

COMMUNITY SELF-ASSESSMENT:  
THE CASE OF SMALL TOWN AMERICA

by

William E. Waters

B. S., Kansas State University, 1970

959-5358

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

1972

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

**THIS BOOK  
CONTAINS  
NUMEROUS PAGES  
WITH THE ORIGINAL  
PRINTING BEING  
SKEWED  
DIFFERENTLY FROM  
THE TOP OF THE  
PAGE TO THE  
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED  
FROM THE  
CUSTOMER.**

LD  
2668  
T4  
1972  
W37  
C.2  
DOCUMENTS

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Phillip Althoff, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Kansas State University, for his guidance in planning this study and in preparing the manuscript. In addition, Dr. Frederick Herzon, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Kansas State University, provided valuable assistance in preparing the data utilized in this study for computer analysis.

Also, the author would like to thank his wife, Mary, for her assistance, patience, and understanding which greatly aided the completion of this study.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
Chapter	
I. THE AMERICAN SMALL TOWN IN PERSPECTIVE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Research Procedure.....	7
Conclusion.....	11
II. THE TWO COMMUNITIES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Politics and Government.....	14
Finances.....	17
Economics.....	18
Conclusion.....	20
III. CITIZEN SUPPORT IN SMALL TOWN AMERICA.....	22
Introduction.....	22
The Survey Instrument.....	23
Basic Social Economic Characteristics.....	24
Pressing Needs.....	28
Community Rating.....	30
Indices of Community Rating.....	34
Social and Economic Differences in Community Rating....	38
Effect of Political Efficacy and Trust.....	54
Some Efforts for Increasing Small Town Viability.....	65
Business and Industry.....	66
Education and Recreation.....	75



IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	81
APPENDIX I.....	88
APPENDIX II.....	90
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95

### List of Tables

Table 1 : The Basic Social Economic Characteristics.....	25
Table 2 : Years of Residence, Social Organizations, and Political Party.....	27
Table 3 : Most Pressing Needs of the Communities.....	29
Table 4 : Community Ratings in Westmoreland and Enterprise.....	32
Table 5 : Indices of Community Rating in Westmoreland and Enterprise.....	37
Table 6 : Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sex.....	39
Table 7 : Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Age.....	41
Table 8 : Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Education.....	44
Table 9 : Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Occupation.....	46
Table 10: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Income.....	50
Table 11: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Years of Residency in the Community.....	53
Table 12: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sense of Political Efficacy.....	56
Table 13: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sense of Political Trust.....	58
Table 14: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of Local Government Action to Save Small Towns.....	60
Table 15: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of Local Business Leaders' Action to Save Small Towns.....	62
Table 16: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of State and National Leaders' Efforts to Save Small Towns.....	64

Table 17: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support Efforts to Increase Employment Opportunities.....	67
Table 18: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Businesses.....	69
Table 19: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Industries.....	70
Table 20: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Businesses, Even at the Expense of Higher Taxes.....	72
Table 21: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Industries, Even at the Expense of Higher Taxes.....	74
Table 22: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support Increased Taxes for Education.	76
Table 23: Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support Increased Taxes for Recreation	77

## CHAPTER I: THE AMERICAN SMALL TOWN IN PERSPECTIVE

### Introduction

Today, the cry is again being raised, as it has been for the past fifty years, that the future of the small town in rural America is indeed dim. This dire prediction is based upon the realization that, as American society has advanced, several things have occurred: The number of people employed in agriculture has declined because of the increased mechanization of farming techniques; the mass media has carried the supposed opportunities of urban life to the youth of small towns; and transportation improvements have allowed for a high level of mobility to urban areas.<sup>1</sup> In addition, urban centers provide more employment opportunities, usually with higher pay and more fringe benefits, than the employment opportunities available in small towns. Finally, there is a flare and excitement to urban life that is attractive to many, particularly the youth of America, including those in the small towns.

While it is true that fewer people live in small towns today than at any other time in America's immediate past history, many declare that they would like to, and most claim a family memory of the bliss of small town life. Until recently, a significant number of Americans spent all or some of their life in a small town, and the myths of small town life were rampant.

The myth structure of America's small towns probably originated with Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson thought that the agrarian,

including the small town, way of life was synonymous with democracy. He believed that there was a peculiar virtue in farming, not simply as an occupational pursuit, but as a way of life. He not only saw honesty, integrity, courage, and governmental capacity as the attributes of the simple yeoman, but considered cities as the "diseased" segment of society.<sup>2</sup>

Basic to Jefferson's theory of agrarianism was John Locke's "natural right" to property. In the new American republic the most common form of property was land, and, as a result, Jefferson reasoned that farming must be the most natural of occupations. And, if farming is the natural occupation, urban occupations must be unnatural and thus abnormal. Essentially, the agrarian theory is derived from the natural law concept.<sup>3</sup>

Jefferson's agrarianism became more powerful with the passing of time, and gradually acquired the stature of a myth. This agrarian myth intensified as the American frontier pushed westward. Frederick Jackson Turner and his followers extolled the individuality, the independence, and the democratic spirit of the American frontiersman. The values of Turner and his followers are exemplified by the values of the Midwestern small town. The agrarian myth structure now included the values of the Midwestern small town.

The values of the Midwestern small town are a direct consequence of the fact that the small town in the Midwest was seen as the agent of civilization and capital behind the sometimes bleak and desperate existence of the prairie farmers. Soon, the small town of the Midwest became the focus of rural discontent, of the

country's rebellion against the East with its large cities, bankers, monopolies, and railroads. The values of the Midwestern small town had become values of liberality and equality of opportunity.<sup>4</sup>

The rise of large cities changed the American small town. Some small towns, of course, became large cities, but those towns that were not already large cities, or on the way to becoming large cities were destined to remain small towns. Furthermore, population, and with it political and economic power, was slowly shifting from rural America and its small towns to urban constituencies.

The basic stereotypes of rural and urban communities became intensified and remained diametrically opposite to each other. The city was seen as an area dominated by "crime, dirt, filth, immorality, vice, and corruption . . . a collage of man's inhumanity to his fellow man . . . a place full of inhabitants whose only aim is to strip an honest man of his money and his virtue."<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the small town was seen as providing the opportunity to be "closer to nature, where a man can be physically and spiritually healthy, enjoying the simple pleasure of family living."<sup>6</sup>

Many researchers in the social sciences, in removing the facade of the stereotypes of the American small town, conclude that rural and small town life is sterile, i.e., that most small towns are resistant to new ideas or innovations. These observations are as misleading and untrue as the stereotypes that they attempt to disprove.

Although America's small towns, i.e., incorporated and unin-

incorporated communities with populations under 2,500, are neither as numerous nor as populated as they were earlier in the century, they numbered 13,706 and contained a total population of 53,886,996 in 1970.<sup>6</sup> These statistics compare favorably with 13,749 small towns with populations under 2,500 and containing a total population of 54,054,425 in 1960. In 1950, small towns with populations under 2,500 contained a total population of 54,478,981.<sup>7</sup> These figures indicate that the American small town is "holding its own."

Small towns continue to serve important and necessary functions; specifically, small towns provide basic connections between dispersed agricultural populations and agglomerated urban populations. For the most part, these direct connections are through the goods and services which are provided in the small towns for the agricultural populations surrounding them and as an entrepot for agricultural goods for the cities.<sup>8</sup> In addition, small towns provide financial, commercial, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities for the citizens that live in them as well as for individuals living in the immediate rural area. For example, small towns provide banking and insurance services for farmers in the surrounding areas as well as markets and transportation facilities for their agricultural products. Finally, small towns provide the environment for a distinctive life style attractive to many with rural or rural oriented backgrounds. For example, such entertainment facilities as theaters and taverns are centered in small towns, and fairs, ball games, and other sporting events are common affairs in small town life. In sum, while small towns may seem to be dying when viewed from the vantage point of

statistics, the small town remains a healthy component of the American scene.

Throughout most of the relevant literature, population change is used to measure the surge and decline of small towns.<sup>9</sup> However, this is not an adequate measure of the vitality of a small town. In the first place, hundreds of small towns are not even recorded in the official censuses because they are too small or are unincorporated. In the second place, where population data is available, population may not be a true reflection of small town viability. For example, the increase in population of a small town may be no more than the transfer of an originally dispersed hinterland population to a point of central residence. This kind of transfer of population will not significantly affect the amount of economic activity in the small town because these "new" residents were already within the economic sphere of the small town. Also, although a small town may show no growth in population, it may still be viable in economic terms as long as the hinterland population continues to demand the same level of goods and services.<sup>10</sup>

A necessary component of small town viability is citizen support--support ultimately in terms of finances for the continuation of existing, as well as for the initiation of new, programs. This support can come primarily from outside the community, i.e., from the state and national government, but ideally will come primarily from inside the community, i.e., from the citizenry itself. In the final analysis, of course, regardless of the degree of external support, the future of the small town rests upon the



degree of internal support. That is to say, while it seems likely that small towns cannot prosper without some kind of external support, they definitely cannot survive without internal support. Thus, the critical factor in the future of America's small towns seems to revolve around citizen support for the community.

Citizen support is a relatively difficult concept to define and measure. This is probably because the concept can entail numerous dimensions. For example, citizen support might imply a high level of participation in the political, economic, and social life of the community or, on the other hand, it might imply nothing more than an acceptance of the legitimate existence of the community. Citizen support, therefore, can be primarily active or primarily passive, or, as is probably most often the case, a combination of both active and passive elements.

Regardless of the manner in which citizen support is defined and measured, however, the nature of citizen support must be conditioned by the nature of the community. Specifically, if a community's citizens have a favorable rather than an unfavorable perception or assessment of the community and its facilities, it seems reasonable to assume that, at the very least, a solid basis for the development of citizen support exists. Thus, the citizen's perception or assessment of the community and its facilities is a variable relevant to the development, or continued existence, of citizen support.

This study presents the findings of a community self-assessment study conducted in two small Midwestern towns. The findings of this study are related to the critical question of citizen

support. Further, the implications of the findings are of fundamental importance to city planners and government officials interested in the revitalization of the American small town because any programs or proposals aimed at revitalizing the American small town should take into consideration the sentiments and feelings of the people most directly affected--the small town residents themselves.

### Research Procedure

**The Research Site:** Two small towns were selected as research sites. Only towns with a 1970 population of 2,500 or less were included in the population. Then, it was stipulated that the selected towns not be dominated by the economic structure of an urban center. That is, it was felt that the small towns selected should have a significantly independent economic life such that they could not be classified as suburbs or appendages of urban areas.

One of the small towns selected was Westmoreland, Kansas, an incorporated community with a 1970 population of 485, located approximately 20 miles northeast of Manhattan, Kansas. Westmoreland is the county seat of Pottawattomie County. Westmoreland was chosen partly as a result of ease of access, but primarily because it is an example of a typical Midwestern small town. Westmoreland is typical in that it is a local trade and service center providing goods and services for a dispersed agricultural population. In short, the frequency and magnitude of the functions

performed in Westmoreland depend on the economic structure of the surrounding agricultural area.

The other small town selected was Enterprise, Kansas, an incorporated community with a 1970 population of 868, located approximately 20 miles west of Junction City, Kansas, and approximately 7 miles east of Abilene, Kansas. Enterprise is the site of a small, but meaningful industry, the J. B. Ehram and Sons Manufacturing Company.

Enterprise was chosen in part as a result of ease of access, but primarily because it too is an example of a typical Midwestern small town. Enterprise is typical in that it is a local trade and service center providing goods and services for a dispersed agricultural population.

Certain contrasts are evident in comparing the two sites selected. These contrasts were ascertained on the basis of extensive field work. As noted above, Westmoreland is a county seat. A considerable number of the 13,706 small towns in the United States with populations under 2,500 are also county seats. Also, as noted above, Enterprise has located within it a small industry. Many of the small towns of America are also the sites of small industries.

The above mentioned observations should not leave one with the impression that Westmoreland is a community solely embroiled in the business of county government, or that the life of Enterprise entirely revolves around its manufacturing concern. Both towns, typical of small towns in agricultural areas, are local trade and service centers, providing goods and services for a

dispersed farm population, and serve as entrepots for agricultural products for urban centers.

The Survey Instrument: The survey instrument designed to collect the data for the realization of the purposes of this study was a radical expansion and revision of the Community Rating Schedule originally devised by the New York State Citizen's Council.<sup>12</sup>

As Delbert C. Miller points out concerning the Community Rating Schedule, "the quality of community life, of 'goodness' of the community is assessed" by this instrument. Specifically, the Community Rating Schedule requests that the respondent rate his community as good, fair, or poor in relation to similar communities in the United States in the following ten institutional areas of community life: education, housing and planning, religion, economic development, cultural opportunities, recreation, health and welfare, government, community organization, and equality of opportunity. In addition, the instrument allows for the recording of any qualifications expressed by the respondent.

The Community Rating Schedule suggested by the New York State Citizen's Council was revised to account for the unique aspects of small town America. Of the ten institutional areas devised by the New York State Citizen's Council, nine were finally selected as relevant for small towns. The area of equality of opportunity was dropped because both of the selected communities contained so few residents of minority races and nationalities as to deprive the area and its subsequent rating of much of its relevance. The nine eventually selected areas each were expanded from single

paragraphs in each area, each requiring a single rating to from three to five shorter statements, each requiring a single rating. This expansion was undertaken to remove some of the ambiguity inherent in the longer paragraphs. For example, in the area of cultural opportunities as devised by the New York State Citizen's Council, respondents were asked to rate the community's opportunity to enjoy music, art, and dramatics, as well as to rate the library, the newspaper, and the radio. This was accomplished within a single paragraph requiring an individual rating. Accordingly, three statements were devised, one appropriate to each of the categories of the area of cultural opportunities--music, art, and dramatics, the library, and the newspaper. Ultimately, the nine selected institutional areas were expanded to include thirty separate statements. Also expanded was the range of responses permitted by the respondents. In the New York State Citizen's Council Community Rating Schedule, respondents were permitted to reply good, fair, or poor. In the survey instrument utilized, respondents were permitted to reply excellent, good, average, poor, or bad. This expansion was to permit the respondents a greater flexibility in their responses.

