal, and the environment is even more likely to change the self-concept than the self-concept is to change the environment.

When the latter happened, and no satisfactory rationalization was forthcoming, youth, according to his thesis, turned sometimes from the prescribed patterns to less approved activity and delinquency.

With reference to the transition from childhood to adolescence, an important point was made.

There is an interesting parallelism between this period of habit replacement following the advent of puberty and the period when the small child is passing from the period of initial habits to the period of socialization. One difference is that the adolescent brings to the current replacement the experience of his previous transition, which may have been good or bad. An hypothesis might be that transition to adolescence is easier when the earlier transition was favorable, and difficult when the earlier transition was difficult.

Gottlieb brought to the discussion the observation that no single youth culture existed. He viewed adolescence as "a series of transitions which every individual in every society must undergo. Writing as a sociologist, he contended that

\[1^{\text{Ibid.}, \ pp. \ 15-27.} \quad 2^{\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 17.} \quad 3^{\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 26.}\]
it is essential to view both the social climate or structure of the society and the characteristics unique to a specific group of youth.¹

In a study dealing with college subcultures, it was stated that "youth will become involved in those activities which they perceive as being related to their own goals, and will tend to reject those in which they fail to see a connection between personal goals and potential activity."² An implication of this for interpersonal relations was that youth become involved with referents whom they believed had the ability and desire to help them.

Holtzman and Moore, in a discussion of "Family Structure and Youth Attitudes," indicated that family size created problems for today's youth; that children who live with both parents had fewer problems than those who lived in homes with stepfathers, especially if the original father had been college educated and the stepfather had not; that the loss of the real mother brought about problems whether or not the father remarried; and that ordinal position of the child made no difference.³

Another study by the Sherifs which was reviewed noted that both individual and group levels of analyses were essential to an understanding of youthful behavior.⁴ Although the study emphasized

the primary importance of the reference group,¹ the influences of the neighborhood and larger society were also stressed. Furthermore, a dilemma in anticipating behavior patterns was expressed thusly.

If the physical arrangements of the neighborhood and the behavior of its residents vary over a period of time within definable ranges, and if these affect the pursuit of one's interests, then differing neighborhoods may be expected to play a part in creating different pictures in one's plight or one's fortune, as the case may be.

On the other hand, in a modern society, where mass communication is the rule and where physical movement out of one's neighborhood and city is so greatly eased by modern means of travel, we may also expect that individuals' evaluations and goals would be similar in certain respects in all settings of that society. Here the question is, "How similar are they and with respect to what spheres of living?"²

The findings, based on representative samples of urban high school youth in low, medium, and high socio-economic areas, showed that the respondents possessed "common values, traceable to the larger society, as well as variations in self-radius and goals related to characteristic differences in their neighborhoods."³ While identifying the areas of similarity as "the uniformity and urgency of desires for the good things in life," and an "image of individual success in American life as purveyed by the magic world of TV, movies, papers, magazines, and popular books," the Sherifs concluded that it would be inexcusable to ignore the group "setting

¹Those groups in which one "wants to be counted as an individual, which include the individuals whose opinions make a difference to him, whose standards and goals are his," were defined by the Sherifs as one's reference groups. Ibid., p. 180.

²Ibid., pp. 96-97. ³Ibid., p. 257.
and its available facilities and goals among the independent variables in studying group behavior.\(^1\)

The basic premise put forth by the Sherif's was that age-mates in general, and one's own voluntary associates in particular, become major reference groups for the individual. "They are the ones whose opinions matter and whose actions count."\(^2\) The reason given for this was that individuals who share in the formation of group practices and norms reflect the same in their attitudinal reactions, standing for some persons, objects, groups, and institutions, and against others.

The importance of the reference group to the individual was summarized succinctly as follows:

To the extent that the individual derives a sense of belongingness and a sense of being somebody to be counted through his membership in the group, the group increasingly becomes the source of his personal security and the context for gauging his personal feelings of success and failure in relevant spheres of activity. Hence, ... the binding rules, values, or standards for his conduct are those of his reference group(s).

When he feels that he does not belong, that he is not wanted, and that his interests are not included in the larger scheme of things, his personal sensitivity is aroused in a context of those who do belong to him, who do want him, and who do take account of his interests.\(^3\)

This study was included in the review of literature because it sought to answer the question, "Does growing up ... in different neighborhoods result in differences in youths' conceptions of

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 102.  \(^2\)Ibid., p. 164.  \(^3\)Ibid., p. 251.
themselves, in their values, in goals for the future?" The findings revealed differences, but the observed differences were relative, not absolute or categorical. However, it was noted (1) that the neighborhoods were differentiated according to socio-economic criteria; (2) that the research focused on large cities located in the Southwest; and (3) that the participant-observer technique was employed, using field workers of similar ethnic background and only slightly older than the subjects. Another observation recorded in the study was that school, recreation and community officials were inclined to deny the existence of informal groups of adolescents because the latter were equated with trouble and were, therefore, broken up.

Rural Youth in a Changing Environment

The second edited volume reviewed, and mentioned earlier, contained the unique elements from fifty-four background papers prepared for the conference on "Problems of Rural Youth in a Changing Environment," held at Stillwater, Oklahoma, September 22-25, 1963. These papers, condensed into twenty-seven chapters, were listed under six headings: "(a) Their Rural Community Backgrounds; (b) Rural Education; (c) Physical and Mental Health of Rural Youth;

1Ibid., p. 257.

(d) Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency in Rural Areas; (e) Adapting to Urban Ways; and (f) Helping Socially Disadvantaged Rural Youth."¹

The first chapter viewed contemporary American society to be best understood as a predominantly urbanized and industrialized society, "in which the larger cities organize and integrate commercial, financial, and other activities throughout a large area."² Within this context, it was noted that nonfarm employment in rural areas is not increasing fast enough to absorb rural youth coming of age, "thus ensuring continued heavy outmigration from labor surplus areas."³

The second chapter included a section which dealt with the adverse effects of rural areas, in which it was stated that,

if a rural youth, or an adult for that matter, seeks to improve his personal economic position through outmigration, he confronts many institutional impediments, both public and private .... Generally, only the harder to fill positions and/or the least attractive ones will be open for the rural migrant. Sometimes, too, jobs are rationed on the basis of formal school completion. To the extent that this occurs, many rural migrants are further disadvantaged, especially when labor slackens, because of their low educational attainment.⁴

A chapter by Bealer discussed "The Myth of a Rebellious Adolescent Subculture: Its Detrimental Effects for Understanding Rural Youth."⁵ He concluded that the research record seemed to indicate that rebellion was not a characteristic of youth in the

¹Ibid., p. ix. ²Ibid., p. 3. ³Ibid., pp. 16-17. ⁴Ibid., p. 25. ⁵Ibid., p. 36.
United States. In an attempt to explain the persistence of the myth, the author placed the major responsibility on a confusion with reference to the meaning of culture: youth do not have a separate culture; they differ with adults in their behavior in degree only rather than in kind.

In the section on delinquency, traditional factors were listed as causes: rejection, family, economic, etc. However, it was noted that a change has taken place with reference to treatment. Whereas in the past efforts had been made at changing the individual, recent theory suggested that changing the social situation may be more effective in controlling delinquency.1

The section dealing with "Adjustment to Urban Ways" stressed that rural-to-urban migration was nothing new, but that it has taken on a new significance with the closing of the frontier and the almost simultaneous tightening of immigration quotas; namely, to provide labor for urban industry.2 A youth's decision to migrate was seen to be influenced by his "definition of the situation," the degree of cohesiveness in the family, and the degree to which the parents stimulated and motivated him.

When youth did migrate, usually to larger towns and cities accessible to the home community, they were aided in their assimilation by education, a task for which the rural community school was

---

1Because this study dealt with types of juvenile offenders, a more extensive review of the same is not included even though this concern motivated, in part, this research.

2Ibid., pp. 257-370.
considered hardly adequate. In reference to this, the question was raised whether "any community is really committed to assimilating youth unless it is taking a major step to improve its schooling," as well as the quality of its housing and neighborhoods. To say that one wants to assimilate people without supporting that statement with community funds and actions was considered simply "to disillusion those who are not already disillusioned." ¹

Socialization in a Community Setting

Another study which dealt with the community, especially community structure, sought "to provide a meaningful frame for community analysis and to demonstrate its potential application to community development." ² Within this framework, the community was defined formally as the structure of elements (relationships among institutions, groups, formal organizations, or other component units within the community) and dimensions (the all-pervasive patterns these relationships may take) "to solve problems which must be solved within the local area." ³

Among the contributions of this study were the observations or principles contained within or at the end of each chapter. For instance, it was noted that

¹Ibid., pp. 284-285.


³Ibid., pp. 21-24.
it is the contention of some observers that the adjustment of youth to the institutions of the community is becoming less favorable, an observation that foreshadows trouble for the community if age can be regarded as a factor predictive of the behavior of future adults.¹

It was also noted that, in most small communities, "the school is the largest enterprise in the community, both in terms of budget and number of people involved."² The significance of this observation is that, although the rural school may be hardly adequate in preparing its youth for urban life, it does represent a major effort of the rural community.

Another book, intended primarily as a text for undergraduate courses, viewed the community as a social system.³ One of its contributions was the distinction it made between system and structure: a social system was defined simply as a set of interrelated parts; while a social structure was presented as a particular pattern of relationships between the parts, which is identifiable at a given point in time, and also retains a degree of consistency over a period of time.

Sanders viewed the community as a social system, which could be considered to consist of two aspects. The community could be studied with a focus on its setting and components, or with its

¹Ibid., p. 212.    ²Ibid., p. 344.
operations in mind. The first of these investigated how a community was structured and organized; the second was concerned with how a community operated.

A more empirical study, although primarily concerned with determining "trends in the amount of trade center decline and the kinds and locations of centers susceptible to decline," has been cited because of its definition of a viable center as "one that can sustain, or even enhance, its position as a commercial center in the context of normal social and economic change."1 Youth who lived in a viable center, as defined above, could be expected to be more viable and to reflect the same in their attitudes toward themselves, others, and their communities.

An abstract of another Canadian study indicated that loss of population in a rural area, with a subsequent decline or disappearance of hamlets and convenience centers was not the only type of problem rural areas have to face. In the research cited, three arctic communities were compared.2 All of the communities had experienced increasing amounts of modernization, had common cultural backgrounds, and had differential contact histories with the dominant Canadian society. This study served as a reminder that more


modern rural communities might be experiencing an even greater level-of-living struggle, if it were not for the extensive out-migration of youth that has taken place.

Another American study sought "to trace in detail the relationship between the rural community and the various agencies and institutions of American mass society that affect rural life." The authors presented their book as a descriptive and social analysis, not as a prescription or a prognosis. Furthermore, they did not profess to have studied the community "whole." Areas such as marriage, courtship, and child rearing were not directly treated, nor was any particular attention given to the problems of youth.

This book was included in this review because it was considered to be an example of the rural community operating within the context of urbanized social organization. Springdale's people were pictured as living in a world which they could not and did not control. In that life must go on, various forms of illusion and defense were employed. These enabled the inhabitants to perform their daily duties, to be useful and productive to a degree, and to live, to a certain extent, "full and not wholly unenjoyable" lives. The question raised by these authors was, "Do rural people today

---


engage in self-deception to keep from facing the real state of affairs, namely, control and domination by the mass society?"

After having surveyed what this writer considered to be a pessimistic, if not cynical, evaluation of a rural community in its relationship to mass society, a brief review was made of one of the controversial yet influential interpretations of the American experience: "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," an essay written by Frederick Jackson Turner and read before the American Historical Society meeting in 1893. It opened a new period in the interpretation of the history of the United States, and stimulated the production of numerous monographs by students who explored and documented the thesis that the frontier had been the dominant factor in American institutional development. The thesis gained wide acceptance in popular thought, for it proved "to be emotionally satisfying to the generation to which it was addressed."

Turner argued that the most important effect "of the frontier has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe," but warned that

the democracy born of free land, strong in selfishness and individualism, intolerant of administrative experience and education, and pressing individual liberty beyond its proper bounds, has

---

its dangers as well as its benefits. Individualism in America is allowed a laxity in regards to governmental affairs which has rendered possible the spoils system and all the manifest evils that follow from the lack of a highly developed civic spirit.  

Critics of Turner's thesis have attempted to minimize its importance. For instance, one historian wrote that urban America intrigued Turner no less than the West, for he had prepared an outline on "The Significance of the City in American History."  

Another writer suggested that Turner may have overestimated the uniqueness of America's frontier experience, while admitting that products of the frontier--rugged individualism and laissez faire--were still powerful forces.  

It was also noted that an Italian economist, Loria, had advanced the thesis that the gradual decrease of free land, not the moving frontier, was the basic factor in the social development of America.  

A Swedish economist also challenged Turner's thesis, contending that "the protecting oceans were as important as the frontier for American domestic development and,

\[
1\text{Ibid., pp. 671-672.}
\]
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2\text{Roy A. Billington, "Why Some Historians Rarely Write History: A Case Study of Frederick Jackson Turner," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, L (June, 1963 - March, 1964), pp. 3-27.}
\]
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particularly, its system of government, a fact not adequately developed by historians. ¹

A major theoretical development, which shares with the above an interest in history, has been set forth by Martindale in two of his recent books. Although the basic elements were observable in the earlier book,² they have been refined and given universal significance in the more recent volume.³ Much of the latter book was devoted to a discussion of the ceaseless way in which man has varied his social arrangements in his attempts at the mastery of nature, socialization, and social control.

Seeking to supply a historical perspective within which the uniqueness of large-scale organizations may be appreciated, he developed "a rough typology of historically significant human communities."⁴ Martindale defined the community as "a grand strategy of collective life, representing a modification of the various group strategies by considerations that exceed the limited objectives of specific groups."⁵ One of the group strategies with which he saw the community concerned was the transformation of man into a human

⁴Ibid., p. xv. ⁵Ibid., p. 533.
being—socialization. Relating this strategy to the rough typology he had developed, he stated that there is sufficient evidence to show that each of the various historically significant communities has carried out the task of socialization in ways unique to it. Our age is engaged in its own special organization of the institutions of socialization.¹

In a study focused on the process—socialization—rather than the setting—the community—Elkins defined socialization "as the process by which someone learns the ways of a given society or social group so that he can function within it."² He added that socialization includes both the learning and internalizing of appropriate patterns, values, and feelings . . . . The term socialization, in itself, refers to learning the ways of any established and continuing group—an immigrant becomes socialized into the life of his new country; a recruit into the life of the Army; a new insurance agent into the patterns of his company and job.³

Two other writers have discussed the relationship between socialization and the changing environment.⁴ Wheeler stated his position as follows.

Just as individuals may become differently socialized because of differences in past experiences, motivations, and capacities, so may they become differently socialized because of differences in the structure of the social settings in which they interact.

¹Ibid., p. 400.


³Ibid.

The guiding assumption is simply that in many situations individuals remain highly adaptable and flexible, prepared to fit their behavior into the demands of the current social context. The result is that we must not only look at underlying motives, that is, how people have internalized deeply rooted features of the social order. Much can also be learned by taking a close look at the structure and situation within which it occurs.¹

He further suggested that the effect of socialization settings on socialization outcomes may be mediated through a parallel set of intervening processes. These were considered capable of changing

(a) the organization's capacity to provide clear and unambiguous norms for performance, (b) its capacity to provide opportunities for learning and practicing the required performance, or (c) its capacity to selectively reward the behavior of its recruits.²

He expected that the most favorable socialization outcomes, from the point of view of the socializing agency, would occur

in settings where the typical recruit is motivated and capable of learning . . . . and where the setting itself presents a clear normative structure, offers many opportunities for performance, and has the power of selective reward.³

Brim also focused on the complexity of modern societies and the possibility that socialization is never complete or totally effective.⁴ After employing a truism (people learn different things at different times and places in their lives), he specified six

¹Ibid., p. 54. ²Ibid., p. 110. ³Ibid., p. 112. ⁴Ibid., p. 24. A statement attributed to R. C. Angell listed the conditions essential for effective socialization as follows: "A child is most likely to internalize the common values and norms of his society when (1) the society itself is well integrated; (2) he lives in a stable neighborhood or community; (3) his family
probable changes in the content of socialization which accompany the varying life-cycle changes. The most important of these he considered to be a shift from a concern with values and motives to a concern with overt behavior.

Attitudinal Differences Among Youth

Studies reviewed which focused on the product of socialization rather than the setting and content were of two types.

General Studies

One of these included studies which dealt with career aspirations and experiences of rural youth, such as those sponsored by the Works Progress Administration in the late 1930's; e.g., "Youth in Agricultural Villages," by Bruce L. Melvin and Elna N. Smith.¹ In more recent years, similar studies have been a part of North Central Regional projects; e.g., "Career Choices of Rural

¹Bruce L. Melvin and Elna N. Smith, "Youth in Agricultural Villages," Research Monograph XXI, Works Progress Administration, 1940.
Youth in a Changing Society,"¹ and a contemporary study of high school students in South Dakota.²

The first of these attempted to summarize and integrate research findings relative to the factors that influence the occupational choices youth make. Specifically, the report dealt with the following.

1. The process and stages involved in making an occupational choice.
2. Comparison of the process of occupational choice and occupational achievement between rural and urban youth.
4. Comparison of factors which differentiate between farm-reared boys planning to farm and those planning non-farm careers.
5. Research findings in understanding occupational choices.
6. Some considerations for programs that should improve occupational choices among rural youth.³

The South Dakota study reportedly found that high school seniors tend to make their career selections on the basis of job title rather than job content. It also found that parents were rated most influential in shaping educational plans of their children.⁴


²A brief reference to this project has been made in Appendix B, page 140.

³Burchinal, loc. cit., p. 3.

Several similar studies have been made with Wisconsin subjects. One of these used a random sample of farm boys who were high school seniors in 1957 (N = 932). Among the findings were the following: (1) planning to farm had a depressing effect on educational aspirations, while choosing a professional or executive occupation tended to raise them; (2) the more receptive a student was to new ideas the less apt he was to plan on farming, and the more likely he was to choose a professional or executive occupation; and (3) the degree to which significant others expected high achievement was inversely related to farming plans and directly related to professional or executive occupational plans.

