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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Communication Commission dictate of March 22, 1976 (Document #19816) requires non-commercial television broadcasters to undergo formal procedures for ascertaining the needs and interests of their local viewing audiences. The Commission provides a checklist of 19 elements within a community, among them are the political minorities, religious and educational constituencies, from which the broadcasters are to select leaders to interview. In addition to the survey of the community leaders, the Commission requires the non-commercial television stations to make general public surveys. Among the various options allowed by which the stations may undertake this task is the random-sample survey. The Commission feels that the broadcasters should be able to ascertain the needs and interests of their audiences by this data collecting method.

This recent ruling promises to be another example of government regulations which will foster new research grants in the black community, further substantiating the fact that the American black community has come of age as a legitimate arena for social research. However, black observers of social research in their communities contend that something is askew.

Brazzier (1973:43) comments that all kinds of studies have been performed but unfortunately, many of
the researchers are not recognizing themselves as part of the problem. "Blacks are frustrated with white researchers coming in, doing research and leaving everything the same—except for the researchers' professional careers," maintains Couchman (1974:45). Costello (1973:490) argues that "the volume of social research far out distances changes in services in the black community. If one were to convert available research findings into social policy and practice, it would take years to close the gap between knowledge and practice."

Williams (1974:4) infers:

Most of the social science research in the black community is not sensitive or responsive to the needs of the people. The research typically is not oriented toward bringing about change, but toward elevating the professional status of the researchers and bringing more research grants. From an extensive review of the literature, it is clear that research conducted over the years in black families' has led not to positive definitions regarding life styles, manhood and womanhood, but to many negative formulations.

Consequently some questions pose themselves again as the non-commercial broadcasters collect their data. Will the massive information collected be used to improve the stations' planning and implementation of programming for the black segment of viewers? Will the ascertainment studies be used simply to satisfy the broadcasters' legal responsibilities to learn all they can about the local black audiences - inasmuch as the law only requires the stations to collect data on community problems? Will the
data be made available to other social science researchers for reevaluation and consideration? Will the sharing of these data make definite changes in the total application of knowledge and services in the black communities? Only time will answer these questions, but social science researchers are able by their actions to foretell the direction of these answers.

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) write that one of the main deficiencies of social science research is the lack of cooperation among researchers in the various fields to pool their findings, concepts and generalizations to help develop a more descriptive and precise picture of the population. These data which the public broadcasters must collect deal with the identification of community leaders, individual perception of personal and community problems and enlightenment on mass media seeking habits. This information may easily serve as a springboard for related social sciences reevaluation and empirical support for changes in and better understanding of community social services goals and method of operation.

One particular aspect of social change comes under the heading of modernization. The concept of modernization is not new to social science research although it has undergone various stages of emphasis. Eisenstadt (1966:1) defines the historical implication of modernization as being the "process of change towards those types of social,
economic and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America from the 17th century to the 19th century and have spread to other European countries and in the 19th-20th centuries, to the South American, Asian and African continents."

Tipps (1975:199, 202) suggests:

The term modernization in its present connotation is of relatively recent origin, becoming accepted in American and international social science research in the 1960's. The proliferation and alternative definitions has been such that in fact the ratio of those using the term to alternative definitions would appear to approach unity. The general agreement is that modernization is a type of social change which is both transformational in its impact and progressive in its effect. It is also "multifacted process" which touches at some time every institution of society but in a manner such that transformation of one institutional sphere tends to produce complementary transformation in others.

Because of the Western World's influence being related to modernity, almost all of the modernity studies have exclusively dealt with developing and/or Third World nations.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the relationships between modernity and social change as determined by problem perception. The independent variables were highest level of education completed and residence time in one's neighborhood. Dependent variables were the perceptions of the three most important community problems and the two most important personal problems. Data utilized in this study were from a larger data set compiled for "Methods for Evaluation Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations," (McCain and Hofstetter, 1977) which was funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Grant 4436-Al.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their first most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

2. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their second most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

3. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their third most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.
4. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their first most important personal problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

5. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their second most important personal problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

6. There will be no significant differences in blacks' perceptions of Family Life Orientation Problems (Education, Finances and Housing) and their modernity level (i.e., Modern, Mixed or Traditional) when observed across the three most important community problems and the two most important personal problems.

Assumptions

The assumptions underlying this study were:

1. That the data obtained from the "Methods for Evaluation Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations" (McCain & Hofstetter, 1977) funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (Grant 4436-Al) were indeed archived factually and reliably.

2. The respondent in the study from which these data were drawn (McCain & Hofstetter, 1977) answered honestly, i.e., told the interviewers the truth.

3. That the term black includes all terms referring to persons of African descent.
Limitations

1. The questionnaire employed in this study was designed by the primary researchers of the Ascertainment Study (McCain & Hofstetter, 1977). The reliability and validity of the questionnaire was not formally established prior to its usage. The literature, professional judgment and a small pilot study were used to help establish some validity. Consequently, the exact reliability or validity of the questionnaire is unknown.

2. The generalizability of this study will be restricted to the Columbus, Ohio black population.

Definitions of Terms

Community Problem Perceptions:

The open-ended answers respondents gave to the question "What would you say is the most important problem facing the black community in Columbus?" This question was asked three times to ascertain the primary community problems and concerns.

Family Life Concerns and Orientations:

Three problems--housing, finances and education--were selected from the combined frequency counts of community and personal problem perceptions. This group of problems was examined to determine if any significant correlations existed between the problems and the modernity groups.

Modernity:

The Modern-Traditional dimension of an individual's
orientation toward change as measured by educational achievement and length of time of residency in the neighborhood.

Modernity Index Score:
The position an individual takes in the modernity continuum. It may be one of three—Modern (high modernity) meaning having a high educational achievement level and a low residency time; Mixed modernity meaning having either high educational achievement and high residence or low educational achievement and low residency time; and Traditional (low modernity) meaning having low educational achievement and high length of residence time in the neighborhood.

Personal Problem Perceptions:
The open-ended answers respondents gave to the question "What would you say is the most important problem facing you personally?" This question was asked twice to ascertain the two most important personal problems of each respondent.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is presented in three major sections: definitions of modernity; theoretical framework; and research approaches to modernity.

Modernity Defined

The common characteristics of modernization refers to both socio-demographic aspects of societies and structural aspects of the social organization (Eisenstadt, 1966). Rosen (1972:353) defined "individual modernity as a social-psychological complex which emerges with industrialization."

The term 'social mobilization' was coined by Deutsch (1961:494) to denote most of the demographic aspects of modernization. It is defined as the process in which major clusters of old social, economic, and psychological commitments are eroded and broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behavior.

"Thus modernization becomes a series of transitions from primitive, subsistence economies to technology-intensive, industrialized economies; subject to participant political cultures; close, ascriptive status systems to open, achievement-oriented systems; extended to nuclear kinship units; religious to secular ideologies, etc." (Tipps, 1975:204)

This process of abandonment of old ways for new ones has been copiously described and labelled, according to Migdal (1974:189). He suggests that various models have been offered--among them are the information theory,
communication and personality theories. Tipps (1975:204) comments that modernization is not simply a process of change, but one which is defined in terms of the goals toward which it is moving. Migdal (1974:197) further explains "modernization as the actual adoption of new commitments and patterns resulting in the use of new levels of technology and in structural differentiation."

Rogers (1972) offers the following characteristics of a less developed and less complex social system usually referred to as being traditional. A traditional society experiences high literacy and low education and its members lack the ability of outsiders to the system. In the sense of an ideal type norm description, the traditional society also lacks favorable orientation to change; communication by its members with outsiders; transportation facilities and general communication network with the larger society; and serves as a social enforcement of the status quo in its social system, facilitated by affective personal relationships, such as friendliness and hospitality, which are highly valued as ends in themselves (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971:31).

In contrast, the norms of the ideal type called modern is typified by a generally positive attitude toward change; a well developed technology with a complex division of labor; a high value on education and science; rational and businesslike social relationships rather than emotional and affective; and the ability on the part of the members to empathize, or see themselves in the roles of others quite different from their own (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971:33).
It would appear quite natural then, that most modernity studies have looked at developing and emerging nations.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework from which these modernity studies were approached can be conceptualized as falling into one of two categories: the 'critical variable' theories or the 'dichotomous theories' (Tipps, 1975:203). The first theories equate modernization with a single type of social change. Proponents of this view include Schwartz (1972) whose position is that modernization is a synonym for the process of rationalization; Levy (1953), who defines modernization in terms of two technological indicators of industrialization and Moore (1963), who simply equates modernization with industrialization (Tipps, 1975).

Tipps (1975) suggests that most social scientists have opted for the second method—'dichotomous theories'. It is defined in such a manner that it serves to conceptualize the process whereby 'traditional' societies acquire the attributes of 'modernity'.

The advantages of the 'critical variable' approach according to Tipps (1975:205) is that it avoids many difficulties of the 'dichotomous theories' by conceptualizing modernization as an open-ended rather than a goal-directed process and by defining it in terms which are narrow and concrete, thus giving the concept greater operational clarity. However, the disadvantage is when the 'critical variable' is defined in relation to a single variable, which is already identified by its own unique term, the term modernization functions not as a theoretical
term but as a synonym. To equate modernization with industrialization adds nothing to the utility of the latter concept and renders the former redundant."

Simmel (1964) argues that rationality which is the dominant characteristic of modern man is man's adaptation to the overwhelming stimulation and complexities of metropolitan life. Black (1966) contends that the characteristic of modern societies is the growth of new knowledge and that this presumes the existence of men with increasing capacity to understand secrets of nature and to apply this new knowledge to human affairs (Weiner, 1966: 4). Social change may be produced by two different orientations, suggests Coleman (1971). The first is the achievement or personal resources theories, which are akin to Weber's Protestant Ethic concept. McClelland (1966) also underlines self-reliance and an achievement orientation as essential qualities of modern man.

The second orientation suggested by Coleman (1971:49) is the Revolutionary Transformation theories which align themselves with general connotations of revolutionary tactics.

"To think that the modernization process is unidimensional and therefore can be measured by a single criterion or index, is a common misconception," argues Roger and Svenning (1969:15). This viewpoint leads into the following critique by Tipps of the second conceptualization of modernization, 'dichotomous' approaches.

Tipps (1975:206) writes that "one of the most frequently heard complaints against modernization theories in this
tradition is that they are the product of an essentially ethnocentric world-view," meaning Western World. To this, Rogers and Svenning (1969:14) would comment that modernization is a synthesis of old and new ways and to imply that the source of change necessarily is the Western World ignores variations in different environments.

