THE INFLUENCE OF URBAN-RURAL ORIENTATION, LENGTH OF RESIDENCE AND LEVEL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ON SOCIAL INTERACTION IN THE URBAN-RURAL FRINGE IN UPSTATE NEW YORK

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Tariq Masud Durrani

September, 1969

To my parents

This monograph and a forthcoming companion work by Ghulam M. Sandami, Ph. D. are a part of a larger program of applied research on housing and community development in rural, small town and urban fringe areas of New York initiated by the late Professor Glenn H. Beyer and continued by the present writer. This program of research, funded primarily by the State of New York, through the College of Human Ecology, and the U. S. Department of Agriculture, through the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station began as early as 1948 with a study of farm housing in New York State. Housing research in the College since 1948 has, under Professor Beyer's guidance, shifted more and more from a primarily physical and structural focus to a concern for the relationship between housing programs and patterns of social change in the United States and elsewhere.

The latest in this series of studies --(initiated in September 1969, only a few months before Professor Beyer's premature death)-- a study of housing needs, residential mobility and life style in rural New York, was to be directed jointly by Professor Beyer, Professor Lewis L. Bower and Professor Earl W. Morris.

The research reported here by Professor Durrani, as well as the Samdani study was funded under Hatch project 284 from the U. S. Department of Agriculture through the Cornell Agricultural Experiment Station to the Department of Housing and Design (now Consumer Economics and Public Policy).

Mr. Tariq Durrani was born in Dera Ghazi Khan (Pakistan) on April 7, 1936. He received the degrees of Bachelor of Arts (1955) and Master of

Arts (1959) in sociology from the University of the Punjab. In 1959 he received a Ford Foundation Scholarship to study at the Athens Technological Institute, Athens, Greece where he received the Diploma in Ekistics in 1961. He has served the Governments of Pakistan (1961 to 1963) and West Pakistan (1964 to 1965). He wrote several reports on West Pakistan's housing programs between 1964 and 1965. In 1969 he was awarded the Ph. D. degree from Cornell University. He was elected Councillor (1964) and Finance Secretary (1965) of the Pakistan Sociological Association, was elected to the membership of the Cornell University chapter of Phi Kappa Phi in 1968, and is a member of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. He currently is Assistant Professor in the School of Urban Design, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Earl W. Morris

Abstract of the Report

The urban-rural fringe in the metropolitan areas of the United States seems to be experiencing the same cycle of growth *as* the suburbs did in the past: a progression from rural to mixed rural-urban to sub-urban land uses and an infusion of an urbanized life style. The crucial point, however, is not that the areas become "suburbs" but that they become integrated with the city.

Since these communities undergo a change in their character while in the process of transformation from rural to "suburban," it is believed that changes also take place in the amount and nature of social interaction in these communities. Questions have been raised regarding whether or not social life would be disrupted in rapidly growing fringe communities. Would social interaction continue with friends and relatives in the place of origin or will new patterns rapidly develop? Such questions are of great importance for an understanding of the current trends in present fringe and for planning of future development.

This study analyzed social interaction in the context of three different communities at various levels of fringe development. One of these areas was in an early stage of development, another one in an advanced stage and the third area was in the final stage of development toward suburbanization and integration into the metropolitan area.

It is to be expected that the amount of social interaction in the fringe is influenced by one's community orientation (rural or urban) and length of residence in an area. It is known that rural- and urban-oriented people differ in the amount and type of social interaction they engage in, and that over a period of time not only do the fringe areas

develop in terms of changes in social patterns but the level of interaction also changes for individual residents with increased time in the area.

It was found that in general the length of residence had greater Influence on the amount of social interaction than community orientation. In the most developed of the three areas, even this distinction faded out. Generally, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle had only small effect on the amount of interaction in these areas. However, in some specific aspects of social interaction, variations were found arising from differential community orientation and length of residence.

Generally, in all areas studied, people in the "high" socioeconomic class showed greater institutional participation than those in the "middle" or "low" classes. In the more developed areas, the middle aged respondents showed greater institutional participation than the young and the aged. However, in the less developed area, participation levels were less clearly influenced by family life cycle stage.

Most respondents, regardless of community orientation, socioeconomic class or stage in the family life cycle, expressed great satisfaction with fringe residence.

The present day fringe area is far from being an "institutional desert." Those who have opted to live there become part of the community to a great extent. Long-time residents seemed to be more active in the social life of the area while newcomers were more active in its institutional life. Higher levels of development of a community have been

shown to reduce the differences between rural- and urban-oriented residents in various specific aspects of social interaction and institutional participation.

Acknowledgements

June, 1965 was a particularly important month to me. My late request for acceptance as a graduate student in the Department of Housing and Design at Cornell University and for the financial support was received enthusiastically by the late Professor Glenn H. Beyer. His constant encouragement and guidance as Chairman of my Committee made my graduate work at Cornell possible. Thanks are also due him for permitting the use of data from his research study of Housing in Rapidly Growing Urban-Rural Fringe Areas and to the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station which sponsored the project with Hatch 284 finances.

For dissertation guidance I am grateful to my Committee--Professors Glenn H. Beyer, Kermit C. Parsons and Earl W. Morris, particularly to Professor Morris, who in the absence due to ill health of Professor Beyer devoted many hours to the various drafts of the dissertation and made extremely useful suggestions.

I am also thankful to Mrs. Sylvia Wahl, a former Research Associate on Professor Beyer's project, who helped not only in my adjusting to the new work environment but was always willing to share her knowledge on various aspects of the project to which she had been associated from the beginning through collection of the data and first statistical analyses.

My warmest thanks are due Mrs. Carolyn A. Lebsock who showed a continuous interest in my work and kept my morale high (though often it was reciprocal) over several years of association in the Department of Housing and Design. She also read the preliminary draft and made extensive editorial and scholarly suggestions--though my imperfections

might still be visible at places.

I am happy to concede that if there was anyone who kept me on my toes between July 28 and August 29, 1969, it was Miss Anna E. Lane. With an amicable willingness she has accepted the onerous responsibility to type the final draft in the very short time that was available.

The Christian belief that God does not send us a cross any heavier than we can bear seems to be another way of saying that nothing succeeds like success, that is, if you looked at it optimistically. And I thank God for the successful completion of my work at Cornell. But it is only a beginning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Organization of the Study	7
II.	THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND	8
	The Concept of Urban-Rural Fringe: Historical Development and Criticism	8
	Previous Studies and Their Major Findings	21
	Major Areas Covered and Variables Tested in This Study	33
	Population Characteristics	34
	Social Interaction	34
	Institutional Participation	35
	Attitude toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	35
III.	METHODOLOGY	37
	Selection of Fringe Areas	37
	Selection of the Sample and Sampling Techniques	39
	Sampling Method and Rate	41
	Interview Schedule Construction	43
	Field Operations	44
	Analysis and Statistical Techniques	44
	Major Variables and Indexes Used in the Analysis	45
	Residence-Orientation Typology	45
	Community Orientation	45
	Length of Residence	47
	Family Life Cycle	47
	Socioeconomic Status	48

Chapter		Page
III.	(cont'd.)	
	Institutional Participation Index	49
	Social Interaction Index	52
	Anomie	54
IV.	A COMMUNITY IN AN EARLY STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT--PARMA	56
	Characteristics of Parma Residents	56
	Residence-Orientation Typology	56
	Length of Residence	59
	Socioeconomic Status Score	60
	Stage in Family Life Cycle	62
	Social Interaction	63
	Summary of Findings on Social Interaction	78
	Institutional Participation	79
	Summary of Findings on Institutional Particiation.	87
	Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	88
	Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	95
V.	A COMMUNITY IN AN ADVANCED STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT --CLARENCE	97
	Characteristics of Clarence Residents	97
	Residence-Orientation Typology	97
	Community Orientation	98
	Length of Residence	100
	Socioeconomic Status	100
	Stage in Family Life Cycle	103
	Social Interaction	104
	Summary of Findings on Social Interaction	136
	Institutional Participation	138
	Summary of Findings on Institutional Participation	171
	Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	172
	Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	181

Chapter		Page
VI.	A COMMUNITY IN FINAL STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT--CAMILLUS	183
	Characteristics of Camillus Residents	183
	Residence-Orientation Typology	183
	Community Orientation	184
	Length of Residence	186
	Socioeconomic Status	186
	Stage in Family Life Cycle	189
	Social Interaction	190
	Institutional Participation	222
	Summary of Findings on Institutional Participation	247
	Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	249
	Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie	258
VII.	LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS: SIMILARITIES AND CONTRASTS IN THE THREE FRINGE AREAS	260
	Social Interaction	260
	Hypotheses	260
	Extent and Intensity of Participation in Recreational Activities	264
	Institutional Participation	276
	Hypotheses	276
	Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe	287
	Hypotheses	287
	Anomie	296
	Hypotheses	296
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS	305
APPENDIX		310
BIBLIOGRAPHY		342

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Population Growth of the Selected Townships of Parma, Clarence and Camillus	38
2.	Percentage Distribution of All Eligible Dwelling Units by Strata, Parma, Clarence and Camillus	40
3.	Sampling Fractions Obtained From the Listed Units by Strata, Parma, Clarence and Camillus	42
4.	Final Weighted Samples, Clarence and Camillus	42
5.	Rank Correlations Between Items and Total Score for Institutional Participation Index, Parma, Clarence and Camillus	51
6.	Rank Correlations Between Items and Total Score for Social Interaction Index, Parma, Clarence and Camillus	53
7.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology	57
8.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Community Orientation Score	57
9.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index	58
10.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Length of Residence	59
11.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score	60
12.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife	61
13.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Annual Family Income	61

Table		Page
14.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family	62
15.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle	63
16.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction	64
17.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction	66
18.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction	66
19.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	69
20.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors	69
21.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	70
22.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers	71
23.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	73
24.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	75
25.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	76

Table		Page
26.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Friends	77
27.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation	81
28.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation	82
29.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation	83
30.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	84
31.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	85
32.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	86
33.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes	89
34.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes	90
35.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	91
36.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	91
37.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	93

Table		Page
38.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	91
39.	Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie	95
40.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology	98
41.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Community Orientation Score	98
42.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index	99
43.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Length of Residence	100
44.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score	101
45.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife	102
46.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Annual Family Income	102
47.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family	103
48.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle	104
49.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction	105
50.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction	106
51.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction	107

Table		Page
52.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction	108
53.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors	110
54.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	110
55.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	111
56.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers	113
57.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	113
58.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	114
59.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors	115
60.	Percentage Distribution of Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors	116
61.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	118
62.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	118
63.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	120

Table		Page
64.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	122
65.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	123
66.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood .	124
67.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood .	125
68.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Farmers	127
69.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	127
70.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	128
71.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Farmers	129
72.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	131
73.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	131
74.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	134
75.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Village Residents . . .	135

Table		Page
76.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	137
77.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation	139
78.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation	140
79.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation	141
80.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score, and Intensity of Institutional Participation	143
81.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation	144
82.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Church Attendance	146
83.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	147
84.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	148
85.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	149
86.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	151
87.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	152

Table		Page
88.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	153
89.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	155
90.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations In Which Office Was Held	156
91.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	156
92.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	158
93.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	159
94.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	160
95.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Church Attendance	162
96.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance	164
97.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance	165
98.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	166
99.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	168

Table		Page
100.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	169
101.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	170
102.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Head's Satisfaction with Convenience of Driving to Work	173
103.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes	174
104.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes	175
105.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	176
106.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	177
107.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	178
108.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	178
109.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie	180
110.	Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Extent of Anomie	181
111.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology	184
112.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Community Orientation Score	184

Table		Page
113.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index	185
114.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Length of Residence	186
115.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score	187
116.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife	188
117.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Annual Family Income	188
118.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family	189
119.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle	190
120.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction	191
121.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction	193
122.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction	193
123.	Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Component Items of the Index of Social Interaction, Camillus	196
124.	Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Component Items of the Index of Social Interation, Camillus	197

Table		Page
125.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	198
126.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	199
127.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood	200
128.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Neighborhood Families	201
129.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status and Frequency of Visiting with Neighborhood Families	202
130.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Neighborhood Families	203
131.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends	206
132.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Friends	206
133.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	208
134.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	209
135.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives	210
136.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers	213

Table		Page
137.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Farmers	214
138.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	215
139.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents	216
140.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	217
141.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	218
142.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Newcomers	218
143.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation	223
144.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation	225
145.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation	225
146.	Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status and Component Items of the Index of Institutional Participation, Camillus	227
147.	Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Component Items of the Index of Institutional Participation	229

Table		Page
148.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	231
149.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged	232
150.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number or Organizations to Which They Belonged	232
151.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	234
152.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	235
153.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held	236
154.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	238
155.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings	239
156.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Resicence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	241
157.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	242
158.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs	243
159.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Church Attendance	244

Table		Page
160.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Church Attendance	245
161.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance	246
162.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Head's Satisfaction with Convenience of Driving to Work	250
163.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes	251
164.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes	252
165.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	253
166.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes	254
167.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	255
168.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years	256
169.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie	257
170.	Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Extent of Anomie	257

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The fringe areas of our metropolitan cities are undergoing an enormous change as is apparent from the population growth and development of areas outside the traditionally defined "urban" and "rural" areas. A higher rate of population growth in the satellite areas surrounding large cities than within their limits has been noticed in the nation since 1900. During the period between 1920 and 1930, while the population in central cities increased by 22.3 percent, those parts of the metropolitan districts lying outside the central cities grew at almost twice this rate. Noting this trend, the National Resources Committee pointed out about three decades ago in 1937 that this phenomenon was "not a general devolution of cities or a flight from the city. What is actually happening is, rather, that the urbanite is steadily being transformed into the suburbanite."[1] The Committee considered this dispersion and redistribution of population as an evidence of a new phase of city growth which was "emptying at the center and spilling over its own corporate boundaries."[2] According to the Committee:

---

1. National Resources Committee, "The Process of Urbanization: Underlying Forces and Emerging Trends," in Cities and Society, Paul K. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (eds.), 2d ed. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), p. 70.

2. Ibid., p. 71.

> The model suburb, whether it is industrial or residential, however superior, aloof, and detached it may believe itself to be, has its basis of existence and draws much of its substance from the noisy, grimy city of which economically and culturally it is an integral part, but from which it has managed to remain independent politically.[3]

In his analysis of the decennial growth rates of the metropolitan areas of the United States, from 1900 to 1950, Schnore distinguishes the metropolitan territory in terms of its central city and its urban and rural "rings."[4] The rural "rings" are further subdivided into the incorporated and unincorporated areas. Retrojecting the official definition of a Standard Metropolitan Area used by the Census Bureau in 1950 to his analysis, Schnore demonstrated that since 1930 population had increased at a much higher rate in the rural rings than the urban rings of the metropolitan central cities. Between 1930 and 1940, the population of the rural rings increased by 21.2 percent as compared to 8 percent in the urban rings. Between 1940 and 1950, the rates were 45.2 percent and 26.0 percent respectively. Similar high rates were noted in the unincorporated as compared to the incorporated areas of the rural rings during the interdecade periods. The rates of increase in the unincorporated and incorporated areas, respectively, were 22.3 and 13.2 percent in the 1930 to 1940 period, and 46.5 and 34.1 percent in the 1940 to 1950 decade.

This trend remained unchanged between 1950 and 1960. The urban fringe, a term introduced by the Census Bureau in 1950, showed the

---

3. Ibid.

4. Leo F. Schnore, "Metropolitan Growth and Decentralization," in The Suburban Community, ed. by William M. Dobriner (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958), pp. 4-5.

greatest increase within the urbanized areas. Noting this trend Beyer stated that "for all metropolitan areas combined there was an increase in population within the 1950 central city limit areas of less than 2 percent, while outside those areas the increase amounted to 62 percent."[5] The highest rate of growth between 1950 and 1960 was registered in the areas outside the central cities of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of a population between one-half and one million (81 percent) followed closely by those areas with a population of three million or more (72 percent).[6] Martin observes, however, that in view of the changes in census definitions of suburban, rural-nonfarm and urban fringe since the 1920 census, "it is not possible to make an exact statement about rate of growth in the rural-urban fringe."[7] The growth of unincorporated areas clearly has been greater than the growth of suburbs and central cities.

The President's Committee on Urban Housing took note of the growth in the "ring" areas of the SMSA's, the areas surrounding the central cities of metropolitan areas but within the SMSA's:

> About one-quarter of the U.S. population lived in these ring areas in 1950; about 40 percent will live in them in 1978. In that period the population of these areas will increase from 36 million to over 90 million persons. In the mid 1960's the total population of all the rings first exceeded the total population of all the central cities they surround. By 1978, the rings will hold 50 percent more people than do the central cities.[8]

5. Glenn H. Beyer, Housing and Society (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 364.

6. Ibid., p. 379 (Table 11-1).

7. Walter T. Martin, The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location (Eugene, Oregon: University Press, 1953), p. 3.

8. A Decent Home, Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, Edgar F. Kaiser, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 136.

It appears that population pressures on the urban-rural fringe areas will remain high in the coming years. The extent of this pressure was brought out by the National Commission on Urban Problems in its report of 1968:

> Over the next 30 years 18 million acres of land will come into urban use for the first time. This is about the size of all the urbanized land within the SMSA's right now. Between now and the year 2000, nearly all metropolitan area population growth, some 80 million people will occur in the suburbs, which will use that next 18 million acres. We have come this far in our urban civilization in a haphazard way and the results surround us. We cannot afford to let our future urban growth occur the same way.[9]

Not only is a physical change being brought to these previously rural areas, but also a complex of different social, economic and cultural values and needs is introduced. Planners share the concern, expressed so clearly by the National Commission on Urban Problems, over an unorderly and haphazard sprawl, inconsistent and incompatible land uses and noticeable inadequacy of facilities. In many cases the haphazard growth occurs because the local government is not ready to handle the influx of population and all its concomitants. Tax losses and higher costs of facilities are a matter of grave concern to the city government because of the expansion taking place outside its limits, but the lower taxes, greater flexibility offered by lack or absence of various restrictions and controls on development of new subdivisions and larger profits attract the developer to these areas.

---

9. U.S. Congress, House, Building the American City, Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Congress and to the President of the United States, Paul H. Douglas, Chairman, House Doc. 91-34, 91st Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 20.

A vast amount of literature exists on suburbs and on rural and urban communities, but less on the urban-rural fringe areas per se. Although a considerable amount of work relating to various facets of the development of urban-rural fringe areas has accumulated over the past two decades or so, several potential areas of research remain to be explored and consolidated. Differences of opinion exist, even on the fundamentals, ranging from the definition of urban-rural fringe areas and the demographic characteristics of their populations to the amount of participation in social and institutional life by the new and oldtime residents of these areas. In fact, as Martin pointed out, observers have used such descriptive terms for the fringe areas as "an institutional desert, a 'marginal area,' a 'twilight zone,' a 'dead center' characterized by 'pathological conditions,' 'shifting land values,' 'variability and instability,' 'capriciousness and diseconomy' in land use patterns."[10]

Conflicting attitudes and reactions as to the present and future needs of these rapidly growing communities may arise from differences in background, socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle of the rural- and urban-oriented residents. The reaction assumes greater importance in fringe areas since it arises from a situation in which a large number of urban families and their life style has impinged upon previously rural areas. Some of the important areas of change and adjustment in these rapidly growing communities are reflected in the

---

10. Walter T. Martin, "A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents," American Sociological Review, XVII (Dec. 1952), 687.

patterns of social interaction and institutional participation of local residents, attitudes of residents towards each other and toward general conditions of life in the fringe areas, as well as the extent of satisfaction from living in these areas.

This study aims at an analysis of the social impact of the new residents who have moved primarily from urban areas to the newly built subdivisions in rural areas beyond the suburbs, thus bringing the urban life style to the doorsteps of the rural areas. Besides testing a number of hypotheses developed for this study, some of the findings of previous studies were also tested. Various indexes were developed for measuring the phenomena to be studied. Some of the important considerations in this study were the experimental nature of the project, a recognition of the fact that not all fringe areas are at the same level of development, and that differences in the characteristics of fringe residents could be a significant factor in the process of adjustment to fringe residence.

Two fringe areas (Parma and Clarence) with high growth rates in the metropolitan areas of Rochester and Buffalo, respectively, were selected initially for the study in 1964. Another area of rapid growth (Camillus) from the Syracuse metropolitan area was included in the study in 1965. Parma (Rochester) was in an early stage of development, while Clarence (Buffalo) was in an intermediate or near advanced stage, and Camillus (Syracuse) in an advanced stage of development in terms of the degree of urbanization.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II deals with the concept and definition of the urban-rural fringe area, and examines the available literature pertinent to urban-rural fringe areas. The hypotheses and findings of previous studies along with the sets of hypotheses regarding various areas of investigation covered in our study are also discussed in this chapter.

Chapter III, on methodology, gives the details regarding selection of the sample and sampling technique, the field operations, the statistical analysis and major variables and indexes used in the analysis.

Chapters IV, V and VI, respectively, dealing with Parma, Clarence and Camillus are identical in format. The first part of each chapter treats certain characteristics of the fringe population, socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle. This has been done to facilitate comparison of data among the three areas. The analysis in the second part of these chapters tests the relationships, respectively, among length of residence in community orientation (rural or urban), socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and each of the variables of social interaction, institutional participation, attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe areas, and the extent of anomie.

Chapter VII combines the analysis of a number of hypotheses put to test in the three fringe areas and thereby provides further comparison on the basis of level of development of these areas.

A summary and conclusions of the study are presented in Chapter VIII.

Chapter II

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

The concept of urban-rural fringe is used in this study to imply an urban expansion cutting into the rural areas. In this chapter we take note of the origin and development of the concept and the criticisms leveled at various definitions of this concept.