Another Wisconsin study explored the correspondence between "the social psychological characteristics of farm boys, their occupational choices, and the needs of society for optimum allocation of talent to various occupations." It found that boys from farm backgrounds generally match, in social and psychological characteristics, the occupations they prefer to enter. A third study compared the "entrepreneurial orientation" of 416 boys from Washington County, Wisconsin. On the measures employed to ascertain the entrepreneurial factor(s), farm boys scored lowest, with

---


the working-class boys only slightly higher, and the middle-class boys highest.¹

On a statewide study of students in thirty rural high schools in Washington, Slocum did not find lower levels of educational aspiration among farm than among nonfarm high school students, as had previous studies by American rural sociologists. He attributed the relatively high levels of educational aspirations and expectations of farm boys and girls to family and peer (reference) groups and the long-term influence of the state's educational system. The need to leave farming was seen to have been communicated to a majority of farm boys and girls; those who did plan to farm had been convinced of the need for scientific knowledge in successful farming.²

An Arkansas study revealed that the aspirations of senior high school boys from a low-income area compared favorably with those of boys in higher-income areas; however, the authors considered their major finding to be that "a lack of capabilities may be a more limiting factor than aspiration levels in the occupational


achievement of rural youth." The findings implied that the social environment, including education, may exercise more of a restraint on capabilities necessary for occupational success than on occupational aspirations.

A study of the relationship between occupational aspiration and occupational achievement, covering a ten-year period for 1001 young males, produced findings which complemented those of the previous study. Although adolescent aspirations were found to be positively related to subsequent occupational attainments, the general conclusion was that aspirations do not appear to be a good predictive device for long-run occupational attainments. Furthermore, this study found that the discrepancy between aspiration and achievement varied directly with the relative prestige level of the original occupational choice.

The studies reviewed above, although not exhaustive, were found to be representative of those dealing with the career aspirations of youth. For the most part, distinctions between subjects were made on a rural-urban or on a farm-nonfarm basis. Little or no attention was given to specific variables and particular communities, such as has been done in the studies discussed below.


Community Studies

Studies which did deal with particular communities were of two types. The first of these consisted primarily of descriptive studies, in vogue about 1940, which did suggest, overtly or covertly, something about the orientation of these communities with reference to their youth. Only selected sections which imply or express something about how these communities felt about youth have been cited.

The first of these studied a rural New Mexico community, in which the youth were becoming increasingly inclined to look for opportunities away from home.\(^1\) Two developments encouraged this attitude: on the one hand were the pull factors, represented by recently established government agencies for young people (such as the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration); on the other hand, the influence of the opinions of the older people worked to encourage youth to emigrate. With reference to the latter, it was noted that the older people are not concerned about the new tendency on the part of a few young men to leave El Cerito. They regard such a move as advantageous because it alleviates the pressure of population at home, and feel that the movement should be encouraged as much as possible. Under present conditions they see no other solution to the overcrowded

---

situation than making jobs available in town for a large number of local young men.\footnote{Ibid., p. 61.}

A second study was concerned with a contemporary (1940) rural community delineated on the basis of the area served by a high school.\footnote{Earl H. Bell, "Culture of a Contemporary Rural Community: Sublette, Kansas," Rural Life Series: 2, U. S. Department of Agriculture, September, 1942.} It asked, "What happens to the youth?" A follow-up of high school graduates revealed that seventy-two per cent had left the county. Furthermore, the study revealed that those who leave rarely return. The important observation here was not how the adults felt about most youth leaving the county, but how prepared did they consider their youth to be.

In general, the people assume that their young people can compete anywhere, although they do not have outstanding success stories.

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 101-103.}

Objectively, the people generally recognize the curtailment of opportunity on the outside but, emotionally they are beginning to blame the young people. Several said that the young folks lack ambition; that they are satisfied to stay around home and not try to get anything to do.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 101-103.}

In this study also, the community seemed anxious to export its excess youth, but the latter were reluctant to leave and were subjected to criticism.

A third study described a New England community from which many youth had left for other rural areas, some to work in small
towns, and an apparent majority to find employment in the cities. The remaining youth were so few in number that it became difficult to conduct "games, parties, or other forms of group activity." The authors described the community as thinking well of the young people who get employment elsewhere as soon as they are finished with school. The present farmers realize that most of the young men have little to start a farm with a reasonable chance of success. City work is simply the sensible choice of a boy who wishes to be something more than a casual laborer.

Implied in the above was the idea that "good youth" move out of the community after graduating from high school.

A fourth study in this series described an Old Order Amish community in Pennsylvania. Here the problem with reference to youth was "restraining" them within the community, rather than exporting them. The post-adolescent, pre-marriage years were considered the most critical age-period. In 1939, the chief conflict seemed to center around the desire of these youth for forbidden pleasures; e.g., the automobile. The primary remedy employed was that of an early marriage, which the elders believed would check the

---


2Ibid., pp. 88-90.

"wildness" of youngsters. "When they marry, we can usually stop worrying about them."\(^1\)

The fifth community study reviewed revealed that most of the Iowa farm boys in a sample (20 of 35) wanted to farm, although a larger proportion of girls favored small town or village life. The young men in the study were confident that they would become more successful in agriculture than their parental generation had been.

This community appeared to have been a classic example of the popular stereotype of virtuous rural life.

During the years he is in school and after his schooling is finished, a boy, if not needed at home, is expected to work out as a farm hand or at some other employment. In somewhat the same way a girl, after her schooling is done, is to do the work for which she is prepared, or work with her parents, or work for others at some honorable employment . . . . As soon as young people are settled in their own minds, they should marry, and early in their married life they should have children.\(^2\)

Generally, the young people were seen to adhere rather closely to the prevailing moral standards with reference to crime and delinquency.

The final community study in this series was noteworthy in that it included "parents whose children were, for the most part, grown up and had migrated to the city. All were virtually forced to leave the community because of the lack of opportunities there."\(^3\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 78.


Other more recent studies, and more directly related to the research reported in this paper, attempted to identify attitudinal and/or adjustment differences between rural and urban youth. In one such study, data were gathered from three New York City schools, and one town school which was attended by both town and farm children.\(^1\) The data revealed that the suburban children, in these samples, were the most adjusted, the urban children ranked next, the rural children third, and town children poorest of all. The urban way of life was considered advantageous because of (a) a wider range of social contacts, (b) a greater exposure to the mass media, and (c) better schools. However, it was noted that the rural-urban gap was narrowing as urban values spread to rural areas.

A study of all 17-year old boys in a Michigan county in the spring of 1957, indicated that personality orientations are related to residence; e.g., farm boys scored lower than urban boys on intelligence and educational aspirations.\(^2\) In another study concerned with residence, a sociometric questionnaire was administered to the entire population of a high school, the purposes of which were: (1) to investigate the existence of preference and prejudice by rural and urban schoolmates for each other; (2) to discern the


alterations in indices of preferences in different activities; and
(3) to isolate by chi-square analysis the respects in which persons
who make out-group choices differ from those who restrict their
choices to the in-group. The findings revealed (1) that substan-
tial preference and prejudice by students for each other exist along
residential lines, (2) that minority-group status is accorded rural
students by urban schoolmates and is accepted by rural students, and
(3) that certain avenues of affiliation and participation serve as
socializing and desocializing devices.

The implications of the above two studies have been qualified
by two non-American studies. Schwarzweller, in a study of German
youth, found that social status of the parental family appeared to be
a far more important determinant of career choices and socioeconomic
life chances of youth than the degree of rurality of residence.
Likewise, Balan's study of farmers' sons in Monterey, a large
Mexican industrial city, showed that farm background per se did not
impose a handicap. Found to be more important was the ability of
the farmer to provide his offspring the opportunity to grow up in an

---

1Louis H. Orzack, "Preference and Prejudice Patterns Among
Rural and Urban Schoolmates," Rural Sociology, XXI (March, 1956),
pp. 29-33.

2Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Community of Residence and Career
Choices of German Rural Youth," Rural Sociology, XXXII (March, 1968),
pp. 46-63.

3Jorge Balan, "Are Farmers' Sons Handicapped in the City?"
urban environment. Thus, Balan stated that "status of origin is a more important predictor than size or zone of the community of origin."

The above studies indicated that the resources of the family are a critical variable in the adjustment of youth, rural and urban. This observation was supported by Boyle's findings in a survey of 1,701 high school girls in Western Canada. Seeking an explanation for the documented lower aspirations of adolescent residents of smaller communities, he concluded that differences in educational opportunities available to students living in communities of different size may be the important explanation for the lower scholastic ability of rural high school students. The reason given was that, generally speaking, community size is directly related to a community's ability to provide adequate educational facilities. However, no indications were given as to how large the size differences must be before size can be considered an important variable.

---

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Guiding Principles

The guiding principles for this study developed out of the review of literature discussed in the previous chapter. These consist of a number of interrelated observations and/or generalizations which have been stated as follows:

1. The attitudes an individual has toward himself, others, concepts and objects, are products of social interaction.

2. Attitude development, thus, is concurrent with membership and/or participation in a group.

3. Although the family is recognized as the primary group (socializing agency), it functions within the context of a community, in which both individual and family attitudes are shaped.

4. The process of attitude formation begins in infancy, and the particular attitudes developed therein are potentially modifiable throughout the life cycle. The period of adolescence, especially, has been depicted as being preoccupied with the reformulation of attitudes about self, others, concepts and objects.

5. Individuals, including youth, who have experienced success within a community (as measured by criteria specified in a later section of this report) reflect more positive attitudes toward themselves, their communities and institutions, than the less successful.
6. Communities differ with reference to the degree to which their structures are oriented toward helping all members of the community achieve success. Some communities can be thought of as arenas within which families and individuals compete with one another, while other communities appear to be attempting to provide successful experiences for all their members.

7. Communities differ with respect to growth status, with the growing community being able to provide more members with successful experiences than a stable or declining community. Migration rates as well as questionnaire items provide support for this observation.

8. Communities differing in growth status, not to mention structure, may also be found to differ ecologically even though sharing a similar geographical and economic environment.

The Hypotheses

Within the context of the above guiding principles, the following hypotheses were formulated.

1. There are observable ecological and socioeconomic differences between communities which are related to growth status.

2. Successful youth in a community, the stars as indicated by their classmates, differ from the isolates in (a) intelligence,

1A typology of communities was developed on the basis of its orientation toward its members. See page 158 of Appendix D for a brief description.
(b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

3. Popularity is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

4. Being identified as having done most for the class and/or school is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

5. Predicted success in the post-high school years is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

6. Stars express more positive attitudes than isolates toward (a) the community, (b) its institutions, and (c) the future.

7. Positive attitudes toward self, others, concepts and objects, are a function of differential experiences within a given structure rather than related to different community structures.

8. Positive attitudes toward self, others, concepts and objects are a function of differential experiences with success within a community rather than of the community's growth status.

Criteria for Selection of Communities

Earlier it was stated that the three communities used in this study would differ with reference to growth status; i.e., one would have had a consistent record of population growth, a second of stability, and a third community would have declined, as follows:
1) growing community, a population increase of five per cent or more, between 1940 and 1960;

2) stable community, a population increase or decrease of less than five per cent; and

3) declining community, a population decrease of five per cent or more in the 1940-1960 period.

Inasmuch as growth status was to be used as an independent variable, it was considered essential that the communities to be studied be matched as closely as possible. In an attempt to do this, the following additional criteria were initially established to guide in the selection of the sample communities.

1. A population in excess of 1,000 in 1940 and, preferably, of less than 1,250. This criterion was established because it is generally accepted that communities of a lesser size tend to decline.

2. All of the communities should be county seat towns, or none of them should. The reason for this was that county seat towns tend to hold their population numbers, or to grow.

3. A similar geographic base; that is, the soil, annual rainfall, and annual temperature should be such that no one of the communities would have an agriculturally productive advantage over the others. Balancing for this factor reduced the possibility that the growth or decline of a community could be attributed to non-cultural factors.
It was recognized that other variables warranted consideration also; and some of these have been identified in the description of the sample communities.

Collection of Data

The collection of data for this paper consisted of five main phases, the first of which was a period of about five years, during which selective perception operated; i.e., any literature encountered in the researcher's reading was either recorded or incorporated into his total understanding of the research problem area. This long period of observation and reflection proved to be invaluable when the time came to take more specific action.

The second phase consisted of (a) the selection of the sample of matched communities, a task difficult in itself but rendered more difficult because of a desire to eliminate from consideration communities already included in research projects underway by the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University; (b) the preparation and pretesting of instruments; and (c) the use of secondary sources, such as Census data and historical materials, to obtain a more exact understanding of the peculiar characteristics of the communities to be studied.

The instruments prepared consisted of the questionnaire given to the high school seniors in the sample communities. The questionnaire included personal data and check list items, as well as its two main features. One of these was a sociometric device aimed at identifying, in each community, the probably successful
(the stars) and the less successful (the isolates). The second feature consisted of a form of the Twenty Statements Test. In the first instance each member of the class was asked to name three fellow members of the class who (1) were most popular, (2) had done most for the class or for the school, and (3) were most apt to succeed in the post-high school years. The purpose of this was to measure attitudinal differences between the "stars" and the "isolates," as well as between youth of the sample communities. These were pre-tested, using a senior high school class, not identified with the actual study, as the pretest sample. Several adjustments were made before the questionnaire was administered to the sample subjects. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B. The other instrument, a set of open-ended questions used in interviews with community leaders, was drafted, tested, and revised. A copy of this instrument is included in Appendix A.

A third phase of the data collecting consisted of securing permission, from the school superintendents in the sample communities, to group interview the members of their senior classes. The permission was readily granted, and the questionnaires were

---

1This premise has been supported by Walter Slocum, "The Influence of Reference Group Values on Educational Aspirations of Rural High School Youth," Rural Sociology, XXXII (September, 1967), p. 271. "In addition, the aspirations of youth may be influenced by his self concept. This is considered to be a product of his experiences, including his evaluation of the esteem with which significant others regard him."

2The High School Superintendents: Lyle Lester, De Smet; E. G. Harris, Howard; and Clifford Jansen, Armour.
administered the early part of May, 1967. While in the communities doing the above, an attempt was made to make initial contacts with the editors of the weekly newspapers. Brief visits were held with two of the three, one editor not being in at the time. The main purpose of these visits was to inform these community leaders that a study was being made which involved their communities, and to assure them that they would be consulted when the interviewing of adults would be conducted later in the summer. Also, a six-month subscription to each of these weeklies was ordered.

The fourth phase of the data collecting consisted of spending a number of days in each of these communities, observing and interviewing community leaders. A schedule was established whereby the same days of the week—Thursday through Sunday—could be spent in the growing and declining communities, while the intervening days, Monday through Wednesday, would be spent in the stable community. This was done in August of 1967.

Basically, the same approach was followed in each community. The first stop was at the newspaper office, and consisted of interviewing the editor. From a list of names supplied by him, other interviews were conducted until the researcher was satisfied that the important community leaders had been identified and interviewed, and that a reasonably reliable picture of the leadership structure

---

1Hadley Klug, Graduate Assistant, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, Brookings, assisted in this phase.
had been obtained. These structured interviews were supplemented by casual observations and other informal conversations. Two clergy-men were interviewed in the growing community, and three in the declining community. Only one was interviewed in the stable community, the only one "available," in that several were on vacation or in the process of moving. A Sunday Worship Service was attended in the communities visited on weekends. In each instance, it was a congregation associated with the United Church of Christ (formerly Congregational and Reformed). This permitted a balance between the communities, and was considered more meaningful than visiting different denominations in each community. (Incidentally, both of these congregations had new buildings.)

The fifth phase of the data collecting consisted of a detailed analysis of the editorials and front-page items in each of the community's weekly newspapers as the latter related to youth. Although a few of the first issues were surveyed so as to get some feeling of the communities before entering them, the actual analysis of the papers did not begin until the six-month subscription had expired. This material was used to classify the communities in the typology mentioned earlier.

Limitations of Study

After describing the procedures employed in collecting the data, some limitations of the study were noted.

1. Although it was hoped that the conceptual framework and tools developed herewith may be useful elsewhere, especially
the typology of communities, it was not intended that the findings would be valid other than for the communities involved.

2. In that the sample communities were matched on three basic criteria, and shared a common regional culture, it was not expected that major inter-community attitudinal differences would be observed. This limitation has been incorporated into one of the hypotheses mentioned above.

3. A limitation suggested by the review of literature is that the viability of a trade center community may exert a greater impact on developing attitudes than growth status. Viability is the essence of social organization; growth status is not.

4. A fourth and major limitation of this study was the lapse of time between the period used in determining growth status (1940-1960) and the year in which the field work was done (1967). If the data had been collected immediately after the 1960 Census data became available, the findings might have differed more and reflected a greater importance of growth status as an independent variable.

5. In that the youth respondents in this study were to graduate from high school shortly, their agemates who did not finish high school were not represented in these samples. The implication of this is that they had experienced less success than the isolates and, therefore, observed attitudinal differences would be greater if they had been included.
6. The final limitation, truly a posteriori, was the influence of a situation encountered in the field work. Several of the interviewees were somewhat apprehensive and guarded at first, until it became clear to them that the interviewer was not identified with a legislative research committee seeking to effect a reorganization of county government in South Dakota. In all communities, the feeling was expressed that any of the proposed reorganization plans would have a detrimental effect on the sample communities.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The Communities Selected for Study

Using the criteria mentioned previously, three communities were selected for study. Each of these communities was evaluated in terms of the criteria. The communities were:

1) the growing community: De Smet, County Seat of Kingsbury County;

2) the stable community: Howard, County Seat of Miner County; and

3) the declining community: Armour, County Seat of Douglas County.

Population Data

The population data for the three communities is presented in Table IV-1. The data show that the growing and declining communities had almost identical populations in 1940 (De Smet, 1016, and Armour, 1013). The stable community also qualified for each decade as well as for the over-all 1940-1960 period.

