This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 68-12,834

EKSTROM, Charles Arthur, 1940-
COMMUNITY SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND ISSUE
DIFFERENTIATION: A STUDY IN THE POLITICAL
SOCIOLOGY OF WELFARE.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1968
Sociology, public welfare

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

COMMUNITY SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND ISSUE DIFFERENTIATION:

A STUDY IN THE POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY OF WELFARE

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

Charles Arthur Ekstrom, B.A., M.A.

* * *, * * *

The Ohio State University
1968

Approved by

Kent P. Schwirian
Adviser
Department of Sociology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express very great appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee: Professors C. Richard Fletcher, Nason E. Hall, and Saad Z. Nagi. Particular thanks are due my adviser, Professor Kent P. Schwirian. Both he and Professor Hall contributed to whatever focus, brevity, and rigor the finished product may possess.

I would also like to thank David B. Patton, a graduate student of the Department of Political Science, The Ohio State University. Mr. Patton collected part of the data on which the dissertation is based.

Finally, the greatest possible appreciation and affection must go to two members of my family: my mother, Faith Fravel Ekstrom, and my wife, Anna Griebeling Ekstrom. From both I have received understanding, encouragement, and prodding at the proper times.

VITA

November 24, 1940	Born - Champaign, Illinois
1962	B.A., Denison University, Granville, Ohio
1962-65	Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1965	M.A., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1965-67	Fellow, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1967-68	Instructor, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PUBLICATIONS

"Social Areas and Welfare Voting," Ohio Valley Sociological Society,
April, 1967.

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Sociology

Studies in Urban Sociology: Professors Christen T. Jonassen and
Kent P. Schwirian

Studies in Research Methods and Statistics: Professors Saad Z.
Nagi, Kent P. Schwirian, and Raymond F. Sletto.

Studies in Medical Sociology: Professors C. Richard Fletcher and
Saad Z. Nagi

Studies in Political Sociology: Professor Nason E. Hall

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
II. THE SYSTEMIC MODEL	8
III. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	34
IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	53
V. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	60
VI. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUMMARY	71
APPENDIX	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Zero-order Correlations and Beta Weights for the Shevky-Bell Variables and Indexes of Issue Differentiation	61
2. Zero-order Correlations and Beta Weights Describing Relationships among two Shevky-Bell Variables: Social Rank and Segregation, Two Aspects of "Urbanization": Women in the Labor Force and Property Ownership, and two Dependent Variables: Indexes of Issue Differentiation	65
3. Multiple Correlations for the Relationships Between Two Sets of Independent Variables: The Shevky-Bell Framework and An Alternate Framework, and Dependent Variables: The Indexes of Issue Differentiation and Raw Data for These Welfare Levies	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This study is primarily an attempt at prediction of relative response to two pairs of welfare measures: general relief vs. health care for the indigent and general relief vs. child welfare. The three measures involved were each voted on by the public at large in referenda conducted in a single community. General relief constitutes the baseline for comparative study, and, in a sense, "controls" for phenomena such as cost to the voter. The other proposals were selected because they appeared to fit criteria of acceptability associated with traditional conceptions of appropriate social welfare activity.¹

The study is an effort to understand the phenomena involved through the conceptual frameworks developed by Scott Greer and Norton Long.² In particular, the technique of "social area analysis" is employed. This is a demographic framework for the description and analysis of the modern industrial, urban community.³

¹See Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958). These authors have described a persistent tendency among Americans to prefer forms of welfare organization which aid only limited categories of dependents (e.g., children or the aged). Such a tendency is related to a failure to support the institutionalization of a high level of service to all dependents, including those whose dependency is primarily economic.

²Scott Greer, The Emerging City (New York: The Free Press, 1962); Norton E. Long, "The Local Community as an Ecology of Games," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (November, 1958), pp. 251-261.

³Eshref Shovky and Wendell Boll, Social Area Analysis (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1955).

A distinct mode of analysis for the sociology and political science of the urban community is coming into existence through work done by a number of social scientists. This may be called the "systemic model."⁴ Studies of social welfare as a community institution have not been conducted employing this model. Previous studies usually have used ecological and "rational" conceptions of the community.

The latter models differ from the systemic in various ways. For example, the ecological model suggests that in the contemporary community, disorganization predominates over organization. The rational model assumes the manifest nature of community problems and the capacity of community action systems to perceive, evaluate, and act upon them. The systemic model assumes (1) that the community today is an organized role system, adapted to a low degree of centralization of power, resources, and authority, (2) that "problems" are relative to the structured perceptions provided by that role system, and (3) that action systems are limited in their adaptive capacities by these characteristics.

The conceptual grounding of earlier studies was also relatively apolitical. Political scientists have identified an "administrative" bias in American social science in dealing with the local community.⁵ The systemic model focuses on political interaction, and its relation

⁴Greer, "The Rational Model, the Sociological Model, and Metropolitan Reform," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVII (Summer, 1963), pp. 242-249.

⁵Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson, City Politics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Lawrence J. R. Herson, "The Lost World of Municipal Government," American Political Science Review, LI (June, 1957), pp. 330-345.

to the social structure of communities. This dimension must be examined in order to account for both leadership and public reaction to problems and to proposals for their solution.

Perhaps it goes without saying that communities are complex social systems which have changed dramatically in character as a result of social changes such as urbanization and industrialization. However, the systemic model provides a unique sense of how such changes, summed up as the growth of societal "scale," have impacted on the community. Many units of the social structure of the community (e.g., corporations, union organizations) are now linked to extra-community systems by more social effective ties than those which bind them to other units within the community.

In consequence, in both their material and normative aspects, community social systems are not so much organized by internal principles as by a complex play of forces, involving both and extra-community and intra-community links of their units. Earlier models, both ecological and rational, tend to view the community as a system with a relatively high degree of internal coherence.

In contrast, in this study's use of a systemic model, two assertions about the characteristics of communities are emphasized: the activities which take place within them are best understood as consumption activities, and any given community role tends to lack reciprocity with other community roles. In the more proto-typical social system, one finds in its material aspects a balance of rewards associated with regular interaction among the occupants of differentiated roles. For example, the isolated rural community displays a regular cycle of production, distribution, and consumption of resources. Today's

communities differ in that production and distribution tend to be organized by large-scale societal units, and the remaining functions of the community tend to center around consumption.

In addition to these changes in their material aspects, community social systems show evidence of changes in their normative aspects. Perhaps the most fundamental is a weakening of a common set of norms and values, guiding the behavior of the occupants of various differentiated roles. Long speaks of "games" following norms supplied by "partial social structures."⁶ These are clusters of roles distinguished by the strength of their ties to extra-community systems or by their own internal solidarity, but not by relationship to a single, cohesive community normative system.

This study applies the systemic model to the explanation of events in the sphere of public welfare activity in the community. Specifically, tendencies of voters to accept or reject innovative conceptions of appropriate social welfare activity are related to the norms upheld by various partial social structures identified by the model.

The main focus is on roles which grow out of specific life styles, or types of consumption activity. Greer and Morris Janowitz have presented evidence of the existence of partial social structures formed, or at least reinforced, by the interaction of like demographic types living in spatial contiguity.⁷ Janowitz sees normative structures emerging from the interaction of familistic types. Normatively,

⁶Long, loc. cit.

⁷Greer, The Emerging City; Morris Janowitz, The Community Press in an Urban Setting (Glencoe: Free Press, 1952).

these types prefer a "community of limited liability." Greer finds that the interaction of higher status types produces a variant normative pattern, supporting "good government."

However, other social roles result from the performance of specific activities in the community by individuals, such as members of professions, attached to wider networks of social relations. Around these activities other partial social structures develop. Finally, some roles are specific to circles, such as governmental officials and various "elites", which seek to provide leadership in community systems. These too can be described as partial social structures insofar as leadership roles are weakly linked to those of "followers."

As a result of such characteristics of communities as social systems, a power/authority crisis exists.⁸ As new problems arise from the continuing impact of social change, the inability of communities to mobilize resources for their solution becomes increasingly evident. Long, in particular, argues that whatever coordinating and adaptive mechanisms are present among community institutions today exist chiefly because of ecological exigencies.⁹

This study is thus of public response to the groping efforts of some circles to "solve problems" in welfare by building public support and legitimation for various attacks on types of social and economic dependency. It is set in the context of a community generally weakened

⁸See Robert A. Dahl, "The Analysis of Influence in Local Communities," in Social Science and Community Action (Charles R. Adrian, ed. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1960), pp. 25-42.

⁹Long, loc. cit.

by a crisis in power and authority. In today's communities, direct appeals to the public are frequent vehicles for attempts to introduce, strengthen, or legitimate types of community activity.¹⁰ Therefore, use of data from referenda is particularly appropriate.

An heuristic device which is used to give a unifying thread to this study of role structure and political functioning is the notion of a normative complex identifying appropriate community activity. Such a complex specifies legitimate output of the community as a system and proper and purportedly effective means to achieve such output. In so doing, the complex supplies a definition of the rights and responsibilities of the individual as citizen in relation to the community as polity.

The referenda studied are part of a series of events occurring in a community over a ten-year period. Various organizations concerned with social welfare sought to plan for welfare needs, to rationalize and professionalize public programs, and to build demand for them and public confidence in them. However, their efforts were far from successful and an atmosphere of crisis mounted. In the place of rational promotion of all welfare objectives arose a scramble to support programs directed at the needs of particular types of dependents. In the course of these events, such specific proposals were often made directly to the voters. The relative appeal to types of welfare programs can therefore be observed and related to bases in the social roles of an urban electorate.

¹⁰Greer gives extended treatment, in The Emerging City, to the relationship between procedures of direct democracy and the urban crisis.

To achieve this goal, a technique has been developed which we feel measures the differentiation of the response of the electorate to sets of issues. Indexes of issues differentiation are used to operationalize value orientation of specific social types as they pertain to the problems of public welfare. These indexes isolate meaningful variations in such phenomena when the responses of the population types identified by the systemic model are compared. Thus, some inferences about the bases of public response to the issues can be made.

CHAPTER II

THE SYSTEMIC MODEL

This chapter presents the systemic model and its relationship to the phenomena studies. In the preceding chapter, the traditional models employed in the sociological study of welfare as a community activity were noted. These models have received considerable attention in the construction of the theory and method of community organization for social welfare. This body of knowledge is also highly colored by the traditions of municipal and social reform in the United States.¹

The expectations of the field of social work with regard to the likely course of institutionalization processes in the community provide a context for our research problem. It is possible that with wider consideration of the systemic model some changes in the theory and method of this specialty might suggest themselves. However, the main concern of this study is not with this substantive field or with its doctrines. Rather, it is with the uses of the systemic model in predicting response patterns among the public to one area of community controversy.

According to established social work doctrine, efforts to build support for welfare activity in general, as well as for specific types of programs, should be more likely to succeed if democratic methods

¹e.g., Arthur Dunham, Community Welfare Organization (New York: Thomas Y. Corwell, 1958), and Murray G. Ross, Community Organization (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955).

of community organization are applied. These methods place faith in the ability of the public, and particularly its better informed members, to evaluate rationally the needs of the community and the wisdom of welfare measures to meet them. Faith in these methods rests, in turn, upon the assumption that welfare needs are relatively manifest and will be discovered by rational search and evaluation behavior. It also rests upon the assumption that communities, as systems, possess the capacity for such behavior.

Capacities of communities to meet these expectations depend upon the nature of the typical roles played by community members, that is, upon whether the roles permit the required behavior. Earlier models, in assuming that community role systems are primarily disorganized, neglect consideration of this question.

One main objective of this study is to examine the extent to which institutions for the therapeutic treatment of a condition of economic dependency can be promoted in the contemporary community. Do the social roles upon which public response is likely to be based lend themselves to discovery of this emergent "need" and, in turn, to support for greater aid to the economic dependent?

Chapter III discusses the issues involved in the question of economic dependency and the variables examined in this study in more detail. Here, the concern is with the systemic model, which identifies certain critical aspects of current community roles. These may lead many community members away from "rational" evaluation of issues and from support of community efforts in general. They may also be related to a tendency for some to find relief for the economic dependent unacceptable.

Greer says:

The city itself may be conceived of as one macroscopic role system, in which the categories of groups perform the various tasks necessary for the totality to stay alive and healthy in the condition of interdependence.²

But not all urban roles involve clearly defined norms of reciprocity between social types. Many urban situations are "crowd" situations where action is highly impersonal. In many other cases, action is not coordinated through a fabric of mutual understanding so much as through limited structured contact where each actor supplies limited definitions of a given situation, having little understanding of the other's point of view. Many of the important links in an urban role system are symbiotic, rather than consensual, in their fundamental nature.

This leads to a system of coordination which Greer describes in the following way:

The metropolitan community is continuously improvised; its evolution is organic, not rational; change is creative, not revolutionary; problems are solved by trial and error, not by fiat.³

One condition which leads to this situation is that the various social types which constitute the public lack the necessary high level of participation and political sophistication which would permit a democratically based system of rational choice-making. Increasingly, he argues, "resources are divorced from responsibility; rights are separated from duties."⁴

²Greer, The Emerging City, p. 39.