Two other areas of critique offered by Tipps (1975) are centered around empirical assertions and methodology. He feels that empirical assertions, in the form of either erroneous or misleading claims have been incorporated into the conceptual framework.

Methodological evaluations focus upon the underlying strategy of conceptualization involved in modernization theory and its usefulness (Tipps, 1975:217).

For all the attention it has received, the conceptual apparatus of modernization theory has done remarkably little to advance our understanding of the many transformations which have been experienced by human societies. It has encouraged a preoccupation with questions of a descriptive and taxonomic nature while ignoring or obscuring more fundamental issues... Both the number and vagueness of attempts to conceptualize modernization are in fact symptomatic of its lack of unity. Rather than attempting simply to describe the various transformations of societies, such a problem structure should identify in more or less operational terms the underlying core structural problems common to all societies to which these transformations are a response...(Tipps, 1975:223, 234).

Approaches to Modernity Studies

Modernity, the process by which new lifestyles are accomplished, may be analyzed from various units. Schnaiberg (1970:400) suggests the following four: international
(Nettl & Robertson, 1968); societal (Levy, 1966 and Lerner, 1958); community (McCain & Wall, 1975 and Sjoberg, 1964); and individual (Kahl, 1958 and Inkeles, 1969).

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) submit seven traditions of modernity research: anthropology, early sociology, rural sociology, education, medical sociology, communication and marketing. The aspects in common between the various units of analyzation and various traditions to the research are methods of securing information, mainly questionnaires or surveys, and the bottom line of the source of information—the individual.

The levels of change as grouped by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971:10) suggest that the individual is the adopter or rejector of modernity life styles. The individual represents a microanalytic approach, while the social systems (Schnaiberg's first three units) center on the change process from a macroanalytic vantage point. "The common characteristic of modernity refers both to sociodemographic aspects of societies and to structural aspects of the social organization," adds Eisenstadt (1966:2).

Eisenstadt (1966:2) explains his views by stating that the movement to modernity must pass through certain sequence of stages and each stage has different problems associated with it. These challenges affect the individual simultaneously as it does the social order. Ponsioen (1969:14) asks, "What is society at large: Is it a thing, or a person or a state? or is it the mere addition of the three? Society", he
concludes, "is a omnifunctional, comprehensive process; an overall structure embracing the unifunctional, multifunctional and territorial social units imbuing them (i.e., the social units) with a feeling of belonging" (Ponsioen, 1969:14).

Three primary sources of change are suggested by Colemang (1971:80), namely, the individual member of the group in question; collective actors drawn from the group in question; of the environmental conditions wherein the action occurs.

Migdal (1974:180) writes that the key explanation of modernity is the same:

Exposure to the modern—'cultural contact' will lead people to abandon the old and attempt to garner fruits of the new. This explanation of exposure and contact as change causes are based on these components, a) benefits of modern ways far outweigh benefits of traditional ways, b) the individual is free from severe institutional restraints which would prevent his making a free decision, c) those individuals who select the new are rational and optimizers (educated) and d) those who fail to accept the modern ways do so because of 'wrong' or non-rational values.

Inkeles (1966) outlined attitudes which he felt were shared by men in modern societies, irrespective of cultural differences: 1) disposition to accept new ideas and try new methods, 2) readiness to express opinions, 3) share a time sense which makes men more interested in the present and future than the past, 4) demonstrate a better sense of punctuality, 5) have greater concern for planning, organization, and efficiency, 6) have a tendency to see the world as calculable, 7) possess faith in science and technology and 8) believe in distributive justice.
Modernity studies have been designed to assess various dimensions of living thereby determining which variables are reliable indexes of modernity. Schnaiberg (1970:408) offers the following dimensions: mass media; nuclear-family role structure; environmental orientation, productive/consumption; religiousity and extended-family ties. Another list by Glenn (1967) differs only slightly from the first: religion, morals; political issues; international relations, racial and ethnic minorities; relative desirability of occupation and attitudes toward work. Determining whether the dimensions of modernity indexes should be structural or attitudinal orientations is the point of controversy between Stephenson (1968) and Inkeles (1969).

In 1965, Stephenson conducted a four-month field study in Shiloh, a cluster of neighborhoods served by a common school, churches and stores, in the southern Appalachian mountains. Extensive notes were taken on the 130 residents' conversations, interviews and behaviors. Later, in 1967, the statements were condensed into fifty-odd examples and subjected to judgment by a panel of seven persons who were asked to sort them on the basis of their 'traditional' or 'modern' content.

The judges were asked to sort the statements into three piles which indicated a clearly modern attitude, a clearly traditional attitude or reflected an ambiguous attitude. Seven dimensions of modernity examined time, achievement, work, education, person-versus-object orientation, religion,
and sex role orientations. Stephenson however, based these dimensions on the selected criteria gathered from the sample, stating that the community decides for itself the modern/traditional continuum. In other words, that the dimensions for measuring modernity in individuals may vary from community to community, depending on how that particular community feels.

Inkeles' (1969) responded that Stephenson's philosophy was "nonsense" (Inkeles, 1969:148). He offers the illustration of the physician's treatment being determined by the patient's diagnosis. The social scientist should inevitably have other dimensions which he considers either on theoretical grounds or because he has empirical evidence from other studies to indicate to be important. Stephenson is saying that only indigenous modernity index scales are valid, argues Inkeles. But other studies particularly Inkeles' in India, which compared indigenous scales to transnational scales, have proven to be extremely reliable in assessing the very same dimensions.

Stephenson's determinants of modernism were very much like Inkeles': education, occupation and residence. But Stephenson wanted to prove that measurement based on criteria external to the community is meaningless. "A red herring" is Inkeles' opinion about this method of determining modernity indexes (Inkeles, 1969:149).

In conclusion, Inkeles advice is:

If the researcher's purpose is to identify the way local people view the process of change, Stephenson's method, if better constructed is appropriate.
If the purpose is to measure attitude changes on dimensions which sociological theory has
identified as important because of their relationship to social structure, Inkeles' method is fine. But, if the purpose is merely to discriminate most accurately attitudinal differences among a set of men, still a third method might be best (Inkeles, 1969:149).

A study by McCain and Wall (1975) was designed along Inkeles' structural orientations. Their research sought to operationalize the degrees of modernity in a social system called "River Ridge". The problem at hand dealt with the community's voting responses to a proposed school board sponsored bond issue. McCain and Wall's argument was that not all individuals in a social system adopt a new idea at the same time, and that by clearly defining the groups of adoption over time, the school board could better plan its future campaign strategies.

The elements used by McCain and Wall (1975) to define modern and traditional systems are of two basic types: structural and attitudinal/orientational. Attitudinal/orientational differentiators of modern and traditional systems include the systems favorableness toward change, empathy, and types of personal relationships. The descriptors of the social system's structural elements are level of education, relative geographic isolation, simplicity of technology, and length of residence. These structural identifiers of modernity can be viewed as producing various attitudinal viewpoints. (McCain and Wall, 1975:7)

The River Ridge studies asked the questionnaire respondents to indicate the highest educational level they had obtained and the length of time they had lived in the River
Ridge School district. These two criteria were used to define the precincts as follows: Modern social system—high in education and low in residence time; Mixed social system—either high in education or low in residence time, but not both and Traditional social system—low in education and high in residence time (McCain and Wall, 1975).

Grasmick (1973), another researcher of modernity in the United States, sought to examine the psychological effects on the values and beliefs of the Southerner experiencing the rural-urban transition. He too refers to Stephenson's attempt to critique the strategy of selecting values and beliefs based on theoretical discussion of modernity which turned out to be support for the type of items already in use to measure individual perception of modernity.

Grasmick's study used a sample of 1,130 Americans living in the southern region of the country. The sample was stratified according to region of state and city size. Grasmick's questionnaire items were to assess and measure dimensions of sex roles, fatalism, attachment to kin, neophobia and localism. The conclusions of the study were that it would take more than one generation to close the gap between attitudial differences. He did find two categories for determining one's attitude toward modernization. The early adopters had had early family experiences of high value on education and their fathers' had good jobs. The late adopters attitudes seem to correlate to their travel experience, i.e., the number of times they had moved, mass media exposure and size of their residential town.
McKinney and Bourgoue (1971) maintain that certain values and beliefs of Southerns have remained in spite of changes in the social structure. "To the extent the daily occupational and educational environment of the Southerner becomes similar to that of the non-Southerner, the attitudes and values of the two will also be indistinguishable" (p. 408).

It seems appropriate to mention some of the landmark studies of modernity in other nations which have had some bearing on family life. Fox (1973) and Holmstrom (1973) both looked at the determinants of modernity in Turkey. The sample in both studies were women.

Fox's study was to assess the impact of social change on the status of 803 women. When the differences of attitudes and behaviors were examined, the type of community background, amount of education, the age of marriage and exposure to mass media could be formed into an orderly system of influence which determined how modern or traditional a woman would be as a wife (Fox, 1973:520). Education was expected to be the key factor in the process of change from constrained to emancipated behavior and from traditional to modern minds, Fox (1973:523) felt.

Holmstrom (1973) centered more on the range of permissible behavior for women depending on the social class status. These differences varied fairly consistently with the rural-urban differences. His study...
"Suggests that the process of modernization for women in industrializing societies does not invariably involve painful conflicts pitting established cultural norms against evolving behavior patterns. Outcomes are more variable in terms of personal stresses and satisfactions depending upon other crucial factors such as perceived status of the husband as the family provider, role or exemplary cultural elites, and perception of self in relation to reference groups and society at large" (Holmstrom, 1973: 552).

Rosen's (1972 & 1973) studies in Brazil support the conclusions in Turkey.

"Modernity in women tends to increase with level of education, skill of occupation, social status and membership in voluntary associations" (Rosen, 1972:353).

Like the others, the study was designed along a rural-urban continuum of residence. However,

"The goal, was not to make generalizations about communities or all groups of women, but to obtain subgroups of individuals who had been differentially exposed to industrialization. The focus was on limited groups of women from different social settings, not on the settings as such" (p. 335).

In another study, Rosen (1973) specifically contrasts rural families and peasants at one end of the rural-urban continuum to lower class city dwellers at the other. The sample was 167 boys observed during family interaction to determine the impact of industrialization on migrant family structure and socialization.