County Seat Towns

Each of the communities was a county seat town and had been since the beginning of the Twentieth Century. However, only De Smet has been a county seat since the organization of the county. Howard
TABLE IV-1.--Population changes in the selected communities during the 1940-1960 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>De Smet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1950</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1960</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1960</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was the second county seat in Miner County, and Armour was the fourth community to host the courthouse in Douglas County. Details as to the struggle for the honor of being the county seat have been discussed in the section on the historical backgrounds of the communities.

Geographical Factors

Various indices have been used in comparing geographical factors, but the most common of these--soil, moisture, and temperature--were used in this study. The first of these, soil, was evaluated in several ways: one approach revealed that all three
communities were located in the Chernozem Region with reference to South Dakota's three major soil regions,\textsuperscript{1} and were alike in their soil problems—moisture conservation and fertility maintenance.

Soils have also been compared on the basis of their total consumptive use of water. Here, again, the soils of the selected communities compared favorably. All three communities have been classified the same (Area IV) with reference to Precipitation Effectiveness, an index based on a combination of rainfall and temperature.\textsuperscript{2} Douglas County has had a higher average temperature, which has been counter-balanced by a higher average rainfall.

The third basis on which soils were compared was to match land use and productivity. This indicated minor and insignificant differences, on the basis of which it was concluded that the geographical factor as reflected in soil productivity did not differentiate any one of the communities from the others.

History and Background

In an attempt to identify background factors which might have differentiated the communities, a history of each of the communities and counties included in this study was compiled. Other than noting that Douglas County had been settled primarily by two

\textsuperscript{1}Soil Survey Series No. 3, Agronomy Department, Agricultural Experiment Station, South Dakota State College, Brookings, pp. 10-20.

\textsuperscript{2}Interview with Dr. Fred Westin, Soils Specialist, Agronomy Department, South Dakota State University, Brookings.
nationality groups--from Germany and Holland--while the other counties were more heterogeneous, the historical similarities were considered more important than the differences. The histories as compiled appear in Appendix E.

**Community Growth Status as a Dependent Variable**

The criteria employed in selecting the three communities included in this study have been discussed; that is, the geographical base, size of community in 1940, and whether or not the community was a county seat town. The next task sought to enumerate other possible variables as these may have exerted a continuing influence on a community's growth status.¹

**First hypothesis:** There are observable ecological and socio-economic differences between communities which are related to growth status.

**Size of Political Unit**

One observed variable that may have affected a county seat community was the size of the county in which the community is located. The assumption was that, although a county seat town does not have a monopoly on the shopping loyalty of the county's population, nor is its service or shopping area necessarily restricted to the county's population, a legal identity does exist. Therefore, if

¹Growth status as used herein refers to whether a community has been growing, declining, or remaining relatively stable in terms of population numbers.
counties were balanced for population density, the county seat town in the larger county would have identified with it a larger population.

The data in Table IV-2 show that the three counties in which the communities under study were located did differ in size as one anticipated; that is, the growing community was in the largest county, the stable community was in the middle-sized county, and the declining community was in the smallest county.

**TABLE IV-2.--A ranking of the counties in the study on the basis of square miles and total acres.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County Seat</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>552,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>299,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population Density**

As suggested above, a larger territorial area did not guarantee a larger population; therefore, population density was considered as a variable. These data, presented in Table IV-3, show that the smallest county had the greatest density, the middle-sized county the least density, and the largest county a density which was nearly mid-way between the other two. This was not what one expected to find, if the counties were balanced for size. Thus,
this variable gave support to the importance of county size when related to growth status of county seat towns.

TABLE IV-3.--Population density and the selected counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County Seat</th>
<th>Persons/Square Mile*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Heterogeneity of Population

A variable considered of equal importance with population density, but for a different reason, was the heterogeneity of the population. It was assumed that a more heterogeneous population, usually associated with urban areas, would be less resistant to innovations (social change) than a population made up of a single or several strong ethnic groups. If one accepted this premise, one would expect the declining community to be most homogeneous and the growing community to be most heterogeneous.

Interviews with community leaders supported the latter of these expectations. The growing community leaders made mention of the fact that the community was not dominated by any religious and/or ethnic group. In fact, the churches of the growing community
were ecumenical in their programs, with Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Methodist, and the United Church of Christ clergymen working together in a ministerial association, and also cooperating in special observances during the church year.

The heterogeneity of the growing community has been a long-standing tradition. Available historical data revealed that most northern European nationality groups were represented among the early settlers.

The anticipated homogeneity of the declining community, on the other hand, was not supported by observation. Again, as in the growing community, clergymen of Catholic and Reformation traditions worked together on problems and projects of concern to the larger community. However, the ecumenical spirit did not appear to be as zealous as in the growing community. Furthermore, a major denomination (Lutheran) minister remained somewhat aloof from the other clergymen in town; although the night before the researcher entered the community, this minister had participated with the other clergymen in assisting at a barbeque put on by the commercial club as part of the annual achievement days for the County's 4-H Clubs.

An observed difference between the growing and declining communities in this respect was that the latter had been influenced by the fact that strong ethnic groups have existed in the county as a result of early settlement patterns. It was reported that few of the youth from these ethnic communities settled in Armour, or made it a first stop in their movement away from the home community.
Instead, they usually went directly to urban communities which were heavily represented by persons of similar ethnic background. It was also of more than passing interest to know that the pastor of the Reformed Church in the declining community considered his congregation to be more cosmopolitan than other Reformed Churches in the area.

In contrast to the cooperative attitude prevailing among the churches in the growing and declining communities, especially the former, ecumenism was almost non-existent in the stable community.¹ The situation in the stable community suggested that heterogeneity is conducive to community growth and/or change only if the diverse groups exchanged ideas and expressed mutual confidence in and respect for each other. In summary, with reference to cooperative-heterogeneity, the growing community appeared to manifest most, with the declining community slightly less, and the stable community manifesting the least of the three.

Age Distribution

One of the variables, usually considered critical with reference to population, is the age distribution. In evaluating age

¹One interviewee reported that the pastor and church board of one congregation refused to let a minister of another congregation enter the congregation's cemetery to officiate at the internment of a member who was reportedly not in "good standing." In this community it was suggested that one not even attempt to interview the pastor of one of the established congregations, for the simple reason that in all probability an interview could not be obtained. (No interview was attempted.)
distribution as a variable related to growth status, four ratios—Dependency Ratio (DR), Child Dependency Ratio (CDR), Aged Dependency Ratio (ADR), and Young Adult Ratio (YAR)—and the Index of Aging (IA) were employed. Data for these are presented in Table IV-4.

An analysis of the data in Table IV-4 reveals that each of the participating communities experienced an increase in DR, CDR, ADR, and IA between 1940 and 1960, and a decline in YAR. In each instance, the 1960 figures for the first four indices mentioned above exceeded those for the State of South Dakota as well as for the United States as a whole. Also, the YAR for each of these communities was below that of the State of South Dakota as well as for the whole United States.

A more detailed analysis revealed that Armour, although having the lowest DR of the three communities being studied, was the only county seat town of the three to have a higher DR than for the whole county. Conversely, Armour was the only town to have a YAR in 1960 that was lower than for the total county.

Perhaps the most important of these indices is the IA. According to the Index of Aging, the communities ranked as one might hypothesize, if one used the relationship of the county seat IA to the county IA in 1960. The De Smet IA was 120 per cent of that for Kingsbury County, the Howard IA was 153 per cent of the Miner County IA, and the Armour IA was 193 per cent of the Douglas County IA.

The observed IA for Douglas County was almost identical with the IA for the State of South Dakota (31.1 and 31.3 respectively),
TABLE IV-4.--Selected dependency and aging ratios for the participating counties, communities, the State of South Dakota and the United States.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit and Year</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>CDR</th>
<th>ADR</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>YAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour, 1960</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury County,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Smet, 1960</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner County,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, 1960</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota, 1940</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States, 1940</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratios compiled by J. Pew, Graduate Assistant, SDSU Department of Rural Sociology and based on U. S. Census data. Formulas given in Appendix C.
and more similar to that of the United States (29.7) than were the IA's of Kingsbury and Miner Counties (39.9 and 41.6 respectively). The fact that Howard had a somewhat higher IA than Armour was considered of secondary importance to the writer; of greater concern was the relation of the IA of Armour to that of Douglas County as a whole.

Armour's high IA relative to Douglas County's is more readily understood if one considers statements made by several interviewees. One stated that there were at least ninety houses in Armour being occupied solely by widows. Another stated that the going wages in Armour would not support a family man. A third pointed out that youth in the area tend to by-pass Armour and move directly to urban areas within and without the State of South Dakota.

In summary it can be said that the indices of age distribution employed in this study suggested that a declining county seat town is more apt to have an IA considerably higher than that for the total county, while the growing county seat town's IA more nearly approximates that of the county in which it is located.

Migration Rates

Another relevant phenomenon, related to age distribution of the population, was that of migration rates. Table IV-5 contains the estimated migration rates for these counties. The data show that Douglas County had a migration rate loss for all ages of 20.3 per cent; Kingsbury County, 19.7 per cent; and Miner County, the greatest out-migration, 22.8 per cent. If a more detailed observation is
TABLE IV-5.--Selected migration rates for Kingsbury, Douglas and Miner Counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Age 1960</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
<td>-19.8</td>
<td>-19.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>-30.4</td>
<td>-30.6</td>
<td>-30.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>-55.7</td>
<td>-54.0</td>
<td>-57.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>-29.9</td>
<td>-28.8</td>
<td>-31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>-57.9</td>
<td>-59.4</td>
<td>-56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>-22.8</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
<td>-20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>-33.4</td>
<td>-34.0</td>
<td>-32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>-72.1</td>
<td>-73.2</td>
<td>-70.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from data compiled by J. Pew, Graduate Assistant, SDSU Department of Rural Sociology and based on U. S. Census data.

made, it can be noted that Miner County had the highest (out)migration rates for two categories (ages 15-19 and 20-24), which are -30.4 per cent and -72.1 per cent respectively. Kingsbury County's comparable rates were -30.4 per cent and -55.7 per cent, while Douglas County had the lowest migration rate loss for ages 15-19 (-29.9 per cent), and an in-between rate (-57.9 per cent) for ages 20-24.

Douglas County data revealed a greater percentage of female out-migration for ages 15-19 and a greater percentage loss of males for ages 20-24. This could reflect the observed tendency for
females to migrate earlier (at younger ages) than males. Just the opposite pattern seems to have applied to Kingsbury County; the percentage of male emigration was highest in the age 15-19 category, and female emigration percentages were highest in the age 20-24 category. The Miner County data reveal that male emigration exceeded female emigration in each of these categories.

More significant than the differences between the counties in age-specific emigration rates was the extent of the emigration of youth in all of the counties. The losses ranged from 29.9 to 33.4 per cent for ages 15-19, and from 55.7 to 72.1 per cent for ages 20-24. In the 20-24 age category, the migration rate loss was from 282 to 316 per cent of the rate for all ages. Although adult interviewees expressed a concern about the loss of young people, they may not have been aware of its extent.

Income

A study of migration rates is usually concerned with the economics of the areas involved. The counties under observation in this study were included in a regional research project dealing with population change and migration. Two reports of the results of this larger study were available, although there were slight differences between them. Both used combinations of the following in classifying counties: (1) in or out migration, (2) high or low farm operator level of living and (3) high or low percentages of persons
employed in manufacturing.\textsuperscript{1} The Iowa State University publication reported a study in depth of the impact of population changes on individuals and institutions, and was based on data collected from seven midwestern counties. In it all three counties were classified "OUT-HI-LO;" that is, out for direction of net migration, high farm operator level of living, and low percentage of persons employed in manufacturing.\textsuperscript{2} It also listed the three counties with which the present study was concerned as having a net migration between 1950 and 1960 of minus 16 to 30 per cent.\textsuperscript{3}

The Michigan State University publication listed the eight migration patterns used in the North Central project and classified each county within the thirteen states that cooperated in the study. However, a four-fold classification was used: Regional patterns for 1950 and for 1960, and State patterns for 1950 and for 1960.

The Regional patterns for 1950 are based upon direction of net migration between 1940 and 1950, and Regional averages for level of living and employment in manufacturing as of 1950; Regional patterns for 1960 are based upon direction of net


\textsuperscript{2}Klietsch, et al., loc. cit., p. 6.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 8.
migration between 1950 and 1960, and Regional averages for level of living and employment in manufacturing as of 1960. The State patterns are formed in a parallel manner but are based upon State averages in 1950 and 1960 for level of living and manufacturing employment.¹

All three counties were classified "OUT-HI-LO" based on 1950 data, for both Regional and State averages, but only Kingsbury County retained this classification for 1960. Douglas and Miner Counties were listed as "OUT-LO-LO" based on 1960 data, for both Regional and State averages. This means that Douglas and Miner Counties moved from a high to a low farm operator level of living during the decade of the 1950's. Thus, a distinction did appear between the county with a growing county seat town and counties with stable or declining county seat towns.

The difference noted above has been expressed more directly in terms of income. Table IV-6 presents income data for the three counties for 1955-59, 1960-64, and 1980 (projected). The data show a slight differential in favor of Kingsbury County.

Education

A variable with which income tends to be correlated is level of education. It was expected, from the above, that the growing community would have a higher percentage of adults attaining a higher level of educational achievement than the declining community. A detailed description of the educational level of the three communities observed in this study was not available, so county data were

¹Beegle, et al., loc. cit., p. 23.
TABLE IV-6.--Average annual per capita income for 1955-59, 1960-64, and 1980 (projected).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1955-59</th>
<th>1960-64</th>
<th>1980 projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>$1400</td>
<td>$1430</td>
<td>$2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1400</td>
<td>$2660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>$1480</td>
<td>$1450</td>
<td>$2640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Kingsbury</th>
<th>Miner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955-59 to 1960-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-64 to 1980</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-59 to 1980</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Except for 1955-59 to 1980 (projected) percentage change, data is adapted from unpublished manuscript by Rex Helfinstine, Economics Department, SDSU.

used instead. These data are presented in Table IV-7 and show that Miner County had the highest percentage of high school graduates in the adult population. The percentage for Kingsbury County was only slightly less, but for Douglas County the percentage was considerably less. The relative figures for Kingsbury and Douglas Counties were what one might hypothesize. The Miner County percentage may be more directly related to migration; that is educated parents may have been more apt to encourage their children to achieve a higher level
of education, and more highly educated persons have been more mobile and thus prone to migrate.

TABLE IV-7.--Percentage of high school graduates in the adult population in 1960.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Extension Circular 651, loc. cit., p. 22.

Average Size and Number of Farms

In that education has been related to level of living or income, a brief survey of the average size and number of farms in each of the counties was attempted. This aspect was considered important because rural county seat towns are influenced greatly by the number of families and persons engaged in agricultural operations. Predicted changes in the size and number of farms are presented in Table IV-8. The data show that the number and average size of farms varied directly with size of county. However, when one considered the 1980 projections, this relationship no longer appeared. Stated in terms of percentages based on the number of farms in each county in 1940, the 1980 projections indicated the following: Kingsbury, 54 per cent as many farms in 1980 as in 1940; Miner, 48 per cent; and Douglas County, 63.5 per cent. A question
TABLE IV-8.--Number and size of farms in selected counties, 1940, 1959, and 1980 (projected).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1940 Number</th>
<th>1940 Size</th>
<th>1959 Number</th>
<th>1959 Size</th>
<th>1980 (Projected) Number</th>
<th>1980 (Projected) Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Helfinstine, loc. cit.

that remained focused on the consequences of this predicted continued decline in the number of farms on the populations of the various counties. Fortunately, this has been projected also and is presented in Table IV-9. The data show that each of these counties will have a slightly smaller population in 1980 than they had in 1960. However, the projection did not make any projection as to whether the loss in farm population would be offset by an increase in the number of persons living in towns, or if an increase was expected in the rural non-farm segment of the population.

Centrality of Location

Turning from demographic considerations, not to mention the ecological factor of farm numbers and average size, another variable related to growth status given attention was centrality of location. It has been documented that centrality of location is conducive to increased satisfaction and leadership among persons in groups, and
TABLE IV-9.--Populations of the selected South Dakota Counties, 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1980 (projected).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>9,962</td>
<td>9,227</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>5,636</td>
<td>5,113</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Helfinstine, loc. cit.

among families in communities. Other things being equal, it was assumed in this study that the more centrally located county seat had an advantage over the less centrally located, and that this advantage would be reflected in growth status. Figure IV-1 shows that the anticipated spatial relationship existed. De Smet was most centrally located, Howard less so, and Armour least of all. However, it should be noted that some residents of Kingsbury County—those in the extreme northwest and southeast corners—had as great a distance to the county seat as did any in Douglas County.

Highways Servicing the Community

Highways, state and federal, that serviced the communities of the area are shown in Figure IV-2. In that communication and transportation, as social institutions, depend heavily on road vehicles—passenger cars, buses, trucks, etc.—it was assumed that

FIGURE IV-1.--Sectional map of South Dakota, showing approximate location of present county seats in counties being studied.
there is a relationship between the number and quality of roads servicing a community and growth status. If growth status is indicative of the importance of roads and/or highways, several generalizations can be made. First, federal (or U. S.) highways rank above state highways, and state highways above county roads. Second, the availability of both a federal and a state highway rank above the presence of only one in combination with county roads. Third, east-west highways rank above north-south highways, at least for the communities included in this study. Fourth, highways linking larger trade areas in the immediate region rank above highways linking more distant urban centers.

An examination of Figure IV-2 revealed that the growing community was serviced by U. S. Highway 14, running east and west, and by State Highway 25, running north and south. The stable community was located on State Highway 34, running east and west, and State Highway 25 terminated as it forms a junction with State Highway 34 to the west of the Howard city limits. The declining community, Armour, was serviced by U. S. Highway 281, running north and south; county and township roads served the areas to the east and west. Thus, in these instances, the generalizations enumerated above were supported.