³Ibid., p. 199.

⁴Ibid., p. 175.

The difficulties for rational coordination produced by the nature of the urban community might be lessened if organizations which perform institutional activities could be employed in governing the local area. This does not seem to occur, chiefly because such organizations function in terms of expectations structured by their attachments at the societal level. For example, limitations are placed on a business executive's local participation by his position vis a vis his company. Indeed, he may be positively encouraged to participate in local activity, but only insofar as he does not go against the interests of his company.

This, perhaps, is the essential meaning of Long's phrase, "the ecology of games." "Games" refers to the normative principles underlying the roles of particular actors. In claiming that such games form an ecology it is argued that community interaction is difficult to describe in rational or problem-solving sequences or in terms of any common normative framework.

The public, and social science, do not in general see the community in this way. Much traditional political theory speaks metaphorically in terms of a "sovereign" and "the general will." Recent references to "power structures" and even conventional references to "city fathers" intensify what Long argues is an illusion, the view that a responsible core exists which "runs things."

The systemic model sees the community as a role system, but not one adapted to centralized control. Rather, it may be viewed sociologically as a role system characterized by "undirected cooperation and particular social structures, each seeking particular goals, and, in doing so, meshing with others."⁵

⁵Long, op. cit., p. 258.

Others have approached the community in ways somewhat similar to, but also diverging from, the systemic model. Warren, for example, is a "structural-functionalist."⁶ He does not define the control system of the community as undirected cooperation of partial social structures. He also emphasizes possible viability for a common normative system (to which he refers as a system of horizontal attachments of community roles, in contrast to their vertical attachments to societal-level organizations). Yet he too recognizes essential weaknesses of the community as a social system. In structural-functional terms, it is apparent that the community lacks clear boundaries and that its functioning is frequently disrupted by influences from extra-community systems. The community lacks either the formalism and centralization of power and authority which characterize some types of social systems, such as large-scale bureaucracies, or the spontaneous and direct mechanisms of social control which characterize the other pole of social systemic types, such as the family or the peer group.

A political scientist, Robert Dahl, perceives some of the same characteristics for the community.⁷ He refers to it as a "slack system," one with a wide dispersion of potential resources for influence which are little used, and which tend to be used inefficiently when they are employed. Dahl's general explanation of this situation is that the costs of using influence are low in relation to rewards for successful use. Other systems than the community give the individual his primary

⁶Roland Warren, The Community in America (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

⁷Dahl, loc. cit.

rewards, and seldom reward effort in the locality. Often, to serve the local area, one must give up certain more desirable rewards from other systems. The use of power furthermore brings diminishing returns; maximum mobilization is seldom necessary. When power is used, the rewards from a locality are far less certain than the rewards of other systems.

All of these contributions, though phrased in varying terminology, point to community actors' more effective involvement in extra-community systems. This situation is one of the basic emphases of the systemic model. Roles specific to units within the community today are also specific to wider systems. These systems provide definitions which are carried into the community, and the rewards of such systems are often greater than those of the community itself.

This state of affairs is in large part the result of the removal from the community of productive and distributive functions, leaving only consumption functions. The rewards gained from productive activity are not conditional upon community role behavior, but on roles related to larger scale systems. This relates to another basic point, the lack of reciprocity of community roles toward each other. For example, community "leaders" are individuals who bring into the community generalized high status from productive activities specific to extra-community systems. They do not bring into the community "followers" bound by obligatory ties to their roles. That is, capital and labor enter the community on terms somewhat different from those encountered in productive activity. In general, one of the reasons for the decentralized nature of power and authority in the community is this incompleteness of the material base for the social system.

Consequently, it makes sense to view efforts to solve community problems as a groping, relatively unstructured process, located sociologically some place between the functioning of the more arch-typical social system and collective behavior. It is appropriate in such a situation that communities frequently rely upon mechanisms of direct decision-making, such as referenda and other legacies of past reformers, for action efforts. In many cases (e.g., endemic controversy over fluoridation) it is both safe, and defensible by democratic ideology, to avoid adaptive responses by shifting the burden to the public. Greer concludes:

So constricting has the iron hand of the referendum been on local government structure, that one suspects that none of those great changes which Americans identify with progress would ever have come about if they had been subject to a vote of the citizens.⁸

Action systems within the community tend to be relatively ineffective because of a lack of connection with any long-term source of structural support. Unless such a system has continuing support from a system external to the community, its chances of mobilizing effort for sustained activity are low. Certainly, the "public," as a range of types of consumers, is a force resistant to various efforts.

Warren has criticized traditional conceptions of community decision-making because action systems are conceived of as rational, and even therapeutic.⁹ Such conceptions encompass the basic features of classical problem-solving behavior, the scientific method applied

⁸Greer, The Emerging City, p. 175.

⁹Warren, op. cit., pp. 303-339.

to a non-laboratory situation. Warren feels that in the case of the community the "client system" is so amorphous that to speak in concrete terms about its processes of discovery, identification, goal-selection, etc., is a serious distortion. Warren argues that the phases of community decision-making would be better laid out in terms of a social system model, constantly emphasizing the environment of action systems (links to other systems).

Warren's formulation is a useful contribution to the analysis of the integration of action systems with the ongoing pattern of activity in communities. Through study of links between action system roles and roles of environmental systems, it can be discovered that many efforts at community action are likely to be deficient in terms of effective systemic links, and this deficiency is likely to persist through the various phases of the action system.

One way to handle the conceptual problems involved in this weak linkage is through more intensive analysis of the roles played. Warren focuses almost exclusively on roles related to formal units within the community and those of formal and voluntary leaders. Just as important, from the point of view of the systemic model, is a way of conceptualizing the types of roles played by followers. Greer makes an effort to provide this tool. He follows Shevsky and Bell's analysis of changing patterns of social differentiation in urban society and Janowitz's discussion of emerging community normative patterns.

Shevsky and Bell's work is organized around the concept of "scale," a summary variable indicating the cumulative impact of technological and organizational changes on society. Societies grow in scale as

they change from primary to secondary, and then to tertiary, techniques of production. Not only their economies change, but their entire systems of social relationships. Scale is defined as "the scope of social interaction and dependency."¹⁰

While organizations which are societal in their range of action proliferate, they absorb the greatest part of the energies and commitments of the society's population. The forms of earlier communities become less and less relevant to the behavior of individuals, at least in terms of a percentage of their total activities.

At the same time, and as a direct result of the growth of scale, the differentiation of society becomes much more complex. In small-scale societies, one finds a relatively monolithic division of labor, coterminous with other forms of social differentiation, particularly with the family system of the society. Other differentiations, such as age, sex, or ethnicity, are also closely tied to the division of labor. Little specialization exists in social roles.

When societies grow in scale, occupational specialization increases to a very high level. Simple differentiations along age, family, or similar lines provide an inadequate basis for this specialization, and such differentiations are thus freed from their close correspondence with the division of labor.

On the basis of their factor analyses of U.S. Census data, Shevky and Bell claim that two other dimensions, other than the division of labor, significantly differentiate the populations of aggregates found in urban societies. One such aggregate, of course, is the

¹⁰Shevky and Bell, op. cit., p. 7.

population of a given community. The dimensions with which they deal are: social rank, "urbanization" (or familism), and "segregation."

Theoretical and operational definitions follow:

"Social rank" is the "changing distribution of skills in modern society," and is measured by census data on occupation and education, combined in a standardized index. It corresponds to the division of labor.

"Urbanization" is defined as "the changing structure of productive activity," and is indicated by measures of fertility, women in the labor force, and type of dwelling unit. It is not to be confused with "urbanization" in the sense with which that term is used by students of the demography of the urban area. Bell feels the term "family status" more aptly describes this dimension:

"Segregation" is defined as "changes in the composition of the population which are manifested by the redistribution of the population in space, alteration in the age and sex composition, and the isolation of groups," but is measured simply by the proportion of Negroes and representatives of "new" migrations present in a population.

Each of these dimensions represents an array of social types differentiated by their relationship to the carrying society's market system, and to its polity. A range of both productive and consumption behaviors is associated with these types. "Life styles" vary along these three dimensions, and with them sentiments, values, "interests," and other phenomena susceptible to stabilization through interaction into social roles.

The social rank dimension is obviously similar to many indexes of social class employed by sociologists. Segregation has a unique conceptualization, tied to long-term societal trends, but operationally is similar to other indexes of racial and ethnic status. In a society

such as the contemporary United States, where ethnic differentiation is strong, this dimension may be especially significant in producing variant life styles.

The unique dimension of social area analysis is "urbanization." In Greer's work, and in Janowitz's, the effects of this dimension upon patterns of social organization are traced out. Bell, too, has elaborated on this dimension's significance.¹¹ For him, it represents a "social choice" available to individuals in modern society. They may choose a familistic way of life, or they may prefer life styles conducive to mobility, or sheer consumption.

Greer, in his contributions to the systemic model, has also employed the work of Janowitz, which focuses on a dimension very much like "family status." Janowitz's analysis of less formal groupings of the urban public was formulated in the course of his study of the community press in an urban setting.¹² His discussion of patterns of local life leading to the normative configuration of the "community of limited liability" has, however, proved to have explanatory utility for a wide range of events in the urban world.

In common with a basic assertion of the systemic model, Janowitz emphasizes that the vast bulk of urban dwellers do not live in a state of social disorganization. Although the patterns which predominate in the contemporary community little approximate an ideal-type primary community, meaningful channels of social participation do exist.

¹¹Bell, "Familism and Suburbanization: One Test of the Social Choice Hypothesis," Rural Sociology, XXI (October, 1956), pp. 276-283.

¹²loc. cit.

Paradoxically, there is a limitation on the involvement in communal bonds, yet a cushion is provided against individuation feared by theorists of the "mass society."

Community roles provide for most of the minimal satisfactions of the traditional locality, a sense of involvement and some amenities essential for individuals' private lives. Yet these individuals can be mobile at their pleasure, and can readily withdraw from a particular local area.

Janowitz was primarily interested in the communication system created in the local areas of a metropolitan center, and in the social role of the publisher. However, it was necessary for him to have a systematic scheme for examining the audience of the community press. He therefore developed the notion that certain life styles, created or reinforced by particular characteristics of the population of a given area, were variables differentiating the audience. Familism was one such characteristic. It was argued that familism leads individuals into a matrix of social relationships which provide some degree of primary interaction and a stable flow of communication, with resulting norms and means for their enforcement.

These norms, found in areas high in the characteristics of familism, devalue large-scale efforts at coordination and effort. The local press, for example, stresses the friendliness, neighborliness, and small scale of the local area. Controls from centralized authority or big enterprise are rejected when they seem to threaten to interfere with this image of the local area.

Participation in the affairs of the locality is certainly encouraged, but the content of the participation and its organization into concentrated projects is overwhelmingly to protect the status quo of the neighborhood in its relationship to the larger community.

Janowitz's treatment in no way identifies manipulative behavior by the publisher. Quite the contrary, the convergence upon norms of the "community of limited liability" seems to arise from the publisher's perception of the norms of the existing social organization of the areas. The same configurations would be found in any sample of sentiments observed.

Janowitz's conceptualization fills a critical gap in the systemic model. While the public in which he was interested were readers of the community press, it can be readily seen that the same public constitutes the consumers of the output of all community institutions. When individuals do not act as members of a specific interest group, their only relation to the large-scale community and its governing and private coordinating mechanisms is through their roles as types of consumers.

Differentiation along lines of familism and other parallel types of community integration (neighboring, local voluntary activities, churches, etc.) provides an axis which must be considered in explaining differential attachment to communities and all events conditioned by such a social fact. The content of the social norms developed by matrixes of interaction located along this supplies an interpretive link in explanation.

Greer studies behavior of individuals toward the community, in part as it was determined by characteristics of familism, and in part by other characteristics.¹³ He found that reaction to public proposals, such as for metropolitan reorganization, varied significantly when populations differing in familism and social rank were compared. By and large, however, he argued that patterns of participation upon which such reactions were founded were an "embarrassment for democracy."¹⁴

Populations high in familism tend, according to his findings, to be parochial, satisfied with their local area, and not attuned to "needs" for more efficient functioning at the level of the larger community. From these responses could be abstracted a resistance to restraints the larger community might place upon the individual's behavior in the course of efforts to achieve a high level of rationalized, coordinated service for all areas.

Areas high in social rank appeared to possess a variant normative constellation. Their norms might be described by stereotyped "good government" ideology of the middle and upper class reformer. Support for proposals for metropolitan reorganization seemed to be a function of values of efficiency and rationality. These values, in turn, derived not only from political roles generally diffused among individuals at these levels of social rank, but from roles specific to experiences of these types in local areas. The middle and upper class

¹³Greer, "The Social Structure and Political Process of Suburbia," American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), pp. 514-526; Greer and Peter Orleans, "The Mass Society and the Parapolitical Structure," American Sociological Review, XXVII (October, 1962), pp. 634-646; Greer, Metropolitics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963).