"The data showed that the interaction with migrant families became more open and responsive as their length of residence in the city increased. The relationship of time in the city to family and socialization is more curvilinear than linear. Thus an emphasis on
achievement as independence is least evident in rural groups, becomes more apparent among recent migrants, and increases with established migrants, declining with groups who have lived longest in the city. It was assumed that the length of residence would provide an adequate, although rough and ready, index of experiences in urban ambience. But logically, length of residence relates more to exposure to the urban milieu than experience time" (Rosen, 1973:210, 211).

Urban residence and education are two dimensions which continually appear as introduction and measurement of modern attitudes. Gore (1968) studied urbanism and family change in India, a country where industrialization has not proceeded very far. Gore recognized the influence of liberal thought which emphasizes rationality in action; a universalistic ethic of equality of opportunity for all groups and individuals and the value of individual as the major factor in social change. These influences have been brought in by the bureaucracy and western oriented system of education (Gore, 1966:77).

Hill's (1959) investigation into the population control question in Puerto Rico found an urbanity typology continuum was created by combining properties of urban-rural residence, type of marital union, and amount of education. Rank order correlations were discovered to co-vary with urban family types from the most conservative to the most progressive.

Portes' extensive study of 1,060 cases in Guatemala summarized his findings into three basic conclusions:

"In Guatemala, as in other countries previously researched, a hypothesized modernity
dimension can be identified empirically; secondly, a series of more specific, but meaningful components, some possessing a predominantly cognitive character, others being expressive in nature, underlies a basic modernity dimension; and lastly, a model envisioning the emergency of modernity as dependent on statue and residential variables—which determine alternative contexts of socialization—is strongly supported" (Portes, 1973:32).

Education and urban residence were used to help clarify the meaning of six factors: intrafamily orientations, urban experience, numerical definition of family, religiosity, general information and reproductive orientations.

"Modernity in the West is not identical with underdeveloped modernity if for no other reason than that the first is, in the broadest sense, the organic production of internal processes of structural differentiation and growth, while the second is, to a large extent, the product of cultural diffusion" (Horwitz, 1970).

"The exposure which urban residence, years of education and the vantage point of higher socioeconomic status afford the individual is, for the most part, exposure to influence originating from the West. Modernity may thus owe its cross-national stability to being largely an 'import product' from the same source and, hence, artificially superimposed on the social structures of receiving countries" (Portes, 1973:33).

Summary

The term modernization (modernity) across all studies implies the acquisition of new social-psychological processes when industrialization, along with its inherent educational advancements, become more prominent in any
given developing society. Ideal type norms of traditional and modern societies have given incentives to cross cultural research designed to examine whether the characteristics identified in one society are valid descriptors of traditional and modern in another society.

Theoretically, the modernity studies have been one of two types: critical variable versus dichotomous theories. Critical variable based studies equate modernization with a single type of social change; whereas dichotomous theories tend to conceptualize the process whereby traditional societies acquire attributes of modernity.

Modernity studies have been approached from various vantage points. Stephenson (1968) proposed that modernity indexes be constructed based upon asking the sample for their opinion about social changes and behavior occurring about them. Inkeles (1966) and McCain and Wall (1975) maintain that an empirically constructed questionnaire will ascertain both underlying attitudes and the structural orientations, such as education, length of residency, social status, etc. Wall and McCain (1976) suggest that by operationalizing education and length of residency in the community, it is possible to then construct modernity social systems of moderns, mixed and traditionals for any community.

However, the growing number of modernity studies, undertaken from either perspective, indicate some trends between one's educational achievement and place of residency to his/her attitudes toward social change.
These findings point to a need for more studies in industrialized nations to further substantiate the generalization drawn from research in developing nations.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between modernity (as an indicator of social change) and blacks' perception of personal and community problems. The independent variables were educational achievement and length of residence time in the neighborhood. The dependent variables were the community and personal problems perceived and the family life orientations. Data utilized in this study were from the data set "Methods for Evaluating Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations", (McCain and Hofstetter, 1977) which was funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Grant 4436-A1. The present study attempts to combine Stephenson's approach of 'asking the people what changes are important as reflections of their attitudes about social changes occurring in their community' and Inkeles'(1969) and McCain and Wall's (1976) reference point of theoretically identified dimensions of modernity.

Sample Population

The target population was the 99,627 black population of Columbus, Ohio, a large midwestern city with a total population over 500,000 (1970 Census of Population and Housing, 1972). The sample population was randomly selected on the basis of address numbers supplied by an independent
research firm. This Company updates its mailing addresses every six months.

**Sampling Procedure**

The sampling procedure was to obtain every eleventh address of census tracts having a black population of 50 per cent or more and every 31st address of census tracts having a black population between 12.5 and 50 per cent. Total addresses supplied were 3,800.

Telephone numbers were then located for the addresses by using the city directory. Each number was then called and the person answering the telephone was asked his/her racial designation. If the respondent answered in any way other than those terms associated with Negroid distinction, namely, colored, black, Afro-American or Negro, the call was terminated by the interviewer. If the telephone number did not belong to a private household, the call was also terminated by the interviewer. An attempt was made to balance the sex ratio by requesting the female head of household when the telephone number ended in even digits and the male of the household if the last digit was odd. The final sample was: male respondents, n=160; female respondents, n=289; and the total sample, N=449.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The interviews were conducted on the telephone by trained professional black female interviewers. Female interviewers were used because pretesting indicated that female interviewers were better received by the respondents when both sex inter-
viewers were used. Orientation sessions were held and at that time the interviewers were made aware of the importance of maintaining the reliability of the questionnaire by following the format and wording as printed on the questionnaire. Call sheets were assigned and attempts were made to identify each number as a completed interview, incomplete interview, initial refusal, no respondent, non-black respondent, and non-eligible respondent (as in business telephone numbers). These completed call sheets were returned a project supervisor who made random calls to verify that the interviewers did make the call and recorded the information accurately.

**Instrument**

The questionnaire was designed by the principal investigators from the Communication and Political Science Departments at The Ohio State University. It was developed so as to ascertain black opinions of their community leaders, mass media habits, and personal and community problems. (See Appendix A for complete Questionnaire.)

Data in this study were obtained from the first two questions, which were open-ended and asked: "What would you say is the most important problem facing the black community in Columbus?" and "What would you say is the most important problem facing you personally?" Space was allotted to obtain three responses to each question and the respondents were asked to rate each problem on a scale of "Extremely Important, Very Important, or Important".

The independent variable of educational achievement and
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length of residence time in the neighborhood were obtained from questions fourteen and sixteen which were respectively: "How many years have you lived in this neighborhood?" and "What is the highest year of school you completed?" The precoded responses to question 14 were: a) less than one year, b) one to three years, c) four to nine years, and d) ten or more years. The precoded responses to question 16 were: a) eighth grade of less, b) ninth - eleventh grades, c) high school graduate, d) some college, i.e., 13-16 years, e) college graduate and f) post graduate, i.e., 17+ years.

**Problem Categorization**

The two focus point questions, community and personal problems, under consideration in this study were open-ended and the information obtained was extensive. These responses collected in the "Methods for Evaluation Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations" (McCain & Hofstetter, 1977) were categorized by professional coders into forty-eight problem responses, in addition to a 'none' and 'other' groups (See Appendix A for complete list of 'other responses). For the purpose of this study, the 48 problem responses were clustered into six groups obtained through a two step q-sorting.

The q-sorting was accomplished by asking five black persons representing the community, home economics, academia and the original researchers to place each of the 48 problem responses into not more than ten piles, including an "other" pile. These groupings were then compared for unity and eight
category headings were determined: city services problems, concerns and orientations; community problems, concerns and orientation; discriminatory problems, concerns and orientations; domestic problems, concerns and orientations; educational problems, concerns and orientations; racial and political problems, concerns and orientations; economic and employment problems, concerns and orientations; and "Other" problems, concerns and orientations.

These eight group headings were then submitted, along with the 48 problem responses to three persons representing home economics, academia and the community for q-sorting.

At this point a frequency count was made for each of the 48 problem responses to determine the sample's absolute response to each problem over the five parts of the two questions. This was done because it was apparent that some problems were being placed in more than one category and it was felt that if the absolute frequency was low, it would not be necessary to continue q-sorting to achieve unity over the categories' content.

Because the second group of q-sorters verbally expressed to this researcher the close and overlapping scope of some of the group headings, the following categories were combined: a) city services and community problems and b) racial and political problems with discriminatory problems. In addition, because housing was the dominant problem in domestic concerns and housing also represented the largest frequency, the domestic category label was expanded to include housing.
The "Other" category was defined by problems lacking unity among the second set of q-sorters.

The practice of clustering questions which were constructed to pinpoint specific areas of modernity was followed in almost all the previous studies reviewed. The clusters used in this study reflected the dimensions previously investigated and identified as characteristic concerns of Traditional and Modern ideal type norms in any given society. Thus, the final clusters (Category Headings) for this study were:

I. CITY SERVICES/COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   city services, crime, police, juvenil delinquency, transportation, drugs, garbage collection, special projects, community involvement, shopping facilities, welfare system, recreation facilities, apathy, general atmosphere and neighborhoods

II. DISCRIMINATORY, RACIAL AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   prejudice, black/white relations, other discriminations, political support, political representation, political awareness

III. EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   education, communication, segregation/desegregation, mass media

IV. ECONOMIC/EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   employment, advancement, labor concerns, finances, business opportunities for blacks

V. HOUSING AND DOMESTIC PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   housing, child neglect, family solidarity, child rearing practices, food/hunger, personal problems

IV. OTHER PROBLEMS, CONCERNS AND ORIENTATIONS:
   religion, utilities, health care, social services, aging, services for the elderly
Family Life Orientations

One other category was also under investigation in this study, Family Life Orientations. It was constructed by data obtained from q-sorting done by three family content specialists. These persons were asked to identify ten problems from the 48 which they felt had significant bearing upon the quality of family life. The unity was perfect on housing, finances, and education. The other choices had low frequency counts among the sample and varied agreement among the content specialists, thus, they were eliminated from the analysis.

It should be noted that the number of respondents varied for each of the five parts of the two questions, therefore, the sample size differs for each part of the questions.

Data Analysis

A high Modernity Index Score (Modern) was defined as high in educational achievement and low in length of time in the neighborhood. High in educational achievement was operationalized as having a high school diploma (McCain and Wall, 1975). Low in residence time was operationalized as having lived in the community less than ten years (Durand, 1973 and McCain and Wall, 1975).