Railroad Services

Federal highways and major railroad lines tend to link major cities and/or trade centers. Thus, one would expect that a growing community would be on a federal highway as well as on a major
FIGURE IV-2.--Sectional map of South Dakota, showing major State, U. S., and Interstate Highways.
railroad line. The importance of this was related to both bus and train service. It was discovered that the declining and stable communities were without regular bus and train services; conversely, the growing community was provided with daily bus and train services.

Figure IV-3 shows the railroad lines affecting the communities in this study. It can be seen that the stable and declining communities were located on branch lines that terminate at small centers nearby, while the growing community was serviced by a trunk line. As was the case with highways, east-west railroad lines rank above north-south lines in importance. Although there were some lines running north and south that did connect major trade centers, none of these ran through any of the communities being studied. Also, there were branch lines that ran east and west but did not connect major trade centers.

Relationships to Larger Shopping Centers

The impact of the larger shopping center on a smaller community has been more directly influenced by roads than by rail-ways. Whereas initially the trade area was restricted to a day's drive by horse and wagon, for most of the farmers in the area, it has been replaced by the "hour's drive" concept. The latter has been extended with improved roads and cars to a radius of fifty to sixty miles around a trade center.¹

¹Extension Circular 651, loc. cit., pp. 9 and 13.
FIGURE IV-3.--Sectional map of South Dakota, showing major railroads serving the communities.
Rapidly growing communities were observed to lie near or outside the periphery of the 50 mile radius of the trade area we have delineated. At the present time, at least, they are beyond the area of heaviest concentration. Had it not been for the rapid advances in automobile transportation and roads, they too might have been major trade centers. Their future, and possibly that of some of those presently designated as complete shopping centers, probably is tied closely to future advances in cars and roads. 1

Figure IV-4 shows each of the communities being studied located within the radii of complete shopping centers. 2 2 De Smet and Howard were included within four shopping areas and on the border of a fifth. Armour, in contrast, was within a fifty-mile radius of a single shopping center, namely, Mitchell. This indicated that being located where shopping centers overlap—that is, at the fringe—was conducive to a stable population or to a growing population. It suggested that having several alternatives with respect to shopping may lead to a compromise; i.e., shop at home.

Although Dun and Bradstreet designated all three sample communities in 1940 as banking towns, Antonides placed each town in a different category in 1960: Howard, partial shopping center; De Smet, full convenience center; and Armour, partial convenience center. 3 The placing of Howard in a higher category than De Smet was undoubtedly related to the several large implement dealers operating in the former community.

1Ibid., p. 15.
2Ibid., adapted from Figure 7 on page 13.
3Ibid., p. 14.
FIGURE IV-4.--Fifty-mile radii from complete shopping center.
Special Factors

In addition to shopping facilities, it has been noted that communities which have special features such as colleges, medical centers, or developed recreational resources, tend to grow. None of the above were located in the communities included in this study. However, De Smet had a number of features on which it was capitalizing. First, publicity was given to the fact that De Smet and Kingsbury County were the homes of Harvey Dunn, the painter, and Laura Ingalls Wilder, the writer. Efforts were underway to enlarge upon this heritage as a tourist attraction.

A second feature that De Smet had was the presence of several small industries. One of these, an alfalfa drying plant, selected the community presumably because considerable alfalfa was grown in the area. The other industry—a rendering plant—reportedly located in De Smet because of the community's general location. Possibly the availability of adequate water was also a factor.

A third special feature of the De Smet community was that it alone, of the three being studied, had a sale barn. The value which the community placed on the sale barn was indicated by the fact that the local residents shared in successful efforts to rebuild the sale barn after the older facility had burned. Howard, at the time of the interviewing, was negotiating for a sale barn and was hopeful of being successful. Armour had had a chance to get a sale barn some years ago, but a party with a vested interest reportedly blocked the venture, with the result that the sale barn
in Douglas County was located in Corsica, and has become a successful operation.

Leadership

Another of the critical variables related to growth status was leadership. Do aggressive leaders cause communities to grow, or does more aggressive leadership tend to develop in communities with a growth potential? An analysis of the leadership in each community gave some support to both positions. On the one hand, the growth of De Smet was attributed, at least in part, to the fact that most of the businessmen on main street following World War II were young men. On the other hand, respondents in Armour mentioned that younger and more aggressive individuals were selected to leadership positions, beginning around 1960. Thus the growing community may have had more progressive leaders than the declining community during the decade of the fifties.

The writer noticed that the reputational leaders of both the growing and declining communities were men in their forties and early fifties. The major observable difference was that the leaders in the latter were more aware of the ecological limitations of their community and, thus, expressed more caution as to what can reasonably be expected in terms of community growth. The leaders in the growing community, in contrast, reflected the experience of those who have had a degree of success and, thus, were more optimistic about future possibilities.
Leadership in the stable community was more diverse, with several of the identified leaders holding the esteem of their colleagues because of their entrepreneurial success; that is, they were respected because they had been personally successful. In both the growing and declining communities, more of the leaders were esteemed because they had initiated or supported projects in the community.

The Weekly Newspaper

Closely related to the leadership variable is the role of the weekly newspaper in the life and growth of the small town. Here again, the weekly published in the growing community consisted of more pages in each edition, as well as more advertising. On the surface it appeared that a good newspaper promoted a community, but one might also argue that a community with a growth potential provided a more fertile soil in which a weekly newspaper may grow. Only in the growing community, however, did any interviewee credit the local paper for being a contributing factor in the community's success.

Two observations warrant mention here. First, the editor of the weekly in the growing community stated that he considered his paper an area rather than a purely local paper. Second, he and several others gave much of the credit for the success of the paper to an aggressive advertising salesman. This suggested that aggressive or progressive leaders are advantageous, if not necessary, if a community's growth potential is to be maximized.
A Summary of Variables Related to Growth Status

Rather than assigning a definite weight to each of the variables discussed above, the communities were ranked on each of these. The community considered to have the advantage with reference to each variable was ranked first; the least advantaged ranked third; and the remaining community was ranked second. In some instances two or more communities shared a rank, indicating that they were comparable as far as a particular variable was concerned; e.g., all three communities were given a "Two" on the variables used as criteria in selecting the communities. The variables were listed under three subheadings: the basic criteria, those identified with the county seat town, and those that were descriptive of the county. A composite rank was given for each subheading, as well as for all variables, with the lowest total representing one; next lowest, two; and the highest, three.

The resulting data, presented in Table IV-10, gave visible support to the relevance of each of the variables in analyzing the growth status of communities.

Youth Attitudes as a Dependent Variable

Second hypothesis: Successful youth in a community, the stars as indicated by their peers, differ from the isolates in (a) intelligence, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

This hypothesis implied that the enumerated indices in combination contribute to successful experiences for youth in rural
TABLE IV-10.--A ranking of the communities with reference to variables related to growth status: a summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic criteria:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Population between 1000 and 1250 in 1940</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. County seat town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Geographic factors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rank for subheading</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified with county seat:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperative-heterogeneity of population</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age composition of population*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Highways servicing community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Centrality of location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Railroad facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relationship to larger shopping center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Special factors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rank for subheading</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified with total county:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Size of county</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Density of population*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Migration rates*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Income*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Percentage of high school graduates in adult population*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of farms (1950)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Size of farms (1959)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rank for subheading</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rank for all variables</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1960 data.
communities. Although it was not considered necessary that the stars differ significantly with reference to each of these variables, it was expected that the stars would not be exceeded on any of these by members of the other groups. Therefore, each of these variables was considered independently as a null sub-hypothesis, and in the order given.

(a) Intelligence: the stars, as indicated by their peers, do not differ significantly from the other groups in intelligence.

In testing this hypothesis, a two-fold approach was pursued. First, the respondents' evaluations of themselves were reviewed. This was achieved by examining responses to questionnaire items such as the following:

To what degree do you think the following describe you academically? Circle the number under the response that best describes how you feel about yourself for each of the items (Item 30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Talented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Successful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thorough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Capable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Intelligent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a distribution of responses shows a significant difference at the one per cent level of confidence for each of the above except one (C. Thorough), only the data for intelligence have been presented in Table IV-11. The basic reason for this was that objective data were available to verify the subjective information
TABLE IV-11.—A distribution of responses describing the degree to which the respondents considered themselves intelligent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups*</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 13.707 \quad df = 4 \quad P < .01 \]

*Group A, the stars, respondents most chosen by classmates. Group B, the isolates, respondents not chosen by classmates. Group C, respondents chosen by classmates but fewer times than stars.

**One Group A respondent did not check this item.

obtained above. These objective data included percentile rankings of scores on the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED), given to the respondents while they were juniors. These rankings, as well as a listing of respondents who took a college entrance examination (ACT), have been cited only for Groups A and B. These data have been summarized in Table IV-12, and were found to be consistent with the findings reported in the previous table. On the basis of the latter, the null hypothesis was rejected and the observed differences considered significant.

Having established that the sociometrically-selected groups differed with reference to intelligence, the next sub-hypothesis tested was residence:
TABLE IV-12.—Summary of data supporting differences between Group A and Group B members in intellectual ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average percentile rank of ITED scores</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage of respondents in group who took ACT examinations | 96.9 | 31.0 |

(b) The stars, as indicated by their classmates, do not differ significantly from the other groups in residence.

The data by means of which this hypothesis was tested were obtained from responses to the question, "Where do you live?" The respondents were given four alternatives from which they were to choose: (1) city, over 2,500 population; (2) town or village, under 2,500; (3) in the country, but not on a farm; and (4) on a farm. The distribution of responses, presented in Table IV-13, show that the observed differences were not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

TABLE IV-13.—A distribution of responses on basis of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village, town, or city</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm or rural nonfarm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 1.495 \]

\[ df = 2 \]

\[ P. = .50 \text{ to } .30 \]
A third sub-hypothesis related to this major hypothesis was concerned with estimated family income:

(c) The stars, as indicated by their classmates, do not differ significantly from the other groups in their estimates of family income.

Two questionnaire items were used to test this hypothesis:

12. Compared to the income of the parents of other students in the high school, the income of my parents is:
   1. one of the highest incomes
   2. higher than the average income
   3. about average
   4. less than average
   5. one of the lowest

18. Estimate of family income:
   1. under $3,000
   2. $3,000-5,999
   3. $6,000-8,999
   4. $9,000-11,999
   5. $12,000 or over

A distribution of the responses to Item 12 have been presented in Table IV-14. Item 18 responses revealed differences which were less significant; their not being cited was based on two other considerations: (1) nearly ten per cent of the respondents did not complete this item, and (2) relative income rather than absolute income may be more important in the formation of the self concept.

The data in Table IV-14 show differences which are significant at the five per cent level, and are accounted for by the higher proportion of Group A respondents estimating family income to be higher than average while more Group B respondents rated family income as less than average. On the basis of these data, the null hypothesis relating to estimated family income was rejected.

The final null hypothesis to be considered in this section dealt with level of parental education:
TABLE IV-14.—A distribution of respondents' estimates of family income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 10.213\]  \[df = 4\]  \[P < .05\]

(d) The stars, as indicated by their classmates, do not differ significantly from the other groups with reference to level of parental education.

The respondents were asked to circle the number of the statement cited in Table IV-15 which indicated the highest grade completed by their fathers and mothers. The data revealed distributional differences that are significant at the two per cent level for fathers, and at the five per cent level for mothers. However, a composite distribution, such as is presented in Table IV-15, shows differences which are significant at the one per cent level. In any case, the null hypothesis was rejected and support given to the major hypothesis.

After considering the four sub-hypotheses separately, the findings were related to the general hypothesis. This was done by listing the variables, together with the level of significance of observed differences between the various groups, as follows:
TABLE IV-15.—A distribution of respondents’ listing of level of education achieved by parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school plus vocational school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 32.061 \]
\[ df = 12 \]
\[ P. < .01 \]

(a) intelligence, \( P. < .02 \);
(b) residence, \( P. < .70 \) to .50;
(c) estimate of family income, \( P. < .01 \); and
(d) level of parental education, \( P. < .01 \).

When these were rearranged, according to level of significance (from lowest to highest), the order became: residence; intelligence; and estimate of family income or level of parental education, both of the latter two showing differences equally significant.

In that the above implied that residence was of questionable value as a variable contributing to successful experiences on the part of youth, an attempt was made to pin-point the impact of each of
these variables. To do this, attention was focused on the three criteria by means of which youth who were considered as having experienced success were identified; these included ratings by classmates as (1) being most popular, (2) having done most for the class and/or school, and (3) most apt to be successful in the post high school years. This suggested that one might profitably look at three minor hypotheses related to the above criteria.

**Third hypothesis:** Popularity is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

The degree to which this hypothesis was supported is shown in Table IV-16. The data show that the distribution of responses for the nine respondents (three from each community) identified by their classmates as being most popular (when compared with those not mentioned with reference to any of the criteria) was significant at the five per cent level only with regard to the variable "level of parental education." However, the data also show that these variables could be ranked, with intelligence being least significant; i.e., less significant than residence.

**Fourth hypothesis:** A second minor hypothesis stated that being considered as having done most for the class and/or school is related to respondent's (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

Using the same procedure as above, the relevant data have been included in Table IV-16. The data show that the null hypothesis can be rejected at the five per cent level only with reference to
"level of parental education." However, it was noted that intelligence ranked above residence on this variable, even though the latter retained the same level of significance as it did with popularity.

TABLE IV-16.--Levels of significance resulting from Chi-Square comparisons of all Group A respondents with all Group B respondents on selected variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>(Variables)</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most popular</td>
<td>a) Level of parental education</td>
<td>P. &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Estimated family income</td>
<td>P. = .10 - .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Residence</td>
<td>P. = .30 - .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Intelligence*</td>
<td>P. = .70 - .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Done most for class and/or school</td>
<td>a) Level of parental education</td>
<td>P. &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Estimated family income</td>
<td>P. = .10 - .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Intelligence**</td>
<td>P. = .20 - .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Residence</td>
<td>P. = .30 - .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most likely to succeed in post high school years</td>
<td>a) Level of parental education</td>
<td>P. &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Estimated family income</td>
<td>P. &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Intelligence***</td>
<td>P. &lt; .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Residence</td>
<td>P. = .70 - .50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The average percentile rank on ITED scores is 81.
**The average percentile rank on ITED scores is 90.
***The average percentile rank on ITED scores is 90.

Fifth hypothesis: The third minor hypothesis stated that predicted success in post high school years is related to respondent's (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

The data in the lower part of Table IV-16 show that a higher level of significance prevailed for both intelligence and estimated
family income than was the case with the previous two criteria. Likewise, the null hypothesis was rejected at the five per cent level with all of the variables except residence; and there was reason to believe that residence may have more importance than indicated. This may be true because the data included in this study did not differentiate between farm residents who live on the edge of town from those who live on the fringes of the community; i.e., the school district in this case. Nor was any distinction made between those who lived on farms accessible by all-weather roads and those farms which were located on inferior roads. The importance of the residence factor was not considered simply a farm-town dichotomy; it was rather concerned with the degree to which a farm residence removes or isolates one from the community center.

Sixth hypothesis: A hypothesis, closely related to the above, stated that stars express more positive attitudes than isolates toward (a) the community, (b) its institutions, and (c) the future.

A number of items in the check list (Part II, C of the questionnaire) were designed to measure the respondent's attitudes toward the community and several of its institutions. A distribution of responses for one of these (Item 10) is presented in Table IV-17, and shows differences which are significant at the five per cent level of confidence. Most of the observed differences were attributed to the proportionately lower number of agree responses and higher number of disagree responses by Group A members and, conversely, to the proportionately more agree responses and fewer
disagree responses by Group B members. This indicated that the isolates saw their communities practicing favoritism rather than providing opportunities for all.¹

Considered equally germane were questionnaire items that sought to measure the respondents' attitudes toward community institutions, particularly the family, religion, and the school. Of the three items which relate to the school (Items 11, 22, and 23), only the first revealed differences that were significant at the five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Other items relating to the community, and a percentage distribution of all responses to each item, are as follows:

1. This community is an ideal place in which to live.
2. I hope to move away from here within the next few years.
3. It is easy for a high school graduate to find a job in this community.
4. The community has provided adequate and available facilities for recreation; e.g., tennis courts, swimming pool, dancing facilities.
5. There are, in the community, adequate and available library facilities, both for research and general reading pleasure.
6. The local community leaders are conscious of youth needs and problems.
7. Social status or "pull" determines who gets a job in this community.

Although subsequent discussion will show that there are significant inter-community differences on four of the items (numbers 1, 4, 5, and 9), a crucial observation at the moment is that a minority of the respondents considers their community as providing any opportunities for the future; e.g., only thirteen per cent do not expect to emigrate within the next few years, and only nine per cent agree that "it is easy for a high school graduate to find a job in this community."
TABLE IV-17.—A distribution of responses to, "Social status or pull determines who gets a job in this community."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Χ² = 9.867  df = 4  P. < .05

per cent level. Group C respondents tended to agree that one's socioeconomic status was more important in school than how hard one studied, while Group A respondents disagreed to a greater degree. The majority of students (61 per cent) felt that the local school was adequately preparing them for their future educational and occupational goals (Item 35).

Before considering attitudinal questions concerning the family, several observations were noted. First, there were no significant differences observed among the group distributions of responses to (a) marital status of mother and father, (b) current household arrangements, or (c) ordinal position of the child in the family. However, data with reference to number of siblings are presented in Table IV-18. The observable differences, significant at the five per cent level, were primarily the result of relatively more Group A respondents listing one and two brothers and/or
sisters, while Group B exceeded expectations in listing three, four, and five siblings. Group C exceeded expectations at both ends of the distribution; i.e., in having no siblings and in having eight or more brothers and sisters.