¹⁴The Emerging City, p. 102.

consumer develops, in interaction with his fellows, a variant pattern of attachment to the community, associated with norms committing the individual to the activity of the larger unit.

This normative pattern has been identified by others, particularly in political science. Banfield and Wilson have sketched out two syndromes of "public-regardingness" and "private-regardingness." The former is defined as "willingness to regard the welfare of others as an aspect of one's own welfare."¹⁵ "Private-regarding" types hold an opposite conception, particularly appropriate to the era of machine politics in urban areas. "Public-regardingness" is associated with support for reform politics.

"Public-regardingness" is postulated to have a relationship to social status. It bears an obvious relationship to "good government" tendencies found by Greer. Banfield and Wilson also assert that certain ethnic groups are predominantly private-regarding in their political attachment to the community. The traditional political roles of certain groups, e.g., the Irish, fit this definition very well, although the authors argue that the behavior of more recently politicized minorities also shows evidence of the syndrome, particularly that of Negroes.

In other recent political research, Williams and Adrian have identified abstract "roles of government" which also identify cultural configurations relating individuals to their local government.¹⁶

¹⁵Banfield and Wilson, "Public-Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior," American Political Science Review, LVIII (December, 1964), pp. 876-887.

¹⁶Oliver P. Williams and Charles R. Adrian, Four Cities: A Study of Comparative Decision Making (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963).

While they found that such configurations are susceptible to diffusion within a community, they also find that they remain more highly associated with social status.

The normative pattern of higher social rank areas bears some relationship to the perspectives and behavior of community leadership. Greer has described leadership activities as one type of partial social structure, and has characterized its culture as a "morality play."¹⁷ Leadership concern with efficiency and rationality of community institutions, and commitment to community control, is a specialized preoccupation. It is not shared by the public at large, where one finds a predominance of limited concern with community needs. A serious gap exists between demand for effective community action perceived by leadership circles and that actually manifested by the public.

Greer's research carefully traces out the influence of the life styles of the social areas on patterned behavior, such as local political roles. He finds that the neighborhood, the local area, and the wider community may each serve as a significant arena for interaction and identification.¹⁸ Likely patterns of participation on each level result from experiences in specific social structures. Through proximity to individuals similar to oneself and the necessity of using facilities and services in common with them, an actor becomes part of such structures. The urban aggregate is thus constantly producing roles for community participation; these may be identified by the variables of social area analysis.

¹⁷Greer, Metropolitica.

¹⁸Greer and Orleans, loc. cit.

A series of evidence is especially supportive of the asserted importance of these aggregate characteristics in producing patterns of community attachment. It shows how aggregate characteristics can be used to predict behavioral variations above and beyond those which would be predicted by individual characteristics.¹⁹ For example, workers of lower social rank living in middle social rank areas appear to be influenced by the characteristics of their area of residence. Their behavior is more like that of middle rank individuals than is the behavior of lower rank individuals not living in heterogeneous areas.

Patterns of interaction and of emergent norms found in areas high in familism and high in social rank have been described. What of patterns for areas low on these dimensions?

Areas low in familism, while they may be more likely to favor increases in the scale of general authority, are relatively ineffective in providing structured roles which lead individuals to express such patterns of preference. Individuals living in such areas are exposed to experiences likely to lead to apathy and non-participation. When participation is forthcoming, it is less likely to be structured by an identifiable community role, and more likely to result from idiosyncratic personal characteristics.

Areas of lower social rank share some of these characteristics. Patterns of social organization existing there are associated with apathy, and political behavior, when it occurs, is not structured by the clear conception of the appropriate community found in higher

¹⁹e.g., Bell and Maryanne T. Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Different Types of Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, XXI (February, 1956), pp. 25-34.

rank areas. The causation of these patterns varies, however, from that for areas low in familism. In low rank areas, political life is more likely to be instrumental, and subject to "machine" organization. One might say that "urbanized," or non-familistic, areas lack structured political roles and a supporting organizational matrix. Low rank areas, in contrast, possess forms of social organization which devalue political activity or treat it as a commodity for barter.

The roles of residents of areas differing on the axis of "segregation" are also held to be unique by the systemic model. Yet little research has been conducted into them. Wilson and Banfield suggest that some forms of ethnicity are indeed connected with distinctive normative patterns of attachment to the community. In their research, they concluded that, upon closer investigation, disadvantaged ethnic groups would prove to be essentially "private-regarding" in their political behavior. They assert this despite some evidence in their data of convergence in such groups' positions on public proposals and the positions taken by the most highly "public-regarding" types. The major difference is that most of these proposals give their benefits disproportionately to low status groups, and to disadvantaged ethnic groups in particular. For high status groups and old line ethnic groups, in contrast, personal benefits from the measures studied would be slight.

The studies thus far discussed do not exhaust contributions to the development of the systemic model. One interesting study of the differentiation of the suburbs of a large metropolitan areas was

conducted by Williams et al.²⁰ Their interest was in pressures against increasing integration of this highly decentralized system. They argued that small-scale units, frequently thought of as anachronisms, can be usefully conceptualized as specialized responses to the population differentiation of the larger area. As the population of the area studied grew, so did the specialization of subareas, along several dimensions. Specialization in public policy paralleled demographic specialization. For example, increasing variations were found in governmental allocations to specific functions. These adaptations represent, in their view, "an intuitive grasp of the realities of urbanization as they effect particular localities and are adjusted to by their residents."²¹

These authors also question "rational" conceptions of community action systems. Variations in policy were determined by characteristics of "need" -- population density, industrial demands, etc., and by "life style" variations. They were little determined by availability of resources. Little evidence was found for the proposition that those who have spend, nor for any process of matching "needs" with resources. Rather, governmental units' efforts appeared to respond to specialized conceptions of appropriate local activity associated with their residential population mix.

Using the frameworks of systems theory and cybernetics, Deutsch et al. have also focused on pressures retarding the development of

²⁰Oliver P. Williams et al., Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965).

²¹Ibid., p. 29.

community action systems.²² The function of coordination in urban communities remain decentralized, rather than being given over to an identifiable common core.

Furthermore, it appears that some social types "seek a discriminating monopoly on transactions with other social types."²³ To some extent, it is argued, "metropolitan disintegration is an adaptive mechanism to the welfare state."²⁴ The perpetuation of this situation rests upon "cultural prejudice steadily reinforced by economic rewards -- genuine prejudices which are used to defend the institutionalized setup which will perpetuate the rewards."²⁵

Relating these statements to the non-reciprocity of community roles postulated by the systemic model, it would seem that various actors, in their community roles, lack social contact with, and realistic knowledge of, other types in their community roles. This role segregation is functionally related to the economic and demographic specialization of consumption types in urban society. It is dysfunctional to various attempts to mount community action. When proposals for community action affect various social types differentially, it is reasonable to expect differential response patterns. The systemic model explicitly suggests that such patterns will be based on particularized perceptions of community needs, not taking into account the perceptions of other types. Responses to the needs of other social

²²See Philip E. Jacob and James V. Toscano (eds.) The Integration of Political Communities (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1964).

²³Ibid., p. 23.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 173.

types are likely to come on the basis of stereotyped, and possible inaccurate conceptions. Finally, the model argues, response patterns are likely to reflect varying normative frameworks. Therefore, consensus supporting community action is likely to be difficult to obtain.

At this point, the essential features of the systemic model may be summarized. First, the community is seen as a systemic entity, in contrast to earlier perspectives which emphasize disorganization. However, the nature of the system's properties is heavily conditioned by the surrounding societal system. As a result of social change, the community today is a system with weakly defined boundaries and the behavior of its members is often more intimately bound up with parts of the larger system. "Partial social structures" with specific normative orientations to the community are a predominant form. The community lacks an embracing normative system of its own.

Accompanying the fragmentation of the normative system of communities is a diffusion of the material aspects of the system: resources and power. This condition exists in large part because the community is a system without a full economic cycle. The means of production are organized societally, leaving the community as an organization for the consumption of rewards garnered in other systems.

Community effort to perform any activity is to some extent a redistribution of consumption activity. In the typical case, property, a part of the average citizen's consumption activity, will be taxed. Resources so garnered will be diverted to other forms of consumption activity, channeled through public institutions.

Allocation of these resources among functions such as safety, education, health, and welfare activity is a decision-making process. The systemic model views this less as a "rational" process and more as a groping effort at social politics, trying to find bases in social roles to support various redistributive activity. Often, it must involve appeals to the citizenry through mechanisms of direct decision-making. Other decisions also take place in the context of a high degree of "democratic" citizen control. The process is thus specific to the role system of the community and must be understood in relation to the form and content of typical roles. That is, around what activities are the roles organized and what is their normative content?

The systemic model makes a prominent place for roles organized around types of consumption activity. Research has shown some evidence of unique community roles which can be identified through study of "social areas." The public is differentiated, as a typical aggregate in urban society, along the dimensions of social rank, urbanization, and segregation. Partial social structures grow out of the activities of populations with varying mixes of these characteristics. Proposals for types of public activity must contend with definitions of appropriate activity supplied by such structures.

Two variant normative configurations have been identified: the "community of limited liability," related to emerging patterns of familistic populations, and "public-regardingness" related to higher social rank and established ethnic status. In their view of the appropriate level of activity for the larger community and in their specification of the individual's responsibilities to the community,

these two are polar opposites. These configurations provide an interpretive link for the model, and provide a basis for predicting variations in response to types of community activity.

The study reported here involves an attempt to apply and refine (1) the social area framework, as a means for identifying the bases for differentiated community roles, and (2) the link provided by the normative configurations previously identified. Conceptual and methodological problems exist in the use of both. Hopefully, this study will help to clarify them.

The systemic model, if it is further developed, promises to be a particularly useful approach to contemporary community dynamics. Alford has identified three basic approaches found in studies of the community and its decision-making processes.²⁶ These are the situational, the structural, and the cultural. Classes of variables have developed in the study of the community which can be identified as belonging to one of these three levels.

The situational level generally begins explanation with events or a series of events. The structural starts with long-term situations and other stable variables, such as population distributions. The cultural, which is the most abstract, deals with inferred value-commitments and preferred states of affairs.

Each level of explanation also has a preferred set of dependent variables. The situational is used, in most cases, to account for

²⁶Robert R. Alford, "The Comparative Study of Urban Politics," in Urban Research and Policy Planning (Leo F. Schnore and Henry Fagin, eds. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1967), pp. 263-304.

particular outcomes, for example, why a given project is adopted or rejected. The structural tends to be employed to deal with policy, or the long-term drift of particular decisions. The cultural has usually been related to an abstract variable of the "role of government."

These three levels parallel basic approaches used by sociologists in the study of social organization. Duncan and Schnore have identified the behavioral, ecological, and cultural approaches.²⁷ Future investigators of community life face the task of integrating concepts and findings from these levels. The systemic model presents certain advantages for this task.

While the systemic model most closely corresponds with the structural, or ecological, level, it is not inherently incompatible with the others. It has some advantages over traditional ecological models in this respect.

Based upon a postulated dissolution of "moral order" as society urbanizes, ecologists argued that principles of plant and animal orders could provide a framework for analyzing community structure. Organizing concepts such as competition and symbiosis were used, without reference to moral phenomena such as individual sentiments or cultural values. Yet the moral order was not held to have faded entirely away. It was simply argued that it was sufficiently divorced from the conditions of urban life to be excluded on practical grounds from ecological investigations.

²⁷Otis Dudley Duncan and Leo F. Schnore, "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (September, 1969), pp. 132-146.

Riessman has argued that for such exclusion to be valid, two conditions must be met.²⁸ It must be possible to achieve a clean separation of empirical indicators of ecological and moral orders. It must also be possible to assume that the organization studied, such as a municipal area, has clearly demarcated boundaries setting it off from its environment.

Neither condition is met by the nature of the contemporary community. A number of studies have shown the first to be methodologically impractical.²⁹ Today, while it is recognized that cities do serve as regional nuclei, it is more frequently stressed that they are related to one another in national, and even global, systems of interaction.³⁰

The systemic model accepts the latter proposition fully, as indicated by its stress on the results of growing scale. The relationship of values and sentiments to patterns of social organization is also clearly traced out through the propositions related to partial social structures.

In the long run, then, it would appear that the systemic model promises not only to provide its own new insights for the sociology of urban communities, but to provide means for greater conceptual integration of the levels at which community study has been conducted.

In the short run, however, there are many specific problems of the model itself which need more intensive work. The present study

²⁸Leonard Riessman, The Urban Process: Cities in Industrial Society (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 102.

²⁹See the contributions collected in George A. Theodorson (ed.) Studies in Human Ecology (Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1961), pp. 77-122.