Additional information solicited by the research instrument included such relevant variables as the respondent's age, sex, income, education, occupation, political party affiliation, membership in community organizations and geographic mobility. Other variables solicited by the research instrument included such variables as the respondent's degree of political efficacy and political trust with regard to the community's local government. Questions

were devised to obtain information on the above variables. In addition, questions were devised to ascertain the respondent's willingness to support or oppose efforts to increase the number and variety of employment opportunities in his community. Finally, questions were devised to ascertain the respondent's willingness to support or oppose increased taxes for education, recreation, business, and industry expansion.

**The Sample:** In order to select a sample in both Westmoreland and Enterprise, an engineering map of each community was obtained and stratified into areas based upon housing density and quality. Then, a random sample of houses from each strata was drawn. The total number of houses in the resulting sample was 134. These included 48 houses in Westmoreland and 86 houses in Enterprise. Trained interviewers were sent into the communities to administer the interview schedule. As a result, data was obtained from individuals in each of the houses in the sample.

### Conclusion

Historically, the small town has been located within the myth structure of rural life versus urban life. The origin of this myth structure has been traced as far back as Thomas Jefferson's agrarianism. Statistically, the small town has been placed in perspective by examining and comparing census figures for 1950, 1960, and 1970. Functionally, the Midwestern small town has been viewed in the broader regional context of agriculture. Further, citizen support has been examined and a conception of support has been advanced. Finally, this chapter has dealt with various meth-

odological questions pertinent to this research topic.

## Footnotes

1 Richard Pollay, "The Death of the Small Town: Some Causes and Cures," Kansas Business Review, XX (April, 1967), 3.

2 Bill G. Reid, "The Agrarian Tradition and Urban Problems," The Midwest Quarterly, VI (Autumn, 1964), 75, 77, 80.

3 Ibid., 77, 80.

4 Andrew Sinclair, "Small Town," The Spectator, CCXIII (November 27, 1964), 699.

5 Pollay, op. cit., 4.

6 Ibid.

7 U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Number of Inhabitants: 1970, United States Summary, 1-45.

8 Howard A. Stafford, Jr., "The Functional Bases of Small Towns," Economic Geography, XXXIX (April, 1963), 165.

9. Gerald Hodge, "Do Villages Grow?--Some Perspectives and Predictions," Rural Sociology, XXXI (June, 1966), 183-196.

10 Pollay, op. cit., 6.

11 Enterprise, Kansas has been the subject of books by Edward G. Nelson, The Company and the Community, (Lawrence: Bureau of Business Research, School of Business, University of Kansas, 1956), and Ellen W. Peterson, A Kansan's Enterprise, (Enterprise: Enterprise Baptist Church, 1957). Both books are useful aids in obtaining an historical perspective of Enterprise and its people.

12 A copy of the Community Rating Schedule devised by the New York State Citizen's Council and published in Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964) is included in Appendix I.

13 Miller, op. cit., 204.



## CHAPTER II: THE TWO COMMUNITIES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

### Introduction

This chapter contains a description of the form of government applicable to the towns of Westmoreland and Enterprise, as well as a breakdown of the assessed valuation and the tax levies for each community in fiscal year 1971. In addition, an impressionistic economic profile of each of the communities is presented.

### Politics and Government

Kansas statutes list three classes of cities. In general, cities with populations under 2,000 are cities of the third class, those with populations between 2,000 and 15,000 are cities of the second class, and those with populations over 15,000 are cities of the first class. Both Westmoreland and Enterprise are cities of the third class.

The statutes also list five forms of city government in Kansas: (1) mayor-council; (2) commission; (3) mayor-council-manager; (4) commission-manager; and (5) council-manager. Both Westmoreland and Enterprise have the mayor-council form of government.

Westmoreland and Enterprise elect both a mayor and a total of five councilmen at large. The mayor and councilmen must reside within the city limits and are elected for two year terms--two councilmen are elected every odd-numbered year, and three are elected every even-numbered year--on the first Tuesday of April. If a newly elected councilman fails to qualify, or if a vacancy

occurs, it is filled by appointment by the mayor with the consent of the council.

The mayor presides at the council meetings. He has the power to veto ordinances, but an ordinance may be passed over his veto by a majority of the councilmen. He has the power to break a tie of the council in certain cases. He appoints the appointive officers by and with the consent of the council. The mayor is the chief executive officer of the city. It is his duty to see that the laws and ordinances are enforced and that the officers perform their duties. He signs the commissions and appointments of all officers elected or appointed in the city. The mayor should have a general knowledge of the duties of all subordinate officers and cause all subordinate officers to be dealt with properly in the event of neglect or violation of duty.<sup>1</sup>

The mayor also has many functions of a symbolic nature. One such function is the authorization of proclamations. Proclamations have no statutory effect and are usually based on custom. The purpose of a proclamation is to direct the thinking of the people on a given subject for a specified time. Thus, a mayor may issue proclamations relating to Memorial Day, Fire Prevention Week, Clean-up Month, and other such events.<sup>2</sup> Other symbolic functions of the mayor include greeting and introducing dignitaries, presiding at ribbon cuttings for the purposes of opening new businesses and industries, and other such ceremonies.

The city council elects one of its own body as "president of the council" to preside at meetings of the council in the absence of the mayor. However, when the mayor is absent, neither the

president of the council nor the acting president of the council has the power to sign or veto ordinances.

The councilmen have little power when the council is not in session, but the council has a great deal of power as a city legislative body, as a policy-forming body, and as an administrative body. Much of the council work is done by committees; however, there is no statutory requirement for council committees. The primary purpose of committees is to gather information, make studies, and make recommendations to the council. At council meetings, committees make reports and request instructions and authority. Essentially, the council conducts the city's business affairs.<sup>3</sup>

The mayor, with the consent of the council, may appoint, at the first regular meeting of the governing body in May of each year, a city clerk, a treasurer, a marshal, an assistant marshal, policemen, a street commissioner, and any other such officers deemed necessary. Further, the council may by ordinance provide for the appointment of a city attorney. All officers, except the city attorney must be qualified electors of the city. The city attorney must be a qualified elector of the county or of an adjoining county.<sup>4</sup>

By Kansas statute, the mayor and the councilmen are elected on a non-party ballot though the individuals themselves may be active partisans. In the two towns in this study, there are usually a limited number of individuals vying for the positions of mayor and city council. In 1972, both the mayors of Westmoreland and Enterprise were professional men. Also, the majority of the

members of the city council in both towns were also professional men. Specifically, the mayor of Westmoreland in 1972 was a practicing pharmacist. The mayor of Enterprise in 1972 was the president of the Dickinson County Bank of Enterprise. In 1972, the members of the Westmoreland city council consisted professionally of a labor leader, a manager, a general contractor, a construction foreman, and an engineer. In 1972, the members of the Enterprise city council consisted professionally of two managers, a factory foreman, a retired school teacher, and a physician.

#### Finances

Most of the activities of small towns are financed in whole or in part by an ad valorem tax, a tax upon property. However, revenue is also obtained from charges for garbage and trash collection and disposal, fines and costs in municipal court, rental charges and penalties on books at the city library, charges for fire fighting outside the city limits, rental charges for the use of city buildings, fees charged for building permits, and taxes paid by owners and harborers of dogs. Further, all small towns share in the "liquor enforcement tax" collected on retail sales of alcoholic liquor and an occupation tax on retailers, and a portion of the sales tax, as well as a portion of the tobacco taxes.<sup>5</sup>

Westmoreland had a 1971 assessed tangible valuation of \$544,403. Westmoreland's 1971 tax levies were as follows: general operating 6.66 mills; bonds and interest 11.61 mills; trees

0.36 mills; streets 0.33 mills; and lighting 0.48 mills. The total Westmoreland city tax rate in 1971 was 19.44 mills and the total tax rate for all purposes was 94.22 mills.<sup>6</sup>

Enterprise had a 1971 assessed tangible valuation of \$1,117,879. Enterprise's 1971 tax levies were as follows: general operating 7.61 mills; fire, ambulance, and fire equipment 0.50 mills; buildings and maintenance 0.44 mills; library 1.75 mills; and parks and recreation 1.00 mills. The total Enterprise city tax rate in 1971 was 11.30 mills and the total tax rate for all purposes was 72.52 mills.<sup>7</sup>

#### Economics

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Westmoreland is the county seat of Pottawattomie County, but more importantly it is a trade and service center for the surrounding agricultural population. Of direct service to farmers in Westmoreland are a Farmer's Cooperative Association, a feed store, a repair shop, a hardware store, a Cooperative Extension Service, the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Farmer's Home Administration, an insurance agency, and three gasoline stations.

In terms of general service, Westmoreland has a coin operated laundry, a hospital, a fire department, a restaurant, a beauty shop, a barber shop, an appliance store, a social welfare office, a pharmacy, an antique and gift shop, a telephone office, two grocery stores, a shoe repair shop, a sporting goods store, and a

retail liquor store. In terms of educational and cultural service, the town has a primary and secondary school system, a regional library, and two churches. In terms of recreational services, the town has a newly opened youth center for teenagers; also, Westmoreland is located only 5 miles from Pottawatomie County State Lake number two. In addition, Westmoreland has a small weekly newspaper.

Enterprise is the site of the J. B. Ehram and Sons Manufacturing Company. The origin of the present firm can be traced to 1872; however, it was not incorporated under the laws of Kansas until 1902.<sup>8</sup> The principal products manufactured by the firm today include fertilizer plant equipment, grain handling devices, and medium heavy equipment. The company employs between 300 and 350 workers, about half of whom live within Enterprise with the remainder living in nearby rural and urban communities.<sup>9</sup>

More importantly perhaps, Enterprise is also the service center of a dispersed agricultural population. Of direct service to farmers in Enterprise are located an engineering company, a farmer's elevator, a hatchery, a real estate office, a hardware store, a lumber yard, and a bank. Furthermore, of particular interest to farmers, Enterprise is located next to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

In terms of general service, Enterprise has an air service, a funeral home, a post office, a pharmacy, a cleaners, a tailors, a beer parlor, two restaurants, a grocery store, a barber shop, a nursing home, an appliance store, a hotel, a physician, and a surgeon. In terms of educational and cultural services, the town

has a public library, an art gallery, the Enterprise Academy (a Seven Day Adventist Church School), and a Methodist Church. The public school children of Enterprise are bussed to school in Chapman, a small town with a 1970 population of 1,132, approximately 15 miles away. In terms of recreational services, the community has a baseball field, a community building, and a city park.

### Conclusion

This chapter has presented a description of the form of government in the towns of Westmoreland and Enterprise, as well as a breakdown of the assessed valuation and the tax levies for both of the communities in fiscal year 1971. Small town government is of particular importance to the future survival of small towns. Not only do small town governments have a great deal of money to allocate, but also they have the statutory power to conduct the city's business affairs. The programs and innovations necessary to revitalize a small town cannot be undertaken in complete isolation from the small town's governing body. The small town's officials, not only have a great deal of statutory power, but they also have the influence of custom to aid in governing small towns.

Finally, this chapter has also presented an impressionistic economic profile of each of the communities in this study. This was done to give the reader a list of the goods and services presently available in the communities in this study.

1 League of Kansas Municipalities, Handbook for the City Governing Body: Cities of the Third Class (Topeka: The League of Kansas Municipalities, 1963), p. 14.

2 Ibid., p. 98.

3 Ibid., p. 14.

4 Ibid., p. 19.

5 League of Kansas Municipalities, Kansas Government Pub. No. 132-69 (January, 1964), 73.

6 League of Kansas Municipalities, Kansas Government Journal, LVIII (January, 1972), 22.

7 Ibid., 17.

8 Edward G. Nelson, The Company and the Community (Lawrence: Bureau of Business Research, School of Business, University of Kansas, 1956), p. 317.

9 Ellen W. Peterson, A Kansan's Enterprise (Enterprise: Baptist Church of Enterprise, 1957), pp. 36-37.



### CHAPTER III: CITIZEN SUPPORT IN SMALL TOWN AMERICA

#### Introduction

As posited in Chapter I, the critical factor in the future of America's small towns is support. If small towns are to continue to play a meaningful role in American society, they must have support. This support must come ultimately in terms of finances for the continuation of existing programs as well as for the initiation of new programs. This support can come primarily from outside the community from the state and national government; however, it ideally should come from within the community from the citizenry itself.

Citizen support can be either active participation in the political, economic, and social life of the community by the individual, or it may be merely passive acceptance of the existence of the community by the individual. This citizen support whether active or passive or a combination of both active and passive elements, is conditioned by the citizen's perception of the community and its facilities. Specifically, if the citizen has a consistently unfavorable perception of the community and its facilities, it seems probable that only a weak degree of citizen support exists, if citizen support exists at all.