**TABLE IV-18.—A distribution comparing the respondents on the basis of number of living brothers and sisters.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Living Brothers and Sisters</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 26.713 \quad df = 16 \quad P. < .05 \]

Closely related to the above were two items in the check list which dealt with family planning and parental obligations (Items 8 and 25). Although responses to neither showed significant
differences in distribution among the three groups, the same data
distributed on a community basis revealed differences which were
significant at the one per cent level for the former (Item 8).
The data for the two statements, presented in Table IV-19, show
that the communities ranked, on responses to both of these state­
ments, in an order consistent with growth status. This observation
was particularly interesting because the stable community, in which
the largest percentage of respondents identified themselves as
Roman Catholics (43 per cent), gave greater approval to both items
than did the declining community, with fewer Roman Catholic students
(22 per cent). Furthermore, many if not most of the Roman Catholic
students had attended a parochial school until the beginning of
their senior year in high school.

TABLE IV-19.--A percentage distribution of responses agreeing with
statements on planned parenthood and parental responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Community De Smet</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents should plan for only as many children as they can help get started in life.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have a responsibility to ensure their offspring vocational training or a college education.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to questionnaire items related to the family are reported in Table IV-20. An analysis of the data indicated that Group A members reflected more positive attitudes toward their family relationships than did members of the other groups. However, it was also noted that the Group A respondents were less apt to fashion their lives after family members.

Several items in the check list sought to measure the respondent's attitudes toward religion and/or the church (Items 6, 7, 16, and 24). Only one (Item 7) produced a distribution of responses which differs significantly at the five per cent level. This item stated, "The religious training I have received helps in decision-making and problem-solving." The observed differences resulted primarily from the relatively higher proportion of Group A members who disagreed. Otherwise, differences between the groups as to whether the churches should provide more social and recreational facilities (Item 6), on the place of religion in a scientific society (Item 16), and on the changes taking place in Catholic and Protestant Churches were not significant. However, it can be pointed out that Group A members reported participating in more church activities than did Group B members (106 to 66).

Of the three items in the check list referring to the school, only one will be reported fully, as has been done in Table IV-21. An analysis of data indicates that Group B members did feel that academic success went to students who were favored, for one reason or another, rather than to those who studied hard. Responses
TABLE IV-20.—Observed differences among groups in their responses to questionnaire items relating to the family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My parents (or guardians) are considered by most people in the community to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rather important people</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average people</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Of less than average importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not at all important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2 = 18.847$</td>
<td>df = 8</td>
<td>P. &lt; .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Does your father consider his occupation to be
1. Completely satisfactory                                                       | 18     | 9      | 24     | 51     |
2. Fairly satisfactory                                                           | 6      | 9      | 45     | 60     |
3. Good enough                                                                   | 1      | 7      | 11     | 19     |
4. Not very good                                                                 | 1      | 2      | 5      | 8      |
5. Very poor                                                                     | 0      | 0      | 2      | 2      |
   x                                                                              | 3      | 2      | 3      | 8      |
Totals                                                                          | 29     | 29     | 90     | 148    |
$\chi^2 = 27.240$                                                              | df = 10 | P. < .01 |

16. Does your mother consider your father's occupation to be
(same as above but different distribution)
$\chi^2 = 10.461$                                                              | df = 10 | P. = .50 to .30 |

17. Do you consider your father's occupation to be
(same as above but different distribution)
$\chi^2 = 19.397$                                                              | df = 10 | P. < .05 |
TABLE IV-20.—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Compared to other parents in the community, do you consider your parents and/or guardian to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Superior as parents and/or guardians</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Above average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Below average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ineffective as parents and/or guardians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (X^2 = 22.840 \quad df = 10 \quad P < .02) \)

46. Think of the person whom you would most want to fashion your life after. Is the person (Circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A teacher or school counselor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your father or mother</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An older brother or sister</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A relative not in your immediate family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A close friend, not related to you</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A movie or TV star</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A famous athlete</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An important government official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other: specify</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (X^2 = 36.711 \quad df = 18 \quad P < .02) \)

x—Respondents who did not complete this item.
to other items relating to the attitudes of the respondents toward the practicality of course requirements (Item 23), and the degree to which teachers took a personal interest in their students (Item 22), did not reveal significant differences. However, the latter gave some indication that Group B students considered teachers to be less interested in them personally than did Group A members. Thus, there was some empirical evidence affirming that Group A members had a more positive attitude toward the school than did the other respondents.

TABLE IV-21.—A distribution of responses to, "It doesn't make any difference how hard you study, it's who you are that counts."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.488 \quad df = 4 \quad P. < .05 \]

The third facet of the hypothesis under discussion focused on the relative degree of confidence (positive attitudes) the various groups expressed with reference to the future. A check list item simply stated, "Sometimes I get a bit frightened when I look beyond graduation from high school" (Item 15). A distribution of responses
to this statement did not reveal significant differences, although about fifty-seven per cent of all respondents expressed agreement. However, an analysis of other items in the questionnaire revealed that differences did exist, both between groups as well as between communities. A comparison of inter-group responses to selected items, presented in Table IV-22, indicated differences which were significant at the two per cent level or better in each instance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for each item; stars do express more confidence than the isolates about the future. Furthermore, the general hypothesis was supported: stars express more positive attitudes than isolates toward (a) the community, (b) its institutions, and (c) the future.

Having considered selected variables that distinguish the stars (Group A) from the isolates (Group B), the next task was that of considering hypotheses related to the two major independent variables in this study: community structure and growth status.

Seventh hypothesis: Self concept is a function of differential experiences with success within a given structure rather than being related to different community structures.

The basic instrument for testing this hypothesis was an adaptation of the Twenty Statements Test which has been identified with the name of the late Manford Kuhn.\(^1\) However, the categories he

TABLE IV-22. —A distribution of responses to questionnaire items relating to the respondents' attitudes toward the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31.-E. Self-confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Very</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 16.007 \quad \text{df} = 6 \quad P. < .02) \)

33. Educational desires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate from high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduate from vocational program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College or university graduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 29.076 \quad \text{df} = 10 \quad P. < .01) \)

34. Educational expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate from high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduate from vocational program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some college, no degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College or university graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 43.764 \quad \text{df} = 10 \quad P. < .01) \)
TABLE IV-22.--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44. Certainty of occupational choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not very sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uncertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very uncertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 22.776 \quad df = 10 \quad P. < .02 \]

x--Respondents who did not complete this item.

devised for the analysis of data, and a modification thereof were not considered suitable for the purposes at hand. Therefore, the categories listed below were developed to provide a framework by means of which the Twenty Statements Test items have been tabulated in Tables IV-23 and IV-24.

CATEGORIES TO BE USED IN ANALYZING TWENTY STATEMENTS TEST ITEMS

I. **NEGATIVE SELF-ATTITUDE and/or BEHAVIOR**: I am not attractive, intelligent, capable, liked, etc.; or I dislike myself, am overweight, or skinny; or I am shy, nervous, lacking in confidence.

II. **SOCIALLY DISAPPROVED ATTITUDES and/or BEHAVIOR**: I don't like school, work, authority, etc.; or I enjoy or am interested in socially disapproved behavior--laziness, wildness, fun and joking (always), hot-tempered, etc.
III. NEUTRAL ATTITUDES and/or BEHAVIOR: statements in which no indication is given as to the socially-acceptable quality of the statement; e.g., "I am tired of school." Does this mean that the student is ready to drop out, that he has the "spring fever," or that he is anxious to move on to a greater challenge? Likewise, if a student says, "I am concerned about my future," is he merely saying that he has given serious thought to it, or that he is extremely pessimistic about life in general?

IV. SOCIALLY APPROVED ATTITUDES and/or BEHAVIOR: basically, the "Protestant Ethic" (thrift, hard work, sobriety, achievement oriented) as tempered by the secularism of an affluent society (athletics, social drinking, smoking, etc.)

V. POSITIVE SELF-ATTITUDE and/or BEHAVIOR: I am attractive, intelligent, capable, popular, etc.; I accept myself and/or the life I am living; or I have achieved and am, therefore, successful.

VI. CONSENSUAL STATEMENTS: statements which can be verified by empirical data; e.g., "I am in the upper one-third of my class," or "I play in the band." These standards can be verified. But if a student says, "I am of average intelligence," he may or may not be thinking of some objective data about himself. Thus such a response is placed in Category III.

Table IV-23 contains a composite distribution of responses arranged according to the sociometrically-selected groups. The observed differences are significant at the one per cent level. The data indicate that the groups rank in the anticipated order according to the average number of responses given: Group A, 14.48; Group C, 12.38; Group B, 11.10.

The above findings supported the hypothesis: attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a given structure rather than related to differences among community structures. However, two additional considerations challenged such a conclusion. First, there was the question of
A composite distribution of Twenty Statements Test responses arranged according to sociometrically-selected groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Group A*</th>
<th>Group B**</th>
<th>Group C***</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 30.72 \quad \text{df} = 10 \quad P. < .01 \]

*Group A, stars, respondents most chosen by classmates.
**Group B, isolates, respondents not listed by classmates.
***Group C, respondents mentioned fewer times than stars.

validity; can the hypothesis be tested by the data provided above?

A second consideration developed when the above data were rearranged by communities, as has been done in Table IV-24. The observed differences resulting from this arrangement of data are also significant at the one per cent level of confidence. Thus, one was faced with data which support differences in responses within as well as between the sample communities. This raised the question whether inter-community differences are related to community structure, or to some other variable such as growth status.
TABLE IV-24.—A composite distribution of responses to Twenty Statements Test items arranged according to communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 62.715 \]
\[ df = 10 \]
\[ P. < .01 \]

To understand the nature of the observed differences, it was noted that, in Table IV-23, Group A members listed proportionately fewer Category I responses, gave more Category V responses and made fewer negative self-attitudes and more positive self-attitudes than could have been expected on the basis of all responses. A similar examination of the data in Table IV-24 revealed that most of the observed inter-community differences can be attributed to the relatively high proportion of De Smet responses in Category V and of Howard responses in Category VI, and the proportionately fewer responses of De Smet respondents in Category VI and of Howard...
responses in Category V; i.e., on a community basis, De Smet respondents reflected relatively more positive self-attitudes and fewer consensual statements, while the opposite was the case with the Howard respondents.

Thus a two-dimensional basis of differentiation was noted: within communities, the sociometric stars reflected proportionately more positive self-attitudes than the other respondents; among communities, respondents in the growing community reflected relatively more positive self-attitudes than was the case with respondents in the stable and declining communities.\(^1\) In that indices related to differences between groups had been detailed rather exhaustively, the remaining need was to identify indices and variables, distributions of which may vary significantly between the sample communities.

Two sets of five items were taken from the questionnaire and presented in Table IV-25. Analysis of the data indicated that there were differences in religious identification among the respondents of the three communities. The largest number of respondents in the declining community identified themselves with the United Church of Christ. In the stable community, the greatest percentage of

\(^1\)This observation is consistent with the hypothesis "that optimism would tend to be associated with community growth and affluence, pessimism with stagnation and decline." Lois Dean, Five Towns: A Comparative Community Study (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 43.
TABLE IV-25.--A distribution of responses to selected personal data items arranged by communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious identification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>United Church of Christ</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 41.854\)  \(\text{df} = 16\)  \(P < .01\)

30.-D. Degree to which respondents consider themselves to be capable:

|        | Armour | De Smet | Howard |        |
|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| 1. Not at all | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Somewhat | 27 | 21 | 34 | 82 |
| 3. Very | 14 | 32 | 19 | 65 |
| Totals | 41 | 53 | 53 | 147 |

\(X^2 = 8.713\)  \(\text{df} = 2\)  \(P < .02\)

31.-A. Degree to which respondents consider themselves cooperative:

|        | Armour | De Smet | Howard |        |
|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| 1. Not at all | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Somewhat | 28 | 21 | 24 | 73 |
| 3. Very | 13 | 31 | 29 | 73 |
| Totals | 41 | 54 | 53 | 148 |

\(X^2 = 9.557\)  \(\text{df} = 4\)  \(P < .05\)
TABLE IV-25.--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational desires:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate from high school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete vocational training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate from college</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($X^2 = 24.747$)</td>
<td>df = 10</td>
<td>P. $&lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Educational expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate from high school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete vocational training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate from college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($X^2 = 25.214$)</td>
<td>df = 10</td>
<td>P. $&lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x--Respondents who did not complete this item.

Respondents were Roman Catholics, while Lutherans were most numerous in the growing community. Having made this observation, it was recognized that no conclusions should be made as to the relative or actual strength of the various religious groups (denominations and/or sects) in each of the communities. The observed differences were
significant only with reference to the subjects, although a more detailed study of the religious life of these respondents and communities might have revealed other relationships.

The next variable considered (Item 31.-A) was the extent to which respondents described themselves as being cooperative in their social relationships. A distribution of responses on a community basis revealed that the declining community subjects indicated a significant tendency to describe themselves as somewhat, rather than very cooperative. This is consistent with an observation reported elsewhere that youth-adult and/or youth-community relationships were less satisfactory in the declining community than in the other two communities.

The fourth variable in Table IV-25 (Item 33) revealed that respondents in the declining community would, if they were completely free to choose, disproportionately settle for a high school or vocational school education. The remaining variable (Item 34) indicated that their desires were consistent with their expectations.¹ These indications that the declining community respondents viewed themselves as relatively less capable and cooperative, as well as having more modest educational aspirations, raised the question,

¹At least one study shows that subsequent occupational attainments are related to adolescent aspirations in a positive manner; e.g., William P. Kuvlesky and Robert C. Bealer, "The Relevance of Adolescents' Occupational Aspirations for Subsequent Job Attainments," Rural Sociology, XXII (September, 1967), pp. 290-301.
"Can these observed differences be attributed to growth status, community structure, both or neither?" Before attempting an answer, five items from the check list (Items 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9), reported in Table IV-26, were analyzed. Analysis of the data indicate that the respondents in the growing community disproportionately considered their community to be an ideal place in which to live, while the subjects in the declining and stable communities were almost equally divided on the merits of their respective communities. Undoubtedly, this attitude was related to responses recorded with reference to Item 4, which indicated that the growing community respondents overwhelmingly (86 per cent) agreed that their community provided adequate and available facilities for recreation. The declining community subjects, in contrast, almost unanimously (96 per cent) disagreed. They considered their community severely lacking in this respect. The youth in the stable community revealed a moderate level of agreement (53 per cent).

The situation with reference to the adequacy of library facilities (Item 5) was almost identical, with a high degree of agreement being expressed by the growing community's respondents. The declining community subjects expressed a low level of agreement, and the students in the stable community gave moderate support to this statement.

Although Item 8 does not fit neatly into the discussion at this point, it was considered nevertheless. The data show that the respondents from the declining community, primarily conservative
Protestants, did not agree with this statement. The growing community students disproportionately agreed that parents should plan for only as many children as they can help get started in life. As was mentioned elsewhere, the stable community gave strong support to this statement, even though a large percentage of the respondents identified themselves as Roman Catholics.

**TABLE IV-26.--A distribution of responses to selected check list items arranged by communities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>De Smet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This community is an ideal place in which to live:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (X^2 = 24.648 )</td>
<td>df = 4</td>
<td>P. &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The community has provided adequate and available facilities for recreation:

|                                                                      | Armour      | De Smet | Howard |
|                                                                      |             |        |        |
| 1. Agree                                                             | 2           | 45      | 28      | 75      |
| 2. Undecided                                                        | 0           | 7       | 7       | 14      |
| 3. Disagree                                                          | 39          | 2       | 18      | 59      |
| Totals                                                               | 41          | 54      | 53      | 148     |
| \( (X^2 = 86.348 \)                                              | df = 4      | P. < .01 |        |
TABLE IV-26.--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>De Smet</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. There are in the community adequate and available library facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((X^2 = 10.258)</td>
<td>(df = 4)</td>
<td>(P. &lt; .05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Parents should plan for only as many children as they can help get started in life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>De Smet</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((X^2 = 18.954)</td>
<td>(df = 4)</td>
<td>(P. &lt; .01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The local community leaders are conscious of youth needs and problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>De Smet</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((X^2 = 10.258)</td>
<td>(df = 4)</td>
<td>(P. &lt; .05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final item in this set stated that "local community leaders are conscious of youth needs and problems." The observed differences, which are significant at the five per cent level, were
the result of the differential responses between the growing and declining communities. Respondents in the former registered a relatively higher degree of agreement and a lower level of disagreement, while among the declining community respondents the opposite prevailed. Thus, one was unable to retain without qualification the hypothesis that attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a given structure rather than related to different community structures.

**Eighth hypothesis:** Attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a community rather than of the community's growth status.

As had been noted above in the discussion of community structure, there were observable differences related to growth status. Therefore, one might have retained the null form of this hypothesis; i.e., that there is no relationship between attitudinal differences and differential experiences with success that is more significant than the relationship between attitudinal differences and community growth status. However, before concluding that the hypothesis was supported, it was asked whether the observed relationship between attitudes and community growth status might be spurious; i.e., might there be other variables related to growth status that were operative?

If other and/or intervening variables were operative in this situation, what might they have been? A first answer was that any or all of the variables related to growth status might have been
important, i.e., the variables that contributed to a decline in growth status, or at least made an increase improbable, may also have served to lessen the ability of a community to socialize effectively many of its youth. Therefore, it may not have been just the fact of population loss that was important, but the several forces that eventually pushed many persons, especially youth, out of a given community.

A brief recapitulation of significant inter-community differences in distributions of responses to the selected items recorded in Table IV-25 were used to clarify the issue. It had been noted that growth status was related to a respondent's view of himself as being capable and cooperative, as well as to his educational desires and expectations. The next question raised asked whether these observed relationships received any other empirical support; and the answer was positive. For instance, if the percentile rank of scores on the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) made by the Group A and Group B respondents in each community (Group C scores were not obtained) were averaged, the following rank and average percentiles were obtained:

1) the growing community, 70.5;
2) the stable community, 63.3; and
3) the declining community, 52.3

Thus, there were indications that the observed inter-community differences in personal estimates of ability as well as educational plans and expectations, represented real differences. However, the
test title implied a measurement of development or progress; if so, the test scores indicated that success was related to community growth status.