The Concept of Urban-Rural Fringe: Historical Development and Criticism

A review of previous studies brings attention to the fact that the concept of urban-rural fringe still lacks sharpness and there seems to be little agreement with respect to its boundaries.[1]

According to Blizzard, it was T. Lynn Smith who used the term "urban fringe" for the first time in 1937 to denote the "built up area just outside of the corporate limits of the city," followed by J. D. Black who used the term "city's fringe" in 1939.[2] In 1940, George S. Wehrwein, a land economist, defined the fringe as "the territory between

1. Noel P. Gist and Sylvia Fleis Fava, Urban Society, 5th ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1964), p. 196.

2. Samuel W. Blizzard, "Discussion," Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), p. 118.

well established urban [land] uses and farming" in his article, "Land Classification for Rural Zoning."[3]

Firey, in his article on "Ecological Considerations in Planning for Rurban Fringes" (1946), did not define the rurban fringe per se, but he maintained that "from the standpoint of ecological theory the rurban fringe may be viewed as a marginal area . . . [due to its] marginality between alternative types of utilization."[4] According to Queen and Carpenter, Firey designated the "rurban fringe" as "those areas immediately beyond the built-up city."[5] Kurtz and Eicher agreed with this interpretation and added that "Firey does not provide an explicit definition of the fringe area but he implies that any type of subdivision outside the city limits could be considered the fringe."[6]

In his Michigan study Beegle defined the fringe are as "including all townships surrounding a given center which has 50 percent or more non-village rural-nonfarm residents."[7] Kurtz and Eicher's comments on

3. Walter C. McKain, Jr., and Robert G. Burnight, "The Sociological Significance of the Rural-Urban Fringe: From the Rural Point of View," Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), p. 109.

4. Walter Firey, "Ecological Considerations in Planning for Rurban Fringes," American Sociological Review, XI (August 1946), p. 411.

5. Stuart A. Queen and David B. Carpenter, "The Sociological Significance of the Rural-Urban Fringe: From the Urban Point of View," Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), p. 103.

6. Richard A. Kurtz and Joanne B. Eicher, "Fringe and Suburb: A Confusion of Concepts," Social Forces, XXXVII (October 1958), p. 33.

7. J. A. Beegle, "Characteristics of Michigan's Fringe Population," Rural Sociology, XII, No. 3 (1947), p. 255.

Beagle's definition are as follows:

> The fringe was operationally defined by Beegle as the residual area which remains after eliminating the census categories of urban, rural-farm, and incorporated village. This derived census category is referred to as non-village, rural-nonfarm'. . . . Townships in which fifty percent or more of the residents are non-village rural non-farmers are designated by Beegle as 'fringe townships'. . . .
>
> A major difficulty . . . stems from . . . reliance upon census criteria for definition purposes--this technique implicitly assumes that political boundaries coincide with social boundaries . . . subtraction of urbanized area data from standard metropolitan area data leave a residual which is composed partially of specific homogenous rural and urban characteristics.[8]

A definition of the term "urban fringe" was given in the 1950 Census of Population "to denote all territory within urbanized areas but outside their central cities."[9] The components of urbanized areas are explained in the Census as follows:

> The census definition of a place as a concentration of population, which may be independent of legal limits, implies the possibility that a place or a city may be defined in terms of the entire area of continuous concentrated settlement rather than the area defined by corporate limits. Under this definition a place or physical city includes not only the principal incorporated area or areas but also adjacent suburban and satellite areas. . . . To isolate the suburban and satellite areas, an urbanized area is divided into its central city or cities and urban fringe as indicated in the formal definitions.[10]

According to McKain and Burnight, Anderson proposed an ". . . automobile reconnaissance method of delineating the fringe, which in practice

8. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., p. 34.

9. Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Suburbs and Urgan Fringe," in The Suburban Community, ed. by William M. Dobriner (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958), p. 46.

10. Ibid., p. 66.

has its limits at the points of agricultural predominance in land uses."[11]

Gist made a distinction between moving to the suburbs which has been occurring since the early 1900's and the recent phenomenon of moving to the open country "while retaining their occupational and other connections with the urban community."[12] Gist maintained that this recent trend had not replaced the traditional one, it was rather "an extension of the march to the suburbs." Kurtz and Eicher describe this distinction as such that "the fringe is an open country area in which urban-employed individuals reside. . . . The suburb is the traditional cluster of suburban homes."[13]

Queen and Carpenter used the 1950 Census definitions of urbanized area and standard metropolitan area to derive a definition of the fringe area. For the purpose of their study they defined the term rural-urban fringe as "that area within the standard metropolitan area which is outside the urbanized area."[14] They considered the addition of the term "urbanized areas" by the Bureau of Census as an important one.

> For the first time we have a definition of the city which conforms closely to the actual boundaries of the thickly settled territory of closely spaced street pattern. We have, too, a realistic inner boundary of the rural-urban fringe, comparable from city to city. The standard metropolitan area provides us a less dependable outer boundary of the fringe, erratically influenced as it is by county boundaries. Yet no better alternative is available.[15]

---

11. McKain and Burnight, op. cit., p. 109.

12. Noel P. Gist, "Ecological Decentralization and Rural-Urban Relationships," Rural Sociology, XVII, No. 4 (December, 1952), p. 328.

13. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., p. 34.

14. Queen and Carpenter, op. cit., p. 104.

15. Ibid., pp. 104-105.

Kurtz and Eicher maintained that "operationally, the fringe area data are obtained by subtracting urbanized area data from standard metropolitan area data."[16] This had the same limitation as that pointed out by them with respect to Beegle's 1947 study of the population characteristics of Michigan's fringe areas.

In their study of five townships (1953), McKain and Burnight took note of the ". . . 'spongy' character of the concept, its lack of sharpness, and the general lack of agreement among investigators about its definition."[17] They introduced two new terms, "the limited fringe and the extended fringe." This was viewed by Kurtz and Eicher as:

> . . . a contribution to a conceptual clarification by differentiating between the built-up area on the periphery of the city and the built-up area in the agricultural hinterland. . . . The former residence pattern is referred to as 'limited fringe' and the latter pattern of settlement is designated the 'extended fringe.'[18]

The introduction of new terms and the lack of clarification of the concept by McKain and Burnight, however, was criticized by Blizzard in these words:

> Perhaps the most disappointing aspect of the paper, from the discussant's point of view, is the way in which the authors have by-passed the basic question of conceptualization and methodology for delineation. Their suggestions . . . are helpful . . . insofar as they clarify for us the schizophrenic use of the term fringe. . . . From the point of view of conceptualization, however, they are neither as definitive nor as concrete as one would hope. . . . Particularly, the term limited fringe is not meaningful unless it is operationally defined.[19]

16. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., p. 34.

17. McKain and Burnight, op. cit., p. 110.

18. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., p. 34.

19. Blizzard, op. cit., pp. 118-19.

According to Blizzard, the rural-urban fringe has usually been "designated as that area of mixed urban and rural land uses between the point where full city services cease to be available and the point where agricultural land uses predominate."[20] He suggests that in order to study the transitional nature of the fringe:

> . . . a more meaningful conception might be to scale the various fringe developments on an immaturity-maturity continuum. . . . One aspect of this is in the matter of political organization. The fact that a fringe area is, or is not, politically organized, aside from the rural township and county government, is an index of its evolving maturity. The governmental structure of a suburban town may be a symbol of its political maturity; the presence of a rural township form of government in a growing fringe area may indicate political immaturity.[21]

According to Kurtz and Eicher, Jaco and Belknap presented "one of the broadest definitions of the fringe," as it "includes suburbs, satellite cities, and any other territory located immediately outside central cities whose labor force is engaged in non-farm activities."[22] This definition, therefore, does not help much in delineating specific settlement patterns. They remark that:

> More importantly, such a definition leads to confusion since areas such as suburbs and satellite cities are characterised as homogeneous with the fringe. This . . . confusion is illustrated in the following statement by Jaco and Belknap: 'if one follows the clues suggested by current urban population and economic trends in the light of what is already known about the modern suburban family a number of inferences on on the structure of the fringe family becomes possible.'[23]

20. Ibid., p. 118.

21. Ibid.

22. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., p. 33.

23. Ibid.

Martin took note of the rapid growth rates of the unincorporated countryside, and said "it is to this unincorporated countryside interlaced with motor roads and inhabited mainly by former urban dwellers that we apply the term 'rural-urban fringe.'"[24] In other words, he said, the rural-urban fringe was ". . . that area of interpenetrating rural and urban land uses peripheral to the modern city. . . ."[25] Beyer pointed out that Martin's definition of fringe was different from that of the U.S. Census, and that "Martin's concept is far less inclusive and reflects the more general usage of the term."[26]

Duncan and Reiss described the 1950 Census definition of "urban fringe" as:

> . . . poorly chosen, because the term 'fringe' has been applied heretofore to areas of mixed urban and rural types of settlement on the periphery of the well built-up urban area. But the 'urban fringe' as defined in 1950 contains incorporated places as large as 250,000 and nearly half of the 'urban fringe' population (48.7 percent) resides in incorporated places of 10,000 or more, i.e. places generally designated as suburbs in previous research.[27]

In their comparison of the suburbs and urban fringe, Duncan and Reiss used the term "urban fringe" to denote ". . . the non-suburgan population of the territory in urbanized areas outside central cities.

---

24. Walter T. Martin, The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location (Eugene, Oregon: University Press, 1953), p. 3.

25. Ibid., p. iii.

26. Glenn H. Beyer, Housing and Society (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 359.

27. Duncan and Reiss, op. cit., p. 46.

Thus the urbanized area is conceived as having three components, central city or cities, suburbs, and urban fringe."[28] The different meaning given this term from that in the Census was justified by them on the grounds that:

> . . . first, . . . the Bureau of the Census terminology is inconsistent with an already established usage; second, that it was necessary to make a distinction (between suburbs and fringe) not explicitly recognized in census categories; and third, that no suitable alternative term is available.[29]

The term "suburb" as used by most writers, according to Duncan and Reiss:

> . . . appears to denote an urban place (usually an incorporated place) outside the corporate limits of a large city, but either adjacent thereto or near enough to be closely integrated into the economic life of the central city and within commuting distance of it. The criterion distinguishing a suburb from another territory on the city's periphery but within its corporate limits is, therefore, not economic, or ecological, but political. . . .
>
> In accordance with the conception of the suburb . . . many research workers have considered as suburbs those urban places which are within the limits of the metropolitan district but outside the central city or cities.[30]

Kurtz and Eicher utilized the criteria of location, land characteristics, growth and density, occupation, and governmental structure to arrive at their "summary definition" of the fringe area as a:

> . . . location beyond the limits of the legal city, in the legal city, in the 'agricultural hinterland,' exhibiting characteristics of mixed land use, with no

28. Ibid., p. 47.

29. Ibid., p. 65.

30. Ibid., p. 45.

> consistent pattern of farm and nonfarm dwellings. The residents are involved in rural and urban occupations. The area is unincorporated, relatively lax zoning regulations exist, and few, if any, municipal services are provided. The area shows potentialities for population growth and increasing density ratios. Present density ratios are intermediate between urgan and rural.[31]

Thompson noted the usual locational connotation of the concept of rural-urban fringe with its characteristics of mixed land uses and occupations, and taking into account the definition suggested by Kurtz and Eicher (1958) he termed the urban fringe as ". . . the edge of creeping urbanism."[32] Commenting on the definition of Kurtz and Eicher, he stated:

> There are many advantages to an omnibus definition of this sort, and perhaps it should remain inviolate. Among other things . . . it brings to a single focus the interests and competence of a wide variety of disciplines. . . .
>
> For my own purposes, however, it seems less useful to focus on location and somewhat more useful to consider the basis process which characterizes such areas, namely, rapid growth. . . .[33]

Noting the problem of defining the urban fringe, Thompson further observed that "the variables are continuous rather than discreet. In most dimensions, the problem of urban fringe cannot be cut off from development in general, therefore, need to refine the problem in terms of high growth areas."[34]

---

31. Kurtz and Eicher, op. cit., pp. 36-37.

32. Wayne E. Thompson, "The Urban Fringe: First Thoughts on Sociological Perspectives," Problems of America's Expanding Metropolitan Fringe Areas. Report of Conference Held at Cornell University June 15-16, 1961, Ithaca, New York, p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid., "Minutes of the Conference," p. 3.

It is quite apparent from the aforementioned definitions of the concept rural-urban fringe or, simply, fringe that researchers have offered, or not offered at all, definitions according to the needs and context of their studies. Duncan and Reiss took note of the 1950 Census definition of the term "urban fringe" and of the fact that no "official definition" of the concept of "suburb" existed.[35] This was considered by them as one possible reason for the lack of standardization of the concept, as the opposite was true in case of such concepts as "urban" and "rural."

This situation has drawn the attention of researchers only recently. The first significant attempt to systematize and clarify the knowledge on the rural-urban fringe seems to have been made in September, 1952 by the joint session of the American Sociological Society and the Rural Sociological Society held at Atlantic City, New Jersey. Two papers were presented on the "Sociological Significance of the Rural-Urban fringe." The "Urban Point of View" was presented by Queen and Carpenter, and the "Rural Point of View" was presented by McKain and Burnight. Charles E. Lively, in his introduction to these presentations, noted that:

> It is the aim of these papers to explore the nature of the 'fringe' in the light of what is known, and to suggest, if possible, plausible hypotheses for investigation. . . . It would appear that at this stage three hypotheses are possible: (1) The rural-urban fringe represents a position on a continuum within a single rural-urban distribution. (2) The rural-urban fringe represents an overlapping of two distinct distributions--the rural and the urban--providing a scrambled confusion

35. Duncan and Reiss, op. cit., p. 45.

> within the area of overlap. (3) The rural-urban fringe represents a third distribution with some characteristics of both the rural and the urban, but with some new ones found only in the 'fringe.'[36]

In the present study we have tended to view the fringe in terms of a continuum from rural to urban as in (1) above. There surely are unique factors in the fringe that do not appear elsewhere.

McKain and Burnight reported that of "some thirty studies" which used the term rural-urban fringe, ". . . in most instances only a feeble attempt or no attempt at all, was made to define the term."[37] However, they pointed out that one or more of four elements were generally found in the definitions of those studies which did attempt at it. These elements of rural-urban fringe were:

> (1) . . . there are both urban and rural uses of land. . . . (2). . . there is a mingling of people--some of whom work in, and are oriented toward, agriculture--while at the same time the remainder pursue urban occupations and an urban way of life. . . . (3) The fringe is a geographic area with its bounds often arbitrarily determined by gradation in the concentration of the land use and the demographic characteristics attributed to it. . . . (4) . . . the transitional character of the rural-urban fringe and . . . the abnormal or problem nature of the area. . . .[38]

Martin lists an "inventory of findings and shortcomings" of previous literature related "directly or indirectly" to the rural-urban fringe. One of the "five persistent shortcomings," according to him is the "absence of comparable study areas."[39] Noting the previous practice

36. Charles E. Lively, "Introduction" to Queen and Carpenter, op. cit., p. 101.

37. McKain, Jr., and Burnight, op cit., p. 109.

38. Ibid.

39. Martin, op. cit., p. 5. A discussion follows on pp. 6-13.

of individual researchers to define the fringe areas according to their own criteria, Martin welcomed the 1950 Census redefinitions of urban areas and introduction of the term urban-fringe. This, he thought, could minimize the critical problem of area delimitation in rural-urban fringe research.

Ford and Sutton reviewed some twenty-six community studies and twelve fringe area studies.[40] This study, covering the period 1950-61, was a major concerted effort to review the literature and examine the concept of "fringe." They noted that ". . . if there was consensus on what the fringe is, there was considerable variation in the methods used to delineate its boundaries."[41] The grounds of consistency, in their opinion, arose from the use of location and land use criteria rather than social relationships.

It appears that the ambiguity of the concept has been perpetuated, in part, because very little effort has been made to distinguish between the physical and nonphysical attributes of the fringe area. Most of the definitions rely on the former as a criterion of delineation. In others the mixing of the two has added to the confusion. Land characteristics, and growth and density are the physical manifestations of the fringe area which emanate from nonphysical forces. The governmental structure seems to be one of the more important nonphysical forces which determines, to a great extent, the way a fringe area is developed.

---

40. Thomas R. Ford and Willis A. Sutton, Jr., "The Impact of Change on Rural Communities and Fringe Areas: Review of a Decade's Research," in Our Changing Rural Society: Perspective and Trends, ed. by James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964), pp. 198-229.

41. Ibid., p. 200.

Firey had called the "rurban fringe" a marginal area because of its degree of accessibility (independent variable) and social utility (dependent variable). In his words:

> . . . the rurban fringe is a marginal land-use area, not because of its geographic location, its soil type, or its topography, but rather because of its particular degree of accessibility (relative to that of other land uses) to some central transportation.[42]

According to Queen and Carpenter, Firey's thesis is that "slums appear where alternative and conflicting land uses produce equal rent and social utility. At such points, land becomes indifferently suited to either of two alternative land uses. As a result, land uses interpenetrate."[43] It seems, however, that Firey did not bring out the real cause which renders a particular location susceptible to "alternative and conflicting land uses." This state of marginality in the fringe areas probably arises more from lack of proper control than any other reason.

Looking at the criteria used by different researchers and criticism offered of the official definition of urban fringe, it appears that this particular definition has not been of much help in clarifying the concept.

For our purposes, the term urban-rural fringe implies that peripheral area of high population growth, within the boundaries of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, which exhibits both mixed rural and urban land uses and a noticeable quantity of new nonfarm residential buildings,

42. Firey, op. cit., p. 411.

43. Queen and Carpenter, op. cit., p. 103.

and is located beyond the fully developed suburbs lying contiguous to the central city. That is to say that one must "leapfrog" beyond the suburbs to reach the fringe areas. Some other criteria applied in selecting fringe areas for our study are discussed in the chapter on Methodology. It may be added that it was considered quite possible that community facilities in the fringe areas might not be adequate in quantity or quality, in terms of meeting the demands of a growing population, and therefore they might vary in terms of their level of development. This fact was taken into consideration while selecting our study areas.

Previous Studies and Their Major Findings

The nature of studies undertaken in the fringe area, however defined, during the last three decades has varied with the researcher's interests concerning the physical or nonphysical attributes of the fringe areas. A typology of studies could be based upon either of the above criteria or on their analytical level.

Ford and Sutton established four analytical categories in their review of thirty-eight studies of rural communities and of rural-urban fringe areas which were published between 1950-1961. These categories were:

1. Descriptive--studies primarily concerned with the description of conditions, characteristics, or situations with little effort made to relate changes to other general or specific factors.

2. General analytic--studies in which changes in phenomena under observation were explicitly related to general conditions (such as technological change) either within or outside the study area.

3. Specific analytic--studies in which changes in phenomena under observation were related to other specific factors such as migration or the location of an industry in the community.

4. Formal analytic--studies in which formal hypotheses were stated and tested.[44]

They further observed that about 250 sets of relationships were employed in these thirty-eight studies, of which ". . . approximately a fourth involved, on one side of the relational equation, 'general changes' either in the local or nearby environmental situation. . . ."[45] In order of their frequency of use, the specific variables were classified by them into the following order:

> (a) sustenance methods involving either the economic base or technology; (b) population; (c) transportation and communication; and (d) social organization and relationships. In fringe area studies population was the most common independent variable, occurring in about half of the relationships identified. . . . The most common dependent variables were population, land use, and economic institutions.[46]

None of the fringe area studies was found to have concerned itself primarily with the process of change. They found that:

> . . . three fringe studies dealt with the social effects of a particular variable or set of variables (usually population size and composition). A few . . . were concerned with the effects of particular mediating variables; e.g., length of residence on attitudes regarding the de-

44. Ford and Sutton, op. cit., p. 201.

45. Ibid., p. 202.

46. Ibid.

> sirability of the fringe as a place to live, or place of residence as a factor influencing participation.[47]

The following is a brief review of some of the studies which have greater pertinence to the analytical content of our study.[48] Those studies which have dealt with the extent and intensity of social interaction, institutional participation, some aspects of satisfaction with fringe residence, anomie and characteristics of the fringe population are considered to have greater pertinence to the analysis undertaken in the following chapters.

Rodehaver[49] established that the movement to the rura-urban fringe was two-directional, involving both rural and urban population, and that this movement took place for different reasons for the two types. The differences in family size, length of residence, occupation and education of the head of the family did not exhibit significant differences between the two. However, significant differences were found regarding family life cycle stage at which the move was made, the age of the head and income of the family. Families from rural areas had moved to the fringe later in the family life cycle (family heads were older), had an average family income substantially lower than that of the famili

47. Ibid., pp. 203-204.

48. Some good critiques of previous studies may be found in Myles William Rodehaver, "The Rural-Urban Fringe: An nterstitial Area, A Study of the Transitional Area Surrounding the Urban Center of Madison, Wisconsin" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1946), pp. 19-28; Martin, The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location, pp. 5-13, and Ford and Sutton, op. cit., pp. 198-224, passim.