This chapter presents the findings of a community rating schedule as administered to 134 individuals in the towns of Westmoreland and Enterprise, Kansas. Also presented will be the social and economic characteristics of the respondents interview-

ed, including data on such variables as sex, age, education, occupation, and income. These variables present a social and economic profile of the respondents and, since the respondents are randomly selected, theoretically of the entire population of the communities in this study. Also presented in this chapter are data on the variable of years of residence in the community, social organization memberships of the respondents, and the political party affiliation of the respondents. Further, and perhaps most important, this chapter presents data on respondent willingness to pay for expansions of businesses and industries, as well as of educational and recreational facilities by means of increased taxes.

### The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument proposed to determine the degree of support exhibited by the respondents in Westmoreland and Enterprise toward their respective communities is a radical expansion of the Community Rating Schedule devised by the New York State Citizen's Council.<sup>1</sup> Essentially, this survey instrument was developed to permit a respondent to rate his community as "excellent," "good," "average," "poor," or "bad" in response to thirty statements about his community and its facilities. In addition, various questions requesting social, economic, and political data were asked of the respondents.

The survey instrument measures the respondent's assessment of the community and the community's facilities. As posited

earlier, perception of the community is an important element conditioning citizen support; therefore, a respondent's rating of the community is indicative of that respondent's degree of support for the community. Specifically, a respondent rating the community or a facility of the community as "excellent" or "good" is considered to have a higher assessment of the community and its facilities than a respondent rating the community or a facility of the community as "poor" or "bad". For the purposes of this study, a respondent rating the community or a facility of the community as "excellent" or "good" on the survey instrument is considered supportive of the community. A respondent rating the community or a facility of the community as "poor" or "bad" on the survey instrument is considered non-supportive of the community. A respondent rating the community or a facility of the community as "average" is not considered for the purposes of establishing the existence of citizen support.

#### Basic Social Economic Characteristics

Table 1 presents the basic social and economic characteristics of the sample of respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise. This table shows that 78 or 58.2% of the total respondents are over 45 years of age and that 37 or 27.6% of the total respondents are over 65 years of age. These facts coincide with the popular notion that most of the people living in small towns are middle aged or older.

Table 1 shows that 106 or 71.6% of the total respondents have

Table 1. The Basic Social Economic Characteristics

	Westmoreland (N=48)	Enterprise (N=86)
<b>Sex:</b>		
Males	23	40
Females	25	46
<b>Age:</b>		
25 and Under	4	9
26 to 34	8	13
35 to 44	7	14
45 to 54	6	15
55 to 64	9	11
Over 64	14	23
<b>Education:</b>		
Some Grade School	--	1
Completed Grade School	3	10
Some High School	10	14
Completed High School	22	29
Some College	6	24
Completed College	4	3
Some Graduate Study	3	5
<b>Annual Income:</b>		
Under \$2,500	2	15
\$2,500 to \$4,999	14	18
\$5,000 to \$9,999	16	31
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13	12
\$15,000 and Above	3	6
<b>Occupation:</b>		
Professional	11	16
Craftsman	10	18
Retail Worker	2	6
Housewife	14	29
Retired	10	15
Other	1	2

completed at least a high school education. These figures indicate that small town residents have achieved a relatively high level of education.

Table 1 shows that a large majority of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise earn an income of between \$2,500 and \$9,999. This fact coincides with the belief that the people of small towns are generally members of the middle class. Occupationally, most residents of small towns are popularly perceived as being of the "working class", i.e., non-professional people.

Table 2 presents the years of residence, social organization memberships, and the political party affiliation of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise. Table 2 shows that 83 or 61.9% of the total respondents have lived in the communities of Westmoreland and Enterprise for more than nine years. This finding coincides with the popular notion that the residents of small towns are not as mobil as the urban population. Also, in both Westmoreland and Enterprise churches or church related groups predominate among the social organizations most often mentioned by the respondents in the respective communities. This finding confirms the observation that churches or church groups play an important role in the lives of small town residents. Politically, residents of both Westmoreland and Enterprise are considerably more likely to be Republicans than Democrats. This fact coincides with the fact that the Midwest is generally considered to be a Republican stronghold.

Table 2. Years of Residence, Social Organizations, and Political Party

	Westmoreland (N=48)	Enterprise (N=86)
<b>Years of Residence:</b>		
Less than 1	5	8
1 to 3	4	10
4 to 6	8	7
7 to 9	1	8
More than 9	30	53
<b>Social Organizations:</b>		
Community Service	15	10
Church or Church Related	21	40
Masonic Lodges	5	14
Veterans Groups	8	2
Educational	2	5
Social Clubs	6	25
Professional	3	1
<b>Political Party:</b>		
Strong Republican	11	12
Not Strong Republican	12	16
Independent Republican	5	20
Independents	9	6
Independent Democrats	2	12
Not Strong Democrats	2	7
Strong Democrats	5	10

### Pressing Needs

Respondents in Westmoreland and Enterprise were asked to indicate the three most pressing needs of their respective communities. These pressing needs were then consolidated into five general areas of community needs. Specifically, the five areas included employment needs, educational needs, recreation needs, community service needs, and community solidarity needs. Community service needs include such respondent responses as "street repairs," "better fire department," or "an improved water system". Community solidarity needs include such respondent responses as "more pride," "greater participation in local activities," "better church attendance," "friendlier merchants," or "willingness to shop in local stores".

Table 3 presents the five general areas of community needs listing first pressing need, second pressing need, and third pressing need respectively. Table 3 shows that in Westmoreland both recreational and employment needs are mentioned by 34% of the respondents as the most pressing needs of the community. The fact that employment needs are of great concern in Westmoreland is a reflection of the fact that if small towns are to prosper and indeed survive, employment opportunities must be available to the citizenry. As a component of small town viability, recreational services are perceived as an important need. Small towns must be able, not only to retain the existing populus, but to attract new people as well. Modern recreational facilities are an attraction, not only to the existing populus, but to potential migrants

Table 3. Most Pressing Needs of the Communities

Order of Listed Needs:	Westmoreland (N=48)			Enterprise (N=86)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Employment	34%	24%	29%	15%	21%	21%
Education	6	20	--	--	--	--
Recreation	34	17	14	33	27	16
Community Service	22	35	43	43	39	37
Community Solidarity	3	3	14	6	12	26



to the community.

Table 3 shows that in Enterprise community service needs are mentioned by 43% of the respondents as the most pressing need. The frequent listing of community service needs represents a desire on the part of the citizenry of Enterprise to improve the relative quality of the community. As mentioned previously, Enterprise has a small striving industry; therefore, respondents in Enterprise relegate employment needs to a somewhat lower priority than the respondents in Westmoreland. Recreational needs are mentioned by 33% of the respondents as the most pressing need in Enterprise. Again, this reflects a recognition on the part of the respondents in Enterprise that modern recreational facilities are an important asset to community viability. Modern recreational facilities are an attraction to the residents of the community as well as to potential migrants to the community.

#### Community Rating

This section of the chapter presents the finding of the revised community rating schedule for the entire thirty areas of the schedule. These findings show what percentage of the respondents in Westmoreland and Enterprise are supportive or non-supportive of their respective communities.

Table 4 shows the findings of the revised community rating schedule for the thirty areas of inquiry. In this table the five possible responses of the respondents--"excellent," "good," "average," "poor," or "bad"--have been trichotomized into three re-

responses--specifically, "good," "average," or "poor". These responses were trichotomized because for the purpose of analysis, as indicated earlier in this chapter, "excellent" or "good" responses are considered "good" or supportive responses, "average" responses are considered neutral responses, and "poor" or "bad" responses are considered "poor" or non-supportive responses. These same trichotomized values will be used throughout the remainder of this study.

The findings presented in table 4 indicate a high degree of support for the respective communities in the vast majority of the areas of inquiry. Only in the area of adult recreation do respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise indicate a considerable degree of non-support.

The highest ratings in Westmoreland with their percentages of support were as follows: freedom of worship (98%), adequate medical facilities (92%), church influence (83%), library (79%), church strength and support (77%), and community spirit and pride (75%). These findings confirm the importance of church and church related activities in the lives of small town people. The high rating of the medical facilities in Westmoreland is a reflection of the fact that the town has not only a practicing physician, but also a modern hospital, a rarity in a town the size of Westmoreland.

The lowest ratings in Westmoreland with their percentages of support were as follows: high school aged recreation (34%), adequate employment opportunities (23%), adult recreation (22%), and music, art, and dramatics (17%). Even among these lower ratings, only adult recreation had more than 50% of the respondents indicating

Table 4. Community Ratings in Westmoreland and Enterprise

	Westmoreland (N=48)			Enterprise (N=86)		
	Good	Ave.	Poor	Good	Ave.	Poor
Adequate Medical Facilities	92%	6%	2%	81%	15%	4%
Provisions for the Aged and Underprivileged	55	32	13	48	32	20
Medical Assistance for the Poor	58	37	5	40	50	10
Local Newspaper	64	27	9	58	33	9
Music, Art, and Dramatics	17	40	43	31	37	32
Library	79	17	4	91	9	--
Capable Citizens Seek Public Office	53	34	13	43	36	21
Controversy Among City Officials	41	46	13	32	46	22
City Officials Seek Public Opinions	32	38	30	29	36	35
Law Enforcement	38	32	30	55	29	16
City Government Efficiency and Honesty	67	27	6	50	34	16
Community Spirit and Pride	75	21	4	52	32	16
Citizen Participation	51	36	13	31	35	34
Citizen Opportunity to Participate	65	31	4	59	32	9
Freedom of Worship	98	2	--	97	3	--
Church Strength and Support	77	23	--	77	21	2
Church Influence	83	15	2	82	17	1
Adequate Schools	63	24	13	95	4	1
Teachers are Easily Attracted	41	34	5	68	27	5
Relationship Between Community & School Staff	55	34	11	85	15	--
Streets and Parks	51	36	13	65	23	11
Parking and Traffic	64	28	9	71	24	5
Housing	60	36	4	58	36	6
Grade School Aged Recreation	52	23	25	48	33	19
High School Aged Recreation	34	38	28	33	21	46
Adult Recreation	22	24	54	14	29	57
Adequate Employment Opportunities	23	30	47	50	32	18
Business, Agriculture, Government Cooperation	58	31	11	49	32	19
Business Expansion	45	40	15	47	21	32
Industrial Expansion	36	40	24	55	19	26

a "poor" rating. These findings coincide very well with the earlier finding that 34% of the respondents in Westmoreland perceived recreational needs as the most pressing need of the community. Also, 34% of the respondents in Westmoreland perceived employment needs as the most pressing need of the community. Again, these lower ratings of recreational and employment facilities reflect respondent concern about the adequacy of these facilities both for the present populus and for the potential populus in the coming years.

The highest ratings in Enterprise with their percentages of support were as follows: freedom of worship (97%), adequate schools (95%), library (91%), relationship between community and school staff (85%), church influence (82%), and adequate medical facilities (81%). As in Westmoreland, the high freedom of worship and church influence ratings confirm the importance of church and church related activities in the lives of small town people. The high ratings of the medical facilities and the library is a reflection of a great sense of local pride in these facilities in Enterprise. Respondents in Enterprise often accented their ratings of these facilities with comments such as, "we have a wonderful doctor," or "we have an outstanding library".

The lowest ratings in Enterprise with their percentages of support were as follows: high school aged recreation (33%), music, art, and dramatics (31%), citizen participation (31%), city officials seek public opinions (29%), and adult recreation (14%). As in Westmoreland only in the area of adult recreation did more than 50% of the respondents indicate a "poor" rating. While the above

ratings are relatively lower than all other ratings, it should be emphasized that in no area did the respondents give the community a large "poor" or non-supportive rating.

### Indices of Community Rating

For the purposes of further analysis, the data obtained from the revised community rating schedule has been indexed into the broader nine areas of health and welfare, cultural opportunities, city government, community organization, religion, education, housing and planning, recreation, and economic development. The index of health and welfare includes such community aspects as adequate medical facilities, provisions for the aged and underprivileged, as well as medical assistance for the poor. The index of cultural opportunities includes such community aspects as music, art, and dramatics, library facilities, as well as the local newspaper. The index of city government includes such things as capable citizens seek public office, controversy among city officials stems from honest differences of opinion rather than from selfish motives, and city officials seek citizen opinions. The index of community organization includes such things as adequate law enforcement, city government efficiency and honesty, community spirit and pride, as well as the degree of citizen participation in community affairs. The index of religion includes such things as freedom of worship, church strength and support, and church influence on the life of the community. The index of education includes such things as the quality of educational

facilities, how easy it is to attract teachers to the community, and the relationship between the community and the professional school staff. The index of housing and planning includes such things as housing quality and availability, as well as parking and traffic facilities. The index of recreation includes the availability of recreational facilities for all age groups. And finally, the index of economic development includes adequate employment opportunities, business, agriculture, and government cooperation for economic growth, as well as business and industrial expansion. The nine indices encompass the realm of activities and facilities in a small Midwestern town.

To create the respective indices the respondent's rating on each statement on the revised community rating schedule was given a numerical value and the sum of the values was divided by the total number of rating statements to be included in the index. The resulting dividend then became the value of the respondent's rating of the index area, and it is that value that is considered for the purposes of analysis. For example, if two statements are being combined into one index area and the respondent had given one of the statement a "good" rating and the other statement a "poor" rating the resulting index value would be determined this way. The "good" rating would be given a numerical value of 1 and the "poor" rating would be given a numerical value of 3. If the respondent had given one of the statements an "average" rating that rating would have been given a numerical value of 2. Since the numerical value of the "good" rating is 1 and the numerical value of the "poor" rating is 3 the sum of those values is 4. The

value 4 is then divided by the total number of statements being combined to form the index which in this example is 2; therefore, the resulting dividend is 2 and since 2 corresponds with the numerical value given to the "average" ratings, the respondent's rating on the index would be "average". The creation of these indices enables a broader, more generalized rating of the areas and thus allows for more general statements of analysis in each of the areas of community life.