A review of the responses to the items from the checklist, presented in Table IV-26, yielded results which were expected. If the focus were on the item concerned with the adequacy and availability of facilities for recreation, objective observation supported the growing community as being best equipped. Although the stable community had a better library building, the growing community had plans for new facilities. The latter likewise had the added advantage of having several original Harvey Dunn paintings, as well as literature on the Wilder novels. Possessing advantages in reference to the two factors mentioned above, it was considered less than surprising that more respondents in the growing community considered their community an ideal place in which to live. Conversely, it was expected that youth in a community which did not have available similar facilities would be more apt to disagree with the statement, "local community leaders are conscious of youth needs and problems." Finally, in that studies cited in the review of literature listed a higher per capita income and a higher farm operator level of living for the county of which the growing community was the county seat town, the observed greater support for family planning was anticipated.

Having reviewed the data, the conclusion which appeared prudent was that the final hypothesis must be qualified: attitudinal
differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a community rather than of the community's growth status (or structure), but success appears to be more obtainable in a growing community, in which also the community structure may be oriented more toward assisting youth in their quest for success (and more positive attitudes).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The suggestion had been made that the increasing incidence of juvenile delinquency might be reversed if, among other approaches,

a much greater attempt than at present is made to discover exactly how our society is structured, organized, and operated, and what this portends for the everyday life of youth (including delinquent youth) in specific segments of the society, and for their ambitions, values, and sense of self worth.¹

Responding to the challenge embodied in the above suggestion, this study focused on a segment of our society--three rural communities--and sought to ascertain the differential impact of two independent variables--community structure and growth status--on the dependent variable--attitudinal differences among youth.

For purposes of this study, community structure was defined as the particular network of interaction patterns which is identifiable in a community at a given point in time and which persists over a period of time. It was assumed that the particular social structure that prevails in a given community reflected the values and goals of the community, although it was recognized that once

¹Report to Congress on Juvenile Delinquency, loc. cit.
structures and values are established they tend to resist change. It was further recognized that community structures are not uniform; therefore, a typology of communities was developed to provide a frame of reference against which a variety of communities might be compared. The primary or basic characteristic differentiating the several types was its orientation with reference to its members. Four types were projected although all three of the communities in this study were classified as being of the same type.

This community type, called the Transitional, was presented as one that develops whenever a new geographical or technological frontier opens. It was seen to operate on the premise that there were opportunities for all, and that each was permitted to pursue his interests as long as there was at most a marginal impingement on the interests of others. Communities of this type, in their pure form, were considered to be oriented toward maximizing the development of some resource. Thus, they provided opportunities for all who were capable and motivated. When a particular frontier (a new opportunity) had been developed, and no other opportunity became available, these communities tended to become either traditional or "transmutational" in orientation.\(^1\)

The second independent variable, growth status, was more easily defined and measured. Growth status, as used herein, simply

\(^1\)According to the typology, transmutational communities are planned communities, in which there is a prepared place for planned replacements of a community's members. A brief description of the typology is presented in Appendix D.
referred to the experience of a community with reference to population numbers. A loss of population between 1940 and 1960 in excess of five per cent, as calculated from U. S. Census data, was the criterion for a declining community; a similar increase during this period was the criterion for a growing community; and a community with a 1960 population within five per cent of its 1940 population was considered to be a stable community.

The dependent variable--attitudinal differences among youth--was measured by an adaptation of the Twenty Statements Test and selected questionnaire items. To ascertain whether a differentiation of developing attitudes among youth was possible, both within and between communities, a sociometric device was employed. This instrument requested the respondents--high school seniors--to list three members of their respective classes, other than themselves, whom they considered: (a) to be most popular among their classmates; (b) to have done most for their class and/or the school; and (c) most likely to be successful in the post high school years. It was assumed that the persons mentioned most times could be considered most successful and would, thus, reflect more positive attitudes with reference to certain enumerated variables.

In addition to the development of a typology of communities, an objective mentioned above, this study also sought to ascertain whether there was a relationship between an individual's position and experience within a community's structure and the attitudinal
differences developed therein, to identify factors that were related to a community's growth status, and to relate the latter to attitudinal differences among youth.

The review of literature included theoretical studies of the community, treating the community both as a structure and as a system; studies of particular communities, both in the United States and Canada; and writings on the process of socialization. Also, Turner's thesis and monographs related thereto were cited, as well as a variety of articles relating to the problems of youth in the mid-twentieth century.

The conceptual framework for this study was expressed in eight interrelated observations and/or generalizations. These assigned major responsibility for the attitudes developed by youth to differential experiences with success within the community. It was suggested that the process of attitude formation begins in infancy and within the family, but is later influenced by the degree of success the community is able to provide the socializee. It was further suggested that communities may differ with reference to the degree to which success experiences are available to their youth. These generalizations were embodied in the hypotheses.

The sample communities used in this study, other than meeting the criteria earlier specified with reference to changes in population numbers, were matched with reference to: (a) population in 1940; (b) status as county seat towns; and (c) geographical base, the latter constituting an attempt to minimize the importance of
noncultural factors in observed inter-community differences. The subjects in this study were members of the 1967 senior high school class, or reputational leaders, in each of the selected communities. The former were group interviewed, shortly before graduation, using a questionnaire. The reputational leaders were interviewed personally using open-ended questions. The sample communities were: Armour, county seat of Douglas County, the declining community; De Smet, county seat of Kingsbury County, the growing community; and Howard, county seat of Miner County, the stable community.

Findings Related to the Hypotheses

Within the contextual framework outlined above, eight hypotheses were projected and tested. The hypotheses and the conclusions resulting from their testing were as follows:

First hypothesis: there are observable ecological and socio-economic differences between communities which are related to growth status.

This hypothesis was accepted on the basis of the observed differences between the three communities when compared on a number of variables. It was noted that the growing community (a) was the county seat town in the larger county, (b) was more centrally located, (c) was served by more adequate highway and railroad facilities, and (d) was more favorably located with reference to other shopping centers.

Second hypothesis: successful youth in a community, the stars as indicated by their classmates, differ from the isolates in (a) intelligence, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.
Of the four indices mentioned in the hypothesis, the only relationship that was not significant at the two per cent level of confidence was residence, although more of the stars than the isolates reported living in town rather than on farms. There was reason to believe that the importance of residence may have been greater than shown in this study. The reason for this possibility was that rural farm residence may vary as much or more than town residences, both in ecological and economic terms. Dimensions of this have been included in the findings with reference to the following three hypotheses. This hypothesis, then, was accepted with the limitation noted.

Third hypothesis: popularity is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

The data indicated that the null hypothesis can be rejected only for level of parental education. However, it was observed that estimated family income was significant at the ten per cent level, and that residence had a higher degree of significance than intelligence. The higher significance of residence with this hypothesis was explained in terms of central place theory; i.e., town residence locates one closer to where the action is, while a farm residence may mean that one is spatially removed from the center of activity. The low relationship revealed between popularity and intelligence is consistent with other findings; e.g., Coleman.1

Fourth hypothesis: being identified as having done most for the class and/or the school is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

As was the case with the previous hypothesis, the only significant relationship in this instance was level of parental education. It was noted, however, that estimated family income and residence retained identical levels of significance as above, but that intellectual ability was more significant than residence with this hypothesis.

Fifth hypothesis: predicted success is related to (a) intellectual ability, (b) residence, (c) estimated family income, and (d) level of parental education.

The data with reference to this hypothesis indicated that the null hypothesis can be retained only for residence. Intellectual ability, estimated family income, and level of parental education all showed relationships that were significant at the two per cent level of confidence.

Thus, the findings revealed that level of parental education was significant at the one per cent level in each of the four above interrelated hypotheses. Although residence showed almost no relationship to predicted success in the post high school years, it seemed to be an important factor with reference to popularity and in doing most for the class and/or school. The relevance of residence appeared to be related to the degree to which it limited participation at the center of the community.

Sixth hypothesis: stars express more positive attitudes than isolates toward (a) the community, (b) its institutions, and (c) the future.
The data indicated that the null hypothesis can be rejected and the hypothesis accepted as stated above. However, it was observed that the isolate's less positive attitude toward the community seemed to reflect an awareness of strained interpersonal relationships; e.g., pull determines who gets a job, the teachers show favoritism, and my parents are only average when compared to other parents.

**Seventh hypothesis:** Attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a given structure rather than related to different community structures.

The data indicated that differences in attitudes between the stars (the often chosen) and the isolates (the less chosen), as measured by Twenty Statements Test items, were significant at the one per cent level. However, the data also indicated that significant differences existed between communities. This suggested that there was a two-dimensional basis of differentiation. Within communities, the sociometric stars reflected proportionately more positive self attitudes than the other respondents. Among communities, respondents in the growing community reflected relatively more positive self attitudes than was the case with respondents in the stable and declining communities. In that the acceptance or rejection of the significance of community structure appeared to be interrelated with growth status, the final hypothesis shared in the discussion.

**Eighth hypothesis:** Attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a community rather than of the communities growth status.
Thus, the final section of the summary sought to ascertain the differential impact of two independent variables—community structure and growth status—on the dependent variable—attitudinal differences among youth. The data suggested the following four interrelated generalizations, although the observed empirical support for the same was not accepted as conclusive.

1. Attitudinal differences are a function of differential experiences with success within a given community.

2. These differential experiences with success can be attributed to (a) the innate ability of the individual, (b) the location of the socializee's basic primary group (the family), vertically and horizontally, with the community's structure, and (c) the ability of each socializing agency, individually and collectively, to provide successful experiences for its socializees.

3. The ability of a community to provide successful experiences for its socializees is related to the community's growth status; i.e., a growing community generally is able to provide successful experiences for a larger number of potential socializees, but not necessarily for a larger proportion of potential socializees. The latter stresses the importance of the fertility rate with reference to a community's growth status.

4. The ability of a community to provide successful experiences for its socializees is related to a community's structure; i.e., communities vary in the degree to which they are purposefully organized to assist members to achieve successful
experiences. It was assumed that a community structure organized to assist members in achieving successful experiences would encourage community growth.

One other finding, indirectly related to the above generalization, provided a necessary insight into the process of differential experiences with success within a given community. A comparison of the three groups used in this study revealed that Group A members reported fewer living brothers and sisters, differences which were significant at the five per cent level. A similar comparison of the communities revealed differences which were not significant (P. = .30 to .20), although the growing community respondents reported the lowest average number of siblings: growing community, 3.28; declining community, 3.41; and stable community, 4.08.

The above suggested that the following variables may be important, in the order given, to the success experiences of youth:

1. Level of parental education  
2. Estimated family income  
3. Intellectual ability of youth  
4. Number of siblings  
5. Residence in a growing community

The degree to which the above may not apply was seen to vary inversely with the degree to which the community structure was organized to assist youth in achieving successful experiences.

---

1This implied living in town or rural nonfarm. Rural farm communities are declining in population numbers.
These generalizations, based on the data gathered in this study, indicated that the eighth hypothesis may be accepted as valid for the sample communities, for even within the growing community there were isolates who viewed themselves and the community in less positive terms. The observed relationship between attitudinal differences and growth status appeared to be indirect; i.e., the growing community provided more opportunities for success than did the stable or declining community.

The seventh hypothesis, relating concept of self to a differential experience with success within a community rather than to community structure, was also accepted for the sample communities. The observed inter-community differences could not be attributed to differences in community structure, for these were slight. Also, all three communities in this study were considered to be of the Transitional type within the typology developed with this paper.

**Implications for Further Study**

Particular permutations and combinations do not represent ends; they are but temporary arrangements which shortly become a part of or are replaced by others. The concepts, ideas, and data brought together in this dissertation were not presented as being definitive. Rather the approach employed herein sought to identify relationships which may be subjected to examination by more naturalistic devices.
Among the various implications for further research arising out of this paper, perhaps none was deemed more challenging than a further testing and development of the typology of communities established herewith. Its potential fruitfulness was seen to arise out of its focus: a typology of communities based on how communities contribute to the attitudes which develop among their members.

Another area of research suggested by the typology of communities would be to compare attitudinal differences among youth in a community such as a Hutterite colony with the responses obtained from the youth sampled in this study. Or, one might compare attitudinal differences among youth in an established New England community with responses obtained in this study. Finally, one might attempt to compare responses obtained in this study with data solicited from subjects in some community in a nation state which has had welfare programs in operation for a considerable period of time; e.g., Sweden.

Challenging implications for further research also arose out of the findings of this study with reference to variables related to growth status. For instance, one might take the counties of South Dakota, balance for population density, and compare the county seat towns that are growing with those that are declining on the variables used in this study; e.g., county size, centrality of location, highway and railroad services, and relationship to other complete shopping center.
Another ecological aspect that was thought worthy of further investigation is the impact of the relative isolation of rural farm youth on attitude formation. There were indications in this study that rural farm youth are less apt to be popular or to have contributed proportionately to their high school class or school. Was this because they had less free time, or because they were relatively more not "where the action is?" This study attempted to exclude tuition students from the isolate group on the grounds that they were at an ecological disadvantage. This was considered extremely important in the light of school reorganization activities going on at the present time. Should a pattern emerge in which a single high school remains in most rural counties, would the students living closest to the school, other things being equal, enjoy an unfair advantage? In that there has been a concern expressed in recent years about equal opportunity, should not this dimension be investigated?

In that the dropouts were not represented in this study, research similar to this attempt but including dropouts would undoubtedly provide additional insight into the relationship between attitude formation and community structure and/or growth status.

Of greater concern than school reorganization, for the communities at the time of this study, was the proposed reorganization of counties to provide larger administrative units. Presumably, its proponents supported it on the grounds that costs would be cut and services improved. However, adult leaders in the county
seat towns visited were uniformly in opposition to reorganization. They were convinced that the proposed action would cause their communities to decline. Research needs to be carried out that would investigate the total cost of the projected reorganization, including dislocation costs.

Another area that might provide interesting and profitable research possibilities is that of studying in greater detail family size as a variable relating to personal adjustment, or attitudinal differences. Studies cited in the review of literature, and supported by data gathered in this study, indicated that family size is inversely related to a favorable concept of self and positive attitudes. Attempts could be made to establish some optimum family size, although this writer holds the opinion that particular families vary with respect to the number of children they can effectively socialize, in the sense of preparing them for participation in the larger society.

Likewise, this study suggested that an evaluation of differential responses to proposals concerning family planning, between respondents reared in large and small families, could be rewarding. Also, ascertaining differences in attitudes toward family planning among respondents identified with the various religious denominations and/or sects could provide another challenge. The data cited in this study indicated that these respondents conformed more to community values than to denominational or sect patterns.
This study did not delve deeply into the role of religion in the development of attitudes or of the self concept, nor did it attempt to detail the relationship between the degree of ecumenicity prevailing among churches and community structure or growth status. Considered of particular interest to the writer was the almost total lack of any ecumenical spirit among the churches in the stable community. Ecologically, and in terms of the percentage of adults who have graduated from high school, one would have expected the stable community to rank above the declining community. But this did not appear to be the case, although the growing community seemed to reflect the greatest amount of ecumenism as one might have expected.

Another suggestion for further study relates to the problem which provided the motivation for this research—an attempt to counteract the increasing incidence of juvenile delinquency. The data analyzed herein, and other evidence and opinion cited, point to the importance of each level of socialization in preparing the socializee for the subsequent level. This process of building on the foundation provided by previous levels of socialization highlights the importance of the primary socializing agency, namely, the family. It also underscores the responsibility of parents. The implication is that parenthood needs to be taken much more seriously in the present and immediate future than it has been in the past. The support given to statements about family planning indicated that today's youth may be entertaining some thoughts about
the degree to which their parents may or may not have exercised
good judgment in terms of family size.

If the typology of communities developed with this study
has any validity, and if the Transmutational community—the hypothetical
community of the future—becomes a reality, two alternatives
seemed possible. On the one hand, the larger society may continue
to develop programs whereby inadequate families are assisted or
replaced as far as parental responsibility is concerned. On the
other hand, through more adequate preparation for marriage and
parenthood, prospective parents may be encouraged and assisted in
assessing more accurately their ability to prepare a determined
number of offspring to compete effectively (achieve success) in the
larger society and during adulthood. Each of these alternatives
requires further study.

Several observations were made by the researcher relating
to out-migration of youth in each of the sample communities. First,
several of the adults interviewed mentioned that the respective
communities were unable to hold their youth. This concern was
recognized also in the following editorial.

Many lament over loss of young people, but they're not lack-
ing in some areas.

Much is written about the loss of young people to South
Dakota, and there has always been and will always be loss,
as those trained for particular fields go where there is
opportunity for them. But in turn, there are those who come
to our state from others, in business and profession.
South Dakota is not to be considered devoid of youth. De Smet is an instance, with the majority of its business and professional persons in their earlier working years, this to a greater extent than two decades ago.  

No interviewee even hinted that his community may have been and may still be procreating too many—an excess number—of offspring. The assumption that the youth who migrate will find a place elsewhere was interpreted to be a survival of the frontier influence.

Closely related to the above is the question asked reputation leaders in each of these communities as to the causes of crime and delinquency, "not to mention riots and lootings." The respondents did not view these as their problems, and they appeared to be relieved that they were far removed from the scenes of violence. The provocative thing about this was that they did not relate, in any way, the out-migration of youth from their communities with the piling up of youth, many unemployed, in urban areas. A challenging area of research, therefore, would be an investigation of the differential experiences with success that youth from these communities have achieved in urban centers.

---

1The De Smet News, October 5, 1967.
APPENDIX A

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS USED WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS

1. This study is concerned with community adjustment to social change. With reference to the ___________ community:

(a) What have been the major changes confronting the community since 1940? (Or roughly since the end of World War II)

(b) How has the community attempted to face these changes and deal with the problems related thereto?

2. As you think of this community (Armour, De Smet, Howard):

(a) What do you consider its main attractions to be; i.e., why should anyone want to live here?

(b) What further changes would you like to see, if any?

3. If one is to appreciate and understand this community, what special insight (factors) should one keep in mind? That is, what makes this community tick?