49. Ibid., and Myles W. Rodehaver, "Fringe Settlement as a Two-Directional Movement," Rural Sociology, XII, No. 3 (1947), pp. 49-57.

which had moved from urban areas. Differences were also found in the extent and intensity of organizational and political participation: those who had moved from rural places belonged to fewer organizations and had a lower frequency of attending meetings than those who had moved from urban places. This could probably be attributed to the lower economic status and later period in the family cycle when the move was made. According to Rodehaver, "in any event, the families in the rural category appear to be less a part of the 'community' than is the case for the urban contingent."[50]

In his study of the rural-urban fringe area of the Eugene-Springfield SMSA in Oregon, Martin[51] tested sets of hypotheses under two classifications which he termed as the "hypothesis of accessibility" and the "hypothesis of socio-cultural influences." As stated by Martin,[52] the main purpose of the study was to find answers to such questions as the process of residence selection, the preferences, costs and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the final selection. The fringe population was considered a dynamic mass "seeking to adjust to a habitat that is

50. Rodehaver, "Two-Directional Movement," p. 57.

51. Martin, op. cit., and Walter T. Martin, "A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents," American Sociological Review, XVII (December 1952), pp. 687-94; Walter T. Martin, "Some Socio-psychological Aspects of Adjustment to Residence Location in the Rural-Urban Fringe," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June 1953), pp. 248-53; Walter T. Martin, "The Structuring of Social Relationships Engendered by Suburban Residence," American Sociological Review, XXI (August 1956), pp. 446-53.

52. Martin, The Rural-Urban Fringe, pp. iii-iv.

rural yet urban, by techniques which are neither rural nor urban." They are integrated with the city from an occupational standpoint, but "as social beings, as families, they are not of the city." He believed that due to the high mobility rates and the "accompanying process of selection, adjustment, and readjustment, there must be in the population a wide range of reactions to life in the fringe." Acknowledging that the answers were "far from conclusive," the study (conducted in 1949) probed the following questions: How do families adjust to life in the fringe? What are the problems, the frustrations, and the satisfactions of fringe residence location? What are the characteristics of those individuals highly favorable to fringe location as contrasted with those who yearn for urban residences?[53]

Some of the general conclusions reported by Martin[54] were:

(1) The fringe population indicated relationships between extent of formal social participation and socioeconomic status, length of residence in the community, and location of previous residence.

(2) The extent of social participation was not influenced by the location in the city of the job of the head of the family or of the family most frequently visited, but the location of organizations did influence the extent of participation.

(3) Accessibility of the city was not an important factor in the extent of formal participation.

(4) Factors which were significantly related to the extent of

---

53. Ibid.

54. Martin, "Formal Associational Activities," pp. 693-94.

participation were likely to be so with respect to location of activities. The extent and location were significantly related.

(5) Adjustment to fringe residence was not significantly related to the extent of formal social participation or location of the associations.

It may be added that the only indicator of informal association was the question on the location of family most frequently visited. Formal social participation indicated "membership and attendant activities in formally organized associations such as clubs, lodges, union locals, and other groupings with membership qualification, dues and a regular meeting date."[55]

Among the findings on the social-psychological aspects of adjustment to the fringe residence, those of interest to us were that previous place of residence was associated with attitude toward fringe residence; females, the young and the elderly were less satisfied with fringe residence than males, and those in their thirties and forties; and the attitude of females, but not of males, tended to vary with the socioeconomic status.[56] Martin observed that his findings were "not completely free of discrepancies and inconsistencies. . . ."[57]

Gist did a study of the open country residents of Columbia, Missouri and reported his findings on their ties with the city of Columbia, participation in organized groups, unorganized social activities, visiting

55. Ibid., p. 687.

56. Martin, "Adjustment to Residence Location," p. 252.

57. Ibid.

patterns and collective undertakings, and their attitude toward open country life.[58] He categorized and compared the above factors for those families that had moved out of Columbia into the open country ("decentralized families") and those that had always lived in the area or had moved in from other places ("nondecentralized families"). Suggesting that urban employment and rural residence was likely to influence their social patterns and that it could involve an increasing urbanization of the rural setting, he posed questions of whether or not their social ties were still city oriented and whether or not they were satisfied with their "country-style living." For the purposes of comparison, indices were developed to determine the extent, location, and frequency of the aforementioned activities.

Gist reported that the decentralized families had much closer affiliations with city groups than nondecentralized families; that both types of families depended heavily upon the central city for recreation and for particular types of social participation; that the former type of families visited their friends and relatives in the city more than in the country while the opposite was true in the case of nondecentralized families, and that a similar trend was found with regard to collective activities; and finally, that generally the response was of "overwhelming satisfaction toward open-country residence as a way of life" among both types of families.

Queen and Carpenter analyzed the nature of the rural-urban fringes

58. Noel P. Gist, "Ecological Decentralization and Rural-Urban Relationships," Rural Sociology, XVII, No. 4 (1952), pp. 328-35.

of seven standard metropolitan areas from the 1950 Census of Population.[59] They criticized the gradient principle supported by McKenzie, Brunner, Kolb, Bogue and others who suggested that both rural and urban types of resident lived in the fringe areas. Queen and Carpenter argued that urban and rural communities could be treated "as ideal types which represent extremes of a continuum along which actual human communities may be arrayed. . . ."[60] Thus, they hypothesized that "as human communities range themselves along this rural-urban continuum, consistent variations occur in patterns of behavior and social structure . . ." and that with the help of scales or indexes it would be possible to assess the relationship between characteristics of a community and the patterns of social relationship.[61]

By comparing a large number of selected characteristics of the residents of the urbanized areas and the fringe areas, they concluded that "the fringe areas clearly display both an intermediate position between urban and rural characteristics and a lower socioeconomic status than the city."[62] By the use of "a simple index of urbanization" they lent support to their hypothesis of "intermediate status of the fringe on the rural-urban continuum. . . ."[63]

McKain and Burnight reported on a study of five townships, located

59. Queen and Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 102-108.

60. Ibid., p. 102.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid., p. 107.

63. Ibid., p. 108.

in areas defined by them as the "extended rural-urban fringe."[64] They suggested that the extended fringe areas were more likely to be a manageable unit to study as a complete community undergoing a particular process of change. They observed that the interacting population groups in these areas were "usually drawn from the same general cultural backgrounds," and that though the people with "urban interests and city customs . . . may differ in some ways from rural people . . . basically they subscribe to a common value system."[65] The preliminary findings of the study which aimed at describing "the influx of newcomers and to analyze some of the social processes," suggested that almost all newcomers had urban backgrounds and interests, and maintained some urban contacts; most of them had moved out from the city and were still employed there. The authors noted that they were developing an acceptance-rating scale to determine the degree to which an urban newcomer, as an individual or a family, is "admitted to the formal and informal groups of (1) other urban newcomers, and (2) the old timers."[65] The means by which the newcomer might try for acceptance were stated as voting, participation in town meetings and in other organizations, e.g., the P.T.A. or a church, and a host of other methods.

Kurtz and Smith reported their findings on social life in the rural-urban fringe area surrounding Lansing, Michigan.[67] They observed

64. McKain and Burnight, op. cit., pp. 108-114.

65. Ibid., p. 112.

66. Ibid., p. 113.

67. Richard A. Kurtz and Joel Smith, "Social Life in the Rural-Urban Fringe," Rural Sociology, XXVI (March 1961), pp. 24-38.

that the possibility of detecting differences, if any, in the processes of adjustment and integration of the fringe residents had been obscured by the indiscriminate selection of both suburbs and fringe areas in previous studies. Secondly, fringe areas had been consistently described as "institutional deserts, lacking in organization, inhabited only by unintegrated isolates and disgruntled old-timers . . . as in but not of their residential areas."[68] Their study, therefore, examined the "fringe residents' identification and their behavior patterns or 'integration'" to determine to what extent these descriptions could be considered accurate.

They grouped the fringe residents into farmers and nonfarmers and compared them with respect to their demographic characteristics, their perceptions of the area, and the extent of social participation. They developed various indices to measure the extent of social participation and degrees of integration and identification among the two groups. The data suggested that "longtime, relatively stable respondents who have rural, non-Lansing backgrounds and who are committed to the area tend to participate in the Lansing fringe more frequently than sample members who exhibit converse characteristics."[69] The data also indicate a greater social interaction oriented toward the central city on part of those who had moved from the city. This implied that "part of the fringe may be viewed as an extension of the social city, as opposed to the legal city."[70]

68. Ibid., p. 25.

69. Ibid., p. 37.

70. Ibid., p. 38.

Beagle's study of the population characteristics of Michigan's fringe areas was, according to him, the first attempt at "a precise demographic description of the fringe dweller in relation to the urban and the farm resident."[71] By using the published census material he compared the aforementioned three populations with respect to the proportions of foreign-born, Negroes, age groups, males and females, and fertility. The fringe areas were found to have a comparatively larger proportion of foreign born and Negroes than the adjacent rural-farm areas, larger proportions of males than in the urban centers. These areas had "very large proportions of youth, small proportions of aged persons, and an intermediate proportion of productive-aged persons," and had "unusually high" birth rates, "often exceeding those of the adjacent farm areas."[72]

Reissman observed that many previous studies had clearly demonstrated "the existence of a positive relationship between social class position on the one hand, and the character and extent of leisure activity and social participation on the other."[73] A greater proportion of the higher class than the lower class belong to one or more and of greater variety of organizations; more of the former than the latter hold an office; church attendance is more frequent among the former than the latter; the lower class individual has fewer intimate friends, does less visiting with friends and tends to limit his social interaction more to his im-

71. Beagle, op. cit., p. 255.

72. Ibid., pp. 262-63.

73. Leonard Reissman, "Class, Leisure, and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, XIX (February 1954), pp. 76-84.

mediate family than does the higher class individual. By testing the relationships between leisure and social participation and the individual variables of income, occupation and education he found that "regardless of the variable used to measure class position--occupation, income or education--the higher class shows a higher degree of participation and involvement in the community."[74] Therefore, class differences between sub-groups of the fringe population may explain differences in level of participation.

Bell and Force analyzed participation in formal associations in four neighborhoods of San Francisco, two of which scored low and two high on an index of economic status of the area.[75] They based their analysis on the notions that the major social roles of an individual (e.g., economic, family and ethnic status, age, sex and his future personal aspirations)" regulate the amount and nature of his participation in society" and, secondly, that the social type of his neighborhood "is an efficient indicator of his social participation."[76] The amount of participation in each neighborhood was measured by the number of formal group memberships, attendance at formal group meetings and office holding in formal associations. The individual and neighborhood characteristics analyzed were: education, occupation and income, family characteristics and age differences.

74. Ibid., p. 83.

75. Wendell Bell and Maryanne T. Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, XXI (August 1956), pp. 25-34.

76. Ibid., p. 26.

They found that in spite of the differences in the economic status of the four neighborhoods, membership in at least one organization was widespread, though more people living in high status neighborhoods belonged to a greater number of associations, attended meetings more frequently and held an office more often than those living in low status neighborhoods. They also found that generally individuals of higher socio-economic status in neighborhoods with similar status indicated greater participation than those of lower status individuals in neighborhoods of similar status. Their data also suggested that an individual's economic status and age influenced the intensity of participation in associational activities.

Major Areas Covered and Variables Tested in This Study

The foregoing review sets forth a general framework in which to hypothesize and analyze relationships between various variables in order to clarify, consolidate, and add to an understanding of the urban-rural fringe. As noted in the preceding section, the major areas covered in this study are related to certain selected characteristics of the fringe residents, social interaction and institutional participation, attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe area, and anomie. Each of these substantive areas are analyzed in the context of three levels of develop ment as represented by the three study areas, Parma, Clarence and Camillus. These represent points along a continuum of fringe development from an early stage in Parma to an advanced stage in Camillus.

The following is a listing of the key sets of variables analyzed in each of these fringe areas.

Population Characteristics

Residence-orientation typology: Fringe residents were grouped into four types depending upon their rural or urban orientation and their length of residence in the area. Community orientation was determined from the type of community (1) in which head of the family worked, (2) and (3) in which the spouses were brought up, (4) and (5) in which relatives and friends are visited most frequently, (6) in which they lived before moving to the fringe area, and (7) the type of community preferred for residence if a move were required.

Socioeconomic status: Socioeconomic status was measured by using the standard component items of family income, education, and occupation of head of the family.

Stage in family life cycle: All families were grouped into three stages, namely families with children all under six years of age or families without children but the couple was under 35 years of age (early stage), families which had some children under six years of age or between six to seventeen years of age (middle stage), and older couples whose children, if still living with them, were all eighteen years of age or older (late stage).

Social Interaction

The variables included were the number of families known in the neighborhood, the amount of contact with other residents, frequency of visiting with relatives, friends and families in the neighborhood.

Institutional Participation

The variables included were the number of voluntary organizations in which the respondent held a membership, frequency of attending the meetings, number of organizations in which the respondent held an office, membership in church and frequency of attendance.

Attitude toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

The variables used as indicators of attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe area were the degree of satisfaction with living in the fringe area, head of the family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work, and respondent's attitude toward school and property taxes, the amount of residential mobility in a given period of time and anomie--an indicator of the potential for personal and social disorganization based on Srole's scale.

The relationships of stage in family life cycle and socioeconomic status with social interaction, institutional participation, attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe areas, past residential mobility and anomie are all dealt with in individual chapters three to six, respectively, of Parma, Clarence and Camillus. Sets of hypotheses and related analysis under appropriate headings are discussed in Chapter VII where data for the three fringe areas are analyzed together in order to focus upon the similarities and contrasts that might have implications for the different levels of development of the three areas.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the method of selecting the study areas, the sampling techniques used and the statistical tests applied to the data, and operational definitions of the major variables used.

Selection of Fringe Areas

A multistage process was utilized in the selection of fringe areas. As a first step it was decided to confine the study to metropolitan areas of upstate New York. The Metropolitan areas of Rochester, Buffalo and Syracuse were selected for the survey. Delineation of these areas was done by using the Bureau of Census definition of metropolitan areas. This was followed by designation of rapidly growing urban-rural fringe townships, located within these metropolitan areas. One such township near each city was chosen.

The growth rates recorded in the Census for the decade 1950 to 1960 were given major consideration in the selection of high growth rate areas. The figures for population growth of the three selected townships are given in Table 1. It can be seen from the growth rates of 1960 to 1964 that the growth rates of Clarence and Camillus were leveling off while Parma was still growing.

Table 1. Population Growth of the Selected Townships of Parma, Clarence and Camillus

Townships	Population			Percentage increase		
	1950	1960	1964	1950-60	1960-64	1950-64
Parma	4,049	6,277	8,350	55%	33%	106%
Clarence	6,331	13,267	15,731	110	19	148
Camillus	6,735	18,328	22,287	172	22	231

An effort was made to obtain the latest possible estimates on the building activity in these areas for the past 1960 period from town and state officials as well as those engaged in the construction industry in order to supplement the census data on population growth.

Some other major criteria which guided the selection of the study areas were the following:

(1) The three areas should exhibit variation in the level of community development. The three general indicators of level of development were: (a) the amount of new housing construction, (b) the amount of increase in population density, and (c) the amount of increase in public facilities and services.

(2) The areas should exhibit mixed rural and urban land uses and should be beyond the contiguous suburban developments of the central city.

(3) The areas should have a major central school district.

(4) The area should have an identifiable village or villages within the boundaries of its governmental unit in order to study farm, village and new development populations.

Three townships, namely, Parma (near Rochester), Clarence (near Buffalo), and Camillus (near Syracuse) were finally selected for the study as they met all these criteria.

The township of Parma was at an early stage (level) of development, and the new housing construction was interspersed with the older housing. Most of the new construction took place along the existing network of roads and very few new roads had been constructed to serve the new housing. On the other hand, the townships of Clarence and Camillus were more developed than Parma. In these two townships one could distinguish rather clearly between areas with little new construction and generally low density (farm and open country areas), and other areas with great deal of new construction and relatively higher density (the new subdivisions and older village or villages). Many new roads had been constructed and other utility lines laid to serve the new housing areas.

The boundaries of these townships were adjusted to coincide with those of the major central school district therein. Those areas of the townships which were in other school districts (usually small peripheral areas) were excluded from the sampling area. The adjusted boundaries, therefore, served as the geographic boundaries of the three areas.

Selection of the Sample and Sampling Technique

Detailed maps of the three townships were obtained in order to plot the sample. A complete listing of all dwelling units, with the following exceptions, was prepared by the field staff in order to have an up-to-date

sampling frame for each selected township. The exceptions were (a) units in multiple residences, (b) residence with business or commercial properties, (c) trailer homes, even though they be placed on permanent foundations, and (d) summer cottages or other units which were not year-round residences.

The address of each dwelling unit was recorded on a list which started with the house on the southwest corner and proceeded in a clockwise direction.

It was decided to interview, in each township, the wife of the head of the household living in a year-round, owner-occupied, single family dwelling unit located in the given school district of the township. If there was no male head, the unit was excluded from the sample list.

It can be seen from Table 2 that a total of 1395 dwelling units were listed in Parma, 2548 in Clarence (of which 85 percent were in built up areas and 15 percent in farm and open country areas), and 4997 in Camillus (of which 88 percent were in built up areas and 12 percent in farm and open country areas).

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of All Eligible Dwelling Units by Strata, Parma, Clarence and Camillus

Dwelling units listed	Parma	Clarence	Camillus
Built up areas	*	85%	88%
Farm and open country areas	*	15	12
Total	100% (1395)	100% (2548)	100% (4997)

*Not stratified

Sampling Method and Rate

Systematic sampling techniques were used in all areas to draw the sample. Since the population of Parma was not stratified into the built-up and farm/open country areas, a sampling rate of 10 percent was decided upon for the total population. However, sampling rates of 10 percent and 50 percent respectively were decided upon for the two strata in both Clarence and Camillus.

Starting from the second house on the listing, the sampling units were selected systematically from the listings by taking every eleventh house in the built up areas, and every other house in the farm and open country areas. Some revisions, however, were called for in the sampling rates in the later stages of the study, the reasons for which are discussed in the context of alternate selection of units in the following paragraphs.

Considering the limited time available for the completion of interviews in 1964, it was decided to utilize alternate dwelling units liberally rather than undertaking call backs to the originally designated units. In case of a noncontact with an originally designated unit, the interviewers were instructed to contact the next dwelling unit in sequence until they had obtained an interview.[1] This procedure was followed also in Camillus in 1965.

A considerable number of interviews with the alternates took place in the built up areas, but it was possible to interview the majority of the originally designated dwelling units in farm and open country areas.

1. The undesirability of such a procedure is recognized by the author but the data had already been gathered prior to his joining the project.

The percentages interviewed of all eligible units in the three communities are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Sampling Fractions Obtained From the Listed Units by Strata, Parma, Clarence and Camillus

Strata	Parma	Clarence	Camillus
Built up areas	*	9%	13%
Farm and open country areas	*	38	22
Total fraction %	11%	13%	14%
	(159)	(339)[a]	(716)
Total units listed	(1395)	(2548)	(4997)

a. Total number of interviews was 363 or 14.0 percent of the listed units but some schedules were discarded at the time of editing.
* Not stratified.

It can be seen from Table 3 that overall sampling rates of 11 percent in Parma, 13 percent in Clarence, and 14 percent in Camillus were obtained. In Clarence and Camillus the rates in farm and open country areas were 38 and 22 percent respectively, and 9 and 13 percent respectively in built up areas. Because of the differing sampling fractions, it was necessary to weight the two strata in Clarence and Camillus by inflating the built up stratum. Table 4 shows the weighted samples.

Table 4. Final Weighted Samples, Clarence and Camillus

Strata	Clarence	Camillus
Built up areas	810 (85%)	984 (88%)
Farm and open country areas	143 (15%)	134 (12%)
Total	953 (100)	1118 (100)

Interview Schedule Construction

The questions included in the final schedule, used in Parma and Clarence in 1964, after pretesting, covered certain demographic and economic characteristics, age of the house and its value, geographic mobility of residents, condition of the local institutions, local issues and the influence of various political and social groups, participation in social, political, religious and recreational activities, satisfaction with fringe residence, and prospects of a future residential move. The schedule constructed for Camillus in 1965 covered essentially the same areas as in Parma and Clarence. However, as a result of the 1964 experience, certain changes in sequence, dropping of or addition of some questions were carried out in the 1965 survey. Additional questions asked in Camillus related to availability of public water supply and sewage system, shopping facilities, voting pattern in the 1964 national elections, attitude towards neighborhood, and location of friends. These changes, however, were kept to the minimum in order to retain as high a comparability of data as possible.

However, the new information which was considered essential for the dimensions added to the schedule in the case of Camillus in 1965 could not be compared with Parma and Clarence, primarily the latter, as the relevant information was not part of the 1964 survey. This situation was alleviated to a great extent in 1966 when it was possible to secure more funds for revisiting the latter two communities. Not only was the needed information collected, a reappraisal of the local issues and their state

of settlement since our last visit was also made possible. Response to some of the previously open-ended questions was structured in the 1966 revist by selecting variety of statements made earlier by respondents.

Field Operations

The services of a commercial firm based in Rochester were secured for obtaining the interviews. The interviewers were provided a manual of instruction, prepared by the research staff of the project. Training sessions were also held for the interviewers.

In order to attract community interest, the aims and objects of this study were well publicized through the press and the radio. Interviewers were also given a letter of introduction from the project leader to further help them in obtaining an interview.

Analysis and Statistical Techniques

A total of five data cards were prepared for each respondent. However, for analysis reported here, selected information was transferred to three analysis decks.

Statistical analysis was accomplished by a cross tabulation program that calculates percentages and a number of statistics. The test of significance used in our analysis was Chi square. The measure of association used was Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma.

Major Variables and Indexes Used in the Analysis

Residence-Orientation Typology

A typology that formed the basis of our analysis was constructed based on (a) the community orientation (described below), and (b) the length of residence in the present community. The first of the two factors identified each family according to urban or rural orientation. The second distinguished between the residents who had lived in the community for a period of less than 10 years (referred to as new residents) and those who had lived there for a period of 10 years or more (referred to as old residents.

The four types of respondents under this typology were:

1. Rural oriented new residents
2. Urban oriented new residents
3. Rural oriented old residents
4. Urban oriented old residents

The term residence-orientation typology has also been referred to as simply resident typology, or types of respondent/resident in the text of this analysis.

Community Orientation

The following aspects of behavior were selected as indicators of a family's urban or rural orientation.