Table 5 shows the findings of the revised community rating schedule for the nine indexed areas of inquiry. Particularly high ratings are indicated on all of the indices in both communities. Only on the index of recreation do the respondents indicate a greater than 10% "poor" rating.

The highest ratings in Westmoreland with their supportive percentages were as follows: religion (79.2%), health and welfare (65.2%), and community organization (51.1%). The lowest ratings in Westmoreland with their supportive percentages were as follows: economic development (25.5%), and recreation (20.8%). These relatively lower ratings coincide with the fact that 34% of the respondents in Westmoreland indicated that both recreational needs and employment needs were the most pressing needs of the community.

The highest ratings in Enterprise with their supportive percentages were as follows: religion (85.9%), and education (76.1%). The lowest ratings in Enterprise with their supportive percentages were as follows: community organization (23.5%), and recreation (15.7%). The rating on the community organization index is only relatively lower than the ratings on the other indices. In fact,

Table 5. Indices of Community Rating in Westmoreland and Enterprise

	Westmoreland (N=48)			Enterprise (N=86)		
	Good	Ave.	Poor	Good	Ave.	Poor
1.	65.2%	32.6%	2.2%	39.1%	57.7%	3.1%
2.	20.8	77.1	2.1	39.5	60.5	----
3.	31.3	64.6	4.2	30.6	62.4	7.1
4.	51.1	46.8	2.1	23.5	72.8	3.7
5.	79.2	20.8	----	85.9	14.1	----
6.	42.6	53.2	4.3	76.1	23.9	----
7.	42.6	55.3	2.1	46.5	53.5	----
8.	20.8	60.4	18.8	15.7	66.3	18.1
9.	25.5	74.5	----	40.5	55.7	3.8

\* In this table and all tables hereafter the numerals 1 through 9 indicate the following: 1. Health and Welfare, 2. Cultural Opportunities, 3. City Government, 4. Community Organization, 5. Religion, 6. Education, 7. Housing and Planning, 8. Recreation, and 9. Economic Development.



only 3.7% of the respondents gave the index of community organization a "poor" or non-supportive rating. The index of recreation is rated relatively lower because it is perceived as the most pressing need of the community by 33% of the respondents.

### Social and Economic Differences in Community Rating

In this section of the chapter an effort will be made to make a more complete analysis of the findings of the survey instrument by considering the effects of various social and economic differences of the respondents. The social and economic differences selected as relevant to small town residents included the following variables: sex, age, education, occupation, income, and years of residence in the respective communities. These variables were selected because each of the respondents could easily be differentiated on each of these variables. The relevance of these variables will be presented as this section of the chapter proceeds.

Table 6 shows to what extent sex is a relevant variable in the respondents' ratings of their respective communities. Table 6 shows a tendency for females to rate the communities higher than do males. For example, in Westmoreland females rated the community higher on all indices except those of education and recreation. In Enterprise females rated the community higher on all indices except those of health and welfare, education, and economic development. Possibly, the relatively lower ratings by females on the index of education is a consequence of the fact

**Table 6. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sex**

	Good				Westmoreland Average				Poor				Enterprise Average				Poor			
	M	F	(N=23)	(N=25)	M	F	(N=23)	(N=25)	M	F	(N=23)	(N=25)	M	F	(N=40)	(N=46)	M	F	(N=40)	(N=46)
1.	61.9%	68	7	38.1%	28	7	----	4	4	45.2%	33.3%	51.6%	63.6%	3.2%	3	3	----	----	----	
2.	17.4	24		82.6	72		----	4		34.1	44.4	65.9	55.6	4.9	9.1		----	----	----	
3.	30.4	32		60.9	68		8.7	----		24.4	36.4	70.7	54.5	2.6	4.8		----	----	----	
4.	45.5	56		50	44		4.5	----		10.3	35.7	87.2	59.5	2.6	4.8		----	----	----	
5.	78.3	80		21.7	20		----	----		82.9	88.6	17.1	11.4	----	----		----	----	----	
6.	45.5	40		54.5	52		----	8		76.5	75.7	23.5	24.3	----	----		----	----	----	
7.	40.9	44		59.1	52		----	4		36.6	55.6	63.4	44.4	22.5	14		----	----	----	
8.	30.4	12		60.9	60		8.7	28		7.5	23.3	70	62.8	22.5	14		22.5	14	14	
9.	13.6	36		86.4	64		----	----		46.2	35	51.3	60	2.6	5		2.6	5	5	

that females are more likely to have direct contact with teachers and school administrators than are males. For example, mothers more often take their children to school or meet with teachers about specific problems concerning their children than do fathers. Also, females are more likely to be actively involved in the various educational organizations such as P. T. A. and similar such educational organizations than are their male counterparts. These facts may well give female respondents a different perspective of the communities' relative educational facilities.

Table 7 shows to what extent age is a relevant variable in the respondents' ratings of their respective communities. Age has been trichotomized into the following groups: under 35, 35 to 54, and over 54. Age was trichotomized in this manner to insure adequate representation of the youth, the middle aged, and the aged in the groupings. Table 7 shows that in both Westmoreland and Enterprise, there is a marked tendency to rate the communities relatively higher in the over 54 age group.

In Westmoreland only on the index of community organization are the over 54 age group exceeded by either of the other two age groups. In this case the under 35 age group gives the index of community organization a 66.7% "good" rating compared with a 54.5% "good" rating by the over 54 age group. The index of community organization includes such components as "community spirit and pride," citizen eagerness to "participate in community-wide discussions aimed at improving community life and solving community problems," and "citizen opportunities to learn about and take part in local affairs". Many citizens in the over 54 age group

Table 7. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Age

Westmoreland									
Good			Average			Poor			
Under 35 (N=12)	35 to 54 (N=13)	Over 54 (N=23)	Under 35 (N=12)	35 to 54 (N=13)	Over 54 (N=23)	Under 35 (N=12)	35 to 54 (N=13)	Over 54 (N=23)	
1.	58.3%	41.7%	81.8%	33.3%	58.3%	18.2%	8.3%	----%	----%
2.	16.7	7.7	30.4	75	92.3	69.6	8.3	----	----
3.	25	15.4	43.5	75	69.2	56.5	----	15.4	----
4.	66.7	30.8	54.5	33.3	61.5	45.5	----	7.7	----
5.	66.7	76.9	87	33.3	23.1	13	----	----	----
6.	25	30.8	59.1	58.3	69.2	40.9	16.7	----	----
7.	41.7	30.8	50	50	69.2	50	8.3	----	----
8.	8.3	15.4	30.4	50	53.8	69.6	41.7	30.8	----
9.	16.7	7.7	40.9	83.3	92.3	59.1	----	----	----
Enterprise									
(N=22)	(N=29)	(N=33)	(N=22)	(N=29)	(N=33)	(N=22)	(N=29)	(N=33)	
1.	26.3	47.8	40.9	68.4	47.8	59.1	5.3	4.3	----
2.	30.4	37.9	45.5	69.6	62.1	54.5	----	----	----
3.	27.3	37.9	27.3	63.6	55.2	66.7	9.1	6.9	6.1
4.	25	13.8	29	75	79.3	67.7	----	6.9	3.2
5.	81.8	79.3	93.9	18.2	20.7	6.1	----	----	----
6.	75	69.7	87	25	32.1	13	----	----	----
7.	26.1	51.7	54.5	73.9	48.3	45.5	----	----	----
8.	13.6	13.8	19.4	59.1	65.5	71	27.3	20.7	9.7
9.	30	35.7	50	60	60.7	50	10	3.6	----

are retired people on limited incomes. Consequently, many in the over 54 age group are limited by their low incomes from active participation in the affairs of the community. Furthermore, many in the over 54 age group cannot participate in the affairs of the community for various health reasons, as well as for other such reasons unique to older people. The effect of this somewhat lesser participation on the part of those in the over 54 age group relative to the other age groups is to give the over 54 age group the impression, whether justified or not, that there is a relative lacking of community organization in the community.

In Enterprise only on the indices of health and welfare and city government are the community ratings of the over 54 age group exceeded by either of the other two age groups. In the case of the index of health and welfare, the 35 to 54 age group gave the community a 47.8% "good" rating compared to a 40.9% "good" rating by the over 54 age group. Statistically, those respondents in the over 54 age group would be expected to have a relatively greater contact with the health and welfare functions of the community. Thus, the over 54 age group would be viewing the index of health and welfare from a different perspective and, consequently, may have been able to make a more realistic evaluation of the situation as it exists in Enterprise. On the index of city government, the 35 to 54 age group gave the community a 37.9% "good" rating compared 27.3% "good" rating by the over 54 age group. This 27.3% "good" rating by the over 54 age group exactly equals the 27.3% "good" rating given the index of city government by the under 35 age group. Quite possibly these relatively lower ratings by the

two extreme age groups is a reflection of the fact that most of the political power in Enterprise is held by the middle age group, i.e., those in the 35 to 54 age group, consequently their relatively higher ratings of the index of city government.

Table 8 shows to what extent education is a relevant variable in the respondents' ratings of their respective communities. Education was trichotomized into the following three educational groups: grade school educated, high school educated, and college educated. The grade school educated group included all those respondents who had completed less than a high school education. The high school educated group included all those respondents who had completed high school. And, the college educated group included all those respondents who had attended at least two years of college, those who had obtained a degree, and all of those with postgraduate degrees. These three groups adequately encompass the educational groupings that exist in small town America today. Each grouping was well represented in the selected sample of respondents.

The results shown in table 8 are mixed as to which educational group has a higher tendency to support their respective communities. For example, while there is considerable difference between the various educational groups and their respective ratings on the individual indices no consistent pattern can be detected.

In Westmoreland the grade school educated respondents rated the community highest on the following indices: religion (93.3%), education (50%), city government (40%), recreation (33.3%), and

Table 8. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Education

	Westmoreland								
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Grade Sch. (N=15)	High Sch. (N=20)	Coll. (N=13)	Grade Sch. (N=15)	High Sch. (N=20)	Coll. (N=13)	Grade Sch. (N=15)	High Sch. (N=20)	Coll. (N=13)
1.	64.3%	57.9%	76.9%	35.7%	36.8%	23.1%	----%	5.3%	----%
2.	26.7	20	15.4	73.3	80	76.9	----	----	7.7
3.	40	20	38.5	60	70	61.5	----	10	----
4.	64.3	30	69.2	35.7	65	30.8	----	5	----
5.	93.3	75	62.2	6.7	25	30.8	----	----	----
6.	50	40	38.5	50	55	53.8	----	5	7.7
7.	42.9	40	46.2	57.1	55	53.8	----	5	----
8.	33.3	15	15.4	60	55	69.2	6.7	30	15.4
9.	21.4	35	15.4	78.6	65	84.6	----	----	----
	Enterprise								
	(N=25)	(N=29)	(N=31)	(N=25)	(N=29)	(N=31)	(N=25)	(N=29)	(N=31)
1.	42.9	28.6	45.5	52.4	66.7	54.5	4.8	4.8	----
2.	32	41.4	43.8	68	58.6	56.3	----	----	----
3.	16.7	48.3	25	70.8	48.3	68.8	12.5	3.4	6.3
4.	12.5	25.9	30	83.3	74.1	63.3	4.2	----	6.7
5.	84	86.2	87.2	16	13.8	12.9	----	----	----
6.	80	80	69.2	20	20	30.8	----	----	----
7.	48	51.7	40.6	52	48.3	59.4	----	----	----
8.	16	24.1	6.9	56	69	72.4	28	6.9	20.7
9.	50	46.2	29	50	50	64	----	3.8	6.5

cultural opportunities (26.7%). The high school educated respondents rated the community highest on the index of economic development (35%). The college educated respondents rated the community highest on the following indices: health and welfare (76.9%), community organization (69.2%), housing and planning (46.2%). Clearly, there is no consistent tendency for any one educational group to rate the community higher than does any other educational group.

In Enterprise the grade school educated rated the index of education higher than did the college educated respondents and tied with the high school educated respondents--each group with an 80% "good" rating. The high school educated respondents rated the community highest on the following indices: housing and planning (51.7%), city government (48.3%), economic development (46.2%), and recreation (24.1%). The college educated respondents rated the community highest on the following indices: religion (87.2%), health and welfare (45.5%), cultural opportunities (43.8%), and community organization (30%). Again, no consistent tendency is noted for any one educational group to rate the community consistently higher than does any other educational group.