³⁰Brian J. L. Berry, "Cities as Systems Within Systems of Cities," in Regional Development and Planning (John Friedman and William Alonso, eds. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1964), pp. 116-137.

is directed toward some of these, which center on issues of the form and normative content of types of urban roles. One major objective is the development and illustration of a technique for measuring preference patterns among referendum issues. It is contended that this technique operationalizes one aspect of normative configurations associated with community roles which has not yet been studied. A second major objective is a conceptual and methodological evaluation of one of the social area framework's indexes. Chapter III presents a discussion of the study's research variables, and how they were selected to deal with issues in the sociology of welfare and related to the systemic model.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This chapter consists of four sections. First, conceptual issues related to the sociology of community welfare activity are discussed. Second, a review is presented of issues which have arisen over the use of social area analysis. Third, problems related to conceptualization and measurement of values and other normative phenomena are briefly touched on. Finally, the variables used in this study are drawn together, and hypotheses about their relationships are formulated.

In discussing the sociology of welfare, Wilensky and Lebeaux have introduced the terms "residual" and "institutional" to refer to polar types of activity.¹ The terms describe characteristics of particular programs and of constellations of attitudes supporting them.

"Residual" conceptions of welfare activity may be summed up as preference for the following idea: "Social welfare institutions should come into play only when the normal structures of supply, the family and market, break down." In contrast, the "institutional" view sees "welfare services as normal, 'first line' functions of modern industrial society."² These poles in thought can be traced, in turn, to

¹Wilensky and Lebeaux, op. cit., pp. 132-135.

²Ibid.

unresolved value conflicts in American society between economic individualism on the one hand and security, equality, and humanitarianism on the other.

The terminology employed by Wilensky and Lebeaux appears somewhat cumbersome. For example, the "institutional" conception is related to support for programs least institutionalized in that term's general usage, such as comprehensive service for the economic dependent. The "residual" conception is related to support for some of the most highly institutionalized services, such as those with children as clients. Therefore, while following their basic distinction, in this study the terms "traditional" and "innovative" are employed to designate varying conceptions of appropriate social welfare activity.

A theoretical and practical problem for community organization for social welfare has been the persistence of traditional definitions. The normative complex involved in such definitions was, Wilensky and Lebeaux argue, appropriate at a certain stage of industrialization in this country. No longer appropriate, they feel, it will be progressively replaced by a complex supporting innovative programs.

There are several intervening variables not discussed by Wilensky and Lebeaux. Their basic analytical tool -- variations in conceptions and programs on a continuum between traditional and innovative -- is not linked to variations in social structure, but to variations in emphasis on universal values present in the culture. The long-term emergence of any institutionalized program comes, then, as a slow but possibly inevitable response to posited "needs" of portions of the population. The systemic model, on the other hand, forces inquiry

into why some social types, with variant definitions of proper community activity, prefer traditional or innovative programs with greater frequency.

Wilensky and Lebeaux do not treat the secondary impact of industrialization, through urbanization, on community structure. The systemic model suggests that such change undermines the adaptive, or problem-solving abilities of communities even as it creates more people with problems. Nor do these authors treat problems introduced by the political roles which are available for the promotion of any community activity, including new welfare emphases.

The labor force requirements of American society have been rapidly changing. While large numbers of workers have gained a cushion against economic adversity from measures adopted since the New Deal, a large number are so far outside the productive sector of our society that they have no way of gaining the protection of the "welfare state." Elman has suggestively called these people citizens of the "poorhouse state."³

One category totally unaided by federal programs is the childless, non-disabled person whose dependency cannot readily be accounted for, but must be explained by some more subtle condition, such as a "culture of poverty." The welfare profession has made some effort to encourage and advise local leadership in an effort to develop local institutions capable of recognizing economic dependency as a legitimate object of a program of social control. However, especially with a lack of

³Richard M. Elman, The Poorhouse State (New York: Pantheon Books, 1966).

federal incentives, few programs have been successfully promoted. If particular reasons for dependency can be found, for example when aid is justified as for children of the unemployed, the likelihood of gaining public support appears greater.

Although it is probable that no community uses its general relief program to spearhead an attack upon the problems of economic dependency, legally, at least, such funds can be used to aid this type of dependent. This type of program must be presented sheerly as welfare, and cannot be relabelled "child aid" or "benefits for the aged." Such a program is most closely connected with freeloading or chisseling stereotypes of the relief recipient.⁴

The main point is that support for programs for the relief of the individual whose dependency is mainly economic is related to an innovative conception of social welfare activity. Even though general relief is one of the oldest forms of financial assistance, it is least connected to any other image than welfare per se. A tendency to support more strongly the relief of dependents with particularistic explanations for their status is related to the application of the traditional conception.

Given an interest in these conceptions, the variables dealt with in this study are fortunate ones. Support for general relief is contrasted with support for specific forms of dependency: childhood and medical indigence. Thus, it will be possible to assess whether or not local citizens will take on the responsibility for what Myrdal has

⁴Samuel Meuchner, "Newburgh: The Recurrent Crisis of Public Assistance," Social Work, VII (January, 1962), pp. 3-11.

called the "underclass" when its needs are separated out from those of vulnerable groups recognized as deserving by traditional norms.⁵

Economic dependency may be distinguished from traditional poverty. In historical communities, all forms of economic distress were dealt with primarily by the extended family, and in the event of its failure, by the local community of friends and neighbors.⁶ When an entire community was struck by economic adversity, there was little possibility of aiding a special class of dependents.

In the modern urban community, economic dependency appears to be emerging from labor force changes brought about at the societal level. The management of the phenomenon, even more than that of other forms of dependency, has remained a local activity. A complicated situation has developed. The community has within its bounds persons who vary considerably from one another in present and potential dependency. Responsibility for such dependency is less likely to be associated with communal bonds today, and more likely to arise from a generalized duty to be humane with the weak. Specialists in community organization for social welfare today ask questions such as: how can communities be persuaded to take responsibility for this special category? Analytically, the question resolves into one of more direct interest to the urban sociologist: who in the community, on the basis of what role, is especially likely to respond to appeals for this type of dependent?

⁵See the preface by Gunnar Myrdal, Poverty as a Public Issue (Ben B. Seligman, ed. New York: Free Press, 1965), pp. v-ix.

⁶For the historical normative conception, see Russell R. Dynes et al., Social Problems: Dissensus and Deviation in an Industrial Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 52-57.

This is the basic substantive question addressed by this study. Questions of sources of support for the needs of the economic dependent vis a vis those of other dependents will be further discussed in the formulation of the study's specific hypotheses. Following is a discussion of issues related to social area analysis, the framework employed in this study to identify roles relevant to support of types of welfare.

In the preceding chapter, the technique of social area analysis was discussed in some detail. To summarize, Shevky and Bell developed a technique for reducing urban census data to three abstract factors: social rank, urbanization, and segregation. These three factors emerge from a single division of labor as societies grow in scale. Social rank and segregation, while they have unique conceptual justifications, resemble commonplace sociological measures of social class and ethnic segregation. Urbanization is a unique factor, both operationally and conceptually.

Research has shown that some phenomena are independently related to all three variables, and that each adds predictive power in a multivariate framework.⁷ However, other research has uncovered problems in validity and reliability. These problems provide part of the context for the research problem, and the hypotheses tested.

In the sociological literature, there has been frequent criticism of social area analysis, primarily by more traditional ecologists and demographers. In developing the technique, Shevky and Bell hoped

⁷e.g., Walter C. Kaufman and Scott Greer, "Voting in a Metropolitan Community," Social Forces, XXXVIII (March, 1960), pp. 196-204.

to supersede purely ecological approaches.⁸ Following the logic of earlier investigations, it appeared to them that some cities, particularly those of the West Coast, defied description. Meanwhile, their factor analyses of West Coast cities convinced them that the variations in census data could be explained by the three factors discussed. They also believed that these factors could be matched with theoretical constructs developed by Shevky to deal with long-term effects of technological changes on society. This matching process was, of necessity, inductive and post hoc. Duncan described and condemned it as "ratiocination."⁹ Elsewhere, the claim was made that communities' areal structure was inadequately represented by the scheme, which fails to take account of spatial and distributive dynamics of community structure.¹⁰

The problem of "ratiocination," while a serious one, can be laid aside, for this method of procedure is often a necessity, though not a virtue, of social science investigations. The second criticism is much more serious.

Shevky and Bell claimed to be concerned only with patterns of social differentiation of aggregates with no necessary reference to their spatial distribution. Yet their typology was derived from data contained in the U.S. Census. This data is in all cases collected

⁸Shevky and Bell, op. cit., pp. 1-3.

⁹Duncan, review of Social Area Analysis, American Journal of Sociology, LXI, (July, 1956), pp. 84-85.

¹⁰Duncan and Amos Hawley, "Social Area Analysis: A Critical Appraisal," Land Economics, XXXIII (November, 1957), pp. 337-345.

by spatial units. While part of the data deals with sheer population characteristics, another large part has to do with housing. As such, it reflects not only social characteristics but the characteristics of a physical resource, fixed in time and space. The "urbanization" index uses housing data for one of its components. Furthermore, subsequent uses of this index, such as Greer's, imply an areal referent to patterns of social interaction.

If the urbanization index were established as reliable and valid, its reliance on some spatially related data might not be consequential. But this is not the case. Duncan has noted that the index has a "two-way stretch."¹¹ That is, its components, although correlated similarly with each other at multiple points in time, do not vary directly with each other. The index cannot therefore be said to meet the criterion of "unidimensionality."

Several analyses of census tract data in the United States have failed to find a single "urbanization" factor.¹² Two factors have emerged in such analyses, one representing family and fertility characteristics and the other housing and land use characteristics.

Part of such problems in validity and reliability may stem from an original divergence between Shevky and Bell over the proper interpretation of this variable. Their disagreement is indicated by Shevky's designation of "urbanization" and Bell's of "family status." The use

¹¹Duncan, review of Social Area Analysis.

¹²Theodore Anderson and Janice Egeland, "Spatial Aspects of Social Area Analysis," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), pp. 392-393.

of housing data seems especially germane from Shevky's perspective, which stresses the changing productive role of the household. For Bell, familism, as a type of consumption, was conceived of as a pattern which might or might not be valued in a changing society. The type of dwelling occupied is simply one of a range of possible indicators of familistic style of life.

The problems in validity and reliability identified for this index are particularly serious for the future development of the systemic model. It is through this dimension that the phenomenon of the "community of limited liability" is said to emerge. Therefore, in this study, the consequences of this lack of unidimensionality for prediction and explanation are explored. Specifically, the predictive value of the index is compared with that of indexes of housing-type and family-type used separately.

Housing also represents a financial investment. Many studies treat housing data as a control for cost to citizens when responses to public proposals are being studied.¹³ This usage tends to assume the calculation of a cost/benefit ratio. The systemic model questions this assumption. Hence, this study attempts to evaluate whether house-type predicts response to proposals sheerly through the cost involved, or through a social role organized around property.

There are other long-range issues related to social area analysis which should be noted, for they concern this study indirectly. First,

¹³e.g., Wilson and Banfield, "Public-Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior."

some questions have been raised about whether the indexes really represent areas at all, especially the full range of a city's "natural areas."¹⁴ Second, the systemic model focuses on the consumption behavior of the types identified by the model, but it cannot be denied that the empirical types may have other referents. For example, social rank identifies a range of types which are distinct in many ways, including work experience. With regard to both these points, it should be pointed out that much more research remains to be done. It will be necessary to establish more firmly the areal basis of present-day community roles and to sort out the effects of consumption experiences vs. other types. This task will require a larger number of field studies, and more control of contextual variables. These remaining research needs lend a degree of provisionality to the present study.

Turning to issues involved in the measurement of normative phenomena related to the central concerns of the study, several brief points can be made. Two distinctive normative complexes have been identified by the systemic model: "the community of limited liability" and "public-regardingness." These are socially upheld definitions of appropriate community activity and of the proper relationship of the individual to the community.

In a strict sense, these are predispositions toward the community not readily resolvable to categories such as values, cognitions, etc. On the other hand, all of these elements are involved, while perhaps the most distinguishing is the degree of value placed on a

¹⁴Duncan and Hawley, loc. cit.

given state of affairs. Robin Williams has distinguished values and other elements (knowledge, beliefs, technology, and norms) as normative aspects of culture.¹⁵ This study's interest is the structural distribution of such normative aspects, although values may be the primary interest. At any rate, the problems involved in the study of values serve to focus attention on problems in studying the normative aspects of culture in general.

Conceptually, and empirically, the identification of values and their measurement in relation to patterns of social organization present difficult dilemmas. These are common to several of the social sciences, including economics and political science.¹⁶ Conceptualization of values involves the observer in elaborate inferences from behavior. Values are generally defined in such terms that they cannot be observed directly.

The normative complexes which have been identified as relevant to the systemic model share such characteristics. One problem in the future development of the model is to find more complex, yet meaningful, measures to represent these complexes. For example, while conceptualizations such as the "community of limited liability" imply criteria underlying response to community issues, these are difficult to observe directly. They have thus far been inferred only from

¹⁵Robin Williams, Jr., American Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), pp. 22-25.