1. Type of community in which head of family worked.
2. Type of community in which head of family was brought up (up to age 18).

3. Type of community in which respondent (wife) was brought up (up to age 18).

4. Type of community in which relatives visited most frequently were located.

5. Type of community in which friends visited most frequently were located.

6. Type of community in which their previous residence was located.

7. Type of community preferred for residence if a move was required.

The five types of communities which could be checked in the seven orientation items according to their degree of urbanism and their respective score values are given below:

Type of community	Score value
Farm, open country	1
Nonfarm, open country	2
Village/town/a small or middle size city	3
Suburb of a large city or new subdivision outside the city	4
Large city	5

Each family was given a score for the degree of urbanism to which it was oriented under each of the seven aspects mentioned above. The scores for the degree of urban orientation could range from 1 to 5 for each item. Rather than calculate a total score an average score per item was obtained. The average item score was divided into two groups those averaging less than 3.0 were considered to have a rural orientation and those scoring 3.0 or higher were considered to have an urban orientation.

Length of Residence

Respondents were divided into two groups according to the length of time spent in their present community. All those who had lived in the community for less than ten years were placed in one group (new residents), and those who had lived in the community for more than ten years were placed in the other group (old residents).

Family Life Cycle

The life cycle of a nuclear family starts with the married couple without children and is completed with the dissolution of marriage by death or separation of some kind. Since by definition our sample included only those families which had both the spouses alive and living together, the last stage considered in our study was that of an older couple whose children had grown up and left home, or if there were some children still living with them they were all eighteen years of age or older.

The following were the stages of a family's life cycle as defined for this study based on age of wife and ages of children, if any.

Stage	Definition
Early	Family with no children, or all children under six years of age.
Middle	Family with children, under six years of age or between six to seventeen years of age
Late	Older couple; if with children, all eighteen years of age or older.

Socioeconomic Status

The method of calculating the socioeconomic status score of a family was adopted from the scoring system used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The score was based on the occupation, education, and income of the chief income recipient. These components are interrelated and an adequate index of socioeconomic status could be derived when they are combined together.[2] Various levels of income, education and types of occupation were assigned different scores by the Bureau. The socioeconomic status score was based on a simple average of the three component scores.[3]

The scores assigned to categories of the component factors derived by the Bureau were as follows:

> . . . The scores for education were obtained by computing a cumulative percentage distribution by education of chief income recipients in families. . . . (For example, persons who had completed five or more years of college were found to be distributed between the 96th and 100th percentiles.) The score assigned to each category of education was the midpoint of the cumulative percentage interval for the category. (For example, a score of 98 was assigned to persons who had completed five or more years of college.)[4]

The same method was used to obtain the income scores. The scores for occupations were obtained as follows:

> . . . The detailed occupations were scored according to the combined average levels of education and income

2. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Methodology and scores of socioeconomic status; working paper No. 15 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 1.

3. Ibid., p. 3.

4. Ibid., p. 4.

> for the given occupation. Thus, the score obtained is an average score for the occupation and it contributes an independent effect to the total socioeconomic score. . . .
>
> The occupational scores obtained by this procedure indicate the position of the average person in a given occupation, based on the education and income distributions for that occupation.[5]

The socioeconomic status scores were broken down into the following three levels in this study.

Socioeconomic status score	Level
022-160	Low
161-262	Middle
263-293	High

Institutional Participation Index

This index was designed to measure the intensity of participation by fringe residents in the institutional life of their community. Five items representing institutional participation were selected for this index. The response categories of each variable were coded so that scores of 1 to 3, depending upon the low, moderate or high intensity of participation, could be assigned. The scores for the five items were added for a total score. Total score therefore ranged from 5 to 15. The sum of these scores was broken into three levels of intensity of participation as follows:

Scores	Intensity level
5	Low
6-10	Moderate
11-15	High

5. Ibid.

The five items selected for the participation index along with the response categories and their scores appear against each item as follows:

Items	Score	Response category
1. Number of voluntary organizations to which the respondent belonged*	1	None
	2	1-2
	3	3 or more
2. Frequency of attendance at meetings	1	Not a member/no attendance
	2	Less than once a month to three times a month
	3	Once a week or more
3. Number of organizations in which the respondent held an office	1	None
	2	One
	3	Two or more
4. Frequency of church attendance	1	Never or mainly on important days
	2	Once or twice a month
	3	Once a week
5. Amount of interest in local affairs	1	Not interested or slightly interested
	2	Interested
	3	Very interested

*Organizations included: civic, community services, business, professional, union, social, country club, church, veteran's political clubs, volunteer firemen organizations, etc.

Table 5 shows the Gamma coefficients of correlation between the component items and the total score for the index of institutional participation. High correlations can be seen between each component item and the total score while at the same time intercorrelations between component items vary from low to high. These results therefore indicate the effectiveness of the index to measure intensity of institutional participation in all areas.

Table 5. Rank Correlations* Between Items and Total Score for Institutional Participation Index, Parma, Clarence and Camillus

Items	Items					Total score
	1	2	3	4	5	
Parma						
1. Number of voluntary organizations to which belonged		.90	.96	.33	.25	.98
2. Number of organizations in which office was held			.88	.47	.41	.98
3. Frequency of attendance at meetings				.32	.16	.95
4. Frequency of church attendance					.02	.89
5. Amount of interest in local affairs						.74
Clarence						
1. Number of voluntary organizations tc which belonged		.88	.98	.33	.44	.99
2. Number of associations in which office was held			.83	.38	.41	.98
3. Frequency of attendance at meetings				.38	.40	.97
4. Frequency of church attendance					.22	.73
5. Amount of interest in local affairs						.73
Camillus						
1. Number of voluntary organizations to which belonged		.80	.96	.29	.48	.97
2. Number of organizations in which office was held			.76	.19	.42	.88
3. Frequency of attendance at meetings				.26	.44	.94
4. Frequency of church attendance					.22	.78
5. Amount of interest in local affairs						.86

*Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma.

Social Interaction Index

The purpose of this index is to measure the intensity of social interaction of fringe residents. This index was composed of four items in Parma and Clarence, and of five items in Camillus. These items were scored from 1 to 3 and added. The additional item in Camillus had resulted from a split in one of the four items. The question on frequency of visits with neighbors and friends was split to make a distinction between visits with neighbors and friends living outside the neighborhood. Thus, the total scores in Parma and Clarence ranged from 4 to 12, and in Camillus from 5 to 15. The score values for the three levels of intensity of interaction were grouped as follows:

Scores for Parma and Clarence	Scores for Camillus	Intensity level
4	5	Low
5-8	6-10	Moderate
9-12	11-15	High

The four items selected for this index along with their response categories and scores are given below.

Items	Score	Response category
1. Number of families known in the neighborhood	1	None to four families
	2	Five to eight families
	3	Nine or more families
2. Amount of contact with other groups (farmers, villagers, newcomers)	1	Low
	2	Moderate
	3	High
3. Frequency of visits with relatives	1	Not visited or visited less than once a month
	2	From twice a month to once a week
	3	More often than once a week

Items	Score	Response category
4. Frequency of visits with friends and neighborhood families	1	Not visited or visited less than once a month
	2	From twice a month to once a week
	3	More often than once a week

Table 6 shows the Gamma coefficients of correlation between the component items and the total score for the index of social interaction. High correlations can be seen between each component item and the total score while at the same time intercorrelations between component items vary from low to high. These results therefore indicate the effectiveness of the index to measure intensity of social interaction in each fringe area.

Table 6. Rank Correlations* Between Items and Total Score for Social Interaction Index, Parma, Clarence and Camillus

Items	Items					Total score
	1	2	3	4	5	
Parma						
1. Number of families known in the neighborhood		.42	.10	.26	--	.90
2. Amount of contact with other groups			.08	.12	--	.75
3. Frequency of visits with relatives				.02	--	.65
4. Frequency of visits with friends and neighbors					--	.63
Clarence						
1. Number of families known in the neighborhood		.26	.08	.32	--	.89
2. Amount of contact with other groups			.09	.34	--	.77
3. Frequency of visits with relatives				.15	--	.61
4. Frequency of visits with friends and neighbors					--	.86

Table 6 (cont'd.)

Items	Items					Total score
	1	2	3	4	5	
Camillus						
1. Number of families known in the neighborhood		.23	-.03	.46	.04	.81
2. Amount of contact with other groups			-.03	.05	.12	.71
3. Frequency of visits with relatives				.05	.13	.71
4. Frequency of visits with neighbors					-.04	.81
5. Frequency of visits with friends						.70

*Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma

Anomie

This variable was selected to serve as an indicator of potential disorganization. It consisted of five standard statements from Srole's "A" scale[6] regarding the situation of the average man in present day society. The statements were the following:

1. Most public officials (people in public office) are not really interested in the problems of the average man.
2. These days a person does not really know whom he can can count on.
3. Now a days a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
4. In spite of what some people say, the lot (situation) (condition) of the average man is getting worse, not better.
5. Most people do not really care what happens to the next fellow.

6. Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 704-16.

The extent of anomie was calculated from responses to the above mentioned five statements. The following were the response categories:

Score	Response
1	strongly agree
1	slightly agree
0	can't decide
0	slightly disagree
0	strongly disagree

Thus, on the basis of five statements, each respondent could score between zero and five. The total scores were trichotomized into scores of 0, 1-2 and 3-5 for nonanomic, intermediate, and anomic categories respectively.

Chapter IV

A COMMUNITY IN AN EARLY STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT--PARMA

The first part of this chapter sets out certain population characteristics, namely, residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle. The second part treats the data on social and institutional participation, attitude toward life in the fringe area, and anomie.

Characteristics of Parma Residents

Residence-Orientation Typology

Table 7 gives the percentage distribution of the Parma residents by residence-orientation typology. It can be seen that the majority of respondents was urban-oriented (55 percent), though a substantial proportion of the population was rural-oriented (45 percent). The urban-oriented new residents made up the largest segment (40 percent) in Parma, followed by rural-oriented long time residents (32 percent).

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology

Community orientation	Length of residence		Total
	Under 10 years	10 years & over	
Rural-oriented	13.2	32.1	45.3
Urban-oriented	40.2	14.5	54.7
Total	53.4	46.6	100.0
	(85)	(74)	(159)

Community Orientation

Table 8 shows the percentage distribution of Parma residents by community orientation score. It was observed that the largest proportion (43 percent) scored 3 (village, small town or middle size city), which was followed by another 31 percent who scored 4 (suburb of a large city or new subdivisions), and 21 percent who scored 2 (nonfarm open country). These scores are based on the seven component items, namely, head of family's place of work, types of community in which both spouses

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Community Orientation Score

Community orientation index scores	Percentage
0.01 - 1.49	3.8
1.50 - 2.49	20.7
2.50 - 3.49	42.8
3.50) - 4.49	30.8
4.50 - 5.00	1.9
Total	100.0
	(159)

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index

Community orientation components	Type of community and score assigned: Farm (1)	Nonfarm open country (2)	Village/small town/medium size city (3)	Suburbs/new development areas (4)	Large city (5)	Total
1. Head's place of work	12.6%	1.9%	17.6%	2.5%	65.4%	100.0%*
2. Place respondent was brought up	31.4	8.2	25.2	14.5	20.7	100.0
3. Place head was brought up	32.1	5.7	22.0	6.3	33.9	100.0
4. Place of previous residence	14.5	10.7	28.9	20.1	25.8	100.0
5. Place relatives visited most often	7.9	14.6	33.8	18.5	25.2	100.0
6. Place friends visited most often	12.3	24.5	45.8	15.5	1.9	100.0
7. Place prefer to move to	20.3	44.9	20.9	12.0	1.9	100.0

*N = 159.

were brought up, types of community in which most frequently visited friends and relatives lived, and type of community preferred if a residential move was to be made. Details of these items can be found in Table 9.

Length of Residence

According to the distribution in Table 10, 54 percent had lived in the community for less than ten years. Of these, 35 percent had lived there for less than five years. Of the old time residents (ten years or more of residence), the two major clusters were in the categories of ten to fourteen years and twenty-five years or more of residence (25 percent and 18 percent respectively).

Table 10. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Length of Residence

Length of residence	Percentage
Under 1 year	11.3
1 - 2 years	9.4
3 - 4 years	14.5
5 - 9 years	18.3
10 - 14 years	25.2
15 - 24 years	3.1
25 years or more	18.2
Total	100.0 (159)

Socioeconomic Status Score

Table 11 gives the socioeconomic status scores for the Parma residents. It can be seen that the majority (69 percent) fell in the middle category. Low and high socioeconomic status categories constituted only

Table 11. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score

Socioeconomic status scores	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Low	19.1%	7.8%	33.3%	21.7%	19.5%
Middle	61.9	78.1	62.8	65.2	69.2
High	19.0	14.1	3.9	13.1	11.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(21)	(64)	(51)	(23)	

$X^2 = 14.87$ $P < .05$

20 percent and 11 percent respectively of the total. Among the four types of resident, the greatest differences in the distribution were found between rural-oriented old and urban-oriented new residents, and the least differences between rural-oriented new and urban-oriented old residents. Rural-oriented old residents had the largest proportion (33 percent) in the low category, while their counterpart new residents had the largest proportion (19 percent) in high socioeconomic status.

Details regarding component items of socioeconomic status score (education, income, and occupation) can be found in Tables 12 to 14.

Table 12. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife

Number of years completed	Head	Wife
Under 8	1.3%	1.9%
8	15.1	12.6
9-11	16.4	12.6
12	38.9	49.0
13 or more	28.3	23.9
Total	100.0% (159)	100.0% (159)

Table 13. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Annual Family Income

Income group in dollars	Percentage
Under $1,000	0.0
1,000 - 2,999	5.0
3,000 - 4,999	9.4
5,000 - 6,999	22.0
7,000 - 9,999	44.7
10,000 - 19,999	14.5
20,000 - 29,999	4.4
30,000 or more	0.0
Total	100.0 (159)

Table 14. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family

Occupation	Percentage	Occupational score
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	13.8	90
2. Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	14.5	81
3. Clerical, sales and kindred workers	7.6	71
4. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	30.8	58
5. Operatives and kindred workers	17.0	45
6. Service workers, including private household	2.5	34
7. Laborers, except farm and mine	1.9	20
8. Farmers and farm managers	11.9	16
Total	100.0 (159)	

Stage in Family Life Cycle

Table 15 shows the family life cycle distribution of the Parma respondents. More than 60 percent of all types of resident were in the middle stage, except for the rural-oriented old residents of whom 41 percent fell into this category. The rural- and urban-oriented old residents had the largest proportions in the late stage (47 and 30 percent respectively), while their counterpart new residents had the largest proportions in the early stage (19 and 30 percent respectively).

Table 15. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle

Stages in family life cycle	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Early	19.1%	29.7%	11.7%	8.7%	19.5%
Middle	61.9	62.5	41.2	60.9	55.3
Late	19.0	7.8	47.1	30.4	25.2
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 27.03$ $P < .01$ level

The long time residents were more often in the late stage than the newcomers and the rural-oriented more often in the late stage than the urban-oriented.

Social Interaction

The index measuring the intensity of social interaction was composed of four variables, namely the frequencies of visiting friends and relatives, number of families known well enough in the neighborhood to call on, and the amount of contact with other groups in the community.

A typical fringe resident with low intensity of social interaction could be described as one whose circle of known neighborhood families was limited to from zero to four families, had no or little contact with members of other groups in the community, namely farmers, village residents, and newcomers, and visited relatives and friends, if any, less frequently than once a month. A resident with moderate intensity of interaction knew

between five to eight families in the neighborhood, had some contact with members of all groups in the community and visited relatives and friends between two to four times a month. A typical fringe resident with high intensity of social interaction knew nine or more families in the neighborhood, maintained a great deal of contact with members of all groups in the community, and visited relatives and friends more often than once a week.

Table 16 gives the percentage distribution of families by residence-orientation typology and overall index of intensity of social

Table 16. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Low	4.8%	3.1%	1.9%	4.4%	3.1%
Moderate	76.2	71.9	47.1	47.8	61.0
High	19.0	25.0	51.0	47.8	35.9
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 12.75$ $P < .05$

interaction. It can be seen that only 3 percent of all respondents had a low intensity of interaction whereas almost two thirds (61 percent) fell in the moderate category and about one third (36 percent) in the high interaction group.

The majority of the new rural- and urban-oriented residents fell into moderate intensity level (76 percent and 72 percent respectively), but only one fifth of the former and one fourth of the latter fell into the high intensity category. These figures contrasted with those of the old rural- and urban-oriented residents in which case almost one half of each fell into high intensity category (51 percent and 48 percent respectively), and most of the remaining one half in the moderate category in both cases. Statistically the data showed a substantial relationship between types of fringe resident and overall score on social interaction.

The relationships were also examined separately for community orientation and length of residence and the overall score. The relationships indicated that intensity of social interaction increased to a greater degree with length of residence than it did because of community orientation. The rank correlation between length of residence and intensity of interaction was 0.45 (X^2 = 14.59, df = 3 which was significant at the .01 level). The correlation between community orientation and intensity of interaction was -0.23 but the X^2 value was not statistically significant. (The urban-oriented residents were on the higher end of the community orientation index.) The details of these data are not presented here.

Tables 17 and 18 show the intensity of social interaction by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle respectively. It can be seen from these tables that neither socioeconomic status nor stage in family life cycle had much influence on intensity of social interaction. The association between intensity of interaction and socioeconomic status

Table 17. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Low	3.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.1%
Moderate	67.7	58.2	66.7	61.0
High	29.0	38.2	33.3	35.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0%

$X^2 = 1.72$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.10$

Table 18. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Low	0.0%	3.4%	5.0%	3.1%
Moderate	71.0	58.0	60.0	61.0
High	29.0	38.6	35.0	35.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 2.68$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.02$

was negligible (G = 0.10) and was even lower in the case of family life cycle (G = 0.02).

However, it may be pointed out that no family of high socioeconomic status or in early stage of family life cycle fell into low intensity of interaction, although between 3 to 5 percent of all other families did fall into this category. More families of middle socioeconomic status had high intensity of social interaction than did families in other classes (38 percent vs. 29 percent and 33 percent respectively for the families in low and high socioeconomic status).

More respondents in middle stage of family life cycle had high intensity level of social interaction than families in other stages of the life cycle (39 percent vs. 29 and 35 percent respectively for those in the early and late stages).

The data were further analyzed to see the relationship between socioeconomic status and the score of social interaction for each type of resident. However, the relationships were not statistically significant. The gamma coefficient gave substantial and high values of association for urban-oriented old and rural-oriented new residents respectively, but this could have resulted from the small number of observations (ten or less) in various categories. The G values were low or negligible for the remaining two types of resident. Therefore, the details of these data are not presented here.

Similarly, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and the score of social interaction was analyzed for each type of resident. The relationship was not found to be statistically significant. Although

the G values of correlation were found to be substantial for urban-oriented new and old residents and for rural-oriented old residents (inverse in case of old residents of either orientation), these could have resulted from the small number of observations (ten or less) in various categories. The details of these data are therefore not presented here.

Table 19 shows the percentage distribution of number of families known in the neighborhood by each type of resident. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant.

The majority of rural-oriented new residents (62 percent) and a large proportion (48 percent) of urban-oriented residents knew the least number of neighborhood families (up to four families). Rural-oriented old residents led all other types of resident in the highest category (knew nine or more families) as almost one half of them fell into this category. About one third each of rural-oriented new and urban-oriented old residents also fell into this category.

It may be added that length of residence and number of families known in the neighborhood had shown a significant relationship (X^2 = 17.76, df = 6, $P < .01$) and a substantial G value (0.34). The details of these data are not reported here.

Table 20 shows the percentage distribution of frequency of visiting with friends and neighbors for each type of resident. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant.

The data indicated less frequency of visiting on part of a greater proportion of urban-oriented old, and rural-oriented new residents than

Table 19. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None to four	61.9%	48.4%	35.3%	21.7%	42.2%
Five to eight	4.8	25.0	15.7	43.5	22.0
Nine or more	33.3	26.6	49.0	34.8	35.8
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0 (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 36.22$ $P < .01$

Table 20. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Once a month or less	33.3%	14.1%	19.6%	34.8%	21.4%
Two to four times a month	23.8	17.2	45.1	26.1	28.3
More than once a week	42.9	68.7	35.3	39.1	50.0
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 20.49$ $P < .01$

their counterparts. About one third of the former had a visiting frequency of once a month or less often as compared to one fifth or less of the latter. Urban-oriented new residents were the most outgoing people as 69 percent of them had a visiting frequency of more than once a week while between 35 to 43 percent of others fell into this category.

It may be added here that length of residence and frequency of visiting with friends and neighbors showed a significant relationship ($X^2 = 23.22$, df = 6, $P < .01$) and a substantial inverse G value (-0.30). The details of these data are not presented here.

Table 21 shows the percentage distribution of frequency of visiting with relatives for each type of resident. The two variables showed a significant relationship.

Table 21. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Once a month or less	28.6%	25.0%	7.8%	34.8%	21.4%
Two to four times a month	47.6	51.6	39.2	34.8	44.6
More than once a week	23.8	23.4	53.0	30.4	34.0
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 16.99$ $P < .01$

Among new residents, greater proportions were visiting their relatives two to four times a month (48 and 52 percent of rural- and urban-oriented new residents respectively). Among old time residents, the majority of rural-oriented residents (53 percent), and a sizeable proportion (30 percent) or urban-oriented residents visited with relatives at least once a week. New residents of either orientation were less than old time residents in this category.

It may be added that relationship between length of residence and frequency of visiting with relatives was found to be significant (X^2 = 16.96, df = 6, P< .01), but the G value was low (G = 0.19). The details of these data are not reported here.

Table 22 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by amount of contact with farmers. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant.