Table 9 shows to what extent professional, non-professional, or retired occupational status affects a respondent's rating of the community. Respondents were divided into these particular categories because in small town America professional or non-professional occupational status is clearly the most distinguishing feature of a resident's employment. Anonymity is nearly impossible in a small town. A plumber, factory worker, or carpenter are clearly seen as non-professionals, while a banker, lawyer, or



Table 9. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Occupation

	Westmoreland								
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Pro. (N=11)	Non- Pro. (N=15)	Re- tired (N=10)	Pro. (N=11)	Non- Pro. (N=15)	Re- tired (N=10)	Pro. (N=11)	Non- Pro. (N=15)	Re- tired (N=10)
1.	81.8%	30.8%	80 %	18.2%	61.5%	20 %	----%	7.7%	----%
2.	----	20	30	90.9	80	70	9.1	----	----
3.	45.5	13.3	30	54.5	73.3	70	----	13.3	----
4.	54.5	26.7	55.6	45.5	66.7	44.4	----	6.7	----
5.	63.6	80	90	36.4	20	10	----	----	----
6.	27.3	40	55.6	63.6	53.3	44.4	9.1	6.7	----
7.	36.4	46.7	44.4	63.6	46.7	55.6	----	6.7	----
8.	9.1	33.3	20	72.7	40	80	18.2	26.7	----
9.	9.1	26.7	44.4	90.9	73.3	55.6	----	----	----
Enterprise									
	(N=15)	(N=22)	(N=14)	(N=15)	(N=22)	(N=14)	(N=15)	(N=22)	(N=14)
1.	41.7	35.3	30	58.3	58.8	70	----	5.9	----
2.	40	40.9	35.7	60	59.1	64.3	----	----	----
3.	33.3	22.7	28.6	66.7	68.2	71.4	----	9.1	----
4.	21.4	4.5	50	71.4	95.5	50	7.1	----	----
5.	93.3	90.9	85.7	6.7	9.1	14.3	----	----	----
6.	64.3	81.8	100	35.7	18.2	----	----	----	----
7.	60	31.8	57.1	40	68.2	42.9	----	----	----
8.	14.3	4.5	15.4	64.3	72.7	76.9	21.4	22.7	7.7
9.	33.3	38.1	53.8	66.7	61.9	46.2	----	----	----

doctor are clearly seen as professionals. Also, an important group in any small town is retired people. Retired people form a sizable bloc that is distinct from the professionals and the non-professionals.

In Westmoreland non-professional respondents rated the community higher than did their professional counterparts. Non-professional respondents in Westmoreland rated the community higher than did the professionals on the following indices: religion (80%), housing and planning (46.7%), education (40%), recreation (33.3%), economic development (26.7%), and cultural opportunities (20%). Professional respondents in Westmoreland rated the community higher than did their non-professional counterparts on the following indices: health and welfare (81.8%), community organization (54.5%), and city government (45.5%). While it is not readily apparent as to why professionals rate the index of health and welfare higher than do their non-professional counterparts, the significantly greater participation of professionals in the affairs of government may well account for their rating of those particular indices higher than did the non-professional respondents. Retired respondents in Westmoreland consistently rated the community high on all of the indices. In fact, no retired respondent in Westmoreland rated the community "poor" on any of the indices. Particularly high ratings were given the community on the indices of religion (90%), health and welfare (81.8%), community organization (55.6%), housing and planning (44.4%), and economic development (44.4%). The high ratings by the retired respondents in Westmoreland on the index of housing and planning may well be a

reflection of the fact that retired people in small towns generally own their own homes. In short, retired people are not likely to be tenants, and therefore are not as subject to changes in rental rates, and changes in the supply of houses to rent. Consequently, the somewhat greater isolation of retired respondents from the housing situation may well account for the higher rating on the index of housing and planning by the retired respondents. Also, the high rating that retired respondents gave the index of economic development in Westmoreland may be a reflection of the fact that retired respondents are no longer active participants in the employment field.

In Enterprise retired respondents also rated the indices of housing and planning and economic development relatively higher than did their non-retired counterparts. In Enterprise non-professionals gave the community higher ratings than did the professionals on the following indices: education (81.8%), cultural opportunities (40.9%), and economic development (38.1%). In Enterprise professionals gave the community higher ratings on the following indices: religion (93.3%), housing and planning (60%), city government (33.3%), community organization (21.4%), and recreation (14.3%). As in Westmoreland, the higher ratings of the professionals on the indices of city government and community organization coincide with the greater participation of the professionals in community affairs and city government. Also, the fact that professionals are considerably more likely to own their own homes may well account for their higher ratings on the index of housing and planning.

Table 10 shows to what extent income is a relevant variable in the respondents' ratings of their communities. Income levels have been trichotomized into the following: below \$5,000, \$5,000 through \$14,999, and \$15,000 and above.

In Westmoreland the \$15,000 and above and the below \$5,000 income groups consistently rated the community higher than did the \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group. The \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group rated the community higher than did the \$15,000 and above income group only on the index of housing and planning and by a mere 0.5% on the index of recreation.

In Enterprise a similar pattern exists for the \$15,000 and above and the below \$5,000 income groups to consistently rate the community higher than did the \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group. Furthermore, there is a marked tendency for the \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group to give the community more "poor" ratings on the indices.

One possible reason for the consistently lower relative ratings on the indices in both communities by the \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group is that a sizable number of the below \$5,000 income group consists of retired people living on social security, pensions, and various other income sources other than wages; therefore, a sizable number of the below \$5,000 income group may actually be of a higher income status, despite their seemingly low reported income. As table 9 showed, retired people consistently rated the communities higher on nearly all of the indices. Therefore, the inclusion of many retired people into the below \$5,000 income group may well have had the effect of boosting the

Table 10. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Income

Westmoreland									
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Below \$5,000 (N=16)	\$5,000- \$14,999 (N=29)	\$15,000 & above (N=3)	Below \$5,000 (N=16)	\$5,000- \$14,999 (N=29)	\$15,000 & above (N=3)	Below \$5,000 (N=16)	\$5,000- \$14,999 (N=29)	\$15,000 & above (N=3)
1.	81.3%	55.6%	66.7%	18.8%	40.7%	33.3%	----%	3.7%	----%
2.	31.3	17.2	----	62.5	82.8	100	6.3	----	----
3.	31.3	31	33.3	68.8	62.1	66.7	----	6.9	----
4.	73.3	37.9	66.7	26.7	58.6	33.3	----	3.4	----
5.	93.8	69	100	6.3	31	----	----	----	----
6.	53.3	34.5	66.7	40	62.1	33.3	6.7	3.4	----
7.	33.3	44.8	66.7	66.7	51.7	33.3	----	3.4	----
8.	31.3	13.8	33.3	62.5	62.1	33.3	6.3	24.1	33.3
9.	33.3	20.7	33.3	66.7	79.3	66.7	----	----	----
Enterprise									
	(N=33)	(N=43)	(N=6)	(N=33)	(N=43)	(N=6)	(N=33)	(N=43)	(N=6)
1.	37.5	41.9	50	58.3	54.8	50	4.2	3.2	----
2.	45.5	37.2	50	54.5	62.8	50	----	----	----
3.	37.5	30.2	16.7	59.4	60.5	83.3	3.1	9.3	----
4.	41.4	14.3	----	58.6	83.3	100	----	2.4	----
5.	90.9	83.7	80	9.1	16.3	20	----	----	----
6.	85.7	73.2	66.7	14.3	26.8	33.3	----	----	----
7.	60.6	34.9	50	39.4	65.1	50	----	----	----
8.	22.6	14.3	----	64.5	66.7	83.3	12.9	19	16.7
9.	50	36.6	33.3	50	56.1	66.7	----	7.3	----

lower income respondents' ratings of their respective communities and consequently making the ratings of the \$5,000 through \$14,999 income group appear to be relatively lower. Income would then seem to be a relevant variable affecting a respondent's rating of the community. Thus, in both Westmoreland and Enterprise higher income status would seem to result in a greater tendency to give the communities higher ratings on most of the indices. This should be expected since the higher income groups have supposedly received a greater financial reward from their residency in the respective communities. The community has been good to them financially; therefore, they perceive the community in a good light and consequently they are more supportive of the community.

The number of years that a respondent has lived in a town would seem to be a relevant variable on a respondent's rating of the community. Generally, it could be expected that the longer an individual has lived in a particular community the greater that individual's support for the community, at least, if the individual was free to relocate in another community. The assumption here is that an individual dissatisfied with his community would relocate in another community rather than continue to live in a community that he did not support.

Table 11 shows what effect, if any, years of residence in a community has as a relevant variable. Residency was dichotomized into less than nine years and more than nine years. Nine years of residency was selected as the dividing point because it is believed that the population of a small town is considerably

less mobil than is the general population of America. As a result of this somewhat lower mobility, it takes considerable more time to become an accepted member of the small town community. While in a more metropolitan area, a resident may achieve a relatively active role in the community in only two or three years, a resident of a small town may not achieve a similar role for eight or nine years. In short, it is posed that it takes longer, possibly as long as eight or nine years, to become a fully accepted member of a small town community.

In Westmoreland respondents who had lived in the community for more than nine years gave the community the highest ratings on the following indices: housing and planning (43.3%), economic development (33.3%), recreation (23.3%), and cultural opportunities (23.3%). Those respondents who had lived in the community for less than nine years gave the community the highest ratings on the following indices: religion (83.3%), health and welfare (70.6%), community organization (58.8%), and city government (33.3%).

In Enterprise respondents who had lived in the community for more than nine years gave the community the highest ratings on the following indices: housing and planning (51.9%), economic development (46.2%), health and welfare (43.9%), and cultural opportunities (42.6%). Those respondents who had lived in the community for less than nine years gave the community the highest ratings on the following indices: religion (87.5%), education (82.1%), city government (35.5%), community organization (31%), and recreation (16.1%).





The results indicated in table 11 show that years of residency has little apparent tendency to affect the ratings of the community in any consistent manner. While it may take as many as eight or nine years to become fully integrated into the communities, it apparently does not take so long to evaluate the communities; consequently, both those respondents that had lived in the communities for more than nine years and those respondents that had lived in the communities for less than nine years gave the communities a similar level of support.

In summary, this section of the chapter has shown that females tended to be slightly more supportive of the communities than were males. Also, it was found that older respondents tended to give the communities higher support than did younger respondents. Education level did not appear to consistently affect a respondent's rating of his respective community. Retired people tended to give the communities higher support than did either professionals or non-professionals. Higher income groups tended to give the communities more support than did lower income groups. Finally, it was found that years of residency in the communities appeared not to be a factor in the respondents' ratings of the communities.

#### Effect of Political Efficacy and Trust

This section of the chapter examines the effect of the presence or absence of political efficacy and political trust on a respondent's rating of the community. Political efficacy is that

subjective feeling that a person has that he can influence the government's decisions. A politically efficacious person feels that he can influence the decisions of the government. A politically non-efficacious person feels that he is powerless to influence the decisions of the government. Political trust is the feeling that the governing officials can be depended on to do what is right.

Both political efficacy and political trust are important variables in considering citizen support for the community. It is important that those citizens with a high level of community support feel politically efficacious, at least in regard to their local government, if that support is to be manifested in community innovations and projects aimed at improving community viability. The local government can be instrumental in initiating the programs and bond issues necessary to improve community viability, but they must have the support of those with the highest level of community support. Political trust is necessary if the local government is to function and to enjoy the continued confidence of the citizens of the community.

Table 12 shows the responses to the following question: "Over the years, how much attention do you feel your local government pays to what people like you think when it decides what to do?" The possible responses included: "a good deal," "some," and "not much". A respondent answering, "a good deal" would be considered politically efficacious on the local level. A respondent answering "not much" would be considered politically non-efficacious on the local level. A respondent answering "some"

Table 12. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sense of Political Efficacy

Westmoreland									
Good			Average			Poor			
Good Deal (N=15)	Some (N=20)	Not Much (N=12)	Good Deal (N=15)	Some (N=20)	Not Much (N=12)	Good Deal (N=15)	Some (N=20)	Not Much (N=12)	
1.	71.4%	60 %	63.6%	28.6%	40 %	27.3%	-----%	-----%	9.1%
2.	40	5	16.7	60	95	75	-----	-----	8.3
3.	60	25	8.3	40	75	75	-----	-----	16.3
4.	73.3	45	33.3	26.7	55	58.3	-----	-----	8.3
5.	80	80	75	20	20	25	-----	-----	-----
6.	53.3	25	58.3	46.7	75	25	-----	-----	16.7
7.	46.7	45	33.3	53.3	55	58.3	-----	-----	8.3
8.	26.7	10	25	53.3	75	50	20	15	25
9.	33.3	25	16.7	66.7	75	83.3	-----	-----	-----
Enterprise									
(N=23)	(N=42)	(N=19)	(N=23)	(N=42)	(N=19)	(N=23)	(N=42)	(N=19)	
1.	42.9	48.5	18.8	57.1	48.5	81.3	-----	3	-----
2.	34.8	51.2	20	65.2	48.8	80	-----	-----	-----
3.	52.2	29.3	5	47.8	65.9	75	-----	4.9	20
4.	42.9	20	10	57.1	75	85	-----	5	5
5.	95.7	80	85	4.3	20	15	-----	-----	-----
6.	89.5	80	52.9	10.5	20	47.1	-----	-----	-----
7.	73.9	39	30	26.1	61	70	-----	-----	-----
8.	31.8	7.7	15	59.1	69.2	70	9.1	23.1	15
9.	57.1	41	21.1	42.9	51.3	78.9	-----	7.7	-----

is not considered for the purpose of establishing political efficacy.

Table 12 shows that the politically efficacious respondent on the local level gave decidedly more support to the community than did the respondent who was politically non-efficacious on the local level. On all of the indices in both communities, with the single exception of the index of education in Westmoreland, the politically efficacious rated the communities higher than did the politically non-efficacious.

Table 13 shows the effect of the presence or absence of a sense of political trust on the local level as a variable. Respondents were asked the following question: "How much of the time do you think you can trust your local officials to do what is right?" The possible responses included: "just about always," "most of the time," and "just about never".