A Mixed Modernity Index Score was defined as being either high in education and high in residency time or low in education and low in residency time (McCain and Wall, 1975).

Consequently, the low Modernity Index Score (Traditional) was defined as being low in educational achievement and high in residency time (McCain and Wall, 1975).
The sample for each of these categories was:

MOD 1 "Traditional"  Low Education/High Residency  n= 44
MOD 2 "Mixed"        Low Education/Low Residency  High Education/High Residency  n=206
MOD 3 "Modem"        High Education/Low Residency  n=196
MISSING DATA
TOTAL SAMPLE  n= 3  N=449

Data were analyzed first according to the total problems identified. A Chi-square analysis of the lack of agreement between the data was used to determine if there were any significant differences in the problem perceptions by the three modernity groups. Five contingency tables, such that three reflected the community problems and two reflected the personal problems, were constructed to examine the differences. The .05 level of significance was established for rejecting the hypotheses. Secondary analyses were done on residency time and educational achievement levels. Particular attention was given to differences in the family life orientation and concerns by modernity groups. A Chi-square analysis was employed; alpha set at .05.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the relationship between modernity and social change as determined by problem perception. The independent variables were highest level of education completed and residence time in one's neighborhood. Dependent variables were the perceptions of the three most important personal problems. Data utilized in this study were from a larger data set compiled for "Methods for Evaluation Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations." (McCain and Hofstetter, 1977) which was funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Grant 4436-A1.

The findings will be presented by each hypothesis. For all analyses the alpha will be .05. A discussion follows the findings and is presented according to the independent and dependent variables.
Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences in blacks' perception of their first most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed, or Traditional.

Hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected. No significant difference was established and the expected continuum (i.e., Modern - Mixed - Traditional) did not occur. Only in the perception of Category V - Housing Concerns did a clear three point continuum unfold, but in the reverse order. That is, the Traditionals reported a higher percentage (18.4%) than the Mixed's (12.6%) which in turn was higher than the Modern's perception (9.3%).

Category IV - Economic/Financial Problems was seen as the most important community problem by all three groups, with the Mixed Group reporting the highest perception (41.8%). Likewise, rather than the Mixed being located clearly between the Modern and Traditional Groups, the Mixed Group shifted from the lowest percentage problem perception in Category VI - Other Concerns, to sharing the higher perception of Category II - Racial/Political Concerns with the Moderns. The Mixed Modernity Group also shared with the Traditional Group the lower problem perception of Category II - Educational Concerns. Category I - City/Community Service Problems were perceived by all three groups as the second ranked first most important community problem.

Table 1 depicts the percentage of respondents reporting each problem as their first most important problem by
modernity level. This indicates how importantly each of the three groups perceived the six problem categories. Looking beneath each problem category heading, reveals the problems' perception across the three groups. It is these percentages which were ranked in order to construct a modernity continuum. One should keep in mind that, although the percentages are reported fairly equal under the problem perception categories, the sample size varied for each group. Thus, a percentage of 26.3% for Traditionals under Category I represents ten persons' responses, whereas 26.8% for Moderns under Category I is an actual frequency count of 26 persons.

TABLE 1

First Community Problem Perception by Modernity Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernity Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/Community</td>
<td>Political/Racial</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Economics/Finances</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \mu < 0.58 \)
Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences in Blacks' perception of their second most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected. Although no significance was established, the total number of respondents was 200 as compared to 317 in Hypothesis 1. Also, the significance level was 0.24 as compared to 0.58 found in Hypothesis 1. Based on a ranking of the percentages of group members perceiving each problem as the second most important community problem three problem categories demonstrated the expected modernity continuum, i.e., Modern - Mixed - Traditional. These categories were; I - City/Community Service Problems; III - Educational Concerns and VI - Other Orientations.

The top three problem perceptions across all three modernity groups were Category I - City/Community; Category IV - Economics/Finances and Category V - Housing. This rank order was also demonstrated in Hypothesis 1. However, the importance of the three problems within a given modernity group was changed. For example, the Moderns perceived Category II - Political/Racial Concerns (14.5%) as more important than Category V - Housing (10.5%) in terms of their second most important community problem.

The rows in Table 2 depict the percentages of each modernity level's perception of the six problem categories.
For the 18 persons identified as Traditional, no one mentioned any response which would be classified in the "Other" category heading (VI). An inspection of the columns will reveal if the expected modernity continuum was established, i.e., that the percentage of the Modern Group perceiving the problem was higher than the Mixed Group's percentage, which in turn was more than the Traditional Group's percentage.

TABLE 2

Second Most Important Community Problem Perception by Modernity Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERNITY LEVEL</th>
<th>PROBLEM CATEGORIES</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City/Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Political/Racial</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics/Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.24

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences in Blacks' perceptions of their third most important community
problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.

Hypothesis 3 failed to be rejected. Although group differences were not significant, the expected modernity continuum developed in two categories (i.e., education and other) and the reversed order of the modernity continuum in two other problems (i.e., City/Community and Political/Racial). No Traditionals gave responses that fell into the categories of educational problems or other concerns. In the remaining two categories, IV - Economics/Financial Problems and V - Housing Problems, a larger percentage of the Mixed Group (28.8% and 17.5% respectively) than the Traditionals (22.2% and 11.1% respectively) or the Moderns (12.2% and 17.1% respectively) perceived the problems.

It should be pointed out, however, that in these two categories (IV & V) the Mixed Group was out of place on the continuum by less than one percent. In the Economic/Financial Problems (IV), there was a .6% difference between the Mixed (22.8%) and Traditionals (22.2%) Groups. If the two percentages had been reversed, a modernity continuum of Traditional - Mixed - Modern would have been constructed. As for V - Housing Concerns, there was a .4% difference between the Mixed Group (17.5%) and the Modern Group (17.1%). If these two percentages were inverted, an expected modernity continuum, i.e., Modern - Mixed - Traditional, would have been found.
Such small percentage differences indicated that a modernity continuum was operating in the perception of the third most important community problem, although the direction, as determined by which group perceived the problem more frequently, was evenly divided among the six categories.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernity Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/Community</td>
<td>Political/Racial</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Economics/Finances</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[p<0.29\]

**Hypothesis 4:** There will be no significant differences in Blacks' perception of their first most important personal problems and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional.
Hypothesis 4 failed to be rejected. In terms of which problems were most often mentioned by all three groups, Category I - City/Community Service Problems and Category IV - Economic/Financial Concerns were the top two. Category V - Housing, which had been ranked third in the first three hypotheses, was replaced by Category VI - Other Concerns. This higher reporting of problem perceptions which were classified as "Other" was expected because many of the personal problems were more specific and less compatible with the five other defined categories. (Note the elements of each category as defined in Chapter III).

Within the problem categories, no modernity continuum was observed; i.e., the Mixed Group did not fall between the Modern and Traditional Groups at any time. Careful examination of the percentages, however, indicate that the Mixed Group was out of position (not between Moderns and Traditionals) by less than two percentage points in five of the six categories. More specifically, in Category I - City/Community Service Problems, the Mixed Group's percentage was 1.2% more than the Traditionals. If they were inverted, a modernity continuum, Traditional - Mixed - Modern would have evolved. In Category III - Educational Concerns, the difference between Mixed and Modern Groups was 1.5 percent; thus, an expected modernity continuum would have developed if the percentages were reversed. Only a .5% difference existed between the Mixed and Traditional Groups in Category IV - Economic/Financial Problems. Like Category III, an
expected continuum would have been demonstrated if the percentages were reversed. In the remaining two categories, V - Housing Concerns and VI - Other Problems, the Mixed Group was more than the Traditional Group by .9% and .1% respectively. Adjustments in these two categories would have resulted in Traditional - Mixed - Modern modernity continuum constructions.

The total responding sample was 227, a little less than one half the sample total of 449. No empty cells were reported. Table 4 shows the percentage of respondents perceiving each category of problems as their first most important personal problem by modernity level.

**Table 4**

**FIRST MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM BY MODERNITY LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernity Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>I: City/Community</th>
<th>II: Political/Racial</th>
<th>III: Educational</th>
<th>IV: Economics/Finances</th>
<th>V: Housing</th>
<th>VI: Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.85
Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant differences in Blacks' perceptions of their second most important personal problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed, or Traditional.

Hypothesis 5 was rejected. This hypothesis was rejected at a high level (p 0.02), but there were three empty cells. The Traditional Group gave no responses to educational and housing problems (Category III and V) while the Mixed Group did not acknowledge education (Category III) as a personal problem area. Category II - Political/Racial concerns received no responses from any of the three groups. The total responding sample was 65, which was the smallest number of respondents for any hypotheses tested.

The expected continuum of Modern - Mixed - Traditional was demonstrated only once, Category V - Housing Problems. The Mixed Group reported Category II 1.1% more than the Traditional Group. If these figures were reversed, a Traditional - Modern - Mixed continuum would have been constructed. The differences between the Mixed Group and any other group in Categories I, III and VI was more than 7%. Categories I and IX (City/Community Services and Economics/Finances) were the most highly reported problem perceptions by the three groups.

Table 5 shows the percentage of respondents perceiving category of problem as their second most important personal problem by modernity level.
TABLE 5
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAL PROBLEM BY MODERNITY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernity Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/Community</td>
<td>Political/Racial</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Economics/Finances</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.02

Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant differences in Blacks' perceptions of family life orientation problems (education, finances and housing) and their modernity level (i.e., Modern, Mixed or Traditional) when observed across the three most important community problems and the two most important personal problems.

Hypothesis 6 failed to be rejected. Although overall significance was not obtained, two significant differences were found in the third most important community problem (p<0.03) and the second most important personal problem (p<0.02).
The third most important community problem did not have any Traditionals reporting the three problems (education, finances and housing). The responding sample of 30 was evenly divided between the Modern and Mixed Groups (i.e., 15 respondents per group). The Mixed reported their problems so that housing (40.0%) was their first family life orientation consideration; finances were second (33.3%) and education third (26.4%). The Moderns ranked education first (60.0%) and housing second (40.0%). They did not report any financial problem perceptions.

Significance at p<0.02 was found for the second most important problem. The responding sample was 22, which was the smallest sample size of all five questions assessing Family Life Orientations. The Traditional Group only acknowledged finances as an indication of their second most important personal problem -education and housing were empty cells. The Mixed Group did not see education as a second personal problem, but offered finances and housing respectively. Education was the Moderns' first perception of their second most important personal problem (50%). Finances and housing had equal responses, 25% each.