Table 22. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None or little (low)	70.6%	69.8%	46.7%	47.4%	59.0%
Moderate	23.5	26.4	22.2	36.8	26.1
Much (high)	5.9	3.8	31.1	15.8	14.9
Total	100.0% (17)	100.0% (53)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (19)	100.0% (134)

X^2 = 17.43 P < .01

On an overall basis the majority (59 percent) had little or no contact with farmers, and only about one fourth (26 percent) had some contact. The majority of new residents of either orientation fell into the former category (about 70 percent each), while the balance had mostly moderate amount of contact. Interestingly, almost one half of old time residents of both rural- and urban-orientation (47 percent each) also had little or no contact with farm families. However, about one third of the former said they had great deal of contact with farmers and the same proportion of the latter (urban-oriented old residents) said they had moderate amount of contact.

It may be added that relationship between length of residence and amount of contact with farmers was found to be significant ($X^2 = 20.76$, $df = 6$, $P < .01$) and gave a substantial G value (0.38). The details of these data are not presented here.

In the following paragraphs we have discussed the relationships respectively between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle, and individual components of the social interaction index. However, this discussion is limited to those items of the index which showed either significant relationship or substantial degree of association with socioeconomic status and/or stage in family life cycle. The relationships with socioeconomic status are discussed first, and are followed by a discussion of the relationships with stage in family life cycle.

The relationships were not found to be statistically significant between socioeconomic status and the following items: number of families known in the neighborhood, amounts of contact with farmers and newcomers,

and frequency of visiting friends. The G values were less than substantial in these cases.

With the exception of frequency of visiting with friends and families in the neighborhood, stage in family life cycle was not significantly related with any of the components of the social interaction index.

Table 23 shows the percentage distribution of families by socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents. The observed value of X^2 was significant and the G value of association was of a substantial degree (G = 0.51).

Table 23. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	57.7%	28.7%	14.3%	32.8%
Moderate	34.6	41.5	35.7	39.6
Much (high)	7.7	29.8	50.0	27.6
Total	100.0% (26)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (14)	100.0% (134)

$X^2 = 13.58$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.51$

The families of low socioeconomic status had the largest proportion in the low category of contact (58 percent) and the smallest proportion in the high category of contact (8 percent). Conversely, the high status families had the highest percentage in the high category (50 percent) and the least in the low category of contact (14 percent). Families in the

middle socioeconomic status were almost equally distributed in the low and high categories (29 percent and 30 percent respectively), but the largest proportion (41 percent) was in the moderate category of conctact. The proportion of families reporting a moderate amount of contact with village residents was almost of the same magnitude in all socioeconomic classes (percentages in this respect ranged from 35 to 41 percent).

Table 24 shows the percentage distribution of families by socio-economic status and intensity of contact with newcomers. The observed value of X^2 was not significant but the G value of association between the two variables was substantial (G = 0.37).

The overall majority (56 percent) of residents expressed that they had no contact or very little contact with newcomers. A little more than one third (37 percent) of the total had moderate amount of contact with the newcomers, and about 7 percent had great amount of contact.

The data showed substantial association (G = 0.37) between various socioeconomic classes and intensity of contact with the newcomers. Families in low socioeconomic status had the largest proportion (73 percent) in the low category of conctact. The rest of them fell into moderate category of contact. Although the majority of families in middle socioeconomic status also had low amount of contact (53 percent), proportionately they were twenty percent less than those in the low socio-economic status. There were about 40 percent in the moderate category and 7 percent in the high category. The families with high socioeconomic status also had a considerable proportion, though least of all others

(43 percent), in the low category of contact. However, about the same percentage of them was found in the moderate category of contact. The high status group had the highest percentage (14 percent) in the high category of contact with newcomers.

Table 24. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socio-economic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	73.1%	53.2%	42.9%	56.0%
Moderate	26.9	39.4	42.8	37.3
Much (high)	0.0	7.4	14.3	6.7
Total	100.0% (26)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (14)	100.0% (134)

$X^2 = 5.91$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.37$

Table 25 presents the percentage distribution of families by socio-economic status and frequency of visiting with relatives. The data showed substantial inverse association (G = -0.31) between the two variables and was also statistically significant at the .01 level.

Frequency of visiting with relatives decreased in the families of higher socioeconomic status. Among the families with low socioeconomic status only 10 percent (least of all status groups) visited their relatives once a month or less often. The majority among them (55 percent), however, visited with relatives between two to four times a month. This percentage was the highest of all status groups. Another 36 percent of those in the low socioeconomic status visited their relatives more often than once a

week. This percentage was almost as high as that of the middle status families but twice as high as that of the high status families. On the other hand, the majority (56 percent) of the families in high socioeconomic status visited their relatives less often than once a month; about one fourth (28 percent) visited between two to four times a month, and only 17 percent visited more frequently than four times a month.

Table 25. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Once a month or less*	9.7%	19.1%	55.5%	21.4%
Two to four times a month	54.8	44.5	27.8	44.6
More than once a week	35.5	36.4	16.7	34.0
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

*Includes no visits. $X^2 = 15.75$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.31$

It was pointed out earlier that stage in the family life cycle did not show significant relationships with the component variables of social interaction, with the exception of frequency of visiting with friends. Furthermore, only one variable, amount of contact with farmers, had even a low rank correlation (0.29) while all other variables had values of even lesser magnitude.

Table 26 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with friends. The data

showed a substantial inverse association (G = -0.39) between the two variables which was also statistically significant at the .01 level.

The frequency of visiting with friends decreased with the later stages of family life cycle. Visiting as infrequently as once a month or less was done by 13 percent of families in the early stage, by 16 percent of families in the middle stage, and by 40 percent of families in the late stage. Visiting as often as two to four times a month did not vary too much from one stage to the other as the proportions ranged from 26 percent to 33 percent. However, a gradual increase in the proportions was seen, the lowest being in the early stage and highest in the last stage. Visiting with friends more often than once a week was most common among families in early stage (61 percent) and least (27 percent) among families in late stage of their life cycle. Fifty-seven percent of the families in middle stage visited their friends more often than once a week.

Table 26. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Friends

Visiting frequency	Family life cycle stage			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Once a month or less*	12.9%	15.9%	40.0%	21.4%
Two to four times a month	25.8	27.3	32.5	28.3
More than once a week	61.3	56.8	27.5	50.3
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

*Includes no visits $X^2 = 14.73$ $P < .01$ G = -0.39

The data were analyzed further to see the relationships between socioeconomic status and individual items of the index of social interaction for each type of resident. A similar analysis was carried out for the relationships between stage in family life cycle and individual items of the index for each type of resident. However, since the total observations for two types of resident (rural-oriented new, and urban-oriented old) was less than 25 each in number, and the majority of the two other types of resident fell into a single category of socioeconomic status or family life cycle, this detailed breakdown resulted in very small numbers of observations in many categories (in many instances 5 or less). The results of the X^2 test and the Gamma coefficient were therefore affected by these distributions. In almost all instances the X^2 values were not significant and the G values were superficially substantial or high. No clear trend could be seen in most cases. Therefore, details of these data are not reported here.

Summary of Findings on Social Interaction

The level of social interaction was examined by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle for the total score and for each item of the index of social interaction. On the basis of overall scores, more oldtime residents were found to be in the higher level of interaction than were new residents regardless of their community orientation. The length of residence was found to be a better predictor of the level of interaction than community orientation. Differences in socioeconomic status or stage in the family life cycle did influence the levels of social interaction but to only a small degree.

Regardless of community orientation the oldtime residents knew more families, visited relatives, friends and neighbors more often and had more contact with farmers than the newcomers.

Differences in socioeconomic status substantially influenced the amounts of contact with village residents and newcomers and the frequency of visiting relatives. More of the middle and high than of low class had greater contact with village residents and newcomers and frequency of visiting relatives was greater among the low and middle socioeconomic classes than among the high class. Respondents in the early and middle stages of the family life cycle visited friends and neighbors more than those in the late stage.

Institutional Participation

The other index used here to measure intensity of institutional participation of fringe residents was composed of five items. These items were, namely, number of organizations to which respondent belonged, number of organizations in which office was held, frequency of attendance at meetings, frequency of church attendance, and amount of interest in local affairs in general.

A typical fringe resident with low intensity of institutional participation could be portrayed as one who did not belong to any organization (and, therefore, did not attend any meetings), did not hold an office

in any organization to which he belonged, did not attend church at all or did so only on important holidays, and had no interest at all or only a slight interest in local affairs in general. A resident with moderate intensity of participation belonged to one or two organizations, attended meetings up to three times a month, held an office in one of the organizations to which he belonged, attended church at least once or twice a month, and was interested in local affairs. A typical fringe resident with high intensity of institutional participation belonged to three or more organizations, attended meetings once a week or more often, held two or more offices in organizations to which he belonged, went to church once a week, and was very interested in local affairs of the community.

Table 27 shows the intensity of institutional participation for each type of resident as measured by the index. The data did not show a significant relationship between types of resident and intensity of participation under the X^2 test. The same test was applied separately to the variables of community orientation and length of residence to measure intensity of participation but the relationships were not statistically significant in either case. However, the G values were negligible in both cases, being -0.16 and 0.15 respectively (the urban-oriented residents were on the higher end of the community orientation index). The details of the data for the latter two variables is not presented here.

The rural-oriented new and old residents had a higher percentage in the high intensity level of participation than the urban-oriented new and old residents. The rural-oriented old residents led all other groups in the high intensity level as 26 percent were found in this category.

Table 27. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Low	14.3%	10.9%	5.9%	13.0%	10.1%
Moderate	66.7	73.5	68.6	78.3	71.7
High	19.0	15.6	25.5	8.7	18.2
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 4.68$ $P > .05$

The urban-oriented old residents were on the other extreme with only 9 percent being in the high intensity level. Among the new residents, rural-oriented families participated at high intensity level slightly more than urban-oriented families (19 percent vs. 16 percent).

Tables 28 and 29 show the intensity of institutional participation by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle respectively. The data did not show a significant relationship under the X^2 test in either of the two tables. A substantial association, however, was obtained between socioeconomic status and intensity of participation ($G = 0.35$). The G value of association between stage in family life cycle and intensity of participation was found to be negligible.

It can be seen from the percentage distribution of Table 28 that more families in high than low socioeconomic class participated at high intensity level (39 vs. 10 percent respectively). Conversely, low status families outnumbered other families in the low and moderate intensity

Table 28. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Low	12.9%	10.0%	5.5%	10.1%
Moderate	77.4	72.7	55.6	71.7
High	9.7	17.3	38.9	18.2
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 6.93$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.35$

levels. However, those with low and middle socioeconomic statuses were found to be quite similar at the low and moderate levels. Among the low status families, 13 percent participated with low intensity, and 77 percent with moderate intensity as compared to about 10 percent and 73 percent respectively for families with middle socioeconomic status.

The percentage distribution in Table 29 shows that institutional participation at moderate level was higher in the early than the later stages of the family life cycle, but more older families participated at high intensity level than did younger families. This trend could be seen when the low and moderate intensity levels were combined and compared with the high intensity level of participation. The families in the early stage had the highest percentages in the combined levels of low and moderate intensity (about 90 percent), followed by those in the middle stages (82 percent), and those in late stage (75 percent). The percentages were lowest (10 percent) in the high intensity level in the case of young

families, with 18 percent of families in the middle stage, and 25 percent of older couples being in this level of participation.

The data did not show statistically significant relationships or substantial Gamma coefficients of correlation, between socioeconomic status or family life cycle and most of the component items of institutional participation index. The only exceptions were the relationships between socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs, and between stage in family life cycle and number of organizations in which office was held by the respondent. These findings, related to the population as a whole, are presented in the following paragraphs.

Table 29. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by State in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Low	3.2%	10.2%	15.0%	10.1%
Moderate	87.1	71.6	60.0	71.7
High	9.7	18.2	25.0	18.2
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 6.45$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.05$

Table 30 shows the percentage distribution of number of organizations in which each type of respondent held an office. The two variables were found to be significantly related.

It can be seen that most respondents (84 percent) did not hold office in any organization to which they belonged. (However, it must be pointed out that 50 percent of all respondents did not belong to any organization.) Larger proportions of rural-oriented old and new residents than their counterpart urban-oriented residents held office in at least one organization to which they belonged (29 percent and 19 percent of the former vs. 4 percent and 8 percent of the latter types of resident). Of the rural-oriented old residents 10 percent held offices in at least two organizations.

Table 30. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None	80.9%	92.2%	70.6%	95.6%	84.3%
One	14.3	6.2	19.6	4.4	11.3
Two or more	4.8	1.6	9.8	0.0	4.4
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 13.26$ $P < .05$

Table 31 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs. The data showed that amount of interest was related significantly with socioeconomic status. The higher the status, the higher was the amount of interest. It can be seen from the distribution in this table that only 12 percent of

Table 32. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None	96.8%	83.0%	77.5%	84.3%
One	3.2	13.6	12.5	11.3
Two or more	0.0	3.4	10.0	4.4
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 7.48$ $P > .05$ $G = 0.42$

in the middle stage, and 13 percent of those in the late stage held office in one organization. None of the respondents in early stage held office in two or more organizations, but 3 percent of those in middle stage, and 10 percent of those in late stage did.

The data were analyzed further to see relationships between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle, and individual items of the index of institutional participation for each type of resident. Just one item, the amount of interest in local affairs, showed statistically significant relationships with socioeconomic status of rural-oriented old residents and stage in the family life cycle of rural-oriented new residents. In some instances very high Gamma coefficients of correlation were obtained but mostly the coefficients were low. The possible reasons for these results, which were similar to those observed for social interaction, have been explained earlier (page 78) and may be consulted for details. These results are not reported here.

Summary of Findings on Institutional Participation

The level of institutional participation was examined by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle. Participation at various levels was found to be quite similar among various types of residents (though more of rural-oriented new and oldtime residents participated at higher levels than did their counterpart urban-oriented residents). Participation in organizations was substantially related with socioeconomic status (the proportions in high level increased with the status), but was irregularly influenced by differences in the family life cycle stages.

Of the various items of the participation index, only one item, number of organizations in which respondents held an office, was substantially related to the types of residents. More of the rural-oriented new and old residents held office in one or more organizations than did their urban-oriented counterparts.

Socioeconomic status was substantially related to the amount of interest in local affairs (greater interest was shown by the higher socioeconomic classes), but it influenced only to a small extent (a) number of organizations to which one belonged, (b) frequency of attendance at meetings, and (c) number of organizations in which respondents held an office.

Stage in the family life cycle did not show a statistically significant relationship with any of the various items of the index. However, stage in the family life cycle influenced substantially the number of organizations in which respondents held an office (greater proportions

of the late stage than of others held office in one or more organizations) and, to a smaller degree, the number of organizations to which they belonged.

Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

The five items used as indicators of attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe area were the following:

1. Satisfaction with fringe residence.
2. Head of family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work.
3. Attitude toward school taxes.
4. Attitude toward taxes on property.
5. Number of residential moves made in the past ten years.

It was found that neither socioeconomic status nor stage in the family life cycle showed statistically significant relationship with respondent's satisfaction with fringe residence, or with the head of family's satiscation with convenience of driving to work. However, statistically significant relationships and substantial or high Gamma coefficients correlation were found for all other items.

The relationship between socioeconomic status score and attitude toward school taxes is presented in Table 33. The data showed an inverse relationship (-0.47) between the two variables, and a significant relationship under the X^2 test.

Table 33. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Reasonable	35.5%	70.9%	66.7%	63.5%
Somewhat high	9.7	21.8	22.2	19.5
Very high	54.8	7.3	11.1	17.0
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 39.39$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.47$

It can be seen that the majority of respondents (55 percent) with low socioeconomic status thought these taxes were very high. On the other hand, the majority of respondents with high status (67 percent) thought the taxes were reasonable. It appears that, as a group, those in the middle class had the most favorable attitude toward school taxes as 71 percent thought the taxes were reasonable.

Table 34 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and attitude toward school taxes. The data showed a significant relationship between the two variables under the X^2 test and a very high Gamma coefficient of correlation ($G = 0.71$). It can be seen that respondents in early stage of family life cycle had

Table 34. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Reasonable	83.9%	75.0%	22.5%	63.5%
Somewhat high	12.9	19.3	25.0	19.5
Very high	3.2	5.7	52.5	17.0
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 55.54$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.71$

the most consolidated opinion about the school taxes. Eighty-four percent of them thought taxes were reasonable while the balance (16 percent) thought they were high. The majority of those in middle stage (75 percent) also thought the taxes were reasonable. Only 23 percent of those in late stage of family life cycle considered these taxes as reasonable. The majority of this group (52 percent) thought school taxes were very high and another 25 percent considered them to be somewhat high.

Table 35 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and attitude toward other taxes on property. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant. The form of relationship was inverse but almost negligible between the two variables as shown by the Gamma coefficient ($G = -.04$). The data revealed a higher degree of agreement over the reasonableness of other taxes than school taxes among all socioeconomic classes. The overwhelming majority, ranging from 78 percent to 87 percent, viewed these

Table 35. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Reasonable	80.6%	87.3%	77.8%	84.9%
Somewhat high	9.7	12.7	22.2	13.2
Very high	9.7	0.0	0.0	1.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 14.05$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.04$

taxes favorably. The percentage of those viewing these taxes favorably was slightly higher among those with low socioeconomic status (81 percent) than among those with high socioeconomic status (78 percent).

Table 36 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and attitude toward property taxes. The data showed

Table 36. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages Early	Middle	Late	Total
Reasonable	96.8%	85.2%	75.0%	84.9%
Somewhat high	3.2	14.8	17.5	13.2
Very high	0.0	0.0	7.5	1.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 12.96$ $P = < .05$ $G = 0.50$

a substantial positive association between the two variables. More respondents in the early stage of family life cycle thought these taxes were reasonable than did those in the middle and late stages. The attitude was overwhelmingly a favorable one: 97 percent, 87 percent and 75 percent respectively in the three stages of family life cycle.

The relationship between the two above mentioned variables was found to be significant under the X^2 test. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was also high (G = 0.50).

Table 37 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of residential moves made in the past ten years. The data showed that higher status families had moved more often than those in the lower status categories. The relationship was found to be statistically significant. It can be seen that 61 percent of those in the low status category had not made one residential move in the past twn years, whereas 73 percent and 83 percent of those in the middle and high status categories had made at least one residential move. In the low status class there were 26 percent of respondents who had moved once as compared to 37 percent and 28 percent respectively in the next two higher classes. There were 13 percent, 36 percent, and 45 percent respectively of low, middle and high status classes who had moved at least twice in the past ten years. The rate of mobility was particularly high among high status families.

Table 38 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and number of residential moves made in the past ten years. The data showed a high degree of inverse association between the

Table 37. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Socioeconomic status scores: Low	Middle	High	Total
None	61.3%	27.3%	16.7%	32.7%
One	25.8	37.3	27.8	34.0
Two	3.2	10.0	16.6	9.4
Three or more	9.7	25.4	38.9	23.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 18.05$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.47$

Table 38. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Family life cycle stages: Early	Middle	Late	Total
None	3.2%	28.4%	65.0%	32.7%
One	38.7	35.2	27.5	34.0
Two	6.5	12.5	5.0	9.4
Three or more	51.6	23.9	2.5	23.9
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 41.86$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.64$

two variables. The respondents in the early stage of the family life cycle had been more mobile than those in the later stages. Only 3 percent of those in the early stage had not made any residential move in the past ten years, whereas 28 percent and 65 percent respectively of those in middle and late stages fell in this category. The proportion of respondents moving once decreased from 39 percent to 28 percent from earlier to later stages in the family life cycle. There were 58 percent, 37 percent and 7 percent of respondents respectively in the early, middle, and late stages who had moved at least twice in the past ten years. The rate of mobility was particularly high among those in the early stage of family life cycle.

The relationship between the two above mentioned variables was found to be significant under the X^2 test, and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was high (G = -0.66)

Table 39 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and extent of anomie. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant under the X^2 test, and a substantial Gamma coefficient of correlation was obtained (G = -0.43). The relationship between family life cycle and extent of anomie was not statistically significant and gave a low Gamma coefficient of correlation (G = 0.27).

It can be seen from Table 39 that extent of anomie was higher among respondents with low socioeconomic status than among those with middle and high status. Of the low status respondents, only 10 percent were nonanomic compared to 33 of middle, and 50 percent of high status

Table 39. Percentage Distribution of the Parma Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie

Extent of anomie	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Nonanomic	9.7%	32.7%	50.0%	30.2%
Intermediate	54.8	51.8	30.3	50.3
Anomic	35.5	15.5	16.7	19.5
Total	100.0% (31)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (18)	100.0% (159)

$X^2 = 13.16$ $P = < .05$ $G = -0.43$

respondents. The majority of the low and middle compared to one third of the high socioeconomic status respondents (55 and 52 percent vs. 30 percent respectively) fell in the intermediate category. Respondents in low socioeconomic status had the highest proportion (36 percent) in the anomic category compared to 16 percent of the middle and 17 percent of the high status respondents.

Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

The degree of satisfaction with fringe residence was not affected by differences in socioeconomic status or stage in the family life cycle as an overwhelming majority in each case was very satisfied. However, substantial differences were found regarding attitude toward school and property taxes. The majority of the low socioeconomic status considered school taxes to be very high while a majority of the middle and high status thought taxes were reasonable. Most respondents, regardless of the status, considered property taxes to be reasonable.

On the other hand, the majority of residents in the later stages of the family life cycle considered school taxes to be very high while most of those in the early and middle stages considered these taxes to be reasonable. Most respondents, regardless of the stage in the family life cycle, considered property taxes to be reasonable, but more of the early than of the middle and late stage respondents thought so.

The rate of residential mobility was higher among respondents of higher socioeconomic status and among those in the early stage of the family life cycle. The converse was true for respondents in the low status or late stage of the family life cycle.