4. (a) De Smet: This community is one of the few rural communities in South Dakota showing a population increase (30.3 per cent) between 1940 and 1960; to what do you attribute this increase?

(b) Howard: The population of this community held rather constant during the 1940-1960 period (1.3 per cent decline); to what do you attribute this?

(c) Armour: This community has shown a 13.6 per cent decline in population during the 1940-1960 period; to what do you attribute this?

5. Our society in general, and many communities in particular, are experiencing substantial increases in juvenile delinquency and crime (not to mention riots and lootings):

(a) To what causes (factors) do you attribute this?
(b) What suggestions do you offer to counteract or control these expressions of lawlessness?

6. What is your thinking with reference to seeking state and federal funds to assist in developing rural communities such as (Armour, De Smet, Howard)?

7. Could you give me the names of about six other community leaders one might visit with to learn more about the community?
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE USED WITH HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS
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Many of the items in this questionnaire, especially in the personal data section, were borrowed from a questionnaire prepared for and used in a contemporary study being conducted by the Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota.

This project, H - 454, is under the direction of Dr. Robert Dimit, the writer's thesis adviser. Robert Kiefert, graduate student and research assistant, carried primary responsibility for preparation of the questionnaire and its administration to seniors in a selected sample of high schools in South Dakota.
Introduction

Within a few weeks you will be graduating from high school, and you and your fellow class members will be entering a variety of new experiences. As you are about to make this transition "out of school life and into life's school," you are requested to share some of the attitudes and feelings which you have developed with reference to: (a) your classmates and yourself; and (b) the community in which you live and its various agencies, such as the school, government, business, religion, recreation, and the family.

The value and success of this study depends largely upon the degree to which the responses you give truly reflect your attitudes and feelings, as you understand yourself. Your responses will be treated anonymously, and will be used only for the purposes of this study. Your cooperation is appreciated!

In that personal interviews may be conducted with some members of your class, please give the following information:

(PLEASE PRINT)

____________________________  ______________________  ______________________
(First name)                  (Middle name)               (Last name)

____________________________________
(Street address)

____________________________  ______________________
(City or town)                (County)                    (State)

____________________________  ______________________
(Telephone number)            (Zip code number)
Summer Address: If you expect to have a different address between June 1 and September 1, do you know what it will be?

___ Yes ___ No If yes, please list: ________________________________

(Street address)

________________ (City or town) ____________________________ (State) __________________ (Zip code)

Also, please check the response below that applies to you!

___ Parents and/or guardians live within existing school district.

___ Tuition student—parents and/or guardian live outside of the school district.

___ Don't know.

Part I. Attitudes and Feelings About Your Senior Class. As you think about your high school experiences, circle or provide a response to each of the items listed below.

1. In terms of class spirit, our seniors would rank

   a) Above average
   b) Average
   c) Below average

2. In terms of intellectual ability, our senior class would rank

   a) Above average
   b) Average
   c) Below average

3. In terms of friendliness, how would you describe your classmates?

   a) Above average
   b) Average
   c) Below average
4. Name the three members of your senior class, excluding yourself, whom you consider to be most popular with other students.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 

5. Name the three members of your class, excluding yourself, whom you feel have done the most for your senior class and/or for the school.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 

6. Name the three members of your graduating class, excluding yourself, whom you predict will be most successful in the post high school years.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 

Part II. Attitudes and Feelings About Yourself

A. There are numbered blanks on the page below. Within the next ten minutes, write as many responses as you can to the question addressed to yourself, "Who am I?" Begin each response: "I am ...." Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you.
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
NOTE: If all lines above are filled in, you may go on to the next page even if the allotted time has not been used up.

B. Personal Data

1. How old are you today?
   1. 16 years old
   2. 17 years old
   3. 18 years old
   4. 19 years old
   5. 20 or more
2. Are you male or female?
   1. Male
   2. Female

3. Where do you live?
   1. City (over 2,500 population)
   2. Town or village (under 2,500)
   3. In the country, but not on a farm
   4. On a farm

4. Do you have any physical handicaps? (Answer "Yes" if you have a handicap that prevents or restricts your participation in activities engaged in by your age mates.)
   1. Yes
   2. No

5. What is your religious identification?
   1. Baptist
   2. Episcopalian
   3. Jewish
   4. Lutheran
   5. Methodist
   6. Presbyterian
   7. Roman Catholic
   8. United Church of Christ
   9. Other: ______________________
   10. None

6. What is the marital status of your mother and father?
   1. Both alive, living together
   2. Both alive, separated
   3. Both alive, divorced
   4. Father not living
   5. Mother not living
   6. Neither father nor mother living

7. Who are you living with?
   1. Both parents
   2. My mother only
   3. My father only
   4. My grandparents
   5. Other: (Please specify) ______________________
   6. One real parent and one step-parent
   7. Foster parents
   8. An older brother or sister
   9. An aunt or uncle
8. How many living brothers and sisters do you have?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 or more

9. Are you:

1. The only child in the family?
2. The oldest child in the family?
3. The youngest child in the family?
4. Neither the youngest nor oldest?

10. What was the highest grade completed by your father and mother? (Circle one number in the left column for father and one in right column for mother.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Did not go to school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grades 1 - 7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Eighth grade</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Some high school but didn't graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Graduated from high school</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Went to vocational school after graduating</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Some college or university but didn't graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 College or university graduate (4 years)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. My parents (or guardians) are considered by most people in the community to be:

1. Very important people
2. Rather important people
3. Average people
4. Of less than average importance
5. Not at all important

12. Compared to the income of parents of other students in the high school, the income of my parents is:

1. One of the highest incomes
2. Higher than the average income
3. About average
4. Less than average
5. One of the lowest
13. My mother:
   1. Has no job outside of the home
   2. Has a part-time job outside the home
   3. Has a full-time job outside the home

14. My father's major occupation (job that provides major portion of income) is: (Be specific)

   If farmer: How many acres does he own? ______ (estimate)
   How many acres does he rent? ______ (estimate)

15. Does your father consider his occupation to be:
   1. Completely satisfactory?
   2. Fairly satisfactory?
   3. Good enough?
   4. Not very good?
   5. Very poor?

16. Does your mother consider your father's occupation to be:
   1. Completely satisfactory?
   2. Fairly satisfactory?
   3. Good enough?
   4. Not very good?
   5. Very poor?

17. Do you consider your father's occupation to be:
   1. Completely satisfactory?
   2. Fairly satisfactory?
   3. Good enough?
   4. Not very good?
   5. Very poor?

18. Estimate of family income:
   1. Under $3,000
   2. $3,000 to 5,999
   3. $6,000 to 8,999
   4. $9,000 to 11,999
   5. $12,000 or over
19. Compared to other parents in the community, do you consider your parents and/or guardians to be:

1. Superior as parents and/or guardians?
2. Above average?
3. Average?
4. Below average?
5. Ineffective as parents and/or guardians?

20. The number of years you have lived in this community (school district) is:

Less than 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9 or more

21. The amount of time that you spend in part-time work is:

1. None
2. 1 - 5 hours per week (on the average)
3. 6 - 10 hours per week (on the average)
4. 10 or more hours per week

22. On the average, during the school year, how many hours a week do you spend on homework away from school? ______ hours

23. The political preference of your father is:

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent or none

24. The political preference of your mother is:

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent or none

25. Your political preference is:

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent or none
26. Do you want to go into the military service?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   Why or why not? ____________________________________________

27. Have you considered making the military your career?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   Why or why not? ____________________________________________

28. Concerning the draft:
   1. I am not eligible—I have a physical disability
   2. I will take my chances on not being drafted
   3. I will get out of going some way or another
   4. I will volunteer for the draft
   5. I don't know what I will do
   6. I am a girl and am not subject to the draft
   7. I am enlisting and not subject to the draft

29. To what extent do you think the following describe your physical status? Circle the number under the response that best describes how you feel about yourself for each of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Energetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Attractive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Athletic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Graceful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. To what extent do you think the following describe you academically? Circle the number under the response that best describes how you feel about yourself for each of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Talented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Successful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thorough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Capable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Intelligent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. To what extent do you think the following describe you in your social relations? Circle the number under the response that best describes how you feel about yourself for each of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Cooperative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dynamic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accepted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Popular</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Self-confident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. If you could have as much education as you desired and were completely free to choose, which of the following would you do?

1. Graduate from high school and never go to school again.
2. Graduate from high school and then complete a business, commercial, nurses training, or some other technical school program.
3. Graduate from high school and get some college training, but not a college degree.
4. Graduate from a college or university.
5. Complete additional studies after graduating from a college or university.
33. What do you really expect to do about your education?

1. Graduate from high school and never go to school again.
2. Graduate from high school and then complete a business, commercial, nurses training, or some other technical school program.
3. Graduate from high school and get some college, but not a college degree.
4. Graduate from a college or university.
5. Complete additional studies after graduating from a college or university.

34. Check the extra curricular activities that you have participated in or are participating in while in high school. Other activities not listed, write in on appropriate blank lines.

**School Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>Annual staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Student Gov't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Class plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Glee Club</td>
<td>Speech, debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td>Future Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural</td>
<td>volley</td>
<td>Future Home-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Church Groups</th>
<th>Other (non-school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-H Club</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts</td>
<td>Worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts</td>
<td>Church School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**35.** Do you feel that your high school is adequately preparing you for your future educational or occupational goals?

1. Yes  
2. No

If yes, why? If no, why not? __________________________________________
36. What specific occupations have you considered going into?

1. ____________________ 2. ____________________

3. ____________________ 4. ____________________

37. What occupation do you think you will finally enter? ____________________

38. For the occupation you have chosen in Item 37, do you think your ability is:

1. Very much above average?
2. Somewhat above average?
3. Average?
4. Somewhat below average?
5. Very much below average?
6. Haven't made a choice yet.

39. Compared to your friends, do you think your chances for getting ahead in an occupation of your choice are:

1. Very much above average?
2. Somewhat above average?
3. Average?
4. Somewhat below average?
5. Very much below average?

40. Would you rather work with:

1. Things?
2. People?
3. Ideas?

41. Would you rather work for:

1. A small company or business?
2. A very large company or business?
3. Yourself?
4. The government?
5. A religious or charitable organization?
6. Other: ____________________
42. Would you rather work:
   1. Inside
   2. Outside

43. Why do you think you will finally enter the occupation listed in Item 37? Circle as many of the following reasons as apply.
   1. This is an important job.
   2. It pays good money.
   3. Other people will look up to me.
   4. It matches my abilities.
   5. I can be my own boss.
   6. I know a lot about it.
   7. It offers me security.
   8. My parents want me to.
   9. It is exciting work.
   10. I can help other people.
   Other reasons: ____________________________________________

44. How sure are you that the occupation listed in Item 37 will be the kind of work you will finally enter? (Circle one response I feel):
   1. Very sure
   2. Sure
   3. Not very sure
   4. Uncertain
   5. Very uncertain

45. After high school my best friend is going to:
   1. Get married immediately
   2. Get a job (other than just for the summer months)
   3. Enter the military
   4. Attend college
   5. Attend a vocational or technical school
   6. Get a job and continue his/her education
   7. I don't know what he/she is going to do

46. Think of the person whom you would most want to fashion your life after. Is this person? (Circle one number)
   1. A teacher or school counselor
   2. Your father or mother
   3. An older brother or sister
   4. A relative not in your immediate family
   5. A close friend, not related to you
   6. A movie or TV star
   7. A famous athlete
   8. An important government official
   9. Other: (specify) ____________________________________________
C. Check List. Indicate your reaction to each of the following statements by checking the appropriate column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>This community is an ideal place in which to live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I hope to move away from here within the next few years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It is easy for a high school graduate to find a job in this community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The community has provided adequate and available facilities for recreation; e.g., tennis courts, swimming pool, dancing facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There are, in the community, adequate and available library facilities, both for research and for general reading pleasure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The churches should provide more social and recreational opportunities for youth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The religious training I have received helps in decision-making and problem-solving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Parents should plan for only as many children as they can help get started in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The local community leaders are conscious of youth needs and problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Social status or &quot;pull&quot; determines who gets a job in this community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It doesn't make any difference how hard you study in school, its who you are that counts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Check List. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. People who can’t leave their home towns are hard for me to understand.

13. I know all there is to know about dating, sex, and marriage.

14. There seems to be less happiness in my home than is the case with most of my friends.

15. Sometimes I get a bit frightened when I look beyond graduation from high school.

16. Religion does more harm than good; it has no place in a scientific society.

17. I consider non-violent racial demonstrations to be an expression of our democratic rights.

18. It would not matter to me if a friend of mine dated a person of another race.

19. The United States has an obligation to give aid to foreign countries.

20. Government has an obligation to bring help to poverty-stricken areas.

21. Young people should join the Peace Corps, VISTA, or other such programs, to help the needy.

22. Teachers in the local school take a personal interest in their students.

23. Senior high school students are required to take too many impractical courses.
C. Check List. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. I am pleased with the changes that are taking place in the Catholic and Protestant churches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Parents have a responsibility to ensure their offspring vocational training or a college education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

FORMULAS FOR RATIOS RELATING TO AGE DISTRIBUTION

1. Dependency Ratio (DR) =
   \[
   \frac{\text{Number of persons under age 15, plus persons 65 and over}}{\text{Number of persons 15 - 64}} \times 100.
   \]

2. Child Dependency Ratio (CDR) =
   \[
   \frac{\text{Number of persons under age 15}}{\text{Population 15 - 64}} \times 100.
   \]

3. Aged Dependency (ADR) =
   \[
   \frac{\text{Number aged 65 and over}}{\text{Population 15 - 64}} \times 100.
   \]

4. Young Adult Ratio (YAR) =
   \[
   \frac{\text{Number 15 - 34}}{\text{Remainder of population}} \times 100.
   \]

5. Index of Aging (IA) =
   \[
   \frac{\text{Number age 65 and over}}{\text{Children (population) under 15}} \times 100.
   \]
A TYPOLOGY OF COMMUNITIES

The typology consists of four community types: Transmigrational, Traditional, Transitional, and Transmutational. The Transmigrational community derives its name from its history of migrations, either in the search of food and fiber or to escape persecution; in either case, the concern is with maximizing the survival chances of the community. As in the case of most of the types in this typology, there are two sub-types of Transmigrational communities. The most typical of these is that of the hunting and fishing tribes, or food gatherers, which could not be hampered by waiting for the aged or the handicapped, who not uncommonly fell by the wayside. This sub-type is becoming increasingly historical. Its modern counterpart is no longer a highly mobile community of food gatherers, but of groups such as the Hutterites. Both of these sub-types attempt to assimilate all of the persons born into the system, and also split up to form new groups when the parent group gets too large to function efficiently. However, the latter sub-type has sacrificed some of its self-sufficiency and has become dependent on the larger society in achieving a higher standard of living for its members.

---

The Traditional community is an inevitable development of social interaction unrestrained by deliberate planning or tradition. The result is a stratified society, with differential rewards usually characteristic of the system. A few reap the greatest rewards, while the many live at a subsistence level—apparently subjected to the iron law of wages. The particular pattern that evolves usually comes to have the benefits of religious sanctions. Differential fertility restricts population numbers in the upper strata, while the disadvantaged are periodically decimated by famine, disease, and war, or are liberated occasionally by the opening up of new frontiers. Again, as in the case of the Transmigrational community, it is helpful to think of two sub-types. One of these is based on an agricultural economy and is typified by "The Corporate Family in Confucian China" and "The Bilateral Extended Family in Latin Europe." The other sub-type is based on an industrial economy, and is exemplified by the one-industry town and the American class system as depicted in The Protestant Establishment. The main difference between the two sub-types is

---

1The Traditional and Transitional community types differ from the manner in which these types have been defined by the late Dr. Vernon Malan, the writer's one-time thesis adviser. See: Vernon Malan, "The Dakota Indian Family," Bulletin 470, Rural Sociology Department, South Dakota State College, Brookings, 1958, pp. 7-11.


3Baltzell, loc. cit.
that the former maintains some degree of population stability through a combination of high birth and death rates, while the latter, ideally, is characterized by low birth and death rates.

The Transitional community is one that develops whenever a new frontier is opened, whether the new frontier be geographical or technological. Rather than having two sub-types, the Transitional community goes through two phases. In the initial phase it goes through a period of rapid population growth, primarily through immigration. As this community type exists in time it tends to move in the direction of becoming a Traditional community, but it maintains a positive value on fertility even though it informally compels many of its members, especially youth, to look for opportunities elsewhere. In the past, the Transitional community, made up of first and second generation migrants, has had great confidence in the ability of its exported youth to make good wherever they happened to migrate. In recent years, however, there has been a growing concern with preparing youth more adequately for life outside the local community. This concern has been reflected in the development of guidance and counseling services, and vocational as well as academic curricula, in the public schools. This tendency is a countervailing force against the drift toward traditionalism, and is in anticipation of the final community type. In the past, the trade center has been an example of this type, but the highly specialized scientifically oriented community reflects some
of the characteristics of the Transitional community, especially in its initial phase.

The Transmutational community is a hypothetical community of the future. Although not as detailed as Brave New World or 1984,\(^1\) this type does contain some characteristics which may be as dismaying to some people as those pictured in the above-mentioned books. However, a review of the characteristics reveals that many of these are already visible, at least to a discernible degree.

In referring to the type as a hypothetical community of the future, two observations are noted. The first of these relates to the difficulties President Lyndon Baines Johnson is having with the "Great Society" programs. The other observation is that the problems of a complex mass society are such that only a planned approach can maximize prospects for human survival; at least, those who are in leadership roles are, for the most part, convinced of this need. Chances are that, if this series of "Great Society" programs doesn't prevail, subsequent but similar programs will.