¹⁶Two dominant uses of the concept of values in political theory of the community (as goals sought in behavior and as moral criteria underlying behavior) cannot be operationalized. For discussion of these uses see Philip E. Jacob, "The Influence of Values in Political Integration," in Jacob and Toscano, op. cit., pp. 209-246.

patterns of convergence among populations in support of or opposition to a series of issues.

Some have argued that in the study of normative phenomena such as values, the development of more precise measures must involve sidestepping some questions of validity. In the study of the relationship among values, it can be assumed, for certain purposes, that it can be represented by the relationship among concrete acts. This position is taken in this study.

A similar position was recently taken by Simmons, McCall, and Glenn in elaborating one set of complex measures of value phenomena.¹⁷ Their interest was in measuring dissensus within a population on a given value. They distinguish between value-conflict (involving the relations between two or more values) and value-dissensus (involving alignment or polarization with respect to a single focal value). While their work dealt with the latter dimension, the logic employed in its justification applies equally well to the former. This study concerns differences in the strength of particular values among populations.

The burden of the authors' discussion is that for a variety of research purposes it may be useful to locate differential acceptance of particular values across positions of a social structure. Following their argument, this study proposes to investigate more intensively the distribution of normative complexes across community structure.

¹⁷J. L. Simmons, George J. McCall, and Norvall Glenn, "The Measurement of Value Dissensus," paper read at the American Sociological Association meetings, Chicago, August, 1965.

It is assumed that concrete acts, such as voting, reflect values and other social norms. Further, it is assumed that voting for one measure with greater strength than for another reflects a normative differential.

Both the syndromes of "public-regardingness" and the "community of limited liability" imply normative criteria underlying responses to public proposals. Wilson and Banfield have specifically argued that not all proposals for public action are regarded as worthy of support by the public-regarding. While general support for the community is characteristic of these types, some issues are less likely to be viewed as in the "public interest." Some proposals may violate their sense of appropriate limits on public activity. Yet, curiously, this dimension of these normative complexes has not yet been studied systematically. More empirical interest has been shown in establishing general differences among groups on a range of issues than in dealing with measurement of criteria underlying choice.

For example, Banfield and Wilson present a series of data showing "public-regarding" support of a series of public efforts. It is shown that higher status areas join with low status areas in generally high support. The present study is more concerned with how such polar groups differ in the relative level of support given particular issues.

To illustrate this point, according to Wilson and Banfield's data, in 1957 64 per cent of the voters in the high income Chicago suburb of Winnetka supported a proposal to build a county hospital. In 1958 76 per cent of the voting electorate of Winnetka supported a proposed new office building for state welfare services in Cook County.

In a very low income district of Chicago in 1957 88 per cent favored the hospital, while in 1958, only 73 per cent favored the new office building.

If interest is in patterns of convergence, both districts converge on a relatively high level of support for both proposals. A middle income district would have given each a much lower percentage of favorable votes. The generalization that there is convergence on support for both issues should be modified, however, to reflect the fact that low income voters were 12 per cent points more in favor of the hospital, and the high income voters 15 per cent points more in favor of the office building.

Wilson and Banfield's major interest is in patterns of convergence. It was necessary to make secondary tabulations to present the data in this form. Yet discrimination among issues is a relevant dimension to the phenomena conceptualized as "public-regardingness" and to other similar normative complexes. A major interest of the present study is in more explicit conceptualization of the gap between support for issues displayed by a population category. This gap may be thought of as a function of the criteria by which issues are evaluated by that category.

The data employed in this study involve relative support for types of welfare issues. Support for general relief programs has been argued to indicate willingness to legitimize efforts to deal with the emerging phenomenon of economic dependency. The level of support of general relief relative to support for other measures constitutes the specific variable studied. Specifically, the inquiry involves whether or not categories which have been identified as "public-

regarding" or believers in the "community of limited liability" incline to relatively high support of general relief or of more traditional measures. These are child welfare and health care for the medically indigent.

The latter set of proposals was selected because they appeared to fit criteria proposed by Wilensky and Lebeaux.¹⁸ The more traditional conception of welfare activity favors aid when specific crises erupt in the lives of individuals -- e.g., illness, the death or incompetence of a parent. A more innovative conception holds that welfare is a more normal function of contemporary society.

Increasingly, the rationale for social work programs is based on therapeutic skills with various social maladjustments. The question, with regard to the economic dependent, is whether institutions for his aid can be established in this mode. Is the public willing to accept the social work rationale that the economic dependent is a maladapted individual deserving of therapeutic intervention in his case?

As noted previously, existing models of community organization for social welfare assume that welfare "needs" are relatively manifest entities. Further, it is assumed that they will be discovered by rational evaluation of the community situation. This is especially likely to occur in certain strata of the community, such as the better educated individuals of higher social rank.

¹⁸Banfield and Wilson, "Public-Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior."

The systemic model also suggests some variations in the roles on which people act in evaluating policy. The tendency of public-regardingness, found in areas of higher social rank, indicates norms most conducive to an abstract, sober evaluation of issues. This study asks the question: do types identified as public-regarding show high support for general relief relative to support for more traditional measures?

Thus, the specific question of whether or not these types will give high relative support to relief for the economic dependent is subsumed under the general question of what activities are deemed appropriate by the norms of their roles. Previous research has established that areas of high social rank give relatively high support to relief measures in general.¹⁹ Low rank areas also give high support. The relationship between rank and support of welfare is curvilinear, with middle rank areas lowest in support. However, it may be asked, are the criteria employed at the various levels of rank in discriminating among issues the same? Does the tendency of high rank areas to support all community measures translate into support for expanded efforts to deal with economic dependency? Finally, what criteria do low and middle rank areas apply?

Turning to the dimension of "urbanization," highly familistic areas are characterized by the norms of the "community of limited liability." How, then, is this dimension related to relative support

¹⁹Charles A. Edstrom, Social Areas and Welfare Voting. Unpublished M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1965.

for general relief? Such types are held to resist efforts to establish a well-organized community capable of redistribution of consumption resources. Therefore, they should be among those opposing welfare services in general. Previous research indicates that they are.²⁰

The grounds for predicting their relative propensity to support general relief vs. more traditionally acceptable varieties are less clear. If, as explanations centered on cost tend to assume, they respond primarily to the burden of such proposals on their resources, they should oppose all equally on the basis of cost. If, on the basis of social norms, they object to the growth of power in the larger community, they should also oppose the proposals in general. However, appeals for aid for particularly abject classes of dependents may provide grounds for "exceptions" to the pattern of opposition. The relative level would then show greater tendency to favor the more traditional measures.

Areas high in "segregation" are asserted by Wilson and Banfield to be "private-regarding." If this is the case, they may diverge from the "public-regarding" in criteria for evaluating issues. Assuming that the latter will tend to relatively high support of general relief, however, it is likely that the two will converge.

This is the case because various factors point to high relative support of general relief by highly segregated populations. First, data show that public welfare programs show an over-representation of Negroes.²¹ This pattern is more pronounced if special programs,

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Eleanor P. Wolf and Charles N. Lebeaux, "Class and Race in the Changing City," in Schmore and Fagin, op. cit., pp. 99-130.

such as aid for the blind or aged, are disregarded. Segregated populations experience a high risk of economic dependency, and have the greatest likelihood of knowing others in similar straits. While segregated populations may show high support for all measures,²² it is likely that they will show highest support for general relief.

On the basis of these considerations, the following relationships are hypothesized between the social area variables and relative support for general relief over more traditional measures:

(H1) The relationship between social rank and relative support for general relief will be curvilinear; areas of high and low rank will show greater relative support for general relief and areas of middle rank, greater relative support for traditional measures.

(H2) The greater the degree of urbanization, the greater the degree of relative support for general relief.²³

(H3) The greater the degree of segregation, the greater the degree of relative support for general relief.

This study is also concerned with evaluating the role of the housing-type components vs. family-type components of "urbanization" in producing response patterns to welfare issues. As explained in the following chapter on methodology, the percentage of women in the labor force is taken as an index of family-type, and percentage of property ownership, as an index of housing-type. The following hypotheses are offered:

(H4) The greater the percentage of women in the labor force, the greater the relative support for general relief.

(H5) There will be no relationship between percentage of property ownership and relative support for general relief.

²²cf. Ekstrom, loc. cit.

²³It will be recalled that highly urbanized populations are low in the characteristics of familism.

The logic of (H4) follows the logic of (H2), involving urbanization and support for general relief. (H5) assumes that property ownership represents a cost factor in determining response patterns to community issues, and is not related to normative criteria for discriminating among them.

Finally, the relative value of the three variable Shevky-Bell framework vs. that of the social rank and segregation indexes plus a house-type index and a family-type index is observed. The welfare measures studied are related to these two sets of variables in alternate multivariate frameworks.

(H6) sets forth the hypothesis for these observations:

(H6) No appreciable gain in ability to predict welfare patterns will result from substitution of indexes of housing-type and family-type for the index of urbanization.

The following chapter explains the methods used in the test of these hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter first discusses the universe involved in the study, and data sources. Then the variables involved are operationally defined in terms of the data. Finally, the design of the study is presented, showing how the data are used to test the study's hypotheses.

The community which provides data for the study is the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Franklin County, Ohio. Columbus is its central city. The units for which data are tabulated and analyzed are the census tracts of this area.¹ Statistics for welfare voting patterns were obtained from official voting statistics of the Franklin County Board of Elections. Social area variables, and other variables, are computed from U.S. Census data.

Two separate elections, six months apart in time, are examined: a general election in the fall of 1963 and a primary election in 1964. The major contest in the fall of 1963 was a mayoralty in Columbus. Similar local contests occurred in other municipalities. In 1964, the election involved the selection of delegates to the parties' nominating conventions and of candidates for a U.S. Senate seat.

To some extent data are drawn from universes of voting behavior which are not strictly comparable. However, turnout for both elections

¹U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts, Columbus, Ohio. Final Report PHC(1)-32, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962.

was light, and while some differences in voters attracted to the two elections occurred, a fairly stable core of high participators may be expected to turn out for such elections.²

Also, it was necessary to compare support for child welfare, as a clear example of a traditionally acceptable program, with support for general relief. The 1964 elections involved only general relief and the measure for health care for the indigent. Therefore, the degree of uncontrolled variation involved in the use of data for the two elections was accepted. Some caution is necessary in interpreting results for this reason. However, it is worth noting that the same underlying political system produced the outcome of both elections, including participation as well as responses to issues.

Election data were obtained by precincts. These were aggregated to approximate census tracts, following a procedure of overlay matching employed in other studies.³ If a majority of a precinct's blocks fell in a tract its data were assigned to that tract; if precinct blocks were evenly divided among tracts, data were assigned, on a random basis, according to the ordinal position of the tract numbers.

Questions may be raised regarding the selection of a county as a "community" to analyze, since its unitary characteristics are problematic. In response, several points should be made. (1) The Shevky-

²Bernard E. Brown and John C. Wahlke, The American Political System (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1967), Ch. 8.

³Kaufman and Greor, loc. cit., Ekstrom, loc. cit.; these studies argue that errors in reassigning data to tracts are minimized by tendencies toward similarity among contiguous tracts and that assignment error should be random, not biasing results in favor of hypotheses.

Bell technique calls for use of the "social areas" of a metropolitan area. (2) The Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, though far from satisfactory in identifying true metropolitan boundaries, is the best available unit of analysis. (3) The county has been found to possess sufficient systemic characteristics to be employed as a unit of analysis.⁴ (4) Welfare policy is a function of the county, which therefore constitutes the unit through which political action must be attempted. (5) Proposals to enhance community functioning on a range of issues typically call for use of a unit of at least the county's scale.⁵

The variables for the study may now be defined operationally. As independent variables, the three social area indexes, the percentage of women in the labor force, and the percentage of property ownership are employed. As dependent variables, this study uses standardized indexes of "issue differentiation" which were constructed from levy data.

The operational definitions for the Shevky-Bell variables were presented in relation to the appropriate theoretical constructs in Chapter II (p. 17). Necessary computational methods are explained in Appendix A.

Social rank is a standardized, weighted index reflecting the percentages of blue collar workers and of individuals with less than

⁴Christen T. Jonassen, "Functional Units in Eighty-Eight Community Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), pp. 399-407.

⁵For documentation and criticism of this tendency, see Long, "Political Science and the City," in Schnore and Fagin, op. cit., pp. 243-262.

a grade school education present in a census tract. The smaller these percentages, the higher the index of social rank. Urbanization is a similar index based upon percentages of women in the labor force, fertility ratios, and percentages of single family dwelling units for each census tract. The higher each variable, the lower the index of urbanization. Segregation is an index based on the percentage of Negroes and representatives of "new" migrations in a tract. The greater the concentration of such individuals, the higher the index of segregation.