Anomie was found to be greater among respondents of low socioeconomic status than among respondents of the middle or high status. More respondents in the late stage than in the early or middle stages of the family life cycle were found to be more anomic, but the differences were not substantial.

Chapter V

A COMMUNITY IN AN ADVANCED STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT--CLARENCE

This chapter follows the format laid out in the preceding chapter on Parma. The first section treats certain characteristics of the Clarence population (resident typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle). The second part of this chapter reports the relationships, respectively, between resident typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle with various indicators of social interaction and institutional participation. This section also examines the findings regarding relationships, respectively, between socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle with various indicators of satisfaction with fringe residence and anomie.

Characteristics of Clarence Residents

Residence-Orientation Typology

Table 40 shows the percentage distribution of respondents of Clarence by residence-orientation typology. The data shows that 17 percent of respondents were rural-oriented and 83 percent urban-oriented. Of the total, 61 percent were new residents and 39 percent old residents. The majority (55 percent) was of urban-oriented new residents.

Table 40. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology

Community orientation	Length of residence: Under 10 years	Length of residence: 10 years & over	Total
Rural-oriented	6.2	10.8	17.0
Urban-oriented	54.8	28.2	83.0
Total	61.0 (581)	39.0 (372)	100.0 (953)

Community Orientation

Table 41 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by community orientation score. The overwhelming majority (93 percent) scored 3 or above, the cutting point differentiating between the rural- and urban-oriented residents. The majority (58 percent) had scored 4 which represented a suburb or new development type of community in which various component items of the community orientation index took place. The details of the component items and type of community in which they took place are given in Table 42.

Table 41. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Community Orientation Score

Community orientation index scores	Percentage
0.01 - 1.49	1.1
1.50 - 2.49	5.9
2.50 - 3.49	25.2
3.50 - 4.49	57.8
4.50 - 5.00	10.0
Total	100.0 (953)

Table 42. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index

Community orientation components	Type of community and score assigned					Total
	Farm (1)	Nonfarm open country (2)	Village/small town/medium size city (3)	Suburbs/new development areas (4)	Large city (5)	
1. Head's place of work	2.3%	3.0%	18.7%	30.5%	45.5%	100.0% (953)
2. Place respondent was brought up	9.5	4.3	30.1	12.4	43.7	100.0 (953)
3. Place head was brought up	13.3	4.2	24.4	15.4	42.7	100.0 (953)
4. Place of previous residence	4.7	4.8	32.1	33.1	25.3	100.0 (953)
5. Place relatives visited most often	2.4	4.2	21.8	37.4	34.2	100.0 (802)
6. Place friends visited most often	3.6	11.9	23.7	54.8	6.0	100.0 (943)
7. Place prefer to move to	4.4	21.7	24.8	43.5	5.6	100.0 (952)

Length of Residence

Table 43 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by length of residence in Clarence. According to the distribution, the majority (61 percent) had lived there for less than 10 years. A substantial proportion of these residents (37 percent) had spent less than five years in their present community. Less than 40 percent of respondents had lived in the community for ten years or more. Only 8 percent of the respondents had been in the community for 15 years or more.

Table 43. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Length of Residence

Length of residence	Percentage
Under 1 year	10.4
1 - 2 years	12.2
3 - 4 years	14.2
5 - 9 years	24.2
10 - 14 years	31.0
15 - 24 years	3.0
25 years or more	5.0
Total	100.0 (953)

Socioeconomic Status

Table 44 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and socioeconomic status score. It can be seen that a greater percentage of old than of new residents fell into

Table 44. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score

Socioeconomic status scores	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Low	8.5%	4.2%	61.2%	16.5%	14.2%
Middle	52.5	44.6	36.9	57.9	48.0
High	39.0	51.2	1.9	25.6	37.8
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 278.89$ $P < .01$

the low socioeconomic status category. The majority (61 percent) of rural-oriented old residents and 16 percent of urban-oriented old residents were found in the low category as compared to 9 percent and 4 percent respectively of their counterparts. The majority of rural-oriented new residents (53 percent) and of urban-oriented old residents (58 percent) fell into the middle socioeconomic status. They were followed by urban-oriented new residents (45 percent) and rural-oriented old residents (37 percent). Urban-oriented new residents had the highest percentage of all residents in the high socioeconomic status (51 percent), which was followed by rural-oriented new residents (39 percent) and urban-oriented old residents (26 percent). Only 2 percent of rural-oriented old residents fell into the high socioeconomic status. The relationship between socioeconomic status score and resident typology was found to be statistically significant.

Details regarding component items of socioeconomic status score can be found in Tables 45 to 47.

Table 45. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife

Number of years completed	Head	Wife
Under 8	3.4%	3.0%
8	10.6	6.6
9-11	10.0	8.8
12	22.4	36.4
13 or more	54.6	45.2
Total	100.0% (953)	100.0% (953)

Table 46. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Annual Family Income

Income group in dollars	Percentage
Under $1,000	0.6
1,000 - 2,999	2.6
3,000 - 4,999	5.8
5,000 - 6,999	20.9
7,000 - 9,999	28.2
10,000 - 19,999	35.5
20,000 - 29,999	5.6
30,000 or more	0.8
Total	100.0% (953)

Table 47. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family

Occupation	Percentage	Occupational score
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	28.7	90
2. Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm	32.1	81
3. Clerical, sales and kindred workers	9.3	71
4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	14.2	58
5. Operatives and kindred workers	11.0	45
6. Service workers, including private household; laborers, except farm and mine	2.7	34; 20
7. Farmers and farm managers	2.0	16
Total	100.0% (953)	

Stage in Family Life Cycle

Table 48 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by typology and stage in family life cycle. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant. The distribution indicated that length of residence rather than community orientation was associated with stage in family life cycle. More of oldtime residents tended to be in late stage of family life cycle and new residents tended to be in middle or early stages of family life cycle. Of oldtime residents, not more than 5 percent were found in early stage while the remainder was almost equally divided into middle and late stages of family

Table 48. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle

Stages in family life cycle	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Early	20.3%	19.9%	4.9%	3.3%	13.5%
Middle	74.6	65.4	42.7	52.0	59.9
Late	5.1	14.7	52.4	44.7	26.2
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 153.85$ $P < .01$

life cycle. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of new residents was found in the middle or early stages of family life cycle.

Social Interaction

The index for determining the intensity of social interaction and its component variables has been discussed in the chapter on Parma. The description of a typical fringe resident with low, moderate and high intensity of social interaction was also included in the above mentioned chapter.

Table 49 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by their residence-orientation and the intensity of social interaction. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

Table 49. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Low	0.0%	2.5%	4.8%	0.4%	2.0%
Moderate	62.7	63.1	51.5	60.4	61.1
High	37.3	34.4	43.7	39.2	36.9
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 14.26$ $P < .01$

The majority of all types of residents fell in the category of moderate intensity of interaction though the percentages varied between 52 percent and 63 percent. Proportionately more new than old residents fell in this category. A considerable proportion of all types of resident (varying between 34 and 39 percent) had scored in high intensity category, but proportionately more old than new residents fell in this category. Generally, the distributions for all resident types exhibited more or less the same proportions in each category of intensity.

It may be added that relationship between social interaction score was also tested separately with community orientation score and length of residence. The relationship was not found to be significant for community orientation and a zero G value of correlation was obtained ($X^2 = 0.06$, df = 1, G = 0.03), but it was significant for length of residence though G value of correlation was negligible ($X^2 = 9.35$, df = 3, G = 0.13). Details of these data are not presented here.

Socioeconomic status did not show a significant relationship with social interaction and gave a zero G value of correlation. The distribution in this respect can be seen in Table 50.

Table 50. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Low	3.7%	1.1%	2.5%	2.0%
Moderate	60.7	60.3	62.2	61.1
High	35.6	38.6	35.3	36.9
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 5.15$ $P > .05$ $G = -0.03$

Table 51 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and intensity of social interaction. The data indicated a lesser degree of interaction among respondents in later stages of family life cycle than among those in earlier stages. A greater proportion of those in early and middle stages than of those in late stage scored in the high intensity category (45 and 38 percent vs. 30 percent respectively). Proportionately more of those in late stage of family life cycle scord in the moderate category (68 percent vs. 55 and 59 percents of those in early and middle stages of family life cycle).

Table 52 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and intensity of social interaction for each type of resident. The data showed an inverse association of substantial degree

Table 51. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Low	0.0%	2.3%	2.4%	2.0%
Moderate	55.0	59.4	67.8	61.1
High	45.0	38.3	29.8	36.9
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 11.97$ $P < .05$ $G = -0.19$

only for urban oriented residents, but the level of significance under the X^2 test varied from the .01 to the .05 level. The relationship between the above mentioned variables was not found to be significant for rural-oriented residents, though the value obtained for rural-oriented old residents was almost significant at the .05 level.

In the case of urban-oriented residents, the data indicated lesser degree of interaction among respondents in later stages of family life cycle than among those in earlier stages. The distribution for urban-oriented new and old residents also indicated that fewer families in the earlier than in the later stages of family life cycle had a moderate insity of interaction, but more families in the earlier than in the later stages scored in the high intensity category of interaction.

The relationships between various types of fringe resident and all component items of the index of social interaction were found to be significant at the .01 level under the X^2 test. The data showing these relationships are presented in the following tables.

Table 52. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
Low	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Moderate	83.3	54.5	100.0	49.5	63.7	79.0	100.0	52.3	46.3	55.6	52.8	69.7
High	16.7	45.5	0.0	50.5	32.5	21.0	0.0	47.7	44.4	44.4	47.2	29.2
Total	100.0% (12)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (339)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (122)
	X^2 = 5.22 Not significant G = 0.27			X^2 = 24.99 P < .01 G = -0.34			X^2 = 9.47 Near significant value at P < .05 G = 0.0			X^2 = 9.65 P < .05 G = -0.34		

Table 53 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and frequency of visiting with friends. The data suggested that the visiting frequency of urban-oriented new and old residents was more alike than that of the rural-oriented new and old residents. In the case of the former, the proportional differences between new and old residents in the three categories of visiting frequency did not exceed 10 percent, but in the latter case the difference was up to 24 percent. The majority of urban-oriented residents, both new and old, visited their friends more often than once a week (63 percent and 53 percent respectively), while the majority of rural-oriented residents visited once a week or less often (53 percent and 58 percent respectively).

Table 54 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and frequency of visiting with relatives. Although the frequency of visiting with relatives did not vary to a great extent from one type of resident to another, old residents of rural and urban orientation were more alike than their counterpart new residents. Old residents visited relatives more frequently than new residents. Two other differences could be noticed. The majority of rural-oriented new residents (54 percent) as compared to the highest proportion of 37 percent among others visited relatives between two to four times a month, and proportionately 12 percent more of urban-oriented new than the highest among other types of resident visited once a month or less often.

Table 55 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and number of families known in the

Table 53. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Once a month or less	8.5%	14.7%	33.0%	16.8%	16.9%
Two to four times a month	44.1	22.8	25.2	30.4	26.5
More than once a week	47.4	62.5	41.8	52.8	56.6
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 39.86$ $P < .01$

Table 54. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Once a month or less	20.3%	42.5%	31.1%	28.6%	35.9%
Two to four times a month	54.2	33.4	36.9	36.3	35.9
More than once a week	25.5	24.1	32.0	35.1	28.2
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 29.87$ $P < .01$

neighborhood. The data indicated that number of families known in the neighborhood depended more upon length of residence than on community orientation. More old residents of rural- and urban-orientation knew nine or more families in their neighborhood (53 and 56 percent respectively) than did their counterpart new residents (22 and 35 percent respectively). There was a greater percentage of new residents of rural- and urban-orientation who knew up to four families in their neighborhood than there was of old residents (about one third and one fifth respectively in each case).

Table 55. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
None to four	32.2%	38.0%	18.4%	22.0%	30.9%
Five to eight	45.8	26.8	28.2	22.0	26.8
Nine or more	22.0	35.2	53.4	56.0	42.3
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 58.31$ $P < .01$

Tables 56 to 58 show the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers. The relationships were found to be statistically significant. The amount of contact with farmers differed substantially

from the amount of contact with village residents and newcomers. The data showed greater similarities between the latter two.

It can be seen from the distribution in Table 56 that the majority of urban-oriented residents had little or no contact with farmers (86 and 71 percent of new and old residents) while only about one third of rural-oriented new and old residents were found in this category. Similarly, more rural-oriented than urban-oriented new and old residents had moderate amount of contact or great deal of contact with farmers. It could, however, be seen that a considerable proportion (26 percent) of urban-oriented old residents had moderate amount of contact with farmers.

Table 57 shows the distribution with regard to amount of contact with village residents. Some differences can be seen between new and old residents but generally the distribution does not offer a pattern. A greater proportion of urban-oriented new and rural-oriented old residents than their counterparts had little or no contact with village residents (49 and 45 percent vs. 36 and 33 percent respectively). With the exception of urban-oriented new residents (27 percent), between 38 to 44 percent of other types of resident had moderate amount of contact. Between 17 to 24 percent each of all types of resident was found in the high category.

Table 58 presents the percentage distribution of amount of contact with newcomers. It can be seen that with the exception of urban-oriented new residents, all other types of resident had no or little contact with newcomers. Fewer old than new residents had moderate amount of contact with other newcomers. Urban-oriented new residents had the highest pro-

Table 56. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None or little (low)	35.9%	86.1%	32.9%	71.3%	72.0%
Moderate	53.8	11.8	42.7	25.9	22.5
Much (high)	10.3	2.1	24.4	2.8	5.5
Total	100.0% (39)	100.0% (338)	100.0% (82)	100.0% (216)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 149.00$ $P < .01$

Table 57. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-new	Urban-new	Total
None or little (low)	33.3%	48.8%	45.1%	36.1%	43.4%
Moderate	43.6	26.9	37.8	40.7	33.6
Much (high)	23.1	24.3	17.1	23.2	23.0
Total	100.0% (39)	100.0% (338)	100.0% (82)	100.0% (216)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 16.73$ $P < .05$

portion reporting great deal of contact with newcomers (28 percent vs. not more than 6 percent among other types of resident).

In the following paragraphs the relationship between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and various component items of the index of social interaction are analyzed individually, first for the total population and then for each type of resident. Both socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle showed statistically significant relationships with each component item for the total population. However, the relationships between socioeconomic status or stage in family life cycle were found to be significant only for some component items not all and only for some types of resident not all. Therefore, those data which showed significant relationships or exhibited a pattern or trend are discussed in greater detail than others which did not.

Table 58. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
None or little (low)	59.0%	33.1%	72.0%	60.7%	48.2%
Moderate	41.0	39.4	28.0	33.3	36.1
Much (high)	0.0	27.5	0.0	6.0	15.7
Total	100.0% (39)	100.0% (338)	100.0% (82)	100.0% (216)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 98.53$ $P < .01$

Tables 59 and 60 present the percentage distribution of frequency of visiting with friends by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle respectively. The data showed statistically significant relationships in both cases. The Gamma values of association were low in both cases but showed an inverse relationship in the case of stage in family life cycle.

The data in Table 59 suggested that the higher the status, the greater would be the frequency of visiting with friends and neighbors. The proportion of respondents in the lowest visiting frequency category decreased gradually from low to high status. In the highest visiting frequency category, the proportion increased from low to high status. In the category of visiting once a month or less, the percentage dropped from 26 percent to 13 percent from low to high status. In the category of visiting more often than once a week, the percentage increased from

Table 59. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors

Visiting frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Once a month or less	25.9%	17.7%	12.5%	16.9%
Two to four times a month	23.7	29.7	23.6	26.5
More than once a week	50.4	52.6	63.9	56.6
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 19.68$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.19$

50 percent to 64 percent from low to high status. It, however, may be pointed out that the majority in all status classes visited their friends and neighbors more often than once a week.

The data in Table 60 suggested an inverse trend: those in earlier stages of vamily life cycle visited friends and neighbors more often than did those in later stages. The highest proportion of respondents visiting friends and neighbors more often than once a week was exhibited by those in an early stage of family life cycle (74 percent), followed by those in the middle (57 percent) and late stages (47 percent).

Table 60. Percentage Distribution of Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Friends and Neighbors

Visiting frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Once a month or less	4.7%	16.7%	23.5%	16.9%
Two to four times a month	21.7	26.4	29.4	26.5
More than once a week	73.6	56.9	47.1	56.6
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 30.78$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.28$

Taken separately by each type of resident, socioeconomic status and frequency of visiting with friends and neighbors showed statistically significant relationships for rural-oriented new and urban-oriented old residents. The G values of correlation were substantial for both rural-oriented new and old residents (0.46 and 0.38 respectively) but the X^2

value was not significant for the latter. Similarly, stage in family life cycle and frequency of visits showed statistically significant relationships for urban-oriented new and rural-oriented old residents (with G values of -0.36 and -0.10 respectively). A low inverse relationship was also found for urban-oriented old residents (G = -0.15). Since these data did not exhibit a pattern, the details are not presented here.

Tables 61 and 62 show the frequency of visiting with relatives by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle respectively. The relationships between the variables were found to be statistically significant in both cases. The Gamma values of association, however, were inverse and low or negligible (-0.22 and -0.11 respectively).

The data in Table 61 suggested that higher socioeconomic status families visited with relatives less frequently than did low socioeconomic status families. The majority in all three socioeconomic classes visited their relatives up to four times a month or less often, but in this category the percentage of high socioeconomic class respondents was the highest (80 percent), followed by the middle and low socioeconomic classes (67 percent each). Conversely, only 20 percent of high socioeconomic status families visited relatives more often than once a week as compared to about 33 percent of the other two classes.

An inverse relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with relatives is apparent from Table 62. Families in early stages of the life cycle visited with relatives more often than did families in later stage of life cycle. The proportion visiting relatives more often than once a month was highest among those in the early stage

Table 61. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Once a month or less	33.3%	28.2%	46.7%	35.9%
Two to four times a month	33.3	39.1	32.8	35.9
More than once a week	33.4	32.7	20.5	28.2
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 34.10$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.22$

Table 62. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Family life cycle stages Early	Middle	Late	Total
Once a month or less	14.7%	40.9%	35.3%	35.9%
Two to four times a month	42.7	34.8	34.9	35.9
More than once a week	42.6	24.3	29.8	28.2
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 34.97$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.11$

of the family life cycle (85 percent), followed by those in the late (75 percent) and middle stages (59 percent). A substantially smaller proportion of those in the early stage of family life cycle than of others visited relatives once a month or less often (15 percent vs. 41 percent and 35 percent of those in the middle and late stages respectively).

Table 63 shows the percentage distribution for each type of respondent by socioeconomic status and frequency of visiting their relatives. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant for all types of resident. The Gamma values were low and inverse for urban-oriented new and old residents and substantial for rural-oriented new and old residents (inverse in the case of new residents).

In the case of urban-oriented new residents in middle and high socioeconomic classes, the visiting frequencies were quite similar to those found for the total population in these two classes (reference Table 61). However, the visiting frequency of the low status respondents was different from the total population. A much larger proportion of urban-oriented residents with low socioeconomic status visited relatives once a month or less (59 percent) and very few (5 percent) visited more often than once a week as compared to 33 percent of total population in the two frequencies of visiting.

In the case of urban-oriented old residents, those with low socioeconomic status visited relatives more frequently than those with middle and high status. The latter two classes were alike in their visiting frequencies. About two thirds of the low socioeconomic status visited

Table 63. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Once a month or less	20.0%	22.6%	17.4%	59.1%	29.4%	52.4%	41.3%	13.2%	50.0%	11.1%	31.0%	34.3%
Two to four times a month	20.0	40.9	78.3	36.4	38.1	29.1	39.7	34.2	0.0	24.4	41.1	32.8
More than once a week	60.0	35.5	4.3	4.5	32.5	18.5	19.0	52.6	50.0	64.5	27.9	32.9
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	X^2 = 12.17 P < .05 G = -0.36			X^2 = 33.61 P < .01 G = -0.27			X^2 = 15.76 P < .01 G = 0.55			X^2 = 22.41 P < .01 G = -0.27		

relatives more frequently than once a month as compared to 28 percent and 33 percent respectively of middle and high classes. About one third each of middle and high classes visited relatives only once a month or less as compared to 11 percent of low socioeconomic status.

Rural-oriented new and old residents showed opposite directions of association between the two variables. The proportion of new residents in the highest category of visiting frequency decreased with status while the proportion of old residents increased with status. Those visiting more often than once a week amounted to 60 percent, 36 percent and 4 percent respectively for the low, middle and high classes among rural-oriented new residents. The percentages in this category for old residents were 19 percent, 53 percent and 50 percent respectively for the low, middle and high classes.

Taken separately by each type of resident, the relationships between stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with relatives were found to be statistically significant for urban-oriented new and rural-oriented old residents. No pattern in these relationships could be discerned. The Gamma values were low, ranging from -.17 to -.25 in all cases, with the exception of rural-oriented old residents in which case it was substantial (G = -.38). The details of these data are not presented here.

Table 64 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of neighborhood families known. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant, but the correlation value of Gamma was inverse and negligible. The data did not suggest any clear pattern.

Table 64. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socio-economic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None to four	37.1%	27.3%	33.3%	30.9%
Five to eight	20.7	26.2	29.7	25.8
Nine or more	42.2	46.5	37.0	42.3
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 11.68$ $P < .05$ $G = -0.07$

Table 65 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and number of neighborhood families known. The data showed a statistically significant relationship, but gave a zero G value of correlation. The number of respondents who knew nine or more families was far less among those in the early stage of family life cycle than those in the later stages. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents in the early stage knew nine or more neighbors as compared to 46 percent of those in the middle stage and 41 percent in the late stage. More families in the early stage of the life cycle knew between five and eight neighborhood families than those in the later stages (36 percent, 27 percent and 21 percent respectively for the three family life cycle stages). The distribution did not offer a pattern in the category of those who knew up to four neighbors. However, in this category the respondents in the early and late stages were more alike as compared to those in the middle stage (36 and 38 percent vs. 26 percent respectively).