As for the three problems (first and second community problem perceptions and first important personal problem) where significance was not found, the responding sample sizes were less than 100, but more than 50 (83, 60, 58 respectively). Two modernity continuums (i.e., Mixed Group percentages were placed between the Modern and Traditional
Groups) occurred in the First Most Important Community Problem Perception as Family Life Orientations by Modernity Levels. Education was an expected continuum: Modern (34.8%) - Mixed (28.8%) - Traditional (12.5%). The reverse order was demonstrated in housing concerns: Traditionals (75.0%) - Mixed (42.3%) - Moderns (39.1%). The difference between Mixed (28.8%) and Moderns (26.1%) in Financial Concerns was 2.7%; thus, if the percentages had been reversed, another expected modernity continuum would have evolved.

Two modernity continuums were also found in the Second Most Important Community Problems as Family Life Orientation by Modernity Levels. Education showed a reversed continuum, i.e., Traditional (50.0%) reported more than the Mixed (41.7%) which in turn was higher than the Moderns (33.3%). The expected continuum for education had been established in the First Most Important Community Problems as Family Life Orientations. Finances, which contained an empty cell for the Traditional Group, met the expected continuum criteria, i.e., Moderns (27.8%) - Mixed (8.3%) - Traditional (0.0%). Unlike the First Community Problem computation for housing, the Mixed and Traditionals tied for higher percentages (50%), thus the direction of the modernity continuum was for both groups to perceive housing as a problem more often than Moderns.

The last part of Family Life Computations (First Most Important Personal Problems as Family Life Orientations
by Modernity Levels), where significance was not established, reveal only one continuum, but an empty cell occurred also. This problem was housing and reverse order continuum was established, i.e., Traditional 20.0%, Mixed, 13.3%, and Moderns 0.0%. Finances, as a personal problem, was perceived by 80% of the Moderns as compared to 60% of the Traditional and Mixed Groups. Education was perceived by the Mixed (26.7%) higher than both the Traditionals and Moderns (20.0% each).

A summary of the modernity continua which developed in the Family Life Orientations computations revealed that seven continuaums (going in either direction, i.e., Traditional - Mixed - Modern or Modern - Mixed - Traditional) were found out of the possible 15. Four of the seven continuaums were in a reverse direction, i.e., Traditional Group perceived the problem more than the Mixed Group, which perceived it more than the Modern Group.

In an attempt to graphically illustrate the modernity continuum across the five problem questions, Table 6 presents each problem (i.e., education, finance and housing) with the corresponding ranking of its importance to the three modernity groups based on percentage reported. Note that first, second and third refers only to ranking of percentages, not the percentages themselves. Table 7 provides this same information by giving the percentages found reported.
### Table 6

Family Life Orientations Continuum by Problems, Questions and Modernity Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>RANK ORDER BY EDUCATION</th>
<th>RANK ORDER BY FINANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Traditional/Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Traditional/Modern</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>Mixed/Modern</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION PROBLEMS BY MODERNITY LEVELS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

MODERNITY LEVELS WITH PERCENTAGE PERCEIVING PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Analysis: Years in neighborhood by problem categories. A clear trend emerged across the five research questions (i.e., first, second and third most important community problems and first and second most important personal problems) in terms of which residency time group (i.e., less than one year; 1-3 years; 4-9 years and 10 or more years) perceived the six problem categories (i.e., city/community services, political/racial; educational; finances/economics; housing and other) more intensely. It was found that Black's who had lived in a neighborhood for more than ten years reported the problems in higher percentages than Black's who had lived in their neighborhood less than 10 years. This trend might have been inductively predicted, but it was hypothesized, based on McCain & Wall's (1975) and Rosen's (1972 & 1973) research: That some problem areas will be perceived more frequently by individuals having lived in a community for less than ten years than by individuals who have longer residency. Such problem categories included political/racial orientations, educational problems and financial concerns. It is also important to note that, for the five research questions, the response ratio of the 10+ years residents was about equal to the less than 10 years residents. The ratio of respondents for each research question were: 209/184; 130/136; 76/60; 148/140 and 44/35.

Significant difference was obtained in the First Most Important Community Problem (p 0.002). In this analysis, 288 persons responded (a little more than one half the total
sample, 449) and the less than one year residents did not report city and community service problems as a problem (i.e., empty cell). As in the primary analyses, city/community services and economic/finances were the top two problems for those having lived either more than or less than ten years in their neighborhoods. In terms of which problem the individual groups (i.e., less than one year; one to three years; four to nine years and more than ten years) ranked highest only, one difference was observed. The three shorter residency time groups reported economic/financial problems while the ten years or more group cited city/community service problems. Graphs 1 through 5 shows the problem category perception percentages across the four residency groups. A glance at the rows will reveal that those having lived in their neighborhood for more than ten years perceived most of the problems more than those who have lived in their community less than 10 years.
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Secondary Analysis: Education by Problem Perceptions

A trend for one of the educational achievement groups (i.e., less than 8th grade; 9-12th grade; high school diploma; some college; college graduate; post baccalaureate) consistently perceive the six problem categories (i.e., city/community services; political/racial; educational; economics/finances; housing; other) more readily than the other groups was demonstrated. Blacks with a high school diploma tended to perceive the problems more readily than persons with less education (i.e., below eighth grade or ninth through twelfth) or those with higher educational achievement (i.e., some college, college graduate or post baccalaureate degree). The highest significant difference between the six educational
levels was found on the second most important community problem (p 0.08). The trend was for city/community services and economic/finances to be the top problems for all of the groups. The graphs 6-10 illustrate Blacks perceptions of the six problem categories by educational achievement levels.

GRAPH 6

PROBLEM PERCEPTIONS BY EDUCATION

FIRST MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM

Percent

Grades

City/ Community Political/ Racial Educational Economics/ Finances Housing Other CATEGORIES

p<.85
GRAPH 7
PROBLEM PERCEPTIONS BY EDUCATION
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM

Percent

Grades

City/Community
Political/Racial
Educational
Economics/Finances
Housing
Other

Categories

p<.08

GRAPH 8
PROBLEM PERCEPTIONS BY EDUCATION
THIRD MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM

Percent

Grades

I
II
III
IV
V
VI

Categories

p<.16
Secondary Analyses: Family Life Orientation by Residency

Two significant differences were found in the analysis of Family Life Orientations (education, finances and housing) by residency time (i.e., less than one year; one to three years; four to nine years and ten years or more). Alphas of less than .05 and .006 were found for First Most Important Community and First Most Important Personal Problems respectively. Empty cells appeared in both computations (1 empty cell and 2 empty cells respectively). In the two computations where significance was found, Blacks with longer residency (i.e., more than 10 years) perceived all six problems more frequently than Blacks with less than ten year residency even though the group sizes were about equal (58/49, First Most Important Community Problem; 37/44, First Most Important Personal Problem). However, housing was the largest reported problem for the first most important community perception (47/107) while finances received over half the responses in the first most important personal problem perception (50/81). Tables 8-10 provide the row percentages for each of the three problems (i.e., education, finances, housing) by research question.
### TABLE 8
**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY YEARS IN NEIGHBORHOOD-EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Years in Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9
**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY YEARS IN NEIGHBORHOOD-FINANCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Years in Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY YEARS IN NEIGHBORHOOD-HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Years in Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Analysis: Family Life Orientation by Education

A significant difference of .04 was found in one (second most important community problem) of the five research questions analyzed (i.e., three most important community problems and two most important personal problems) by educational achievement (i.e., less than eighth grade, ninth to twelfth grades, high school diploma, some college, college graduate and post baccalaureate degree). Overall, this secondary analysis revealed the most variance within educational level and the highest averaged significance 

\[ (.08 + .04 + .25 + .08 + .16) 5 = .26 \] of all the secondary analysis. No one with post baccalaureate degrees reported any personal problems. How one particular educational level
group saw education as its most important problem over the first research questions illustrated the variance occurring among the six groups as defined by educational achievement. In the first most important community problem, the high school graduates reported education as their main problem. In the second most important community problem, those with between a ninth and twelfth grade education pinpointed educational concerns as their primary orientation. Those with some college reported educational problems first in the third most important community problem perception. The high school graduates again acknowledged education as their most important concern in the first most important personal problem.

For the last research question dealing with the second most important personal problem, those with post baccalaureate educational achievements, referred to education as their primary problem.

Compared to the other five educational levels, high school graduates more often perceived finances as a problem area. Blacks with some college and blacks with less than an eighth grade education also reported finances as a major problem area.

Housing was also perceived fairly consistently higher by the high school graduate than by the other groups.

The chi-square analyses for Family Life Orientations by education are presented in Tables 11-15.
### TABLE 11

**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY EDUCATION**  
**FIRST MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.80

### TABLE 12

**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY EDUCATION**  
**SECOND MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.04
### TABLE 13

**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY EDUCATION**

**THIRD MOST IMPORTANT COMMUNITY PROBLEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .12*

### TABLE 14

**FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY EDUCATION**

**FIRST MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAL PROBLEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .08*
TABLE 15

FAMILY LIFE ORIENTATION BY EDUCATION
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAL PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

For both community and personal problem perceptions, a trend developed which implied that as the interviewer probed for the second and third problem areas, the responding sample decreased and the variance in significance increased. Table 16 presented this trend.
TABLE 16
RELATIONSHIP OF SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL TO RESEARCH QUESTION ORDER AND SAMPLE SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis #</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>p&lt;0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>p&lt;0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Important Community Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>p&lt;0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>p&lt;0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Important Personal Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>p&lt;0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This negative relationship between fewer respondents and higher significance levels could be due to a number of factors; first among them is the possibility that the population's unity in racial background overshadowed any differences among the first most important community and first most important personal problem perceptions. City/community services and economics/finances were the top two problem categories. Having a black heritage seems to mean sharing common problems almost in the relationship that cars need gasoline (i.e., there are some cars which operate
rechargeable batteries. These cars - like the blacks who do not share the common black oriented problems - are more of an experiment than the expected norm.