Difficulties with the validity and reliability of the urbanization index were noted in the preceding chapter. In this study, an index of housing-type and an index of family-type are also employed. Percentage property ownership for each tract is felt to be a more direct index of property as a variable form of attachment to the community than is percentage of single family dwelling units. Furthermore, it is a more direct measure of "cost" for a study of levy voting. Percentage of women in the labor force is used as a measure of family-type.

A factor analysis of the universe in question, Franklin County, showed a failure of a clean urbanization index to emerge.⁶ Therefore, it is particularly appropriate to employ indexes of housing-type and of family-type as independent variables in some portions of the study's analysis. As noted, "urbanization" is correlated with support for general relief. Correlation of the two separate indexes with the

⁶Ekstrom, "Social Areas and Welfare Voting," paper read at the Ohio Valley Sociological Society Meetings, Notre Dame, Indiana, April, 1967.

dependent variables of this study can therefore clarify whether each of them produces variations in welfare support patterns, or only one.

The indexes for the study's dependent variables were developed in two stages. The first stage involves tabulating percentage differences between support for general relief and (1) support for child welfare, and (2) for health care for the indigent for each tract. It has already been explained that the two more limited programs were selected because preference for them can be viewed as an operationalization of the traditional stance toward welfare activity. Relative preference for general relief over the other measures represents, operationally for this study, the relative strength of innovative responses to social welfare. Relative preference is measured by the size and direction of the gap found. For example, a large percentage difference in favor of general relief indicates an innovative conception, while a large percentage difference in favor of the more traditional measures indicates the traditional conception.

However, it is recognized that percentage differences are functions of two elements which go into their computation: base and increment. That is, a tract with a high percentage in support of one measure has fewer units of possible percentage change in support of a second. Therefore, the second stage of constructing indexes of issue differentiation involves a standardization for percentage upward change possible. The procedure is simply to divide the percentage difference obtained for each tract by the percentage favoring the base level subtracted from 100.

Thus, for the test of the hypotheses of this study, two sets of indexes of issue differentiation were constructed. Both are indexes of relative support for general relief: one in relation to child welfare and one in relation to health care for the indigent. In order to control for the effect of an initial level of support for general welfare, a standardization procedure has been employed. Therefore, an effort has been made to operationalize the criteria underlying differential support for types of programs while controlling tendency to support programs in general.

A pre-test of the usefulness of the indexes was performed. The percentage differences were tabulated for each decile of support for the raw general relief levy. These categories were used because they were readily available and did not directly reflect the variables involved in the study's explanatory hypotheses. In each case, statistically significant variations were found. Therefore, it was decided to proceed with the study, employing the indexes as constructed.

The research design for the test of the study's hypotheses involves the following elements: (1) computation of zero-order correlations between each independent variable and each dependent variable, (2) observation, by contingency analysis, of the relationship between Shevky-Bell variables and dependent variables as affected by curvilinearity, (3) computation of two sets of multiple correlations and beta weights: one using the Shevky-Bell variables and one using percentage property ownership and percentage of women in the labor force in place of "urbanization."

The study's hypotheses can therefore be tested under conditions controlling for the effects of linearity and for the effect of interaction of the independent variables. For contingency analysis, the Shevky-Bell variables are broken in two cases into upper, middle and lower thirds of their distributions. These cases are social rank and urbanization. In the case of segregation, the index is broken into "natural" high and low categories. Only ten tracts fall into the high category (88.+ on segregation) while the remaining fall in the low group (0 to 38. on segregation).

Beta weights (rather than partial correlation coefficients) are employed to assess relationships with other variables held constant.⁷ These figures reflect both degree of association under conditions of control and the range of dispersion of each variable. The indexes of issue differentiation have very different ranges. Therefore, it is inappropriate to compare weights across problems. However, within each problem they provide a means of rough judgement of strength of association and of changes in association under conditions of control.

Chapter V presents the results of the study in terms of relationships found, hypothesis by hypothesis.

⁷For a discussion of the nature of beta weights, see Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960), pp. 343-346.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Table 1 presents zero-order coefficients and beta weights for the relationship of each of the social area variables with the two indexes of issue differentiation, child welfare vs. general relief and health care for the indigent vs. general relief.

The study's first hypothesis is:

The relationship between social rank and relative support for general relief will be curvilinear; areas of high and low rank will show greater relative support for general relief and areas of middle rank, greater relative support for traditional measures.

Table 1 shows an association, at the zero-order, of $-.232$ between social rank and relative support for general relief over child welfare. The beta weight for this association is $-.038$, which is low relative to the weights of the other Shevky-Bell variables in association with this index. However, the association remains negative.

The following data examine the linearity of the relationship between social rank and relative support for general relief. For the highest third of the tracts on social rank, the mean index of issue differentiation is -32.27 . For the middle third, -29.64 , and for the lowest third, -19.77 . This data does not support the hypothesis of a curvilinear relationship, with high and low rank areas greatest in relative support for general relief. It is lowest in the upper third, which shows the greatest negative score on the index of relative

TABLE 1

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS AND BETA WEIGHTS FOR THE SHEVKY-BELL
VARIABLES AND INDEXES OF ISSUE DIFFERENTIATION*

	Social Rank	Urbanization	Segregation
GR/CW*	r = -.232	r = .249	r = .457
	beta = -.038	beta = .114	beta = .296
GR/HCI*	r = .508	r = -.266	r = -.399
	beta = .085	beta = -.049	beta = -.044

*explanation of symbols: r = zero-order correlation,
beta = beta weight, GR/CW = general relief vs. child
welfare, GR/HCI = general relief vs. health care for
the indigent.

support. It is highest in the lowest third, which shows the smallest negative score.

Table 1 shows an association, at the zero-order, of .508 between social rank and relative support of general relief over health care for the indigent. The beta weight for this association is .085, which is large relative to the other weights related to this index of issue differentiation.

For the highest third of the tracts on social rank, the mean index of issue differentiation is 5.20; for the middle third, 2.34; and for the lowest third, -.055. The association for these two variables also fails to fit the predicted curvilinear pattern. The tracts of lowest rank give higher relative support of health care for the indigent. The tracts of highest rank give high support to general relief vs. health care.

On balance, this hypothesis must be rejected. The predicted patterns of curvilinearity did not appear. High rank areas showed greater preference only for general relief over health care. Low rank areas showed least preference for child welfare over general relief, but most preference for health care over relief. Areas of middle rank occupied an intermediate position for both sets of issues.

The second hypothesis is:

The greater the degree of urbanization, the greater the degree of relative support for general relief.

For general relief vs. child welfare, Table 1 shows a zero-order correlation between this variable and urbanization of .249. The beta weight is .144, which is large relative to those for the other Shevky-Bell variables.

Contingency analysis reveals the following relationships: for the highest third of the tracts on urbanization, the mean index of issue differentiation score is -20.71; for the middle third, -23.48, and for the lowest, -31.22. No third supports general relief more than child welfare, but areas highest in urbanization show the least negative scores.

For general relief vs. health care for the indigent, Table 1 shows a zero-order association between this variable and urbanization of -.266, with a beta weight of -.049, large relative to weights of other explanatory variables.

Contingency analysis shows that for the highest third of tracts on urbanization the mean index of issue differentiation is 0.07; for the middle third, 1.68; for the lowest third, 3.89. The lowest tendency to support general relief over health care for the indigent is found among the most urbanized tracts and the highest tendency among the least urbanized.

The data for general relief vs. child welfare clearly support the hypothesis, while the data for general relief vs. health care for the indigent clearly do not support the hypothesis. The hypothesis, as formulated, is therefore confirmed only in the case of preference for general relief over child welfare.

The third hypothesis is:

The greater the degree of segregation, the greater the degree of relative support for general relief.

Table 1 reveals a zero-order correlation of .457 for segregation and support of general relief over child welfare. A beta weight of

.296, quite large relative to those for other variables, was obtained.

Among ten high segregation tracts, the mean index of issue differentiation score is -2.77; among the remaining tracts, -28.80. High segregation tracts, while relatively preferring child welfare, do so much less than low segregation tracts.

Table 1 shows a relationship between relative support for general relief over health care for the indigent and segregation of -.399. A beta weight of -.044, relatively high, was obtained.

Among ten high segregation tracts, the mean index of issue differentiation is -5.20; among the remaining tracts, +2.69. That is, high segregation tracts showed a relative preference for health care for the indigent while low segregation tracts showed the opposite preference.

Once again, the data for general relief in relation to child welfare support the hypothesis; data for general relief in relation to health care do not. The hypothesis may only be accepted in the first instance.

Table 2 gives zero-order correlations and beta weights for the indexes of social rank and segregation, plus the percentages of women in the labor force and property ownership, in relation to the indexes of issue differentiation.

The fourth hypothesis of the study is:

The greater the percentage of women in the labor force, the greater the relative support for general relief.

Table 2 reports a correlation for this independent variable and preference for general relief over child welfare of .287. This relatively

TABLE 2

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS AND BETA WEIGHTS DESCRIBING RELATIONSHIPS
 AMONG TWO SHEVSKY-BELL VARIABLES: SOCIAL RANK AND SEGREGATION,
 TWO ASPECTS OF "URBANIZATION": WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE AND
 PROPERTY OWNERSHIP, AND TWO DEPENDENT VARIABLES:
 INDEXES OF ISSUE DIFFERENTIATION*

	Social Rank	Percentage Women in Labor Force	Percentage Property Ownership	Segregation
GR/CW*	r = -.232 beta = .002	r = .287 beta = .036	r = -.342 beta = -.103	r = .457 beta = .281
GR/HCI*	r = .503 beta = .072	r = -.369 beta = -.031	r = .418 beta = .018	r = -.399 beta = -.036

*explanation of symbols: r = zero-order correlation, beta = beta weight, GR/CW = general relief vs. child welfare, GR/HCI = general relief vs. health care for the indigent.

low level is accompanied by a beta weight of .036, which is not especially large relative to those obtained for other independent variables. However, some degree of association apparently remains under conditions of control.

Support for general relief relative to health care for the indigent shows a relationship to percentage of women in the labor force of $-.369$, with a relatively high beta weight of $-.081$. While this relationship is stronger, it is in a direction contrary to the hypothesis.

Therefore, the hypothesis may be accepted with some caution in the case of child welfare data, but it must be rejected in the case of health care data.

The fifth hypothesis is:

There will be no relationship between percentage property ownership and relative support for general relief.

Table 2 shows a correlation for property ownership and preference for relief over child welfare of $-.342$. A large beta weight of $-.103$ appears.

For the relationship between property ownership and support for general relief over health care for the indigent, a correlation of $.418$ is reported. The beta weight for this relationship is small in relation to those of other independent variables, $.018$.

Nevertheless, in neither case can the hypothesis of no relationship between property ownership and the indexes of issue differentiation be accepted.

Table 3 presents multiple correlations for two sets of independent variables and the indexes of issue differentiation, as well

TABLE 3

MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS FOR THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TWO SETS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: THE SHEVKY-BELL FRAMEWORK AND AN ALTERNATE FRAMEWORK, AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES: THE INDEXES OF ISSUE DIFFERENTIATION AND RAW DATA FOR THREE WELFARE LEVELS

Dependent Variable	Multiple Correlation (R)	
	(1) Shevsky-Bell Framework	(2) Alternate Framework
GR/CW*	.482	.487
GR/HCI*	.574	.575
General Relief	.786	.857
Health Care for the Indigent	.801	.872
Child Welfare	.699	.735

*explanation of symbols: GR/CW = general relief vs. child welfare, GR/HCI = general relief vs. health care for the indigent.

as levies on which they were based. One set of independent variables involves the social area framework; the other substitutes percentages of women in the labor force and property ownership for urbanization.

The study's sixth hypothesis is:

No appreciable gain in ability to predict welfare patterns will result from the substitution of indexes of housing-type and family-type for the index of urbanization.

The data for the indexes of issue differentiation tend to confirm this hypothesis. The larger of the two gains in prediction is only from .482 to .487, virtually no change.

However, examination of increases in ability to predict the raw levies shows contrary results. For general relief, the gain is from .786 to .857, a difference in R 's of .071 and a difference in R^2 's of .116. For this levy, then, the alternate framework predicts 11+ per cent more of the variation than does the Shevky-Bell framework, with the "urbanization" index.

For health care, the gain is from .801 to .872, a difference in R 's of .071 but with a difference in R^2 's of .119. This represents nearly 12 per cent more variation predicted. Figures for child welfare are less impressive, a gain from .699 to .735, or .036 in R , and in R^2 of .051. This is only a 5 per cent improvement in variance accounted for.

Therefore, on the basis of the data presented, the hypothesis cannot be accepted. While the alternate framework did not improve prediction of the indexes of issue differentiation, it showed greater efficiency in predicting the raw levies.

Discussion of the significance of these findings is reserved for the following chapter. In concluding this chapter, however, several salient observations may be made.