Table 65. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None to four	35.7%	26.5%	38.4%	30.9%
Five to eight	35.6	27.4	20.8	26.8
Nine or more	28.7	46.1	40.8	42.3
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 24.11$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.0$

Table 66 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and number of neighborhood families known. The data showed statistically significant relationships between the two variables for all types of resident. The G values of correlation were higher for rural-oriented new and old residents than their urban-oriented counterparts. However, the higher G values for the former two types of resident could have resulted from small number of observations (5 or less) in one response category each of the resident types. The data did indicate that old residents generally knew more families than new residents of either orientation, and that generally a greater proportion of the middle class knew more families than the low or high classes.

Table 67 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and number of neighborhood families known. With the exception of rural-oriented old

Table 66. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
None to four	60.0%	19.3%	43.5%	63.6%	35.5%	38.1%	22.2%	13.2%	0.0%	42.2%	20.2%	12.8%
Five to eight	0.0	45.2	56.5	31.8	27.3	26.0	31.8	18.4	100.0	2.2	22.8	32.9
Nine or more	40.0	35.5	0.0	4.6	37.2	35.9	46.0	68.4	0.0	55.6	57.0	54.3
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 14.91$ $P < .01$ G = -0.43			$X^2 = 10.65$ $P < .05$ G = 0.05			$X^2 = 9.98$ $P < .05$ G = 0.29			$X^2 = 23.13$ $P < .01$ G = 0.10		

Table 67. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
None to four	8.3%	34.1%	100.0%	42.7%	31.6%	60.5%	0.0%	22.7%	16.7%	11.1%	13.4%	32.8%
Five to eight	83.4	38.6	0.0	23.3	29.8	18.4	80.0	20.5	29.6	88.9	20.4	18.8
Nine or more	8.3	27.3	0.0	34.0	38.6	21.1	20.0	56.8	53.7	0.0	66.2	48.4
Total	100.0% (12)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (339)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (122)
	$X^2 = 14.25$ $P < .01$ G = -0.34			$X^2 = 23.54$ $P < .01$ G = -0.12			$X^2 = 8.34$ Not significant G = 0.06			$X^2 = 39.72$ $P < .01$ G = -0.23		

residents, the data showed significant relationships for all types of resident. The Gamma values were inverse for all except rural-oriented old residents, but were generally less than substantial.

The data indicated that old residents knew more families than new families regardless of community orientation, and that families in the middle stage of life cycle tend to know more families in the neighborhood regardless of community orientation or length of residence in the community. It could also be seen that greater proportion of oldtime than new middle stage families knew more neighborhood families.

Tables 68 to 70 show the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers respectively. The two variables showed statistically significant relationships in each case. With the exception of contact with village residents, the Gamma values of association were substantial.

In Table 68 the data showed a substantial inverse relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with farmers (G = -0.39). The majority (53 percent) of respondents with low socioeconomic status were in the moderate or high categories, whereas the majority of middle and high socioeconomic classes had little or no contact with farmers (72 percent and 81 percent respectively).

The data in Table 69 gave a positive but negligible G value of association. The majority (53 percent) of respondents with low socioeconomic status had little or no contact with village residents. Large proportions of respondents in middle socioeconomic class, however, had moderate amount or great deal of contact (36 and 42 percent respectively) with

Table 68. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
None or little (low)	46.7%	72.4%	80.5%	72.0
Moderate	37.8	21.0	19.1	22.5
Much (high)	15.5	6.6	0.4	5.5
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (278)

$X^2 = 50.73$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.39$

Table 69. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
None or little (low)	53.3%	35.9%	49.8%	43.4%
Moderate	33.3	41.6	23.1	33.6
Much (high)	13.4	22.5	27.1	23.0
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 28.85$ $P < .01$ $G = .02$

village residents. On the other hand, 50 percent of high socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents. More of the middle and high than low socioeconomic classes tended to have great deal of contact with village residents.

In Table 70 the data indicated a substantial degree of association (G = 0.48) between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with newcomers. The majority (78 percent) of respondents with low socioeconomic status had little or no contact with newcomers. They were followed by those in the middle and high classes (53 percent and 31 percent respectively) in the aforementioned category. A substantially large proportion (47 percent) of middle socioeconomic status and the majority (70 percent) of high socioeconomic status residents had contacts of moderate or high intensity level with newcomers.

Table 70. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
None or little (low)	77.8%	53.0%	31.1%	48.1%
Moderate	22.2	34.1	43.8	36.1
Much (high)	0.0	12.9	25.1	15.7
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 72.48$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.48$

Tables 71 to 73 show the percentage distribution by stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers respectively. The two variables showed significant relationships in all cases. The G value of association was substantial only in the case of contact with newcomers (G = -0.41).

Table 71 shows the percentage distribution by stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers. The relationship between the two variables was statistically significant but the G value of correlation was low. It could be seen that although the majority in all stages of family life cycle (varying from 68 to 80 percent) had little or no contact with farmers, the proportion was larger in the early than the later stages. In other words, more of those in the middle and late stages than early stage had greater contact with farmers.

In Table 72 the data showed an inverse but low association between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with village residents

Table 71. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	80.0%	71.6%	67.8%	72.0%
Moderate	15.4	24.4	22.8	22.5
Much (high)	4.6	4.0	9.4	5.5
Total	100.0% (110)	100.0% (394)	100.0% (171)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 10.75$ $P < .05$ $G = 0.17$

The relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with newcomers was not significant except for urban-oriented new residents. The Gamma values were low for old residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.20 and 0.28 respectively) and substantial for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.50 and 0.42 respectively). The details of these data are not presented here.

Taken separately by residence-orientation typology, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers was found to be statistically significant only for urban-oriented new residents. Although the Gamma values of association were high or substantial for rural-oriented new and old residents, they were in opposite direction to each other (-0.78 and 0.42 respectively). These values were negligible for urban-oriented new and old residents (-0.03 and -0.14 respectively). The data indicated that of rural-oriented new residents, those in early stage of family life cycle had more contact with farmers than those in the later stages while the converse was true of rural-oriented old residents. The details of these data are not presented here.

The relationships between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents were found to be statistically significant for all types of resident. Similarly significant relationships were found between stage in family life cycle and amounts of contact with village residents and newcomers. These relationships are examined in the following paragraphs.

Table 74 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents. The relationship between the two variables was significant for all types of resident but the G values of correlation were low or negligible for three of the four resident types. They showed an inverse relationship for urban-oriented new and old residents.

The the case of rural-oriented new residents, the majority (60 percent) of the low socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents, but the majorities of the other two classes had moderate amount or great deal of contact (85 percent and 62 percent respectively) with them.

In the case of rural-oriented old residents the pattern was similar to that of rural-oriented new residents: the majority in the low socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents but the majorities in the other two classes had contacts of moderate or high intensity with them.

Table 75 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with village residents. Significant relationships were found between the two variables for old residents, both rural- and urban-oriented, but in the case of new residents the relationship was significant for urban-oriented respondents only. The Gamma values of association were inverse for all types of resident, with the exception of rural-oriented new residents, but the values were generally low or negligible.

Table 75. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
None or little (low)	57.1%	30.0%	0.0%	46.1%	43.1%	86.8%	0.0%	51.4%	45.0%	55.6%	32.8	38.5%
Moderate	42.9	40.0	100.0	24.7	30.3	13.2	100.0	24.3	42.5	44.4	36.2	46.1
Much (high)	0.0	30.0	0.0	29.2	26.6	0.0	0.0	24.3	12.5	0.0	31.0	15.4
Total	100.0% (7)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (89)	100.0% (211)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (37)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (116)	100.0% (91)
	X^2 = 6.21 Not significant G = 0.51			X^2 = 27.11 P < .01 G = -0.28			X^2 = 12.19 P < .05 G = -0.11			X^2 = 10.28 P < .05 G = -0.12		

Table 76 gives the percentage distribution of residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with newcomers. The relationship was found to be significant for urban-oriented new and old residents. The G values of association did not render a meaningful pattern, though they were inverse in nature for three of the four types of resident and substantial for two.

The data indicated that generally large proportions of oldtime residents in the middle and late stages of the family life cycle, regardless of community orientation, had little or not contact with newcomers. This held true for the new residents of the middle and late stages but to a lesser extent than oldtime residents.

Summary of Findings on Social Interaction

The level of social interaction was examined by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle for the total score and for each item of the index of social interaction. On the basis of overall scores, more oldtime residents interacted at high level than did new residents regardless of their community orientation. The overall scores were only slightly affected by differences in socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle.

It was found that oldtime residents knew more families in the neighborhood and visited relatives more often than did new residents, new residents had greater contact with other newcomers and village residents than had oldtime residents, rural-oriented residents had greater contact with farmers than had urban-oriented residents, and urban-oriented residents visited friends and neighbors more often than did rural-oriented residents.

Table 68. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	46.7%	72.4%	80.5%	72.0
Moderate	37.8	21.0	19.1	22.5
Much (high)	15.5	6.6	0.4	5.5
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (278)

$X^2 = 50.73$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.39$

Table 69. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	53.3%	35.9%	49.8%	43.4%
Moderate	33.3	41.6	23.1	33.6
Much (high)	13.4	22.5	27.1	23.0
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 28.85$ $P < .01$ $G = .02$

village residents. On the other hand, 50 percent of high socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents. More of the middle and high than low socioeconomic classes tended to have great deal of contact with village residents.

In Table 70 the data indicated a substantial degree of association (G = 0.48) between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with newcomers. The majority (78 percent) of respondents with low socioeconomic status had little or no contact with newcomers. They were followed by those in the middle and high classes (53 percent and 31 percent respectively) in the aforementioned category. A substantially large proportion (47 percent) of middle socioeconomic status and the majority (70 percent) of high socioeconomic status residents had contacts of moderate or high intensity level with newcomers.

Table 70. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	77.8%	53.0%	31.1%	48.1%
Moderate	22.2	34.1	43.8	36.1
Much (high)	0.0	12.9	25.1	15.7
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 72.48$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.48$

Tables 71 to 73 show the percentage distribution by stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers respectively. The two variables showed significant relationships in all cases. The G value of association was substantial only in the case of contact with newcomers (G = -0.41).

Table 71 shows the percentage distribution by stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers. The relationship between the two variables was statistically significant but the G value of correlation was low. It could be seen that although the majority in all stages of family life cycle (varying from 68 to 80 percent) had little or no contact with farmers, the proportion was larger in the early than the later stages. In other words, more of those in the middle and late stages than early stage had greater contact with farmers.

In Table 72 the data showed an inverse but low association between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with village residents

Table 71. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	80.0%	71.6%	67.8%	72.0%
Moderate	15.4	24.4	22.8	22.5
Much (high)	4.6	4.0	9.4	5.5
Total	100.0% (110)	100.0% (394)	100.0% (171)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 10.75$ $P < .05$ $G = 0.17$

(G = -0.13). Almost one half of the respondents in late stage had little or no contact with village residents as compared to 40 percent and 46 percent respectively of those in the middle and early stages of life cycle. About one third of the respondents in each stage of the family life cycle had moderate amount of contact with village residents. The percentages in this category varied between 31 percent and 39 percent showing an increase towards the later stages. The respondents in the late stage were less than the others (11 percent vs. 24 and 28 percent) in the high category of contact.

The distribution in Table 73 showed a substantial inverse association (G = -0.41) between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with newcomers. The respondents in late stage of the family life cycle differed substantially from all others. Those in the early and middle stages were more alike in the amount of contact they had with newcomers. The majority of those in late stage (74 percent) had little or no contact with newcomers, but the majority of those in the early and middle stages of the family life cycle had contacts of moderate or high intensity (59 percent and 61 percent respectively).

The relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with farmers was not found significant for any of the four types of resident. The Gamma values of association were inverse and were either low or negligible in all cases except rural-oriented new residents (G = -0.31). These values ranged from -.05 to -.27. The details of these are not presented here.

Table 72. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	45.5%	39.9%	50.3%	43.4%
Moderate	30.9	32.2	38.6	33.6
Much (high)	23.6	27.9	11.1	23.0
Total	100.0% (110)	100.0% (394)	100.0% (171)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 19.54$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.13$

Table 73. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	40.9%	39.1%	73.7%	48.2%
Moderate	40.0	39.3	26.3	36.1
Much (high)	19.1	21.6	0.0	15.7
Total	100.0% (110)	100.0% (394)	100.0% (171)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 73.51$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.41$

The relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of co tact with newcomers was not significant except for urban-oriented residents. The Gamma values were low for old residents of rural- an urban-orientation (G = 0.20 and 0.28 respectively) and substantial for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.50 and 0.42 respe tively). The details of these data are not presented here.

Taken separately by residence-orientation typology, the relatio ship between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with far ers was found to be statistically significant only for urban-oriented new residents. Although the Gamma values of association were high or substantial for rural-oriented new and old residents, they were in opposite direction to each other (-0.78 and 0.42 respectively). These values were negligible for urban-oriented new and old residents (-0.03 and -0.14 respectively). The data indicated that of rural-oriented ne residents, those in early stage of family life cycle had more contact with farmers than those in the later stages while the converse was tru of rural-oriented old residents. The details of these data are not pr sented here.

The relationships between socioeconomic status and amount of con tact with village residents were found to be statistically significant for all types of resident. Similarly significant relationships were fo between stage in family life cycle and amounts of contact with village residents and newcomers. These relationships are examined in the follo ing paragraphs.

Table 74 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents. The relationship between the two variables was significant for all types of resident but the G values of correlation were low or negligible for three of the four resident types. They showed an inverse relationship for urban-oriented new and old residents.

The the case of rural-oriented new residents, the majority (60 percent) of the low socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents, but the majorities of the other two classes had moderate amount or great deal of contact (85 percent and 62 percent respectively) with them.

In the case of rural-oriented old residents the pattern was similar to that of rural-oriented new residents: the majority in the low socioeconomic class had little or no contact with village residents but the majorities in the other two classes had contacts of moderate or high intensity with them.

Table 75 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with village residents. Significant relationships were found between the two variables for old residents, both rural- and urban-oriented, but in the case of new residents the relationship was significant for urban-oriented respondents only. The Gamma values of association were inverse for all types of resident, with the exception of rural-oriented new residents, but the values were generally low or negligible.

Table 74. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
None or little (low)	60.0%	15.4%	38.1%	91.7%	42.3%	52.2%	55.3%	33.3%	0.0%	30.8%	30.4%	49.2%
Moderate	40.0	76.9	23.8	8.3	30.1	25.1	29.8	51.5	0.0	50.0	50.4	18.5
Much (high)	0.0	7.7	38.1	0.0	27.6	22.7	14.9	15.2	100.0	19.2	19.2	32.3
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (13)	100.0% (21)	100.0% (12)	100.0% (163)	100.0% (163)	100.0% (47)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (125)	100.0% (65)
	$X^2 = 12.22$ $P < .05$ G = 0.27			$X^2 = 12.44$ $P < .05$ G = -0.04			$X^2 = 14.46$ $P < .01$ G = 0.38			$X^2 = 19.13$ $P < .01$ G = -0.07		

Table 76. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
None or little (low)	100.0%	46.7%	100.0%	37.1%	25.6%	65.8%	20.0%	78.4%	72.5%	44.4%	49.1%	76.9%
Moderate	0.0	53.3	0.0	43.8	38.4	34.2	80.0	21.6	27.5	11.2	43.1	23.1
Much (high)	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.1	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	7.8	0.0
Total	100.0% (7)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (14)	100.0% (128)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (37)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (116)	100.0% (91)
	X^2 = 8.14 Not significant G = 0.56			X^2 = 35.32 P < .01 G = -0.08			X^2 = 7.45 Not significant G = -0.16			X^2 = 42.57 P < .01 G = -0.55		

It was found that the middle and high status residents visited friends and neighbors more often and had greater contact with village residents and newcomers than those with the low status had, the low status residents had greater contact with farmers than the middle and high status residents had, and both the low and the middle status residents visited relatives more often than did those with the high status. Respondents in the early stage visited friends, neighbors and relatives more often than those with the middle and late stages, those in the early and middle stages had greater contact with villagers and newcomers than those in the late stage, and those in the middle and late stages knew more families and had greater contact with farmers than those in the early stage.

Institutional Participation

The index to measure intensity of institutional participation and the component items of the index were discussed in the chapter on Parma. That discussion also included description of what would typify a respondent with low, moderate or high intensity of institutional participation.

Table 77 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and intensity of institutional participation. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

More new residents, both rural- and urban-oriented, participated at high intensity level as compared to oldtime residents. Rural-orient new residents led all others, with 46 percent being in high intensity level, followed by urban-oriented new residents (32 percent), urban-

oriented old residents (29 percent) and rural-oriented old residents (21 percent). The majority of each resident type, varying between 51 percent and 66 percent, participated at moderate level. There were more old residents in the low participation level compared to new residents (13 percent vs. 5 percent respectively).

Table 77. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Low	3.4%	4.8%	12.6%	13.2%	8.0%
Moderate	50.8	62.8	66.0	58.0	61.1
High	45.8	32.4	21.4	28.6	30.9
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 30.21$ $P < .01$

The relationships were also examined separately for community orientation and length of residence and intensity of institutional participation. Relationship between community orientation and intensity of participation was not found to be statistically significant and G value of association was almost zero. Length of residence and intensity of participation showed significant relationship ($X^2 = 29.62$, df = 6) and gave an inverse but negligible degree of correlation (G = -0.12). The details of these data are not presented here.

Socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle also showed statistically significant relationships with intensity of institutional participation. The Gamma values of correlation were substantial for the variables of socioeconomic status and intensity of participation but were inverse and low for stage in family life cycle and intensity of participation.

Table 78 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and intensity of institutional participation. The data indicated a greater participation at high intensity level among respondents with high socioeconomic status, but at moderate or low levels among respondents with low and middle status. Forty-six percent of respondents with high socioeconomic status participated at high intensity level as compared to the 24 percent and 15 percent respectively of respondents with middle and low status. Participation at moderate and low

Table 78. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Socioeconomic status scores			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
Low	14.1%	9.0%	4.4%	8.0%
Moderate	71.1	66.8	50.0	61.1
High	14.8	24.2	45.6	30.9
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 67.23$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.42$

intensity levels was highest among the low status (71 percent and 14 percent respectively) and least among respondents with high socioeconomic status (50 percent and 4 percent respectively). However, the majority of each class participated at moderate intensity level, though the proportion was larger in the low and middle classes than the high status class.

Table 79 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and intensity of institutional participation. The distribution does not present a clear pattern when the three intensity levels are considered individually, but a clear inverse relationship is obtained if moderate and high intensity levels were combined. Ninety-nine percent of the respondents in early stage were found participating at moderate or high levels, followed by those in the middle (94 percent) and late stages (85 percent). Conversely, more respondents in late stage were in the low participation level than those in early or middle stages of

Table 79. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Family life cycle Stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Low	0.8%	6.3%	15.3%	8.0%
Moderate	91.5	52.4	65.1	61.0
High	7.7	41.3	19.6	31.0
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 107.42$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.13$

family life cycle. The respondents in middle stage had the highest percentage (41 percent) in high intensity category as compared to 20 percent and 8 percent respectively of those in the late and early stages.

Table 80 gives the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and intensity of institutional participation. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant for all types of resident. The Gamma values of association were substantial for all types of resident.

It can be seen that, generally, families with low socioeconomic status were more in low and moderate intensity levels and less in high intensity level of participation than those with middle and high socioeconomic status. Also, more families with high socioeconomic status participated at high intensity level than families with middle and low socioeconomic status.

Table 81 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and intensity of institutional participation. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant for all types of resident except rural-oriented old residents. The G values of association were substantial for two of the four resident types but did not render a pattern. The direction of correlation was inverse for old residents of both rural- and urban-orientation but the degree was low for rural-oriented old residents.

In the case of rural-oriented new residents, the majority (92 percent) of those in early stage fell in the moderate intensity, but the majority (59 percent) of those in middle stages fell in the high intensity

Table 80. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score, and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Low	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	4.5%	14.3%	10.5%	0.0%	17.8%	15.2%	5.7%
Moderate	40.0	71.0	26.1	100.0	68.0	55.1	71.4	60.5	0.0	60.0	65.8	40.0
High	20.0	29.0	73.9	0.0	26.4	40.4	14.3	29.0	100.0	22.2	19.0	54.3
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 33.56$ $P < .01$ G = 0.73			$X^2 = 24.64$ $P < .01$ G = 0.33			$X^2 = 10.59$ $P < .05$ G = 0.39			$X^2 = 31.66$ $P < .01$ G = 0.41		

category. The majority of urban-oriented new residents, regardless of stage in the family life cycle, fell in the moderate intensity level, with the percentages varying between 52 percent and 90 percent. Those in the middle stage participated at high intensity more than others (42 percent vs. the next highest of 22 percent).

The data indicated greater participation at high intensity by new than old residents regardless of community orientation. Of the new residents, more of those in middle stage of family life cycle participated at high intensity than others.

Among rural-oriented old residents, about two thirds each of those in the middle and late stages participated at moderate level. The high intensity of participation was greater among those in middle stage (27 percent) than those in late stage (19 percent). Among urban-oriented old residents, the trend of participation at moderate level was similar to that of rural-oriented old residents. However, more of those in middle stage (39 percent) participated at high intensity and more of those in late stage participated at low intensity (22 percent) than their rural oriented counterparts.