Another speculation as to why the responding sample decreased as the questions required more discriminating responses related to the data collection methodology. It might be assumed that sharing one's perception of the first most important community problem did not threaten the interviewer or in any way imply judgment about his/her involvement and/or awareness of what was occurring in the Columbus black community. However, when the interviewer pressed for secondary and peripheral problem areas, (i.e., the second and third most important community problem), the respondent perceived that the interviewer possibly had some "hidden agenda" of problems previously identified which the study sought to verify. [This was the case, because the section of questions following the open-end community and personal problem perceptions, asked the respondent to rate the importance of some fifteen identified problems. See Appendix A for questionnaire format.] Therefore, since the interviewer had introduced the call as part of a scientific survey dealing with blacks views about television, the respondents could easily have been in a frame of reference which made city/community problems, economic/financial orientations and housing concerns readily available responses to the questions dealing with community problems. Those categories were reported highest across all three modernity groups (i.e., Modern, Mixed, Traditional).
This researcher, who was also an interviewer, felt that one other influence was operating in regards to the declining sample size for personal problem perceptions. Although the interviewers stated anonymity for the interviewees, how often does one just practice sharing their most personal problems with an outsider — especially an interviewer. This would account for the continuance of the trend where city/community services, economics/finances and housing were most often reported, and help explain why the "other" category increased in total percentages for all six categories. This is a phenomenon much like that of married couples pinpointing either sex or money as their most important problem rather than acknowledging their lack of basic communication skills and/or one's personal poor marital adjustment as the real core of their differences.

In addition, the placement of the personal problem questions on the interview schedule followed the three community problem questions. This format constituted a drastic shift of interest — almost shockingly so for some interviewees, who in turn terminated the call at point.

One last comment on why fewer persons responded to the secondary and peripheral community and/or personal problems relates to the original emphasis of this study. It was hypothesized that the problem perceptions would yield differences according to one's modernity continuum placement, i.e., that persons having more educational achievement and mobility would be more sensitive and cognitively
aware of community and personal inadequacies, as well as reporting them (the inadequacies) more objectively and frequently than those with less education and less mobility. Thus, it follows that more Modern and Mixed group members should have responded to the secondary and third problem perceptions. This pattern illustrated Maslow's Hierarchy of Need Satisfaction Model (1954), in that these groups were beyond satisfying their physiological needs. Note the geometric decline in the number of Traditional respondents across the three community problems: 38; 18; 9 (Tables 1-3).

Significant differences between the Modernity groups were not found for any of the three community problems; however, the construction of a modernity continuum was more approximated with each succeeding hypothesis (i.e., first problem, second problem, third problem) dealing with identification of community problem perceptions. For this study, the Mixed Group was expected to be placed between the Moderns and Traditional Groups, regardless of the continuum's direction (i.e., whether the Moderns reported higher percentages than the Mixed, and the Mixed had higher percentages than the Traditionals or the Traditionals reported higher percentages than the Mixed, and the Mixed reported higher percentages than the Moderns.) Such a modernity continuum was demonstrated only once in Hypothesis 1 (first most important community problem); three times in Hypothesis 2 (second most important problem); and four times in Hypothesis 3 (third most important community problem).
As for the personal problems, no significant differences were observed for the first most important personal problem and no modernity continuum was formed. Yet the second most important personal problem where a significant difference of .02 was found, several modernity continuua effects were observed: First, no group identified Category II - Political/Racial Concerns; Second, only one category (Housing) displayed a three point continuum - but the Traditional cell was empty; Third, the percentage differences between the Mixed and Traditionals in the economics/finances category was just at one percent; Fourth, the educational concerns were perceived only by the Moderns; and Last, the other category and the city/community service category had the largest percentage point differences among the three groups.

The discussion of secondary analyses of the problem categories by residency included a trend which was logical. Persons who had lived more than ten years in a community should be and were more aware of community problems and that was a logical trend. Yet, if one had lived for less than a year to nine years in a neighborhood, he/she should be more critical of the newer community's deficits as compared to the previous environment - and this based on Wall & McCain (1975) and Rosen (1973) was also a logical choice for the data to support. A variable which was not considered was whether or not the people who had lived in their neighborhood for less than ten years were in fact moving into a more socially accepted area and were in fact
exchanging some of the negative problem perceptions of the community for the more valued social advantages of the newer neighborhood.

One of the most startling trends noted throughout the entire study was observed in problem categories by educational achievement levels. The high school graduates perceived most of the six problem categories by row total analysis more intensely than individuals that were lesser or higher educated. Obviously, the high school graduate saw themselves from a different perspective when identifying the problem areas than their neighbors of different educational achievement backgrounds. Possibly they saw themselves as fenced in by a social welfare policy and attitude which caters to the less than a high school diploma educated clientele while ignoring the high school graduate and taking for granted the post high school educated person. This is similar to the phenomenon of the "Working Poor."

Family Life Orientation (hypothesis 6) as defined by education, housing and finances, revealed two significant differences: a) Third Most Important Community Problem (p<0.02) and b) Second Most Important Personal Problem (p<0.02). However, the significance across all the research questions was not supported, thus the hypothesis failed to be rejected. It should be pointed out that the two significant findings occurred at the most discriminating levels of the set of questions dealing with community and personal problem perceptions.
The findings support the opening remarks of this discussion about expecting modernity continuums to develop more consistently with each succeeding research question, because the life space reference points of the respondents were thought to be more clearly represented and reported as the questions continued to probe.

Which of the three problems were of most concern in these five questions dealing with Family Life Orientation was also revealing. Across the five research questions (i.e., three most important community and two most important personal problems) the Modern Group referred to education and housing as their main concern. Finances ranked highest only as the first most important personal problem. The Mixed Group, on the other hand, referred to housing and finances respectively throughout the five questions. Perceptions of the Traditional Group centered on housing and finances, but in larger percentages than the Mixed Group. The Traditionals also failed to offer any responses to their third most important community problem and responded only once (to finances) in the second most important personal problem.

Remembering that the Family Life Orientations looked at three problems (education, finances and housing) across five research questions (three community and two personal questions) by three modernity levels (Modern, Mixed and Traditional) a pattern was developed regarding the overall top ranking of the three problems. Thus, housing drew the highest row total six times; finances, four times and education
only twice. What then, does the housing category imply about Family Life Orientations? Undoubtedly, the term housing needs clarification. Does 'housing' mean neighborhood upkeep? property maintenance? neighborhood composition and patterns? attitudes toward home ownerships? or possibly quite a few more concepts? It seems both unfair and unsupported to attempt to draw any implications from this crude category heading, but it seemed adequate to pinpoint housing as a problem perception shared by the three modernity groups thereby making it an area requiring further research.

The secondary analysis of Family Life Orientation by residency, repeated the earlier trend identified in Problem Categories by Residency, i.e., residents of more than ten years consistently reported the problems more frequently than persons with shorter residency. Significance was found twice: a) First Important Community Problem (p<.05) and b) First Most Important Personal Problem(p<.006). Why did significance occur in the first perceptions of community and personal problems rather than in the second or third problem identification as was the case for other significant differences which occurred in this study? Do the problems of the black Columbus community - particularly racially based issues as reflected in education policies; housing patterns and financial achievement orientations - intensify in both quality and quantity over years of exposure to the city's handling of these three areas? The data lends support to this interpretation, because the second community
and second personal problem perception had very low relationships, .75 and .80 respectively.

Finally, the secondary analyses of Family Life Orientation by Education followed the earlier trend of high school graduates perceiving the problem categories more intensely than the lower or higher educated individuals. Significance was found in the Second Most Important Community Problem (.04). Two of the most interesting observations about this analyses were the row percentage interaction across the educational achievement levels and the fact that no one with post baccalaureate degrees reported personal problems. Education was perceived by the high school graduates as their First Most Important Community Problem, but the ninth through twelfth grade level of education achievers saw education as their Second Most Important Community Problem. However, by the Third Community Problem, individuals with some college reported educational problems most frequently. Comparing the research question and the educational level of the highest row respondents implies a refined variation of perception based on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Model (1954). That is, that if the basic physiological needs are not met then the other needs of safety; love and belonging; esteem needs and self satisfaction will most likely not be realized.
Summary

Chi square computation was employed to determine if any significant difference existed between three modernity groups and their perception of three problem areas, namely community, personal and family life orientation.

The overall computations revealed little significant differences. Areas of significance established were; a) the second most important personal problem by modernity, b) the third most important community problem as a function of family life orientation and c) the second most important personal problem as a function of family life orientation.

Secondary chi square analysis on residency by problems revealed significance in the first important personal problem on both the overall six problem categories and in the family life orientation and also in the first most important community problem by family life orientations.

Secondary chi square analysis on education by problems revealed significant differences in the second most important community problem in both the overall six problem categories and in the family life orientations. In addition, significance was established in the first most important personal problem in family life orientation.

Trends evident from the research include the following, that:

a. The construction of modernity continuums in either direction, i.e., Modern - Mixed - Traditional or Traditional - Mixed - Modern.
b. the high frequency problem areas, namely economic/finances concerns and city/community concerns, remained fairly consistent across the three modernity groups.

c. the number of respondents decreased from the first to second to third community problem.

d. the number of respondents sharply decreased between the first and second personal problem.

e. the concern over housing and finances alternated for highest frequency in the family life orientations among all three modernity groups.

f. the longer one lives in the community the more intense his/her perception of community problems and,

g. the high school graduate reported both community and personal problems more frequently than those with less or more educational achievement.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between modernity and a person's perception of community and personal problems. Modernity was defined as an indicator of social change. The independent variables were educational achievement and length of residence time in the community. The dependent variables were perceived community and personal problems and Family Life Orientations.

Prior research on modernity has assumed that at least three groups of people can be identified based on various independent variables. Although two basic methods of collecting data have been explored, the end results tend to be that the independent variables are relatively good indicators of the persons' attitudes and reactions to social change, regardless of dependent variables. However, much of the modernity research has been completed outside of the United States. Thus the hypotheses of the present study were to examine the relationship between modernity and social change occurring within the Columbus, Ohio black community.
Procedure

Original data were collected by using a questionnaire developed by "Methods for Evaluating Ascertainment in the Black Community for Public Television Stations" (McCain & Hofstetter, 1977) which contained questions concerning perception of community and personal problems was administered. From the population responses 48 problems were identified. These 48 problems were clustered into six categories for use in this study. Then another category, Family Life Orientation, consisting of three items (education, finances and housing) was constructed and analyzed.

Sample

The sample consisted of randomly selected black residents of Columbus, Ohio. The respondents were identified by the area of their residence - either 50% or more black residents or 12.5-50% black residents within the community. The sample was 449.

The sample was then broken down into three groups according to educational achievement and residency time within the neighborhood.

Group 1, Traditionals, were persons who had lived in their community for more than ten years and had less than a high school diploma. Mixed, Group 2, were those persons having either a high school diploma and more than 10 years residency or less than a high school diploma and less than ten years residency. Group 3, Moderns, were persons having a high
school diploma or more education and have lived less than 10 years in the community.