First, the findings show opposite profiles in the associations between general relief vs. child welfare and the explanatory variables and those for general relief vs. health care for the indigent and these variables. For many of the study's hypotheses, if it had been assumed that preference for general relief over health care indicates a "traditional" conception of social welfare, the hypotheses would have been differently phrased. Consequently, many more positive findings would have been reported.

Second, there is a general consistency evident in the findings. This is that in every instance of a social category which strongly prefers general relief over health care a concomitant pattern of relatively strong support for child welfare over general relief appears. Indeed, these patterns are related to the following observation. The associations for the two indexes of issue differentiation with raw support for general relief are opposite. The correlation of high support of relief is $-.134$. For high support of relief relative to child welfare and raw support of relief the association is $.466$.

Third, these observations may be related to two others. The index of issue differentiation for general relief relative to health care is more highly predictable than the index for general relief relative to child welfare. R 's of $.574$ and $.575$ were found in the former case and of $.482$ and $.487$ in the latter. The raw response to health care for the indigent was the most highly predictable of

the three levies. R's of .801 and .875 were found in contrast to .786 and .857 for general relief and .699 and .735 for child welfare. Such observations suggest that the universe studied is more highly statistically polarized along the dimensions of the study's explanatory variables on the issue of health care for the indigent than on the other issues.

Finally, the study's findings with regard to the relationship of social rank to the dependent variables should be emphasized. No pattern of convergence between areas of high and low rank can be observed. On both sets of issues, polar response patterns emerge from the data. The response patterns of areas of upper social rank, in addition to being opposite of those of areas of low rank, are also opposite of areas of high urbanization and segregation.

Only data on general relief vs. health care for the indigent tended to confirm the study's hypothesis for social rank. The performance of the index based on this data is suspect, inasmuch as all other hypotheses linking it to explanatory variables were rejected.

Chapter VI discusses the significance of the findings reported, both for the systemic model of the community and for the sociology of welfare as a community activity.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUMMARY

Various aspects of this study have significance for either the systemic model or for the sociology of welfare in the community. Some are particularly significant for both. The development and use of the "indexes of issue differentiation" provide an example.

For the systemic model, these indexes make possible more rigorous study of postulated and implied facets of the model. These measures have several advantages. By comparing responses to two measures relatively equal in cost and other considerations, but differing in type of recipient, the intervention and obfuscation of some factors can be controlled. New information, particularly useful for the sociology of welfare, is thus provided.

The indexes, as formulated and used, tap a dimension of the normative complexes related to the model which has not yet been studied. This is illustrated by the difference between patterns of convergence on issues, more frequently studied, and patterns of differentiation, the object of the indexes. In the preceding chapter, it was noted that on various welfare issues, high and low areas of social rank converge on relatively high support. However, the indexes of issue differentiation show that the relative hierarchy among such issues probably varies for the two types of areas.

It has been argued, in this study, that for some purposes, the latter pattern of differentiation reveals more about community normative patterns than does a pattern of convergence. In this study high social rank areas were found to prefer a hierarchy of welfare measures diametrically opposite to that preferred by low rank areas. The differentiation pattern of a normative complex such as "public-regardingness" is perhaps directly measured by the study's indexes. Wilson and Banfield argued that segregated populations would prove to be "private-regarding", but no means had been found to test the assertion. Insofar as the patterns found for areas of upper rank exemplify "public-regardingness," the fact that highly segregated areas show patterns exactly opposite may be viewed as some evidence for Wilson and Banfield's thesis. This evidence is supplied by abandoning the exclusive focus on patterns of convergence.

The single measures provided by the indexes of issue differentiation have provided differentiated response patterns for all of the dimensions identified by the systemic model. A single index, then, can be used to provide data linking the complex of "the community of limited liability" with that of "public-regardingness." It is possible to sort out the differential impact of these phenomena in sorting out response patterns.

These measures provide an intervening, and interpretive, variable for studies, such as this one, linking a demographic framework with phenomena such as the political process. The more precisely similar measures can be formulated in the future, the more confidence can be

placed in frameworks which stress configurations of values and other types of social norms.

In the future, such variables may be formulated in other ways. For example, the apparently inverse relationship between the general relief/child welfare index and the relief/health care index suggests future construction of Guttman-type scales based on series of multiple issues. Observation of populations' response patterns through multiple issues might reveal complex profiles in other instances.

It is also reasonable to suggest development of attitudinal measures as well as those based on overt acts. Comparison of issue differentiation at these two levels would be useful. Data collected for individuals can be used to sort out individual, contextual and aggregate effects.

As noted, the further development of the systemic model depends upon more systematic observation of the areal basis of community roles, how these "consumption" roles interact with other determinants of individuals' behavior, and how such roles may be linked to community action episodes and systems. In all these tasks, more precise conceptualizations and measures of "issue differentiation" should be useful in providing experimental and control variables.

The study presented here focuses on population types which have been put forward as dominant in creating community roles through consumption life styles. (In some areas, the significant social fact may be an absence or weakness of emerging roles.) While much more remains to be done to establish the significance of these roles for

the organization and coordination of communities, some tentative generalizations may be made about their nature.

One of the most conclusive findings shows that social rank coalitions on general high support for community welfare do not extend to agreement on criteria for discriminating among types of welfare issues. As argued, concepts such as "good government" orientation and "public-regardingness" have stressed a normative definition of appropriate community activity and citizen responsibility. The study shows that "public-regarding" types assign a unique priority to welfare issues. This priority is not congruent with the drive of welfare professionals to achieve legitimation for comprehensive service to the economic dependent. Nor is it congruent with the "felt needs" reflected in the priorities of low rank and segregated populations, most vulnerable to economic dependency.

For the systemic model the basic significance of such findings is confirmation of a lack of congruence between the criteria of one partial social structure seeking community action (welfare professionals) and an important segment of the "public." This lack of congruence can be further illustrated. An earlier study reported that the decision to appeal to the public for health care for the indigent with a levy separate from general relief was made by welfare professionals and some community leaders.¹ Their decision was based on a widely shared belief in the negative appeal of welfare and the positive appeal of

¹Frederick P. Green, A Study of the Health Levy Defeat in Franklin County, Unpublished MSW thesis, The Ohio State University, 1963.

health. A large, and reportedly "powerful" community organization, with ties to elites and to large voluntary associations,² was involved in support of the health care levy. Consensus was high among these circles, and among the "welfare community" in general that (a) the health levy would pass or run far ahead of the general relief levy, and (b) its appeal would be strongest among "better informed," active, and "rational" good citizens (e.g., of high rank). This study shows both expectations were unfounded. Most significant for the systemic model is the evident lack of socially structured communication which might have prevented such inaccurate assessment.

Of further significance for the model is the diametric opposite criteria underlying the choices of upper rank areas and the dependency-vulnerable areas. As noted, polarization of the public is greatest on the issue of health care for the indigent. This polarization might be predicted from the model, which suggests particularized bases for types' responses to issues, and limited communication between types. In such a context, while "needs" may be manifest to the poor, or to social workers, their discovery by "good citizens" may be impeded by realities of urban role structure.

Thus, the study suggests some modification of theory with regard to the response of upper social rank types to some issues. A prediction was made that the general characteristic of "public-regardingness" into relatively greater acceptance of community needs to deal with

²For a discussion of the reputed effectiveness of this organization, see Walter Guzzardi, Jr., "What the Doctor Can't Order But You can," in Medical Care (W. Richard Scott and Edmund H. Volkart, eds. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), pp. 529-542.

economic dependency. This prediction was clearly not supported. The higher the rank of census tracts, the less likely were they to assign high priority to economic dependency in relation to child welfare. The higher the rank, the less likely were tracts to assign the high priority given by low rank and segregated tracts to health care for the indigent.

The exact modification of social area theory which is required probably cannot be supplied by this study's data. The lack of communication among the various types and "leadership" resulting from the non-reciprocity of roles provides one starting point for future research. A related lead suggests investigation of the role of stereotypes imagery of nature of other life styles and its development in relatively isolated partial social structures. As previously stated, the specific source of upper rank priorities, whether from consumption experiences or from position in the larger society, needs better specification.

A second conclusive finding is that "urbanization," though perhaps in need of conceptual and operational reformulation, affords a basis for predicting differential response patterns to community issues. That is, there are variations in normative criteria associated with this dimension which cannot be controlled by variables such as rank and segregation. The complex of the "community of limited liability" evidently operates with other complexes to produce differential response patterns.

The study has shown that two indexes: of family-type and property-type, afford more precise prediction than the present

urbanization index for some variables. Furthermore, it has been shown that each is associated, in some cases, with normative discrimination. This finding is particularly significant for property-type, often employed simply as a control for "cost" in multi-variate analysis. Because property ownership is associated with preference patterns among issues similar in cost, with the likelihood of benefit controlled somewhat by rank, familism, and segregation, it would appear that the effects of social structure organized around property-types are visible.

A large amount of research, comparable to that recommended for the dimension of social rank, is required to trace out whatever sequences of social processes may surround both family-type and property-type variations in the urban aggregate.

New emphases on the political ecology of urban areas, such as those recently begun in political science, present a promising opportunity. Williams et al. note: "The vehicle of social differentiation is not simply a byproduct of economics."³ The objective consequences of property-ownership and other dimensions of life style interact in producing unique stances toward the community as polity. A whole matrix of social interaction networks needs to be charted to describe these and to make them useful for prediction of urban events.

With regard to familism, future research needs to turn to the consequences of its absence (replaced, Bell argues, by mobility or sheer consumption styles). What sequences of interaction occur in these areas? How do they differ from familistic areas?

³Williams et al., op. cit., p. 207.

With regard to the uses of the urbanization index, this study has observed the consequences of employing the index under conditions of doubtful validity. For populations for which property and family characteristics do form a coherent factor, different results might be obtained. Further studies of its predictive utility may be undertaken. However, this study shows that the index cannot be applied uncritically to the prediction of urban phenomena. For populations where the two factors diverge, use of the alternate indexes is recommended.

Finally, with respect to the systemic model, the significance of strong associations between welfare preference patterns and the dimension of segregation should not be neglected. For the data studied, this variable is a strong predictor of stance toward the community. And this stance is opposed to that produced by the variables of social rank, property ownership, and familism.

Studies of the factors which have produced variant needs from those felt by more dominant types in the community are needed. Of particular interest is the association between relative preference for health care and segregation. How does the organization of medical care impact upon the lives of segregated populations?⁴ What are the consequences of segregated life styles for "rational" evaluation of community issues by the electorate? What do these consequences augur for social action based on community roles?

With respect to the sociology of welfare in the community, and to codes of professional practice built on such knowledge, it would

⁴Cf. Anselm L. Strauss, "Medical Ghettos," Trans-action, IV (May, 1967), pp. 7-15.

seem that this study is not encouraging. First, the tendency of high social rank, "public-regarding" social types is not to support the innovative vs. the traditional program. Second, urbanization must be considered as a relevant factor. The influence of this variable also leads away from support of new (or even old) efforts for the economic dependent. Social rank and urbanization work together (not at cross purposes as on some issues) to reinforce relative support for the traditional. Finally, segregation is deeply implicated in differential response patterns.

In a very tentative way, it may be concluded from this study that the organized structure of local life, traditionally trusted by democratic theorists of social organization, is a positive hinderance to the discovery of welfare "needs" and the formulation of action upon them.

To the extent that this proposition is true, attempts to institutionalize welfare solutions in the context of existing community roles are likely to be unsuccessful. Intervention from the larger society and conflict within the community resulting in reorganization of roles are two possible modifying influences. Neither is positively evaluated or recommended by established theory. The data presented in this study, interpreted in light of the systemic model, would suggest two possible consequences of future events. Either radical reformulation of social welfare doctrine will occur, or continued strategic and tactical difficulty for the promotion of the profession's objectives.

Summary. This study was an effort to predict differential response to two pairs of welfare proposals made to a local community's electorate. These were general relief vs. child welfare and general relief vs. health care for the indigent. The more particular proposals were chosen to represent traditionally acceptable forms of public welfare. However, the study showed that those categories of the electorate which preferred child welfare over general relief also preferred general relief over health care for the indigent. It may be that a reversal of the latter pair would more accurately reflect their relative acceptability by traditional conceptions of social welfare.

Studies in the sociology of welfare institutions in the local community have not previously applied the "systemic model." This model identifies roles which may provide the context for efforts to secure community action and adaptation to emerging problems. It argues that urban roles are primarily organized around types of consumption activity, and are most often non-reciprocal with each other. These characteristics arise with growth of societies in "scale." They may undermine the capacities of communities to mount effective social action. A major focus of the research was how these roles predispose community members to respond to types of welfare issues.

Social rank, urbanization, and segregation are identified by the model as relevant dimensions differentiating urban aggregates, such as an electorate. They describe differentiation of census tract data. Social rank has been previously related to general support of

community activity. High and low rank areas have been observed to converge on high support of welfare issues. Urbanization is a dimension frequently ignored, or conceptualized as a non-normative cost factor, in previous research into community response to issues. It is also related to general support of welfare activity. Segregation is related to support of welfare, but the bases for this fact have been little studied.