The fact that only two respondents in Westmoreland and only three respondents in Enterprise indicated that they could "just about never" trust their local officials to do what is right attests to the high degree of political trust that exists on the local level in both communities. Table 13 shows that those respondents with a higher degree of political trust are significantly more likely to rate the community "good" than are those respondents that respond that they can trust their local government only "most of the time". The only exceptions are in Enterprise on the indices of health and welfare, community organization, and recreation and here the differences are small and consequently not of great significance.

Table 13. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Sense  
Political Trust

	Good			Westmoreland Average			Poor		
	Just About Always (N=13)	Most of the Time (N=33)	Just About Never (N=2)	Just About Always (N=13)	Most of the Time (N=33)	Just About Never (N=2)	Just About Always (N=13)	Most of the Time (N=33)	Just About Never (N=2)
1.	84.6%	54.8%	100 %	15.4%	41.9%	----%	----%	3.2%	----%
2.	30.8	18.8	----	61.5	81.3	100	7.7	----	----
3.	53.8	25	----	46.2	75	50	----	----	50
4.	61.5	51.6	----	38.5	48.4	100	----	----	----
5.	92.3	71.9	100	7.7	28.1	----	----	----	----
6.	53.8	32.3	100	38.5	64.5	----	7.7	3.2	----
7.	53.8	41.9	----	46.2	54.8	100	----	3.2	----
8.	23.1	15.6	100	53.8	65.6	----	23.1	18.8	----
9.	30.8	22.6	50	69.2	77.4	50	----	----	----
	Enterprise								
	(N=22)	(N=58)	(N=3)	(N=22)	(N=58)	(N=3)	(N=22)	(N=58)	(N=3)
1.	35.7	43.2	----	64.3	54.5	100	----	2.3	----
2.	66.7	34.4	----	33.3	65.6	100	----	----	----
3.	55.6	26.2	----	44.4	67.2	33.3	----	6.6	66.7
4.	23.5	24.1	----	70.6	72.4	100	5.9	3.4	----
5.	100	80	100	----	20	----	----	----	----
6.	75	74	100	25	26	----	----	----	----
7.	55.6	49.2	----	44.4	50.8	100	----	----	----
8.	11.1	19	----	72.2	65.5	100	16.7	15.5	----
9.	56.3	38.6	----	43.8	56.1	100	----	5.3	----

Another question asked of respondents was: "Do you feel that your local government leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one?" The possible responses were: "doing a good deal," "doing some," and "not doing very much". The question was posed as an expansion of the political trust question and is more directly related to the topic of this study--that is, citizen support for America's small towns. Specifically, citizen support is of direct consequence to the survival of the American small town and this question attempted to ascertain supportive and non-supportive feeling as to whether the local government leaders are doing enough to save small towns.

Table 14 shows that in most cases those respondents answering that their local government leaders were "doing a good deal" to save small towns were also more likely to support the town to a greater degree than were those respondents answering "doing some". Further, those respondents answering "doing some" were more likely to support the town than were those respondents answering "not doing very much". Hence, the more supportive a respondent is, the more he feels that his local government is doing to save small towns. There is a saying that a town is as good as its leaders. These findings seem to confirm the supposed wisdom of that saying.

Another question asked of respondents was: "Do you feel that your local business leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one?" The possible responses were: "doing a good deal," "doing some," and "not doing very much". Local business leaders are an important segment of a small town community and

**Table 14. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of Local Government Action to Save Small Towns**

	Westmoreland								
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Good Deal	Some	Not Much	Good Deal	Some	Not Much	Good Deal	Some	Not Much
	(N=16)	(N=21)	(N=11)	(N=16)	(N=21)	(N=11)	(N=16)	(N=21)	(N=11)
1.	66.7%	65 %	60 %	33.3%	35 %	30 %	----%	----%	10 %
2.	31.3	15	9.1	68.8	85	81.8	----	----	9.1
3.	56.3	25	9.1	43.8	75	72.7	----	----	18.2
4.	62.5	50	36.4	37.5	50	54.5	----	----	9.1
5.	87.5	70	81.8	12.5	30	18.2	----	----	----
6.	50	35	45.5	50	65	34.4	----	----	18.2
7.	43.8	55	18.2	56.3	45	72.7	----	----	9.1
8.	31.3	10	18.2	56.3	65	63.6	12.6	25	18.2
9.	50	15	9.1	50	85	90.9	----	----	----
	Enterprise								
	(N=24)	(N=40)	(N=18)	(N=24)	(N=40)	(N=18)	(N=24)	(N=40)	(N=18)
1.	47.6	33.3	35.7	47.6	63	64.3	4.8	3.7	----
2.	41.7	46.2	16.7	58.3	58.3	83.3	----	----	----
3.	37.5	31.6	5.6	54.2	65.8	77.8	8.3	2.6	16.7
4.	16.7	30.6	11.8	75	69.4	82.4	8.3	----	5.9
5.	95.8	81.6	77.8	4.2	18.4	22.2	----	----	----
6.	90.9	67.7	64.3	9.1	32.3	35.7	----	----	----
7.	62.5	51.3	22.2	37.5	48.7	77.8	----	----	----
8.	16.7	18.9	5.6	62.5	67.6	66.7	20.8	13.5	27.8
9.	41.7	50	16.7	54.2	47.1	77.8	4.2	2.9	5.6

they are an important factor in establishing small town viability. If small towns are to remain viable, businessmen must continue to use whatever economic power they have to promote the community. Businessmen, for example, can work to insure that their places of business are attractive and appealing. Businessmen in many small towns have taken the lead in renewing the business section of the town and thereby have increased the community's sense of pride in the facilities of the community.

Table 15 shows not only that a large number of respondents in both communities feel that their local business leaders are at least making some effort to save small towns, but further, that those respondents who feel that their local business leaders are "doing a good deal" to save small towns tended to rate the communities higher than did those respondents who responded that their business leaders were "doing some" to save small towns. In turn, those respondents who responded that their local business leaders were "doing some" to save small towns consistently rated the communities higher than did those respondents who responded that their local business leaders were "not doing very much" to save small towns. Since businessmen are often the same men who are the political leaders in a small town these findings coincide with the findings in table 14--namely, that those respondents who felt that their local government leaders were "doing a good deal" to save small towns rated their respective communities higher than did those respondents who felt that their local government leaders were "not doing very much" to save small towns.

Another question posed of respondents in Westmoreland and



Table 15. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of Local Business Leaders' Action to Save Small Towns

	Westmoreland								
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Good Deal	Some	Not Much	Good Deal	Some	Not Much	Good Deal	Some	Not Much
	(N=31)	(N=14)	(N=3)	(N=31)	(N=14)	(N=3)	(N=31)	(N=14)	(N=3)
1.	58.6%	71.4%	100 %	41.4%	21.4%	----%	----%	7.1%	----%
2.	26.7	13.3	----	73.3	86.7	66.7	----	----	33.3
3.	36.7	20	33.3	63.3	66.7	66.7	----	13.3	----
4.	62.1	33.3	33.3	37.9	60	66.7	----	6.7	----
5.	80	73.3	100	20	26.7	----	----	----	----
6.	44.8	40	33.3	55.2	53.3	33.3	----	6.7	33.3
7.	44.8	26.7	100	55.2	66.7	----	----	6.7	----
8.	23.3	20	----	56.7	66.7	66.7	20	13.3	33.3
9.	37.9	6.7	----	62.1	93.3	100	----	----	----
	Enterprise								
	(N=21)	(N=42)	(N=17)	(N=21)	(N=42)	(N=17)	(N=21)	(N=42)	(N=17)
1.	41.2	32.3	38.5	58.8	61.3	61.5	----	6.5	----
2.	47.6	35.7	35.3	52.4	64.3	64.7	----	----	----
3.	38.1	31.7	11.8	52.4	65.9	70.6	9.5	2.4	17.6
4.	28.6	25.6	6.3	61.9	74.4	87.5	9.5	----	6.3
5.	100	81	75	----	19	25	----	----	----
6.	88.9	74.3	61.5	11.1	25.7	38.5	----	----	----
7.	57.1	45.2	41.2	42.9	54.8	58.8	----	----	----
8.	28.6	15	----	57.1	70	64.7	14.3	15	35.3
9.	52.4	44.7	11.8	47.6	50	82.4	----	5.3	5.9

Enterprise was: "Do you feel our state and national leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one?" The possible responses were: "doing a good deal," "doing some," and "not doing very much". This question was asked partly to determine the extent that small town people felt the state and national governments were working to save small towns, but, more importantly, to determine whether or not those respondents who felt that the state and national governments were doing enough to save small towns were also supportive of the community. Those citizens who are supportive of the community would more likely accept a state or national program that has as its purpose the perservation of small towns than would those citizens who are non-supportive of the community.

Table 16 shows that those respondents who felt that the state and national government leaders were "doing a good deal" to save small towns rated their respective communities higher than did those respondents who felt that the state and national government leaders were "not doing very much" to save small towns. This is probably because those respondents who are supportive of the communities are probably more likely to be acquainted with any state or national programs designed to help save small towns than are those respondents who are non-supportive of the communities.

This section of the chapter showed that those respondents indicating a high degree of political efficacy and trust with regard to their local government are also more supportive of their respective communities than are those respondents indicating a lesser degree of political efficacy and trust on the local level. This

Table 16. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Perception of State and National Leaders' Efforts to Save Small Towns

Westmoreland									
	Good			Average			Poor		
	Good Deal (N=4)	Some (N=13)	Not Much (N=31)	Good Deal (N=4)	Some (N=13)	Not Much (N=31)	Good Deal (N=4)	Some (N=13)	Not Much (N=31)
1.	75 %	61.5%	64.3%	25 %	38.5%	32.1%	----%	----%	3.6%
2.	25	23.1	20	75	76.9	76.7	----	----	3.3
3.	50	38.5	23.3	25	61.5	73.3	25	----	3.3
4.	75	69.2	41.4	25	30.8	55.2	----	----	3.4
5.	75	76.9	83.3	25	23.1	16.7	----	----	----
6.	50	53.8	37.9	50	46.2	55.2	----	----	6.9
7.	----	46.2	48.3	100	53.8	48.3	----	----	3.4
8.	25	23.1	20	75	61.5	56.7	----	15.4	23.3
9.	50	15.4	27.6	50	84.6	72.4	----	----	----
Enterprise									
	(N=7)	(N=37)	(N=38)	(N=7)	(N=37)	(N=38)	(N=7)	(N=37)	(N=38)
1.	66.7	32.1	42.9	33.3	64.3	53.6	----	3.6	3.6
2.	57.1	40.5	32.4	42.9	59.5	67.6	----	----	----
3.	28.6	33.3	29.7	71.4	63.9	56.8	----	2.8	13.5
4.	28.6	36.1	11.4	71.4	63.9	80	----	----	8.6
5.	85.7	88.9	81.1	14.3	11.1	18.9	----	----	----
6.	100	70.6	80	----	29.4	20	----	----	----
7.	71.4	45.9	37.8	54.1	28.6	62.2	----	----	----
8.	----	16.2	13.9	83.3	75.7	58.3	16.7	8.1	27.8
9.	57.1	47.1	32.4	42.9	52.9	58.8	----	----	8.8

is an important finding relevant to the future of the American small town. Those respondents supportive of their respective communities must feel that they can influence their governments if they are to translate their support into the innovations and programs necessary to revitalize their small towns.

The support of a small town's business leaders is also crucial to the question of small town survival. Further, it is important that those business leaders working to save the small town have the support of those citizens who are supportive of the community. The findings of this section indicate that those respondents who feel that their local business leaders are doing "a good deal" to save their small towns are also most supportive of the town.

Before the state and national government can be successful in programs aimed at helping small towns prosper and survive, their efforts must be perceived and supported by the citizens who are supportive of the communities affected. This section showed that those citizens who felt that the state and national governments were "doing a good deal" or at least "doing some" to save small towns were more supportive of the communities than those citizens who felt that the state and national governments were "not doing very much" to save small towns.

#### Some Efforts for Increasing Small Town Viability

The findings of this study thus far have revolved around citizen perceptions and assessments of the community and its

facilities as reflected in a respondent's rating of the community. The findings have revealed a high degree of citizen support. This support, however, is not necessarily the kind of citizen support that can be translated into the innovations and programs necessary to revitalize a small town. Citizen support is needed that will generate the capital necessary to sustain the innovations and expansion necessary to revitalize the small towns of America.

### Business and Industry

In practical terms, a small town's survival depends on business and industry. A small town must be innovative enough to sustain and expand existing businesses and industries. If new businesses and industries are to be attracted, the community must be willing, for example, to pay for the expansion of schools and the improvement of recreational facilities that is necessary to attract them in the first place.

This section of the chapter seeks to find out if the respondents in Westmoreland and Enterprise that have indicated support for their respective communities are willing to support efforts to expand the number and variety of employment opportunities through the location of additional businesses and industries in the communities. Also, and perhaps more importantly, are those respondents that exhibited support for their community willing to pay for expansions of business and industry, as well of educational facilities and recreational facilities?

Table 17 shows the responses to the question: "Would you



support efforts to increase the number and variety of employment opportunities in this community?" A simple yes or no response was recorded. The table also shows the relative degree of citizen support indicated by those respondents indicating a yes or no response to the question.

Perhaps the most notable finding in table 17 is the overwhelming affirmative response that the question evoked. Only one respondent in Westmoreland and only three respondents in Enterprise answered the question in the negative.

The next question posed was: "Would you support the location of additional businesses in this community?" Again, a simple yes or no response was recorded. Table 18 shows the data obtained from this question.