Findings

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences in blacks perception of their first most important community problem and their modernity level of either Moderns, Mixed or Traditional. Hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected; no significant difference was found. A modernity continuum was established in Category V - Housing; however the Traditional Group perceived that problem more than the Mixed Group which in turn perceived it more than the Modern Group. Category IV - Economic/Financial Problems was identified as the most important community problem by each of the three groups.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences in blacks perception of their second most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional. Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected; no significant difference was found. Three modernity continuums were established in the expected order, i.e., Moderns perceived the problem more than Mixed, who perceived it more than the Traditionals. These problems were Category I - City/Community Services Problems; Category III - Educational Concerns and Category VI - Other Orientations. Category - City/Community Services Problems was identified as the second most important community problem.
Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences in blacks perception of their third most important community problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional. Hypothesis 3 failed to be rejected; no significant difference was found. Four modernity continuum were established - two categories (education and other) in the expected order (i.e., Modern - Mixed - Traditional) and two categories, city/community and political/racial in the reverse order (i.e., Traditional - Mixed - Modern). The Mixed Group was out of place in the two remaining categories economic/financial concerns and housing problems by just about .5%. Such a small percentage difference indicated that a modernity continuum was operating in the perception of the third most important community problem although the direction, as determined by which group perceived the problem more frequently, was not consistently Modern - Mixed - Traditional.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant differences in blacks perceptions of their first most important personal problems and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional. Hypothesis 4 failed to be rejected; no significant difference was found. No modernity continuum was established, however close inspection of the percentage differences revealed that the Mixed Group was out of place by less than 2 percentage points in five of the six categories. Category IV - Economic/Financial Problems was identified as the overall most important personal problem.
Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant differences in blacks perceptions of their second most important personal problem and their modernity level of either Modern, Mixed or Traditional. Hypothesis 5 was rejected, significant differences were established at p<.02. Three empty cells occurred in this analysis and Category II - Political/Racial concerns received no responses from any of the three groups. The expected modernity continuum was found only in Category V - Housing Problems. Category I - City/Community Services Problems was identified as the overall second most important personal problem.

Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant differences in blacks perceptions of Family Life Orientation Problems (Education, Finances and Housing) and their modernity level (i.e., Modern, Mixed or Traditional) when observed across the three most important community problems and the two most important personal problems. Hypothesis 6 failed to be rejected. Although overall significance was not found, two significant differences were found in the third most important community problem (p<.03) and the second most important personal problem (p<.02). Quite a bit of variance was noted in the three groups' perceptions of the education, finances and housing over the five research questions. Of the possible fifteen modernity continuums, seven were identified; however, the seven were about evenly divided in regards to the direction of the continuum (i.e., where Modern - Mixed - Traditional or Traditional - Mixed - Modern).
Conclusions

It was found that relationships among people's perceptions of community, personal and family life orientation by modernity did not differ significantly. This lack of variance suggested questions about the methodological procedures as well as whether the characteristics of being a Black American supersedes any differences based upon educational achievements and residency time. In terms of social service delivery agencies, two distinctive trends were identified: high school graduates and persons living in the neighborhood longer than ten years perceived community and personal problems more frequently than persons with more or less education and those living in the neighborhood a shorter period.

Implications

One of the foremost findings of this study was that the Columbus black community did not perceive political and racial orientations (Category II) as a primary community problem. The three consistent problem areas, i.e., city/community services, economics/finances, and housing, ranked high with each of the three modernity groups over the six hypotheses. Educational problems tended to appear and disappear across the three modernity groups' perceptions of the top three community problems and top two personal problems, but it never was pinpointed as one of
the main problem areas. Likewise, other problems were never identified as one of the primary problem perception areas. This overall rank ordering (i.e., city/community services; economic/finances; housing; education; other and political/racial problems) of the six problem categories implied that the Columbus black community did not tend to view political and educational achievement as a means to reduce the chronic problems of basic survival; herein identified as, money, housing, and city services. The black community seemed to be perpetuating the cycle of lack of community progress due to a lack of community emphasis on the accepted methods of change in the American system, e.g., educational and political means.

The data also seemed to indicate that no one modernity group really controlled the direction of activities in the Columbus black community. The modernity continuum was often split in terms of whether or not the Moderns perceived the problem more frequently than the Mixed Group which in turn saw the problem more than the Traditional Group. The lack of consistency in the direction of the modernity continuum constructions reflected acknowledge sociological problems of lack of unity and relevancy of the problem to any particular person here identified by modernity factors. Of particular note was the fact that those blacks who had achieved sufficient educational attainment so as to afford a comfortable existence were not as concerned with problems of educational orientations. Nor, according to these data, did this group
unite with the less educated in perceiving education as a major community problem area. Likewise, what the Traditional Groups referred to as housing may have meant absentee landlords and poorly maintained property, whereas the Modern Groups' references to housing centered around the need for more street lighting in their subdivision or completion of the neighborhood pool. Another important finding was that high school graduates consistently ranked highest in their perceptions of the problem when compared to the less or more educated. This finding implies that educational achievement level was a valid empirical component for operationalizing modernity; therefore, regardless of whether or not one approached this study from Stephenson's (1968) vantage point, i.e., selected criteria gathered from the sample or from Inkeles' (1966) views of measuring changes on dimensions sociological theory has identified, evaluation of individuals' modernity does have a relationship to their educational background.

This study did not address itself to uncovering reasons why the high school graduates felt so strongly about the six problem categories. However, one may conjecture that the act of obtaining higher education, (i.e., some training beyond the high school level) involves a sacrifice which many persons are unwilling to make. Also, a high school diploma may be the actual and perceived as sufficient training from which to approach the job market. Probably underlying the high school graduates' attitude are the
undertones of peer and family rejection and/or misunderstanding of why the student would wish to move beyond the neighborhood educational norms. The status quo offers support in that all the high school graduates face the same problems and are united in their approach to every day existence. The act of attaining an education high enough to break away from the lower economic lifestyle requires one to break away from family and friendship roots, which are often more highly valued than the benefits higher education offers. Besides, many blacks do not have a history of education paying off and the student, by continuing his/her education, is implicitly stating that what was good enough for my parents and/or for my siblings is not good enough for me.

The secondary analyses of problem perceptions by residency time did not yield clear support for utilizing residency time as a data point for operationalizing modernity. In other studies, particularly Rosen (1972 & 1973) and Portes (1973) the residency variable was related directly to either an urban or rural community environment. Thus, residency time explained how long the subject had been exposed to a more or less industrialized economy. In this study, no attempt was made to divide Columbus into more or less urban type neighborhoods. The residency time variable simply meant how long one had lived in their community. Therefore, residency time probably reflected mobility of the sample. To test this, it was hypothesized
that the shorter time one had spent in a particular neighborhood, the more mobile he/she would be and consequently the more aware they would be of the newer community's deficits. These data did not imply this aspect of mobility (as identified by residency time) to be so. Blacks having lived in their homes for more than ten years fairly consistently perceived the six problem areas higher than blacks who had lived in the community. Thus if residency is to be used as a variable in future studies, it should be defined so as to divide the community by urban type.

The data on residency time seem to allow a strong implication to be drawn in terms of what residential qualifications one should have before they are asked to offer input into community service programs. That is, because a person is mobile, his/her interest and involvement in any community affairs is more likely to be more superficial than long term. These mobile persons may know that they will move within a reasonable period of time, therefore the community's deficits are tolerated and they really do not see any point in major expenditure of energy or effort to change the status quo. Besides, their perception of the problems are oftentimes not shared by those who permanently live in the neighborhood. These blacks who have lived in Columbus for some time are the ones who in fact will implement the changes and therefore do not always appreciate the mobile persons' contribution which are usually quite difficult to carry out once the mobile person is gone. Thus,
program planners seeking to bring about community change should directly involve community persons who have lived in the community for longer than ten years.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings and implications of this study, the following recommendations are offered.

In future examinations of modernity in black segments of an American urban environment, it is recommended that the data collecting method and instrument be more representative of those employed in less developed nations. The sample was observed over a period of time in Rosen's (1973) study. Most of the other researchers, including Portes (1973) and Hill (1959) utilized extensively designed questionnaires to ascertain precise characteristics of modernity. In doing so, more empirically supported conclusions could be made as to whether or not there are relationships between one's views about change and problems and his/her educational achievement level and exposure to an urban society as opposed to a rural environment. This implies that at least two samples need to be studied—simultaneously—those blacks with a predominately rural background and those blacks with an urban background.

It is also recommended that the operationalizing of educational achievement and residency time into low, medium and high categories strictly reflect the indigenous sample's characteristics of educational achievement and residency time.
It could be questioned whether or not a high school diploma in the American black society at large constitutes an average educational achievement level. The educational achievement level might be different for every given community. Likewise, ten years might be too high a determining point for long residency time when one considers the various factors blacks are exposed to when making a decision to settle down.

It is recommended that in future data coding and analyses that multiple responses supplied for the questions be weighted such that the first important problem response is weighted most and the proceeding responses relatively weighted. This handling of the data would provide a clear rank order of the problems by one particular group and facilitate comparisons between and among the three groups.

A questionnaire needs to be designed that addresses itself to subtle and often ignored influences which affect the black American's decision processes. Among these influences are religious beliefs; traditionally held self concepts (such that blacks still expect to be discriminated against); personal and group values on family, peer and community roots, especially when those values are in opposition to personal achievement (such that if a black obtained job training, but employment was not available in his/her community he/she would not relocate); and the influences which overlap from one decision to another, often appearing to have no relevancy to the onlooker (as in the case of trained
unwed mothers who do not wish to expose themselves to others' value judgments when acknowledging dependents on an application and therefore refuse to job hunt).

Recommendations in terms of social service delivery systems revolve around the need for more specific and controlled studies by modernity indicators and predictors as social service programs are being developed. Modernity needs to be more fully understood by the designers and practitioners if the programs are to meet the needs of the clients and achieve the goals established. The present study was too gross in its approach and findings to make specific recommendations in terms of program construction and implementation; yet it does highlight the real need to refine and utilize the modernity approach when designing and implementing community programs. Modernity studies are helpful in establishing specific concerns of both the community at large and particular community type members. Such studies can also better identify those characteristics which make residents the best sources for indigenous input and program legitimatizers, thereby insuring the success of the program.
APPENDIX A

COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE AND PROBLEM RESPONSES
Hello, I'm calling for the Ohio State University TV project. We are conducting a scientific survey about Black people's views about television. My instructions are to interview Black residents. (Pause) Are you Black?