Problems in validity and reliability have been noted for the urbanization index. The study employs the three designated variables, and in an effort to evaluate the performance of the latter, also uses two variables representing its components, family-type and property-type. These variables are used to predict patterns of response to the two pairs of issues.

These variations were summarized by indexes of issue differentiation. The indexes operationalize underlying criteria for discriminating among public issues, and may be thought of as intervening variables for studies linking demographic types with political processes. Such criteria are implied by normative complexes postulated by earlier work. Two such complexes are related to roles emerging in urban communities: "public-" and "private-regardingness" and "the community of limited liability." The former has been related to rank and segregation; the latter, to urbanization. These complexes define appropriate community activity and the legitimate status of the citizen in relation to the local polity.

Findings of the study include: (1) tracts of high social rank prefer child welfare over general relief but general relief over

health care for the indigent. A similar, but less pronounced, pattern appears for areas of middle rank. Areas of low rank show the opposite pattern. (2) The higher the degree of urbanization and segregation, the percentage of women in the labor force and the lower the percentage of property ownership, the greater the relative support for general relief over child welfare and the less the relative support for general relief over health care for the indigent. (3) Use of the variables of women in the labor force and property ownership in place of "urbanization" gives more precise prediction of various welfare levies, though not of indexes of issue differentiation.

The general usefulness and significance of the indexes of issue differentiation was noted, and related to research tasks in community sociology and the sociology of welfare institutions. For example, they make it possible to test the thesis that segregated areas apply to public issues "private-regarding" criteria, opposite of those applied by areas of high rank.

While urbanization was linked to normative differentials, its lack of unidimensionality has consequences for predictive studies which should be considered in future research.

Relatively high community polarization was seen on differential acceptance of welfare issues. Segregation was strongly related to observed patterns. High rank, low urbanization profiles and low rank, high segregation profiles lead to opposite preference hierarchies. The consequences of the situation should occupy future efforts in community sociology and the sociology of welfare. The causes and consequences

of such polarization must be seen in the context of developing patterns of specialization, communication, and social control in urban areas.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR SHEVKY-BELL INDEXES*

Data for these tabulations may be obtained from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population and Housing, Statistics for Census Tracts.

- I. For each census tract compile the basic data and compute the ratios for the indexes of social rank, urbanization, and segregation. Compute the standard scores and combine these into index scores as indicated below:

- A. Social Rank Components

1. Occupation ratio (total number of craftsmen..., operatives..., and laborers... per 1,000 employed persons). (For censuses after 1950 add males and females in the occupational categories.)
 - a) Add:
 - (1) "Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers"
 - (2) "Operatives and kindred workers"
 - (3) "Laborers" (after 1950 "Laborers, except mine")
 - b) Subtract the total number of persons with "Occupation not reported" from the total number of persons "Employed."
 - c) Divide the total number of craftsmen..., operatives..., and laborers by the above difference.
 - d) Multiply the above quotient by 1,000.
2. Occupation standard score¹

*The materials reported here are slightly adapted from Shevky and Bell's presentation, op. cit., pp. 54-57.

¹N.B., each Shevky-Bell index has been standardized in terms of its range for the Los Angeles area in 1940.

- a) Substitute in standard score formula:

$$\text{Occupation score} = 100 - \sqrt{x(r-o)}$$

where

$$x = .1336898$$

$$o = 0$$

r = occupation ratio for each census tract

3. Education ratio (number of persons who have completed no more than grade school per 1,000 persons 25 years old and over).

- a) Add number of persons 25 years old and over who have had only eight years of schooling or less.
- b) Subtract the total number of persons with "School years not reported" from the total number of "Persons 25 years old and over."
- c) Divide the total number of persons completing only elementary school or less by the above difference.
- d) Multiply the quotient by 1,000.

4. Education standard score

- a) Substitute in standard score formula:

$$\text{Education score} = 100 - \sqrt{x(r-o)}$$

where

$$x = .1298701$$

$$o = 130$$

r = education ratio for each census tract

5. Social rank index

- a) Compute a simple average of the occupation and education standard scores. The average is the index of social rank.

E. Urbanization Components

1. Fertility ratio

- a) Record total number of persons "Under 5 years."
(After 1950 add the number of males and females "Under 5 years.")

- b) Add the number of females in the age range 15 through 44.
- c) Divide the total number of children under 5 by the total number of females age 15 through 44.
- d) Multiply the quotient by 1,000.

2. Fertility standard score

- a) Substitute in standard score formula:

$$\text{Fertility score} = 100 - \sqrt{x(r-o)}$$

where

$$x = .1661130$$

$$o = 9$$

r = fertility ratio for each census tract

3. Women in the labor force ratio (the number of females in the labor force per 1,000 females 14 years old and over).

- a) Record number of females "14 years and over" who are in "Labor force."
- d) Divide the above by the total number of females "14 years old and over."
- c) Multiply the quotient by 1,000.

4. Women in the labor force standard score

- a) Substitute in standard score formula:

$$\text{Women in the labor force score} = x(r-o)$$

where

$$x = .2183406$$

$$o = 86$$

r = women in the labor force ratio for each census tract

5. Single-family detached dwelling units ratio (the number of single-family dwelling units per 1,000 dwelling units of all types).

- a) Record number of "1 dwelling unit, detached (includes trailers)."
- b) Divide by total of "All dwelling units."

c) Multiply the quotient by 1,000.

6. Single-family detached dwelling units standard score

a) Substitute in standard score formula:

$$\text{S.F.D.U. score} = 100 - \sqrt{x(r-o)}$$

where

$$x = .1006441$$

$$o = 6$$

r = single-family detached dwelling units ratio

7. Urbanization index

a) Compute a simple average of the fertility, women in the labor force, and single-family detached dwelling units standard scores. The average is the index of urbanization.

C. The Index of Segregation

1. Add the number of persons designated "Negro"; "Other Races"; and "foreign-born white" from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, U.S.S.R., Lithuania, Finland, Rumania, Greece, Italy, "Other Europe," Asia, French Canada, Mexico, and "Other America."
2. Divide the above sum by the total population in each tract.
3. Multiply the above quotient by 100 to obtain the index of segregation for each census tract.

II. Construction of the Social Areas (This procedure is omitted from this appendix because it was not used in the present project.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adrian, Charles R. (ed.). Social Science and Community Action. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1960.
- Anderson, Theodore R., and Lee R. Boan. "The Shevky-Bell Social Areas: Confirmation of Results and a Reinterpretation," Social Forces, XL (December, 1961), pp. 119-124.
- _____, and Janice A. Egeland. "Spatial Aspects of Social Area Analysis," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), pp. 392-398.
- Banfield, Edward C., and James Q. Wilson. City Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Bell, Wendell. "Anomie, Social Isolation, and the Class Structure," Sociometry, XX (June, 1957), pp. 105-116.
- _____. "Economic, Family, and Ethnic Status: An Empirical Test," American Sociological Review, XX (February, 1955), pp. 45-52.
- _____. "Familism and Suburbanization: One Test of the Social Choice Hypothesis," Rural Sociology, XXI (October, 1956), pp. 276-283.
- _____. "A Probability Model for the Measurement of Ecological Segregation," Social Forces, XXXII (May, 1954), pp. 357-364.
- _____. "The Social Areas of the San Francisco Bay Region," American Sociological Review, XVIII (February, 1953), pp. 39-47.
- _____. "The Utility of the Shevky Typology for the Design of Urban Sub-area Studies," Journal of Social Psychology, XLVII (February, 1958), pp. 71-83.
- _____, and Marion D. Boat. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Informal Social Relations," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (January, 1957), pp. 391-398.
- _____, and Maryanne T. Force. "Religious Preference, Familism, and the Class Structure," Midwest Sociologist, XIX (May, 1957), pp. 79-86.

- _____, and Force. "Social Structure and Participation in Different Types of Formal Associations," Social Forces, XXXIV (May, 1956), pp. 345-350.
- _____, and Force. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, XXI (February, 1956), pp. 25-34.
- _____, and Scott Greer. "Social Area Analysis and Its Critics," Pacific Sociological Review, V (Spring, 1962), pp. 3-9.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- Brown, Bernard, and John C. Wahlke. The American Political System. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley. review of Social Area Analysis. American Journal of Sociology, LXI (July, 1955), pp. 84-85.
- _____, and Leo F. Schnore. "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (September, 1959), pp. 132-146.
- Dunham, Arthur. Community Welfare Organization. New York: Thomas Y. Corwell, 1958.
- Dynes, Russell R., et al. Social Problems: Dissensus and Deviation in an Industrial Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Ekstrom, Charles. Social Areas and Welfare Voting. Unpublished M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1965.
- _____. "Social Areas and Welfare Voting." Paper read at the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, Notre Dame, Indiana, April, 1967.
- Elman, Richard M. The Poorhouse State. New York: Pantheon Books, 1966.
- Friedman, John and William Alonso (eds.). Regional Development and Planning. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1964.
- Green, Frederick P. A Study of the Health Levy Defeat in Franklin County, May 8, 1962, with Reference to the Application of Social Action Principles. Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1963.
- Greer, Scott. The Emerging City. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- _____. Governing the Metropolis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

- _____. Metropolitics: A Study of Political Culture. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.
- _____. "The Rational Model, the Sociological Model, and Metropolitan Reform," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVII (Summer, 1963), pp. 242-249.
- _____. "The Social Structure and Political Process of Suburbia," American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), pp. 514-526.
- _____. "The Social Structure and Political Process of Suburbia: An Empirical Test," Rural Sociology, XXVII (December, 1962), pp. 438-459.
- _____. Urban Renewal and American Cities: The Dilemma of Democratic Intervention. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1965.
- _____. "Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis," American Sociological Review, XXI (February, 1956), pp. 19-25.
- _____. and Peter Orleans. "The Mass Society and the Parapolitical Structure," American Sociological Review, XXVII (October, 1962), pp. 634-646.
- Hawley, Amos H. and Otis Dudley Duncan, "Social Area Analysis: A Critical Appraisal," Land Economics, XXXIII (November, 1957), pp. 337-345.
- Herson, Lawrence J. R. "The Lost World of Municipal Government," American Political Science Review, LI (June, 1957), pp. 330-345.
- Hunter, Flody. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.
- Jacob, Philip E. and James V. Toscano (eds.). The Integration of Political Communities. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1964.
- Janowitz, Morris. The Community Press in an Urban Setting. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952.
- Jonassen, Christen T. "Functional Unities in Eighty-Eight Community Systems," American Sociological Review, XXVI (June, 1961), pp. 399-407.
- Kaufman, Walter C. and Scott Greer. "Voting in a Metropolitan Community: An Application of Social Area Analysis," Social Forces, XXVIII (March, 1960), pp. 196-204.
- Lewis, Oscar. Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

- Long, Norton E. "The Local Community as an Ecology of Games," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (November, 1958), pp. 251-261.
- McElrath, Dennis C. "The Social Areas of Rome: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), pp. 376-391.
- Reissman, Leonard. The Urban Process: Cities in Industrial Society. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Ross, Murray G. Community Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Schnore, Leo F. and Henry Fagin (eds.). Urban Research and Policy Planning. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1967.
- Scott, W. Richard and Edmund H. Volkart (eds.) Medical Care. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Seligman, Ben B. (ed.). Poverty as a Public Issue. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Shevky, Eshref, and Wendell Bell. Social Area Analysis. "Stanford University Sociological Series," Number 1, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1955.
- _____, and Marilyn Williams. The Social Areas of Los Angeles. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949.
- Simmons, J. L., George J. McCall, and Norvall Glenn. "The Measurement of Value Dissensus." Paper read at American Sociological Association meetings, August, 1965.
- Strauss, Anselm L. "Medical Ghettos," Trans-action, IV (May, 1967), pp. 7-15.
- Theodorson, George A. (ed.). Studies in Human Ecology. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1961.
- Tryon, Robert. Identification of Social Areas by Cluster Analysis. "University of California Publications in Psychology," Volume 8. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.
- Udry, J. Richard. "Increasing Scale and Spatial Differentiation," Social Forces, XLII (May, 1964), pp. 403-413.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing, 1960. Census Tracts, Columbus, Ohio. Final Report PHC(1)-32, Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Arsdol, Maurice D., Jr., Santo F. Camilleri, and Calvin F. Schmid, "An Application of the Shevky Social Areas to a Model of Urban Society," Social Forces, XXXVII (October, 1958), pp. 26-32.

_____. "The Generality of Urban Social Area Indexes," American Sociological Review, XXIII (June, 1958), pp. 277-284.

Warren, Roland L. The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Charles N. Lebeaux. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Williams, Oliver P., and Charles R. Adrian. Four Cities: A Study of Comparative Decision Making. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963.

_____, et al. Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Wilson, James Q., and Edward C. Banfield. "Public-Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior," American Political Science Review, LVIII (December, 1964), pp. 876-887.