Again, as shown in table 18, the question evoked an overwhelming affirmative response. Only one respondent in Westmoreland and only one respondent in Enterprise answered the question in the negative indicating that they would oppose the location of additional businesses in the communities.

The next question posed was: "Would you support the location of additional industries in this community?" Again, a simple yes or no response was recorded. Table 19 shows the data obtained from the question.

As with the two previous questions, this question also evoked an overwhelming affirmative reply. Only one respondent in Westmoreland and only three respondents in Enterprise answered the question in the negative.

Table 18. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Businesses

	Westmoreland						Enterprise					
	Good		Average		Poor		Good		Average		Poor	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	(N=43)	(N=1)	(N=43)	(N=1)	(N=43)	(N=1)	(N=77)	(N=1)	(N=77)	(N=1)	(N=77)	(N=1)
1.	61	100	36.6%	-----	2.4%	-----	36.2%	-----	62.1%	-----	1.7%	-----
2.	16.3	100	81.4	-----	2.3	-----	40.3	-----	59.7	100	-----	-----
3.	27.9	100	67.4	-----	4.7	-----	28.6	-----	63.6	100	7.8	-----
4.	48.8	100	48.8	-----	2.3	-----	21.6	100	74.3	-----	4.1	-----
5.	79.1	100	20.9	-----	-----	-----	88.2	100	11.8	-----	-----	-----
6.	41.9	-----	53.5	100	4.7	-----	75.8	100	24.2	-----	-----	-----
7.	44.2	-----	53.5	100	2.3	-----	45.5	100	54.5	-----	-----	-----
8.	18.6	-----	60.5	100	20.9	-----	14.9	-----	66.2	100	18.9	-----
9.	23.3	100	76.7	-----	-----	-----	38.4	-----	57.5	100	4.1	-----



Table 19. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Industries

	Westmoreland						Enterprise					
	Good		Average		Poor		Good		Average		Poor	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	(N=42)	(N=1)	(N=42)	(N=1)	(N=42)	(N=1)	(N=70)	(N=3)	(N=70)	(N=3)	(N=70)	(N=3)
1.	65	100	32.5%	-----	2.5%	-----	34	100	64.2%	-----	1.9%	-----
2.	16.7	100	81	-----	2.4	-----	40.8	-----	59.2	100	-----	-----
3.	31	100	64.3	-----	4.8	-----	28.2	33.3	64.8	66.7	7	-----
4.	50	100	47.6	-----	2.4	-----	20.6	66.7	76.5	33.3	2.9	-----
5.	83.3	100	16.7	-----	-----	-----	88.6	100	11.4	-----	-----	-----
6.	42.9	100	52.4	-----	4.8	-----	76.7	66.7	23.3	33.3	-----	-----
7.	47.6	-----	50	100	2.4	-----	45.1	33.3	54.9	66.7	-----	-----
8.	19	-----	61.9	100	19	-----	14.5	-----	66.7	100	18.8	-----
9.	26.2	100	73.8	-----	-----	-----	37.7	33.3	58	66.7	4.3	-----

The next question asked of the respondents was: "Would you support the location of additional businesses, even if it meant an increase in your taxes?" This question was intended to be a more difficult question than the previous question on support of additional businesses. This question involves asking the respondent to express a willingness to make a financial sacrifice to support the location of additional businesses, while the previous question involved only a verbal affirmation of support for the location of additional businesses. Table 20 shows the data obtained from the question.

Table 20 shows that a large majority of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise indicated that they would support the location of additional businesses in the respective communities even at the expense of higher taxes. Also, those respondents who expressed an unwillingness to support additional businesses at the expense of higher taxes tended to give the community higher ratings than did those respondents that expressed a willingness to support the location of additional businesses even at the expense of higher taxes. One possible reason for this occurrence may be that the higher ratings are a reflection of a large degree of satisfaction with the existing status quo and the expression of an unwillingness to change the status quo if the change means higher taxes. Another reason may be that a large number of the respondents answering in the negative may be expressing a protest at a perceived inequity in the present property tax system. Many respondents in both communities stated that they simply could not afford higher taxes.

Table 20. Indices of Community Rating Controlled for Respondent Willingness to Support the Location of Additional Businesses, Even at the Expense of Higher Taxes

	Westmoreland						Enterprise					
	Good		Average		Poor		Good		Average		Poor	
	Yes (N=28)	No (N=8)	Yes (N=28)	No (N=8)	Yes (N=28)	No (N=8)	Yes (N=47)	No (N=18)	Yes (N=47)	No (N=18)	Yes (N=47)	No (N=18)
1.	66.7%	66.7%	29.6%	33.3%	3.7%	-----%	37.8%	42.9%	59.5%	57.1%	2.7%	-----%
2.	21.4	44.4	75	55.6	3.6	-----	40.4	38.9	59.6	61.1	-----	-----
3.	32.1	44.4	64.3	55.6	3.6	-----	40.4	22.2	51.1	66.7	8.5	11.1
4.	46.4	50	53.6	50	-----	-----	20	23.5	77.8	64.7	2.2	11.8
5.	78.6	100	21.4	-----	-----	-----	87	88.9	13	11.1	-----	-----
6.	39.3	62.5	53.6	37.5	7.1	-----	76.2	92.3	23.8	7.7	-----	-----
7.	39.3	50	57.1	50	3.6	-----	40.4	55.6	59.6	44.4	-----	-----
8.	17.9	55.6	53.6	33.3	28.6	11.1	13	23.5	73.9	47.1	13	29.4
9.	28.6	37.5	71.4	62.5	-----	-----	29.5	62.5	63.6	37.5	6.8	-----

The next question asked of the respondents was: "Would you support the location of additional industries, even if it meant an increase in your taxes?" Table 21 shows the data obtained from this question.

Table 21 shows that a large majority of respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise would also support the location of additional industries, even at the expense of higher taxes. Also, those respondents who expressed an unwillingness to support additional industries at the expense of higher taxes tended to give the communities higher ratings than did those respondents expressing a willingness to support the location of additional industries, even at the expense of higher taxes. Again, this may reflect a satisfaction with the existing status quo with regard to industrial development; consequently, those respondents unwilling to pay higher taxes to bring additional industries rate the existing community higher. Another reason, also mentioned before, is that a large number of the respondents answering in the negative may be expressing a protest at a perceived inequity in the present property tax system.

In summary, the large majority of the respondents in both communities expressed support for the expansion of employment opportunities in the communities. Nearly all of the respondents in both communities support the location of additional businesses and industries in their respective communities. Furthermore, the large majority of the respondents in both communities are willing to support the location of additional businesses and industries even if it means an increase in their taxes.



## Education and Recreation

Important to any business or industry contemplating location is a small town is the prospective town's educational and recreational facilities. Small towns are in a competitive situation with regard to attracting businesses and industries. Any town desiring new businesses and industries will find that modern educational and recreational facilities are an important asset.

Table 22 shows the effect of a respondent's support or opposition to increased taxes for education and that respondent's rating of his respective community. Table 22 shows that the majority of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise support increased taxes for education. Of particular interest is the index of education in Westmoreland. Those respondents opposing increased taxes for education gave the community's educational facilities a 75% "good" rating compared to a 31.4% "good" rating by those respondents supporting increased taxes for education. In other words, those respondents opposed to increased taxes for education perceive the community's existing educational facilities as considerably more adequate than do those respondents supporting increased taxes for education.

Table 23 shows the effect of a respondent's support or opposition to increased taxes for recreation and that respondent's rating of the community. Table 23 shows that a large majority of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise support increased taxes for recreation. In Westmoreland those respondents opposing increased taxes for recreation gave the index of recrea-







tion a 33.3% "good" rating compared to a 9.7% "good" rating by those respondents supporting increased taxes for recreation. This may reflect a satisfaction in the existing recreational facilities by a sizable number of those opposing increased taxes for recreation.

In Enterprise both those opposing and those supporting increased taxes for recreation gave the index of recreation a 17.6% "good" rating. However, those opposing increased taxes for recreation gave the index of recreation only a 11.8% "poor" rating compared with a 17.6% "poor" rating by those supporting increased taxes for recreation.

In summary, nearly all of the respondents in both Westmoreland and Enterprise are willing to support efforts to increase employment opportunities in their communities. Also, nearly all of the respondents are willing to support the location of additional businesses and industries in their respective communities. Furthermore, the large majority of the respondents in both communities are willing to support the location of additional businesses and industries in their respective communities, even at the expense of higher taxes. Further, most respondents in both communities are willing to sustain increased taxes to expand the educational and recreational facilities of their respective communities. These findings suggest that the small town residents in Westmoreland and Enterprise are not only willing to vocally support efforts aimed at increasing their community's viability, but they are willing to pay for efforts aimed at increasing that viability as far as improvements and expansions of

business and industry as well as expansions of educational and recreational facilities are concerned.

### Footnotes

1 A copy of the expanded Community Rating Schedule is included in Appendix II.

#### CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been concerned with the question of citizen support for the community in small town America. This study has posited that the future of the American small town rests ultimately upon the degree of internal support for the community by the citizenry of the small town. The nature of this citizen support is conditioned by the nature of the community itself. Specifically, if a community's citizens have a favorable perception of the community and its facilities, a solid bases of citizen support would seem to exist.

The results of this study indicate that in the communities of Westmoreland and Enterprise, Kansas, a solid basis of citizen support does indeed exist. A large majority of the respondents in the selected sample indicated that the services and facilities of their communities were in general better than those of the average American small town--in short, that their communities were good places in which to live and work.

Particularly strong support for the communities in this study was shown in the areas of health and welfare, religion, education, and housing and planning. Relatively less support was indicated in the areas of cultural opportunities, recreation, and economic development. It was found that females tended to be slightly more supportive of the communities than were males. Also, it was found that older respondents tended to give the communities relatively higher support than did younger respondents. Educational level did not appear to consistently affect

a respondent's rating of his respective community. Retired people tended to give the communities relatively higher support than did either professional or non-professional people. Higher income status seemed to be a factor in a respondent's rating of his respective community with the higher income groups being most supportive of the communities.

Other relevant findings reported include the finding that the politically efficacious tended to give the communities significantly higher levels of support than did the politically non-efficacious. Also, respondents indicating a high degree of political trust gave the communities a higher level of support than did those respondents indicating a low level of political trust. Further, respondents who felt that their local government leaders and local business leaders were "doing a good deal" to save small towns gave their communities a higher level of support than did the respondents who felt that these leaders were "not doing very much" to save small towns. Finally, the large majority of the respondents in Westmoreland and Enterprise expressed a willingness to support the community by accepting higher taxes to sustain necessary expansions of recreational and educational facilities as well as to support the location of additional businesses and industries.

Essentially, a small town has two choices: to accept stagnation and death--economically, socially, and quite possibly politically--or to make a commitment to efforts aimed at increasing its viability. Small towns can die economically if they

lose their positions as trade and service centers for the dispersed surrounding populations to other, probably larger urban centers. They can die socially if they lose their identity as a community with its accompanying cultural and historical heritage, or small towns can die by becoming suburbs or appendages of larger urban areas or by simply dying like the proverbial ghost town. And, small towns can die politically by being annexed into another governing unit or by simply disintegrating politically.

If a small town chooses to make a commitment to increasing its viability, it can be in a position to gain from the problems associated with massive urbanization and possibly thereby provide a partial solution to some of the problems of massive urbanization. As the problems, e.g., pollution, crime, high taxes, etc., of massive urbanization increase, increasing numbers of industries and populations are migrating to smaller urban areas. Two specific examples of this migration to smaller cities and towns can be noted in the recent location of a major branch of McCall's Pattern Company in Manhattan, Kansas, a community with a 1970 population of 27,575, and the tentative location of an Oscar Mayer pork processing plant in Wamego, Kansas, a community with a 1970 population of 2,507.<sup>1</sup> It is thus more apparent than at any time in America's immediate past history that industries are locating branches in smaller urban places. It can then be anticipated that industries may be locating in even small communities in perhaps as few as five or ten years.

If small towns want industries and their accompanying populations as a means of increasing their viability, a high level of citizen support must exist. Small towns seeking industry are in a competitive situation. Not only are small towns placed in the position of competing for industry with major or smaller urban areas, but they must also compete with other small towns. Important to a small town's viability or potential viability, among other things, is that town's recreational and educational facilities. Industries contemplating their location in a small town are concerned about the prospective community's recreational and educational facilities. An industry locating in a small town is placed in the position of having to recruit new residents for the community as prospective employees. Modern recreational and educational facilities can be a decided plus in attracting businesses and industries.

Making a small town viable demands certain input from the local business and government leaders. Local leader support is an absolute necessity to attracting new businesses and industries and integral to leader support is citizen support for their respective leaders. Both communities in the sample indicated considerable support for their respective leaders. The large majority of the respondents felt that their local business and government leaders were "doing a good deal" to save their small towns. Therefore, community leaders in the selected communities would appear to have a greater deal of latitude to promote their respective communities than they are now utilizing.

Some of the support found for the small towns in this study indicated support of a passive nature, i.e., respondents had only to make verbally supportive responses. However, those parts of the survey instrument that asked the respondents to indicate whether or not they would support increased taxes to support the location of additional businesses and industries or to expand educational and recreational facilities evoked overwhelmingly positive responses, thereby indicating at least a high degree of potential active support. These responses indicate continued support for these small towns as well as a willingness to provide for the future viability of the communities by increasing employment opportunities as well as educational and recreational facilities.