IF NON-BLACK, "Thank you very much, and terminate."

IF LAST DIGIT ODD: "I'd like to speak to man of the household."
IF LAST DIGIT EVEN: "I'd like to speak to woman of the household."

(REPEAT INTRODUCTION IF NECESSARY. MAKE APPOINTMENT FOR CALL BACK, IF NECESSARY.)

1:10-11 Q.1.a. What would you say is the most important problem facing the Black community in Columbus?

1:12 b. IF ANY, Would you say this is: important, very important, or extremely important?

1. Important
2. Very important
3. Extremely important
8. DK
9. NA

1:13-14 c. IF ANY, Any other problems? (IF NO GO TO QUESTION 2)

1:15 d. IF ANY, How important is that?

1. Important
2. Very important
3. Extremely important
8. DK
9. NA

1:16-17 e. Anything else? (IF NO GO TO QUESTION 2)
f. **IF ANY**, How important is that?
   1. Important
   2. Very important
   3. Extremely important
   4. DK
   5. NA

Q.2.a. What would you say is the most important problem facing you personally?

b. **IF ANY**, Would you say this problem is: important, very important, or extremely important?
   1. Important
   2. Very important
   3. Extremely important
   4. DK
   5. NA

c. Any other problems?

d. **IF ANY**, How important is that: important, very important, or extremely important?
   1. Important
   2. Very important
   3. Extremely important
   4. DK
   5. NA

Q.3. Different people have mentioned a number of problems in the Black community to us. Please just tell us how important you think each of the following are: extremely important, very important, not very important, not at all important?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important 1</th>
<th>Very Important 2</th>
<th>Not Very Important 3</th>
<th>Not at all Important 4</th>
<th>DK 8</th>
<th>NA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:25 a. Job discrimination:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:26 b. Sex discrimination:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:27 c. School segregation:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:28 d. Police:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29 e. Drugs and Alcohol:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 f. Prostitution:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:31 g. Housing discrimination:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32 h. Health care:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:33 i. Welfare and Poverty:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34 j. Inflation:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35 k. Public transportation:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:36 l. Crime:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:37 m. Getting a job:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:38 n. Getting Black folk organized:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:39 o. Taxes:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 p. Services for elderly:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1:41 Q.4. What would you consider the most important source of information when you are faced with a problem in your community? **DO NOT READ ALTERNATIVES. WRITE RESPONSE:**

1. Black newspaper (Call & Post, Onyx, Choking Times, Bilalial News/Mohammed Speaks)
2. Other Newspapers (C-J/Dispatch)
3. Magazines (Specify: ___________________________)
4. Other People
5. Other (Specify: ___________________________)
8. DK
9. NA

1:42 Q.5. In your opinion, who would you say are the most important leaders in the Black community? (PROBE FOR COMPLETE NAMES, TITLES, AND ADDRESSES, IF POSSIBLE)

a. ___________________________________________

b. ___________________________________________

c. ___________________________________________

d. ___________________________________________

e. ___________________________________________
1:43 a. **IF ANY,** About how often do you see these people?

WRITE IN RESPONSE

(ONE MOST FREQUENTLY MET)

1. Weekly
2. Monthly
3. Twice a year or less
8. DK
9. NA

1:44 b. **IF ANY,** Do you ever seek the advice of these leaders about community problems?

1. Yes
2. No
8. DK
9. NA

1:45-46 Q.6. What, specifically, do you feel television can do to help solve problems in the Black community?


1:47 Q.7.a. Have you ever contacted a television station in Columbus about a problem you faced in the community:

1. Yes
2. No (IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 8)
8. DK
9. NA

1:48-49 b. **IF YES,** What was the problem?


1:50 c. How did you contact the station?


1:51 d. Which station was that?


1:52 e. Did your contact get any results?

1. Yes
2. No
8. DK
9. NA

1:53 f. **IF YES,** How satisfied were you with the results:

extremely satisfied, very satisfied, moderately satisfied, or not at all satisfied?
1. Extremely satisfied
2. Very satisfied
3. Moderately satisfied
4. Not at all satisfied
8. DK
9. NA

1:54 Q.8.a. On an average day, about how much time do you spend reading a newspaper?

1. None
2. Less than 10 minutes
3. 11-30 minutes
4. 31-60 minutes
5. 60+
8. DK
9. NA

1:55 b. About how much time you spend with the radio on? (daily)

1. None
2. Less than 1 hour
3. 1-3 hours
4. 4-6 hours
5. 7-10 hours
8. DK
9. NA

1:56 c. About how much time do you spend watching television? (daily)

1. None
2. Less than 1 hour
3. 1-3 hours
4. 4-6 hours
5. 7-10 hours
6. 10+ hours
8. DK
9. NA

1:57 Q.9. Generally speaking, what would you consider the most important source of information when you are faced with a personal problem? DO NOT READ ALTERNATIVES.

WRITE IN RESPONSE

1. Black newspapers (Call & Post, Onyx, Choking Times, Bilal News/Mohammed Speaks)
2. Other newspapers (C-J/Dispatch)
3. Magazines (Specify):
4. Other people
5. Other (Specify):
8. DK
9. NA
Now, a few questions about discussions concerning neighborhood problems.

1:58 Q.10.a. About how often would you say that people ask you for your opinion about problems in your community? several times a week, once a week, once or twice a week, or less often?

1. Several times a week or more
2. About once a week
3. Once or twice a month
4. Less than once a month
8. DK
9. NA

1:59 b. About how many people that you know personally look to you for your opinions about community problems?

1. None
2. 1-3
3. 4 or more
8. DK
9. NA

1:60 Q.11. If someone you know said that they depended on your judgement a great deal about problems in the community that appeared in the news, would you believe them?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DK
4. NA

1:61 Q.12. Would you like to be thought of as a person who others depend on in making up their minds about community problems that appear in the news?

1. Yes
2. No
8. DK
9. NA

1:62 Q.13. Compared to friends, would you say that you are more likely, less likely, or about the same to be asked for your opinions on community problems that appear in the news?

1. More likely
2. Less likely
3. About the same
8. DK
9. NA
Now I need to ask a last few questions for statistical purposes.

1:63 Q.14. About how many years have you lived in this neighborhood?

YEARS

0. Less than 1 year
1. 1-3
2. 4-9
3. 10 or more
8. DK
9. NA

1:64 Q.15. How old are you?

YEARS

1. 18-34
2. 35-44
3. 45-54
4. 55-64
5. 65 or over
8. DK
9. NA

1:65 Q.16. What is the highest year of school you completed?

1. 8 or less
2. 9-11 (some high school)
3. 12 (high school)
4. 13-16 (some college)
5. 17 or more (post-graduate)
8. DK
9. NA

One final question, just to make sure that we get everyone's views.

Q.17.a. Who are the people you usually go to when you need advice on a community problem? PROBE FOR NAMES, TELEPHONE NUMBERS, AND ADDRESSES. BE SURE NAMING COMPLETE.

PROBES: Any others? Anyone else?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>ADDRESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your help. TERMINATE INTERVIEW HERE.

1:66 Q.18. DO NOT ASK IS RESPONDENT?

1. Male
2. Female
Forty-Eight Categories as Identified by
McCain and Hofstetter Study (1976)

99 None, Missing Data
01 Political support (entire system) Political power, leaders elsewhere
02 Employment/unemployment
03 Education, schools personal training, skills
04 Finances, poverty, poor, economics, prices, inflation, money, money for agency
05 Arts, cultural awareness
06 Political representation, own representatives, leadership
07 Women
08 Housing
09 Crime
10 Recreation facilities
11 High utilities
12 Unity, lack of organization
13 Apathy
14 Prejudice, racism, discrimination, equal rights
15 Advancement, bet-er jobs
16 Police - brutality, relations, review board, disrespect for
17 Health, medical attention, health care
18 Communications, information, be better informed
19 General atmosphere - lack of pride, "Black people them-
selves"
20 Transportation
21 Drugs
22 Political awareness (of the people themselves)
23 Court system
24 Desegregation/Segregation, schools, busing, etc.
25 Garbage collection
26 Religion, sin
27 Black-White relations
28 Age, old age
29 Taxes
30 Neighborhood (in general), upkeep, neighbors, pets, planned development of
31 Child neglect/abuse
32 Lack of business opportunities/money for minorities
33 Problems that are strictly personal (examples on attached list)
34 Family solidarity, demise of family, etc.
35 Social services (in general)
36 Welfare, welfare system
37 Problems have to do with children/juveniles, delinquency
38 Child rearing practices
39 Labor concerns - working conditions, lack of trained man-
power, management conflicts
40 Community involvement
41 Hunger, Food
42 City services - sewage, street lighting, day care centers
Responses put in the "Other" category

Blacks are missing opportunities in the Army - no discrimination
Black women as heads of households
Problems in having stated goals achieved and follow through
Carrying on the family business
Being thought as Black first and as a qualified person second
Dealing with economically limited people
White folks' perceptions of Black problems and its usage by
government
Breakdown of discipline - buying services from one another
Bars open on Sundays
Noise
Blacks have been shortchanged in Bicentennial celebration
Are not exposed to enough things
Time spent at home
Letting destructive people move in neighborhood
Respect for authority
Too many problems to single out most important
Lack of utilization of skills
Blacks should be exactly like whites
Opening of bars
Misappropriation of funds
Everything
Opportunities to live
Businesses in community that still cheat people
Conflict in values
Stereotyping
Slowness to make progress
American intransigence attitudes toward
Achieving meaningful community role as Black
Anybody's problem is my problem
Too much noise
Fear
Blacks love to celebrate - fabricate reasons to celebrate
Men
Imposed class status
Inability to solve problems
Air pollution
Study the past and present before taking action of any kind
Slang
Overappeasement - No middle grounds in federal programs
Establishment of Priorities
43 TV, radio, electronic media
44 I670 Project, freeway
45 Services for senior citizens
46 Other discrimination - sex, marital status, Blacks against
   Blacks by skin color
47 Shopping facilities
48 Drinking

00 Other - see examples on attached list
Example of Responses Put in "Personal" Category
(Not Inclusive)

Temper
Procrastination
Too busy
Divorce
Marital problems
Growing up gracefully
Overweight
Wife in hospital
My feelings toward people
Inability to move
Harassment
On probation
Music
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