This type is referred to as the Transmutational community, following the pattern introduced by Stewart's reference to America as a "Transmuting Pot" rather than a "Melting Pot." His argument is that the immigrants came to America in such relatively small

waves that each wave was converted or socialized in essential American ways before the subsequent wave came, without causing much of an influence on the developing American mores.¹

The general assumption is that any community, anywhere, can be placed in one of the four categories in the typology. Communities of the Transmigrational type are those that ascribe statuses to their members. To be a member is to subordinate oneself to the well-being of the group. Members are trained in the community by its functionaries to participate within the community. In its pure type, the socialized member is not prepared to live outside the community. However, there is a place for all within who are able-bodied (in the Horde type) and will conform to group expectations. Deviant behavior is minimal, although a particular Transmigrational community may develop a personality type that may appear abnormal by other community standards.

The Traditional community, in essence, exists for the benefit of the elite. Such concessions as may be made to the masses are deemed necessary to retain some degree of integration. Persons who are socialized within this community type experience differential treatment and expectations, depending upon their socio-economic placement through the accident of birth. Children of the elite tend to develop concepts of self in which success is viewed as a right to which they have unquestioned title. Among the masses, the

prevalent concept of self is that of one who has been decreed by fate (or providence) to live in servitude. However, history does relate incidents in which the masses have revolted, sometimes with success but more frequently with failure. With increasing literacy, and under the impact of the mass media, this community as a pure type is being compelled to make adjustments. The adjustments being made are in the direction of characteristics associated with the Transmutational community in this typology.

The Transitional community is of primary interest in this study. This type, brought into being by the opening up of a new frontier, fosters a spirit of individualism and opportunism, especially in its early phase. The adult generation has internalized the philosophy or ideology identified with the Turner thesis, that success awaits the individual who moves on the newer frontiers—but they are vicariously applying it through their sons and daughters. For many of the adults consider themselves too weary, old, or deeply rooted in the present community, to tackle a new frontier before retirement. In fact, they are not certain that such frontiers exist, but they have begotten children whom they casually assume will find some frontier and success if only they exercise the virtues of initiative, thrift, and diligence imparted to them in the process of socialization. The youth they are sending out are older, have more years of formal education than they have, and are assumed to be adequately prepared for the venture which they are expected to pursue.
The Transmutational type, the hypothetical community of the future, is developing as a reaction to the inequities of the Traditional community and the frustrated optimism and impractical individualism of the Transitional community. Its prototype is exemplified by the "Great Society" programs. It seeks to provide a meaningful existence for all who are born or permitted to immigrate to it; ultimately, however, both of the above will be controlled so that the available resources can be divided among societal members so that each may enjoy an acceptable level of living. Made possible by Western industrialization, it is said to have brought "the anomaly of the individual being urged to take his place as a cog in one of his own machines." The earliest form of man's life, as Jessop saw it, was collective. The wheel of history is seen to have come full circle, to a new collectivism.¹

This new collectivism is suspect to those emotionally committed to Turner's thesis. It is supported by those who believe that mankind is not as apt to be judged or destroyed from without as from within. Its coming is opposed by those who find it difficult to see beyond their immediate vested interests. Among its ideological supporters is that of enlightened self-interest, which stresses that one's long-range well-being is tied in with the well-being of all mankind. While the characteristics of the Transitional community were supposedly formed at the grass roots and on the frontier, the nature of the Transmutational community develops

¹Martindale, loc. cit., p. 69.
out of experimental programs sponsored at the level of the nation-
state. Not until these programs have gained some maturity and
have filtered down to the local level will there actually be a
Transmutational community in existence.

The three communities included in this study were considered
to be of the Transitional type, and all are less than a century
old. Young, as far as community life-span is concerned, they
recall the many communities that struggled with them in their infant
years and have long since ceased to be. They are vividly aware
that the grim reaper—net out-migration—continues to claim com-
munities throughout most of rural America, especially the upper
midwest.

Kingsbury County and Its Seat

The area of South Dakota, of which Kingsbury County is a
part, was the center of a large Indian reservation from 1867 to
1869. Originally set up by an Executive Order of President Andrew
Johnson on April 24, 1867, the reservation included all land lying
between the Big Sioux River and the Big Sioux River north of the forty-
fourth parallel and south of the forty-fifth. Intended for Indians

Indian otherwise noted, the history and background
material in this paper are adapted from History of the Kingsbury and
School, compiled by Donald D. Parker, History Department, South
APPENDIX E

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The geographical area in which the three communities included in this study are located was a part of the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. By an Act of Congress in 1849, it became a part of the newly organized Territory of Minnesota, with the West River area of contemporary South Dakota being Nebraska Territory. The Territory of Dakota was organized in 1861, with William Jayne, of Illinois, as the first Territorial Governor. Montana, initially a part of Dakota Territory, was separated away in 1869, and twenty-eight years later the remaining territory was divided into North and South Dakota, according to the present boundaries of the respective states. South Dakota was granted statehood in 1889.

Kingsbury County and De Smet

The area of South Dakota, of which Kingsbury County is a part, was the center of a large Indian reservation from 1867 to 1869. Established by an Executive Order of President Andrew Johnson on March 20, 1867, the reservation included all land lying between the James River and the Big Sioux River north of the forty-fourth parallel and south of the forty-fifth. Intended for Indians

---

1Unless otherwise noted, the history and background materials in this paper are adapted from History of Our County and State, compiled by Donald Dean Parker, History Department, South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota, 1960.
involved in the uprisings in Minnesota, it was never used. Therefore, the reservation was abolished by Executive Order of President U. S. Grant on July 13, 1869.

Although Nicollet and Freeman reportedly visited the northeastern corner of the county's area in 1839, the first settlement was made in 1872, the year of the county's creation, when Jacob Hanson located in a "little clump of timber on the northwest point of Lake Albert." However, it was not organized until 1879, at which time the present boundaries were arranged. The county was named after George W. Kingsbury (1837-1925), pioneer of Yankton, editor, historian, legislator, and author of the History of Dakota Territory published in 1915.

Without the assistance of the steam engine, the prairie land in the county would have waited many years before being brought under cultivation. But the Dakota Central Railroad, a branch of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, extended its line into the county in 1879. Cheap freight rates brought not only the settlers but also their belongings.

Settlers, consisting of many foreign nationals as well as native American stock, streamed into the county in the 1880-1885 period. Motivated by abundant crops, most of the settlers purchased machinery and plowed up as much land as possible. Those who had gone into debt to finance their operations were hard pressed by the drouths of 1894-1895; many were forced to sell or foreclose their lands and move away. This served as a real awakening as to
the ability of South Dakota agriculture to produce abundant crops year after year. Subsequently, diversified farming practices have been followed, resulting in a more stable economic situation for the farmer.

Four important lakes are located within the county's boundaries—Henry, Thompson, Preston, and Spirit. These have provided excellent fishing and hunting, although recently lake improvement projects have been considered to strengthen the area as a recreational center.

The county seat was located in De Smet on May 3, 1880. However, Lake Preston unsuccessfully challenged De Smet for the honor of being the county seat in elections on November 2, 1880 and around 1900. An intense rivalry has continued between the two communities.

De Smet was plotted and established early in 1880 by the Western Lot Company as the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad Company extended its tracks further into Kingsbury County. The second meeting of the Board of Commissioners appointed by the Territorial Governor designated De Smet as the county seat. At the same meeting, the Board accepted an offer of a block of land for the county buildings, the same being made by the president of the above-mentioned railroad.

De Smet was named in honor of Father Peter John De Smet, "Apostle to the Indians," who explored most of the Dakota Territory and spent most of his life ministering to the Indians.
De Smet was the earliest town in the county to continue, and has proven to be a progressive center. In 1885 a creamery was started, which handled as much as 90,000 pounds of milk a day and shipped butter by the carload. Because of its creameries, De Smet was known for a time as the "Cream City."

The community also had a stove factory which manufactured a hay- or straw-burning stove, which was widely used in the early years. At the turn of the century, a municipal gas plant provided gas for light and heat for cooking. The city was among the first in the area to have concrete sidewalks and hard-surfaced streets. One of its geographical assets has been that it rests above interlocking lakes of good, pure water, obtainable by wells of about thirty feet in depth.

De Smet and Kingsbury County share heritages in being the locale of four of the books for children written by the beloved Laura Ingalls Wilder; this is the "Little Town on the Prairie" (title of one of the books). This was the birthplace of the Wilder's daughter, Rose Wilder Lane, journalist and novelist, who also wrote on the pioneering of the area. Nearby was the birthplace of Harvey Dunn, N. A., famed illustrator and painter of the West. Ivan Dmitri, etcher and color photographer, resided in two towns of the county in his boyhood.  

The history and heritage of the area have received recognition in the De Smet community. Since 1889, a Kingsbury County


2Ibid., p. 5.
Old Settler's Day has been observed on the Tenth of June each year. Hundreds of visitors and students reportedly come to De Smet and Kingsbury County each year to visit the setting of some of the Wilder stories and to view original Harvey Dunn paintings.

The population of De Smet and Kingsbury County has been heterogeneous from the time of the first settlers. Its pluralistic ethnic character was listed by community leaders as one of the reasons why De Smet has been a progressive, friendly and tolerant community. Population data have been presented in Table I. The data show that whereas Kingsbury County had a maximum population of 12,831 in 1940, De Smet's population, except for the 1910-1920 decade, has continued to grow. Although listed in the 1960 Census at 1,324, a more recent survey estimated the 1964 population to be 1,500.¹

In summarizing the history of Kingsbury County and De Smet, it can be said that drought called for an early adjustment in agricultural practices in the area and that the people have been adjustment-oriented throughout the history of the community.

Miner County and Howard

Although Miner County was created in 1873, few white men had set foot in it prior to 1878, and it was not organized until 1880. The first homesteader, Matthew Moore, came from Minnesota in 1878, and the real settlement came in 1879, greatly aided by three

¹Ibid., p. 2.
railroads which had built lines into the area. Among the early settlers were various ethnic groups, e.g., native American, Norwegians, Germans and Welsh.

TABLE I.--Census data for Kingsbury County and De Smet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>De Smet</th>
<th>Kingsbury County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>8,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>9,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>12,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>12,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>12,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>12,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>9,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originally created by the Territorial Legislature on January 8, 1873, it consisted of the northern halves of the present Miner and Sanborn Counties, while the southern halves made up a county known as Brambles. Each county was twelve miles wide and forty-eight miles long from east to west. In 1879, the legislature combined these two counties into one, under the name of Miner. In 1883, this county was again divided, this time north
and south, so that the two counties, Miner and Sanborn, assumed their final form, each consisting of twenty-four miles square.

Miner County supposedly honors two men of the same name but unrelated to each other: Captain Nelson Preston Miner, a native of Hartland, Ohio, and Ephraim Miner, an early settler of Yankton. Both were members of the same legislature, and both were active in the creation and adjustment of county boundaries. Captain Miner appeared to have had a stronger claim to the honor, for the two men were mentioned jointly only in a few instances. Captain Miner organized an army company of one hundred men, which was assigned to duty in the Indian Country, and saw considerable action in quelling disturbances. Captain Miner and his men erected the first permanent schoolhouse in the state in 1864. The site, within the city limits of Vermillion, has been marked by a granite monument.

As has been the case in many counties, Miner County also experienced a "battle" over the location of the county seat. A struggle developed between Forestburg, the initial county seat in the county as originally organized, and Howard, with the latter the eventual winner. The election giving the county seat to Howard was reportedly decided by the voters in Carthage, who had been influenced by a wagon load of candy, tobacco, and beverages. It was said that more votes were cast than there were people living in the county at the time. One visitor to Howard voted four times by the
simple expedient of changing coats and hats, and, finally, by getting a shave.¹

However, ballots did not end the struggle, for Forestburg refused to give up the records. Highly incensed by this refusal, a party of fifty to sixty armed Howard men invaded Forestburg, overpowered the two men on guard, loaded the records into a wagon, and hastily headed toward Howard. They were met at the James River by the sheriff who carried an injunction. J. D. Farmer, himself a judge as well as developer of the Howard Community, urged the party to surrender the records and return them to Forestburg. Shortly thereafter the records were assigned to Howard by a court order. This struggle ended with the division of the county, mentioned above, in which the west half including Forestburg became Santorn County, of which Woonsocket became the county seat.

Howard, the largest and oldest town in Miner County, was surveyed and plotted June 27, 1881, on the homestead of J. D. Farmer, a judge. Ironically, named after a son of the judge—a promising young lawyer who shouldn't have died but did—Howard has been recently referred to as the town that should have died but didn't.²

¹Prairie Tamers of Miner County, prepared by the Federal Writers' Project of the Works Progress Administration in South Dakota, Lyle Reese, State Director, 1939, p. 10. Unless otherwise noted, the historical data for Miner County is taken from this source.

²Dakota Farmer, March 18, 1967.
Its future was threatened early when the Northwestern Railway decided to build its line between Hawarden, Iowa, and Iroquois through Vilas, three miles to the west. Several Howard merchants were ready to move to Vilas, but "several meetings were held, in which citizens and merchants pledged themselves to stand by the older town; and thus it was saved."¹ The interviewed leaders in Howard expressed concern with the town's struggle for survival, and with a commitment to "stand by the old town," they, too, believed it can be saved.

Population data for Miner County and Howard are presented in Table II.

Douglas County and Armour

Of the three communities involved in this study, Douglas County has a history which was, to the writer, most interesting, and for several reasons.

First, five years before settlement within its subsequent boundaries, Douglas County was created out of an irregular segment of Charles Mix County. Second, it was organized initially, and perhaps fraudulently, on February 16, 1881. At that time, a Mr. Brown and several associates petitioned the Governor to organize the county. The request was granted, and the newly appointed commissioners were issued several hundred thousand dollars in warrants.

¹Prairie Tamers of Miner County, loc. cit., p. 18.
TABLE II.—Population data for Miner County and Howard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Miner County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>7,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>8,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>8,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>6,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>6,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>5,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third mystery focused on the location of the county seat. The first courthouse was reportedly a prairie schooner, which was parked at Browndale. This community, one of many in Douglas County that did not survive, was located seven and a half miles from the present site of Armour and on the northwest corner of Section Twenty-Eight. Rumors circulated that a lookout with a telescope kept watch so that the county commissioners could make a quick getaway, should anyone want to challenge their operation.¹

One of the early settlers was Major Robert Dollard, later Attorney General of the State of South Dakota. He played an important role in having the first county charter revoked. When Douglas County was "duly" organized in 1882, attempts to secure the records and warrants were unsuccessful. The original commissioners and mobile courthouse had departed. Brownsdale, the first county seat, of which only three grave sites remain, "a phantom city, had been a brief but expensive luxury;" the county had to repay seven thousand dollars for warrants issued and monies spent.

The county seat of the reconstituted county was located at Huston. Another of the Douglas County communities that did not survive, it was located three miles east and one mile north of the present site of Armour. Huston's reign as county seat was extremely brief. Within its first year, an election removed the county seat to Grand View.

Grand View was a great town while it lasted. It "grew from one store in the summer of 1882 to a thriving town in 1884, 1885, and 1886. Then it went back to not much more than a store, blacksmith shop and courthouse again in the summer of 1887." In describing Grand View, one wrote, "What a superb location for a town! The site is nearly 100 feet higher than Armour, four miles south. It is also higher than Delmont... and Corsica... Douglas County's other two railroad towns. Grand View was in about

1Ibid., p. 58.
the exact geographical center of the county—an ideal spot for a county seat."¹

A roadside marker on State Highway Number Forty-Four, at the now vacated site of Grand View, reads in part as follows:

A village of intense rivalries, Upper Grand View, the original plot, the darling of the "King" Foster-Joe Devy interests, had a bank, the D. C. Chronicle (Democratic, then Republican), a church, hotels, the courthouse and the Silver Cornet Band. Lower Grand View to its south and west, and slightly lower, matched in every particular with the S. D. Tribune (Republican), the post office in lieu of the courthouse and the Martial Band. Those bands would play at the drop of a hat to show who was who in Grand View.

Grand View was also on the Fort Randall-Mitchell and Scotland-Plankinton Stage Lines and was, until the railroad reached Armour, the undisputed metropolis of that area. When Armour got the railroad, the exodus began. But being a trifle closer to the center of the county, Grand View survived two elections over the courthouse, the latter of which in May, 1889, may have been won by the rumor of a railroad for Grand View. In 1894, "Armour promised to build a good courthouse, if given the county seat."² Armour won this election, and the records were relocated in Armour on November 17 of that year.

The town of Armour was founded in 1886, although not incorporated until 1904; it was named after Philip D. Armour, meat packer and railroad director, who responded by purchasing a bell for the town's first church. Many of the Grand View people moved to Armour.

¹Ibid., p. 73. ²Ibid., p. 72.
A Mrs. Piner related "that all along the section line bordering Armour on the north, there were scattered piles of lumber, owned by prospective Armour residents who were forbidden by the townsite company to put any lumber on the townsite until after the lot sale."¹ Thus the final site of the courthouse came to be at Armour because a railroad was more interested in level land than a grand view.

Another factor that may have militated against Grand View was suggested by the following observation. "Douglas County has no permanent streams and no lakes worthy of the name. Flowing artesian wells are obtained all over the county except on the tops of the highest divides."

Douglas County was named for Stephen A. Douglas (1813-1861), the "Little Giant," lawyer and judge, and a member of Congress from 1841-1861. Popularly remembered because of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates on slavery which took place in 1858 in Illinois, the county honored him because he was responsible for the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854. The Bill "provided that two new territories, Kansas and Nebraska, were to be made from Indian Land that lay west of the bend in the Missouri River and north of 37 degrees north latitude."² The West River part of South Dakota was then included in Nebraska Territory.

¹Ibid., p. 71.
The non-native population of Douglas County in 1890 consisted primarily of two major foreign-born groups, immigrants from Germany and Holland. Descendants of these two groups have retained fairly strong identities, but primarily outside the Armour community.

Population data for Douglas County and Armour have been presented in Table III. The data show that whereas Douglas County reached its population peak in 1930, Armour reached its highest population in 1920, retained its numbers with little loss until 1940, and then dropped off in the last two decades.

**TABLE III.—Population data for Douglas County and Armour.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>Douglas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>5,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>6,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>7,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>6,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>5,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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