Today, there is an increasing concern with the problems of rural development. For example, the present national administration, as well as past administrations, has indicated support for programs of rural development. Rural development necessarily means the development of small towns such as the towns in this study because small towns are the focal points of rural areas by virtue of the fact that they are local trade and service centers as well as social and cultural centers for dispersed surrounding populations. Rural development programs stand to learn from some of the failures of urban renewal programs. Often the administration of urban renewal programs was undertaken with the assumption that the populations most directly affected, i.e., the urban residents themselves, were supportive of the programs.<sup>2</sup>



Perhaps many urban renewal programs could have realized greater successes if an assessment of citizen support had been undertaken prior to the commencement of the programs. No program of rural development can be completely successful without a better understanding of the problems and aspirations of small town people. Also, the support of small town citizens for their own communities is integral to the ultimate success of rural development programs.

While it is impossible to totally generalize from the study of only two towns even though it is felt that the communities studied were relatively typical, it is hoped this study can form the bases for further studies of small town citizen support. This study, it is hoped, has successfully exploded the stereotype that small town life is sterile and that small town people are resistant to new ideas and innovations. It is further hoped that this study can provide the impetus for additional such studies. While this study has concentrated on internal citizen support for their respective communities, other studies may wish to examine more regional and national support patterns. Small towns can be studied for academic reasons, but they should be studied for very practical reasons. Industrial leaders, public administrators, and government leaders, both in and out of the small towns, will make decisions that perhaps will intricately affect small towns and the lives of the people who live in them. These decisions can be more intelligently made by considering the support variable as an important, perhaps the most important, variable.

## Footnotes

1 U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population, 1970, Number of Inhabitants: Kansas.

2 Charles R. Adrain, "Public Attitudes and Metropolitan Decision Making," Politics In The Metropolis: A Reader In Conflict and Cooperation, ed. by Thomas R. Dye and Brett W. Hawkins, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1967), p. 526.

## APPENDIX I

## COMMUNITY RATING SCHEDULE\*

Ask respondents to rate community as good, fair or poor as judged by similar communities in the United States.

Standard No. 1 Education

Modern education available for every child youth and adult. Uncrowded, properly equipped schools in good physical conditions. Highly qualified, well paid teachers.

Standard No. 2 Housing and Planning

Every family decently housed. Continuous planning for improvement of residential areas, parks, highways, and other community essentials. Parking, traffic, and transportation problems under control.

Standard No. 3 Religion

Full opportunity for religious expression accorded to every individual--churches strong and well supported.

Standard No. 4 Equality of Opportunity

People of different races, religions, and nationalities have full chance for employment and for taking part in community life. Dangerous tensions kept at minimum by avoidance of discrimination and injustices.

Standard No. 5 Economic Development

Good jobs available. Labor, industry, agriculture, and government work together to insure sound economic growth.

Standard No. 6 Cultural Opportunities

Citizens' lives strengthened by ample occasion to enjoy music, art, and dramatics. A professionally administered library service benefits people of all ages. Newspapers and radio carefully review community affairs.

Standard No. 7 Recreation

Enough supervised playgrounds and facilities for outdoor activities. Full opportunity to take part in arts and crafts, photography, and other hobbies.

Standard No. 8 Health and Welfare

Positive approach to improving health of entire community. Medical care and hospitalization readily available. Provisions made for under-privileged children, the aged, and the handicapped. Families in trouble can secure needed assistance.

Standard No. 9 Government

Capable citizens seek public office. Officials concerned above all with community betterment. Controversy stems from honest differences of opinion, not from squabbles over privilege.

Standard No. 10 Community Organization

An organization-community forum, citizen's council, or community federation-representative of entire town, is working for advancement of the whole community. Citizens have opportunity to learn about and take part in local affairs. There is an organized, community-wide discussion program. Specialized organizations give vigorous attention to each important civic need.

\* Prepared by New York State Citizen's Council; Published in Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement by Delbert C. Miller, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 203-204.

## APPENDIX II

Community \_\_\_\_\_. Date \_\_\_\_\_. Respondent Sex M F

I. First, I would like to ask you some questions about yourself and about your community.

1. How many years have you lived in this town? \_\_\_\_\_. If not all of your life, where did you live before you moved here? \_\_\_\_\_. How many years did you live there? \_\_\_\_\_.
2. What is your primary occupation? \_\_\_\_\_. Do you have any other occupations? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No. If yes, what are they? \_\_\_\_\_.
3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Do you belong or have you belonged to any community organizations? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No. If yes, which ones? \_\_\_\_\_.
5. On the average is your annual family income generally 1. below \$2,500, 2. between \$2,500 and \$4,999, 3. between \$5,000 and \$9,999, 4. between \$10,000 and \$14,999, or 5. above \$15,000. (Circle one)
6. Generally speaking do you usually think of yourself as 1. a strong Republican, 2. a not very strong Republican, 3. an independent, but closer to the Republicans, 4. an independent, 5. an independent, but closer to the Democrats, 6. a not very strong Democrat, 7. a strong Democrat, or 8. do you support a third party? If you support a third party, which one? \_\_\_\_\_.
7. How many grades of schooling did you complete? \_\_\_\_\_.
8. What are your primary sources of news and information? \_\_\_\_\_.
9. What do you feel are the three most pressing needs of this community in order of importance?
  1. \_\_\_\_\_.
  2. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. \_\_\_\_\_.

II. Next, I would like to ask you to rate this town as either Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, or Bad in comparison to what you feel that a small town ideally should or should not be.

1. Adequate medical facilities and well qualified doctors are available to serve this community. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
2. Provisions are made to see that the aged, underpriveleged children, and the handicapped receive proper medical attention. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
3. Families in financial trouble can secure the needed medical assistance. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
4. The local newspaper carefully reviews community affairs. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor.
5. Citizens have the opportunity to enjoy music, art, and dramatics in this community. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
6. A well administered library service benefits people of all ages. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
7. Capable citizens seek public office and are concerned above all with community betterment. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
8. Controversy among city officials stems from honest differences of opinions rather than from selfish motives. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
9. City officials seek your opinions and are easily accessable. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
10. Law enforcement in this community is fair and adequate. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
11. The city government is efficient and honest. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
12. There is a strong sense of community spirit and pride in this town. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
13. Citizens as a whole are eager to participate in community-wide discussions aimed at improving community life and solving community problems. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
14. Citizens have opportunities to learn about and take part in local affairs. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.
15. Every individual in this community is accorded full freedom of worship. \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Average \_\_\_Poor \_\_\_Bad.

16. The churches of this community are strong and well supported.  
☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
17. The churches exert a good influence on community life. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
18. Uncrowded, properly equipped schools, in good physical condition are available for every child, youth, and adult in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
19. Highly qualified teachers are easily attracted to this community and are well paid. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
20. The relationship between the people of the community and the professional school staff is supportive of the entire educational system. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
21. Efforts are made to maintain and improve the streets and parks of this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
22. Parking and traffic problems in this community are under control. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
23. Every family is decently housed and continuous efforts are made to improve the residential areas of this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
24. Recreational facilities are available for grade school aged children in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
25. Recreational facilities are available for high school aged children in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
26. Recreational facilities are available for adults in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
27. Adequate employment is available in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
28. Business, agriculture, and government work together to insure sound economic growth in this community. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
29. This community seeks to encourage business expansion. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.
30. This community seeks to encourage industrial expansion. ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ Bad.

III. Finally, I would like to ask you some questions about the government and some questions about the direction you would like to see this town take in the years to come.

1. What do you consider the likelihood of an unjust or harmful law being considered by your city government? ☐ Very likely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Not very likely.
2. Suppose a law were being considered by your city government that you considered very unjust or harmful. What do you think you could do about it? \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Over the years, how much attention do you feel your local government pays to what people like you think when it decides what to do? ☐ A good deal ☐ Some ☐ Not much.
4. How much of the time do you think you can trust your local government officials to do what is right? ☐ Just about always ☐ Most of the time ☐ Just about never.
5. Do you feel that your local business leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one? ☐ Doing a good deal ☐ Doing some ☐ Not doing very much.
6. Do you feel that your local government leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one? ☐ Doing a good deal ☐ Doing some ☐ Not doing very much.
7. Do you feel that our state and national leaders care about the problems and aspirations of the people who live in the small towns of America? ☐ Care alot ☐ Care some ☐ Care hardly at all.
8. Do you feel that our state and national leaders are doing enough to save small towns such as this one? ☐ Doing a good deal ☐ Doing some ☐ Not doing very much.
9. Would you support efforts to increase the number and variety of employment opportunities in this community? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided.
10. Would you support the location of additional businesses in this community? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided.
11. Would you support the location of additional industries in this community? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided.
12. Would you support the location of additional businesses in this community, even if it meant an increase in your taxes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided.



13. Would you support the location of additional industries in this community, even if it meant an increase in your taxes? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.
14. Would you support increased taxes to expand the recreational opportunities of this community? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.
15. Would you support increased taxes to expand the educational facilities of this community? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.
16. Do the young people of this community usually stay in this area after they complete their education? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Don't know. If no, why do you feel young people leave this community? \_\_\_\_\_.
17. Do you feel greater efforts should be made to keep young people in this community? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided. If yes, what do you feel should be done to keep young people in this community? \_\_\_\_\_.
18. Would you consider moving to a larger community if similar employment to the job you now have were available there? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.
19. Many people feel that small towns are ideal much as they now exist and that efforts to expand their size and function should be actively resisted. Do you agree with the statement that efforts to expand the size and function of small towns should be actively resisted? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.
20. Would you welcome an increase in the population of this town? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided. What do you feel the ideal population of a town such as this should be? \_\_\_\_\_. If the population of this town were to expand considerably beyond or fall considerably below this ideal, would you consider moving from this town? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No \_\_\_Undecided.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adrian, Charles R. "Public Attitude and Metropolitan Decision Making," in Politics in the Metropolis: A Reader in Conflict and Cooperation, ed. by Thomas Dye and Britt W. Hawkins. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merritt Publishing Co., 1967.
- Banfield, Edward C. and James Q. Wilson. City Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press & M.I.T. Press, 1963.
- Dye, Thomas and Britt W. Hawkins eds. Politics in the Metropolis: A Reader in Conflict and Cooperation. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merritt Publishing Co., 1967.
- Madge, John. The Tools of the Social Science. London: Longmans Green & Co., L.t.d., 1963.
- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.
- Nelson, Edward G. The Company and the Community. Lawrence, Kansas: Bureau of Business Research, School of Business, University of Kansas, 1956.
- Peterson, Ellen W. A Kansan's Enterprise. Enterprise, Kansas: Baptist Church of Enterprise, 1957.
- Wilson, James Q. ed. City Politics and Public Policy. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Articles and Periodicals

- Hodge, Gerald, "Do Villages Grow?--Some Perspectives and Predictions," Rural Sociology, XXXI (June, 1966), 183-196.
- League of Kansas Municipalities, Kansas Government Journal, LVIII (January, 1964), 73.
- , Kansas Government, Pub. No. 132-69 (January, 1964), 17-22.
- Pollay, Richard, "The Death of the Small Town: Some Causes and Cures," Kansas Business Review, XX (April, 1963), 3-9.

Reid, Bill G., "The Agrarian Tradition and Urban Problems," The Midwest Quarterly, VI (Autumn, 1964), 75-85.

Sinclair, Andrew, "Small Town," The Spectator, November 27, 1964, 699.

Stafford, Howard A., Jr., "The Functional Bases of Small Towns," Economic Geography, XXXIX (April, 1963), 165-175.

#### Public Documents

Kansas, Handbook for the City Governing Body: Cities of the Third Class, (1963).

U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population, 1970: Numbers of Inhabitants, Kansas.

U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population, 1970: Numbers of Inhabitants, United States Summary.

COMMUNITY SELF-ASSESSMENT:  
THE CASE OF SMALL TOWN AMERICA

by

WILLIAM E. WATERS

B. S., Kansas State University, 1970

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

1972

## ABSTRACT

A necessary component of small town viability is support for the community. This support can come from outside the community, i.e., from the state and national government, but ideally will come from inside the community itself. In the final analysis, regardless of the degree of external support, the future of the small town rests upon the degree of internal support. That is to say, while small towns probably cannot prosper without external support, they cannot survive as a community without internal support. Thus the critical factor in the future of the American small town seems to revolve around citizen support for the community.

Citizen support can entail numerous dimensions. For example, citizen support might mean active participation in the political, economic, and social life of the community, or it might mean nothing more than an acceptance of the legitimate existence of the community. Citizen support, therefore, can be primarily active, or primarily passive, or, as is probably most often the case, a combination of both active and passive components.

Regardless of how citizen support is defined, the nature and intensity of citizen support must be conditioned by the community itself. In other words, if a community's citizens have a favorable rather than an unfavorable perception of the community and its facilities, it seems at least a solid basis of citizen support exists.

A community self-assessment questionnaire was designed to

assess citizen support and was administered to a random sample of the populations of two small towns. Essentially, the selected respondents were asked to rate their respective communities as excellent, good, average, poor, or bad in nine institutional areas of community life. The areas selected included the areas of education, housing and planning, religion, economic development, cultural opportunities, recreation, health and welfare, government, and community organization. Also, the survey instrument was designed to obtain relevant social and economic data such as respondent age, sex, and income. Further, the survey instrument was designed to assess respondent willingness to sustain business and industrial expansion within the communities, as well as expansions of recreational and educational facilities.

For the purposes of analysis, responses of "excellent" and "good" were considered supportive responses, responses of "average" were considered neutral responses, and responses of "poor" and "bad" were considered non-supportive responses. The results of this study indicated the existence of a high level of citizen support in the sample communities.