Only two of the five component items of the index of institutional participation showed a significant relationship with various types of respondent. These items were, frequency of church attendance, and amount of interest in local affairs. The data regarding these two variables is given in the following two tables.

Table 82 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology and frequency of church attendance. The majority of all

resident types attended church every week (rural-oriented new residents were more than others in this category). Attending church only on important days was more common among old than new residents, regardless of their community orientation.

Table 82. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Only on important days	6.8%	11.4%	14.6%	20.1%	13.9%
Once or twice a month	16.9	16.4	10.7	11.0	14.3
Once a week	76.3	72.2	74.7	68.9	71.8
Total	100.0% (59)	100.0% (518)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (273)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 17.72$ $P < .01$

Table 83 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology and amount of interest in local affairs. The two variables were found to be significantly related. The data showed that the majority of rural-oriented old residents showed only a slight interest in local affairs but the majority of all other types of resident were either interested or very interested in local affairs. More new residents, both rural and urban-oriented, said that they were very interested in local affairs than did the oldtime residents (13 and 19 percent vs. 8 and 9 percent respectively).

Table 83. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Slightly interested	30.8%	30.8%	59.8%	33.8%	35.3%
Interested	56.4	50.3	31.7	57.4	50.7
Very interested	12.8	18.9	8.5	8.8	14.0
Total	100.0% (39)	100.0% (338)	100.0% (82)	100.0% (216)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 36.04$ $P < .01$

The total score of institutional participation and all component items of the index, except one, showed significant relationships with socioeconomic status. The exception was in the case of frequency of church attendance. The relationships between stage in family life cycle, total participation score and all component items of the index were also found to be statistically significant. The Gamma values of association were generally positive and substantial for socioeconomic status and total score as well as all component items of the index. Gamma values were generally inverse but negligible with respect to stage in family life cycle, the total score and all, except one, component items of the index.

The following paragraphs examine the relationships between socioeconomic status and each component item of the index for the total population in the first instance and then for each type of resident. These are followed by the data regarding the relationships between stage in

family life cycle and each item of the index in the same fashion as explained above for socioeconomic status.

Table 84 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of voluntary associations to which they belonged. The two variables were significantly related and gave substantial positive Gamma value of association. The data showed that the majority of the respondents with low status (65 percent) did not belong to any association, while a majority in each of the middle and high classes belonged to one or more associations (59 percent and 73 percent respectively). The respondents with high socioeconomic status were almost equally divided between those belonging to one or two associations (34 percent) and those belonging to three or more associations (39 percent). However, most of the respondents with middle socioeconomic status belonged to one or two associations (44 percent) or none at all (41 percent).

Table 85 presents the distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and number of associations to which

Table 84. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged

Number of organizations	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None	65.2%	41.3%	26.7%	39.1%
One or two	20.7	43.4	34.2	36.7
Three or more	14.1	15.3	39.1	24.1
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 108.14$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.42$

Table 85. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and number of Organizations to Which They Belonged

Number of organizations	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
None	60.0%	29.0	21.7%	68.2%	45.9%	29.4%	65.1%	26.3%	0.0%	64.5%	40.5%	18.6%
One or two	20.0	54.8	39.1	31.8	39.8	35.9	22.2	47.4	0.0	13.3	45.6	27.1
Three or more	20.0	16.2	39.1	0.0	14.3	34.7	12.7	26.3	100.0	22.2	13.9	54.3
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 6.40$ Not significant G = 0.36			$X^2 = 41.60$ P < .01 G = 0.41			$X^2 = 22.75$ P < .01 G = 0.60			$X^2 = 58.29$ P < .01 G = 0.49		

respondent belonged. With the exception of rural-oriented new residents, the relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant for all types of resident. The Gamma correlations were substantial in all cases.

The data indicated that regardless of the type of respondent, the majority of those in low socioeconomic class belonged to no organization. Middle status respondents of urban-orientation tended either to fall in the category of none or one to two organizations, but more of rural-oriented middle class respondents tended to fall in the latter category. High status respondents, regardless of resident typology, tended to fall in the category of one or two, or three or more organizations.

Table 86 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and number of organizations to which they belonged. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant, and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was inverse but negligible. The data indicated that the majority of those in the early and late stages was not member of any association (55 percent and 53 percent respectively). However, a substantial proportion of those in early stage belonged to one or two organizations (41 percent), while of those in late stage only about 28 percent fell in this category. Those in the middle stage were the most active as 40 percent belonged to one or more organizations and 31 percent to three or more organizations which was the highest percentage of all others.

Table 87 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, in family life cycle and number of organizations to which

Table 86. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged

Number of organizations	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None	55.0%	29.2%	53.4%	39.2%
One or two	41.1	39.7	27.8	36.7
Three or more	3.9	31.1	18.8	24.1
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 79.81$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.04$

they belonged. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally low but were positive in the case of new residents and inverse in the case of low residents. With the exception of rural-oriented old residents, the relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant for all types of resident.

The membership pattern obtained for each type of resident was not very different from the one obtained for the total population. With the exception of urban-oriented new residents, the number of observations in early stage of family life cycle was too small to render a meaningful comparison among various types of resident. However, it could be seen that, regardless of the type of resident, more middle stage than late stage respondents tended to fall in the categories of 1 to 2 and 3 or more organizations. Generally, similar proportions of the middle or late stage respondents of all types belonged to one or two, or 3 or more organizations respectively.

Table 87. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged

Number of organizations	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
None	83.4%	13.6%	33.3%	46.6%	32.1%	55.3%	80.0%	34.1%	59.3%	100.0%	25.3%	50.0%
One or two	8.3	54.6	66.7	49.5	37.2	22.4	20.0	40.9	24.0	0.0	40.9	32.0
Three or more	8.3	31.8	0.0	3.9	30.7	22.4	0.0	25.0	16.7	0.0	33.8	18.0
Total	100.0% (12)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (339)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (122)
	X^2 = 23.47 G = 0.60		P < .01	X^2 = 43.12 G = 0.10		P < .01	X^2 = 8.39 Not significant G = -0.22			X^2 = 32.75 G = 0.25		P < .01

Table 88 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of offices held in the voluntary organizations to which they belonged. The relationship between the two variables was significant and gave a positive substantial Gamma correlation. The data indicated that for all classes, those who hold offices tend to hold office in one rather than two or more organizations. High status respondents were more likely than low or middle status respondents to hold office in one or more organizations. Comparing low and middle status respondents, about the same proportion held office in one organization, but proportionately slightly more middle than lower status respondents held office in two or more organizations.

It may be pointed out that the "none" category includes those who were not members of any organization. The proportions of nonmembers by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle are shown in previous Tables 84 and 86, respectively.

Table 88. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None*	87.4%	82.5%	72.0%	79.2%
One	11.1	10.7	14.7	12.3
Two or more	1.5	6.8	13.3	8.5
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 26.35$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.31$

*Includes nonmembers (see Table 84 for nonmember proportions).

Table 89 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and number of organizations in which office was held. The relationship between the two variables was not found to be significant for rural-oriented new and old residents, but it was significant for urban-oriented new and old residents. The Gamma values of correlation were found to be substantial for all types of resident, with the exception of rural-oriented old residents.

Regardless of resident typology, low status respondents were most likely to be nonoffice holders. Oldtime residents of middle status were more likely than new residents of middle status to hold office in one or more organizations. (Proportionately urban-oriented new and old residents were more than their rural-oriented counterparts in these categories.) More new than old residents tended to hold office in one organization, but more urban-oriented old residents than other types of resident held office in two or more organizations.

Table 90 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and number of organizations in which they held an office. The data indicated that it was mostly the respondents in middle stage (26 percent) who held office in one or more organizations, followed by those in the late and early stages of family life cycle (17 percent and 6 percent respectively).

The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant, but the Gamma value of association was negligible (G = 0.04).

Table 91 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and frequency of attendance at meetings. The re-

Table 89. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
None*	60.0%	90.3%	70.9%	100.0%	82.7%	73.6%	82.5%	81.6%	100.0%	88.9%	81.0%	68.6%
One	20.0	6.5	21.7	0.0	13.0	15.1	14.3	7.9	0.0	11.1	8.9	11.4
Two or more	20.0	3.2	17.4	0.0	4.3	11.3	3.2	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.1	20.0
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 7.50$ Not significant $G = 0.56$			$X^2 = 15.71$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.34$			$X^2 = 3.46$ Not significant $G = 0.02$			$X^2 = 12.23$ $P < .05$ $G = 0.36$		

Table 90. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None*	93.8%	74.2%	83.1%	79.2%
One	3.1	14.2	12.6	12.3
Two or more	3.1	11.6	4.3	18.5
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 32.54$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.04$

*Includes nonmembers (see Table 86 for nonmember proportions).

Table 91. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Nonmembers	64.5%	41.3%	26.7%	39.0%
Up to 3 times a month	24.4	44.3	51.1	44.1
Once a week or more often	11.1	14.4	22.2	16.9
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 63.27$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.34$

lationship between the two variables was found to be significant, and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial (0.34). The data indicated that respondents with low status attended meetings less frequently than respondents with middle and high status. The frequency of attendance of up to three times a month was 24 percent, 44 percent and 51 percent respectively for low, middle and high status respondents. Similarly, attendance frequency of once a week or more often was greater in high than low and middle status respondents (22 percent, 11 percent and 14 percent respectively).

Table 92 gives the percentage distribution by socioeconomic status and attendance frequency at meetings for each resident type. With the exception of rural-oriented new residents, the relationship between the two variables was found to be significant for all types of resident. The Gamm values of association were generally substantial, except for the rural-oriented new residents.

It could be seen that rural- and urban-oriented old residents generally attended meetings more frequently than their counterpart new residents. This held true for almost all socioeconomic classes. More high status respondents attended meetings with greater frequency than middle or low status respondents regardless of resident typology (with the exception of rural-oriented new residents of middle status who were slightly more than high status respondents in the highest attendance frequency category).

Table 93 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of attendance at meetings. The

Table 92. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Nonmembers	60.0%	29.0	21.7%	68.2%	45.9%	29.2%	63.5	26.3%	0.0%	64.5%	40.5%	18.6%
Up to 3 times a month	40.0	48.4	60.9	31.8	42.0	49.8	22.2	63.2	50.0	22.2	42.4	52.8
Once a week or more often	0.0	22.6	17.4	0.0	12.1	20.8	14.3	10.5	50.0	13.3	17.1	28.6
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 3.85$ Not significant $G = 0.21$			$X^2 = 26.03$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.35$			$X^2 = 20.54$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.48$			$X^2 = 25.63$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.41$		

Gamma value of association was inverse but low (-0.07), and the X^2 test indicated a significant relationship.

The distribution indicated that respondents in middle stage of family life cycle attended meetings more frequently than others. The majority of those in middle stage (51 percent) attended meetings up to three times a month as compared to 35 percent and 33 percent of those in the early and late stages respectively. Among those who attended meetings once a week or more often, the respondents of middle stage had the largest proportion (20 percent), followed by those in the late and early stages (15 percent and 10 percent respectively).

Table 94 gives the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and frequency of attendance at meetings. The relationship between the two variables was found to

Table 93. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Nonmembers	55.0%	29.2%	52.9%	39.0%
Up to 3 times a month	34.9	51.3	32.6	44.1
Once a week or more often	10.1	19.5	14.5	16.9
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 58.91$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.07$

Table 94. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
Nonmembers	83.3%	13.6%	33.3%	46.6%	32.2%	55.3%	80.0%	34.1%	57.5%	100.0%	25.3%	50.0%
Up to 3 times a month	16.7	61.4	66.7	40.8	50.7	28.9	20.0	54.5	25.9	0.0	48.6	36.9
Once a week or more often	0.0	25.0	0.0	12.6	17.1	15.8	0.0	11.4	16.7	0.0	26.1	13.1
Total	100.0% (12)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (330)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (122)
	$X^2 = 23.37$ $P < .01$ G = 0.71			$X^2 = 18.98$ $P < .01$ G = -0.01			$X^2 = 10.69$ $P < .05$ G = -0.13			$X^2 = 32.74$ $P < .01$ G = -0.26		

be statistically significant for all types of resident. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was positive and high for rural-oriented new residents but was inverse and low for all other types of resident.

With the exception of urban-oriented new residents, the number of observations in early stage of family life cycle was too small to render a meaningful comparison among various types of resident. It could be seen, however, that middle class respondents, regardless of resident typology, were more likely to attend meetings up to three times a month, only that rural-oriented residents were proportionately more than urban-oriented residents in this category. Almost similar proportions of all types of resident in late stage of family life cycle attended meetings onace a week or more often.

Table 95 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance. With the exception of rural-oriented old residents, the relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant. The Gamma coefficients of correlation, however, did not give a consistent pattern. The G value was inverse but substantial for urban-oriented new residents and positive but low for their oldtime counterparts. On the other hand, the value was positive and substantial for rural-oriented new residents, but inverse and low for their counterpart oldtime residents.

The data indicated that although an overwhelming majority of each type of resident in all classes attended church once a week, generally more new than oldtime residents of either orientation were found in this

Table 95. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Only on important days	40.0%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	14.0%	15.9%	13.2%	0.0%	17.8%	21.5%	18.6%
Once or twice a month	40.0	12.9	17.4	18.2	10.0	21.9	7.9	13.2	50.0	11.1	15.8	0.0
Once a week	20.0	80.7	32.6	81.8	80.5	64.1	76.2	73.6	50.0	71.1	62.7	81.4
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (23)	100.0% (22)	100.0% (231)	100.0% (265)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (158)	100.0% (70)
	$X^2 = 13.85$ $P < .01$ G = 0.47			$X^2 = 20.37$ $P < .01$ G = -0.35			$X^2 = 4.16$ Not significant G = -0.07			$X^2 = 13.93$ $P < .01$ G = 0.15		

category. Rural-oriented new residents of high status had a considerably larger proportion than their urban-oriented counterparts attending church once a week. Urban-oriented new and old residents of high status presented some interesting contrasts. Attending church once a week was considerably less common among the former (64 percent) than the latter (81 percent), and the remainder of the former were more likely to attend once or twice a month while of the latter they were more likely to attend church only on important days. It could also be seen that more urban- than rural-oriented residents tended to attend church only on important days.

The data in this table have indicated a statistically significant relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance for all types of resident, except rural-oriented old residents. However, the substantial Gamma coefficients for new residents and low coefficients for oldtime residents suggest that length of residence than community orientation influenced the attendance frequency. Even among new residents, the attendance frequency increased with socioeconomic class but decreased among rural- and urban-oriented types of resident respectively.

It may be pointed out that socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance were not found to be significantly related. The X^2 value was not significant even at the .05 level and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was negligible (G = -0.07). The details of these data are not reported here.

Table 96 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance. The two variables showed a statistically significant relationship but the Gamma value was negligible. The data did not indicate a great difference in the pattern of church attendance on the basis of differences in family life cycle. The majority in each case (between 67 percent and 75 percent) attended church once a week. Those in middle stage of family life cycle exceeded others in this category. The respondents in late stage exceeded others in attending church only on important days.

Table 97 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance. With the exception of rural-oriented new residents, the relationship was found to be statistically significant for all types of resident. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally negligible, except for rural-oriented new residents in which case the degree was substantial. These Gamma values were inverse for all types of resident, except for urban-oriented new residents.

Table 96. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Only on important days	13.2%	11.4%	20.0%	13.9%
Once or twice a month	19.4	13.9	12.6	14.3
Once a week	67.4	74.7	67.4	71.8
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 13.97$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.07$

Table 97. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
Only on important days	0.0%	6.8%	33.3%	16.5%	10.9%	6.6%	0.0%	13.6%	16.7%	0.0%	13.4%	29.5%
Once or twice a month	16.7	18.2	0.0	14.6	14.5	27.6	80.0	2.3	11.1	44.4	14.8	4.1
Once a week	83.3	75.0	66.7	68.7	74.6	65.8	20.0	84.1	72.2	55.6	71.8	66.4
Total	100.0% (12)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (103)	100.0% (339)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (142)	100.0% (122)
	X^2 = 4.61 Not significant G = -0.30			X^2 = 11.68 P < .05 G = 0.02			X^2 = 28.90 P < .01 G = -0.03			X^2 = 27.17 P < .01 G = -0.16		

The distribution pattern regarding frequency of church attendance in the case of each resident type generally followed the same overall pattern as was found for the total population (reference Table 96). It, therefore, indicated that type of resident did not affect relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance.

Table 98 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs. The relationship between the two variables was statistically significant and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial. It can be seen that the majority (70 percent) of those with low socioeconomic status showed slight interest in local affairs, while a majority of middle and high status respondents were either interested or very interested (66 percent and 76 percent respectively). The latter two classes, however, did have sizeable proportions in the slightly interested category (34 percent and 24 percent respectively).

Table 98. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Slightly interested	70.0%	34.4%	23.9%	35.2%
Interested	28.9	52.1	56.6	50.7
Very interested	1.1	13.5	19.5	14.1
Total	100.0% (90)	100.0% (334)	100.0% (251)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 66.46$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.41$

Table 99 presents the percentage distribution by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs. The relationship was not found to be statistically significant for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation, but it was found to be significant for oldtime residents of rural- and urban-orientation. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally substantial or high.

The data indicated that regardless of resident typology generally the majority of low socioeconomic class was only slightly interested in local affairs, while the majority of those in middle and high socioeconomic classes was in the category of either interested or very interested. Rural-oriented respondents with low socioeconomic status are more likely to be in the slightly interested category than their urban-oriented counterparts of either length of residence. However, the data indicated that type of resident only slightly affected the relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs.

Table 100 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was inverse but of low degree.

The data indicated that the majority of those in early and middle stages reported to be interested or very interested in local affairs (65 percent and 75 percent), while the majority of those in late stage (58 percent) was only slightly interested in local affairs. There were more respondents in middle than in other stages who were very interested in local affairs (19 percent), with those in late stage having the least

Table 99. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Rural-new socioeconomic status scores			Urban-new socioeconomic status scores			Rural-old socioeconomic status scores			Urban-old socioeconomic status scores		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Slightly interested	60.0%	30.8%	23.8%	50.0%	31.3%	28.8%	80.9	33.3%	0.0%	61.5%	39.2%	12.3%
Interested	40.0	61.5	57.1	50.0	51.5	49.1	17.0	54.6	0.0	38.5	51.2	76.9
Very interested	0.0	7.7	19.1	0.0	17.2	22.1	2.1	12.1	100.0	0.0	9.6	10.8
Total	100.0% (5)	100.0% (13)	100.0% (21)	100.0% (12)	100.0% (163)	100.0% (163)	100.0% (47)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (125)	100.0% (65)
	$X^2 = 3.56$ Not significant $G = 0.41$			$X^2 = 5.15$ Not significant $G = 0.14$			$X^2 = 40.17$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.79$			$X^2 = 25.32$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.52$		

respondents in this category (5 percent). There were, also, more respondents in late stage (58 percent) than in early and middle stages (35 percent and 25 percent respectively) who were only slightly interested in local affairs.

Table 100. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Slightly interested	35.5%	25.4%	57.9%	35.3%
Interested	52.7	56.1	36.8	50.7
Very interested	11.8	18.5	5.3	14.0
Total	100.0% (110)	100.0% (394)	100.0% (171)	100.0% (675)

$X^2 = 59.97$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.29$

Table 101 gives the distribution by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and amount of interest. The relationship between the two variables was found to be significant only for urban-oriented new and old residents. The Gamma values of association were inverse for all types of resident but were substantial only for rural- and urban-oriented old residents. The G values were low for the new residents.

It can be seen that regardless of resident typology, the majority of late stage respondents was found in the slightly interested category while the majority of those in middle or early stages was generally interested or very interested in local affairs. This inverse relationship

Table 101. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Rural-new family life cycle stages			Urban-new family life cycle stages			Rural-old family life cycle stages			Urban-old family life cycle stages		
	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late	Early	Middle	Late
Slightly interested	14.3%	33.3%	50.0%	40.4%	21.8%	57.9%	20.0%	54.1%	70.0%	11.1%	20.7%	52.7%
Interested	85.7	50.0	50.0	45.0	54.0	42.1	80.0	37.8	20.0	88.9	67.2	41.8
Very interested	0.0	16.7	0.0	14.6	24.2	0.0	0.0	8.1	10.0	0.0	12.1	5.5
Total	100.0% (7)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (89)	100.0% (211)	100.0% (38)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (37)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (116)	100.0% (91)
	X^2 = 3.72 Not significant G = -0.20			X^2 = 30.04 P < .01 G = -0.02			X^2 = 8.61 Not significant G = -0.32			X^2 = 27.66 P < .01 G = -0.53		

was greater among rural- and urban-oriented old than new residents. This showed that resident typology did not affect the relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs, though length of residence probably did influence the interest to some extent.

Summary of Findings on Institutional Participation

The level of institutional participation was examined for various types of residents, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle. On the basis of overall scores, institutional participation was found to be greater among new residents than among oldtime residents of either orientation; participation was found to be greater among the high and middle class than among the low socioeconomic class and among the middle than among the early or late stages of the family life cycle.

New residents of either orientation showed greater interest in local affairs than did their counterpart oldtime residents. More oldtime residents attended church only on important days than did new residents, though an overwhelming majority of each type attended church every week.

It was found that more residents of the higher than of the low and middle socioeconomic status belonged to greater number of organizations, held offices in greater number of organizations and attended meetings more frequently. Respondents with the middle and high socioeconomic status showed greater interest in local affairs than those with the low status. More respondents of the middle than of the early and late stages exhibited similar characteristics as above regarding organizational participation, with the exception of amount of interest in local affairs in which case

the early and the middle stages showed greater interest than the late stage. Weekly church attendance was slightly higher among the middle stage respondents than among those in the early and late stages.

Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

A description of the five items used to determine respondents' attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe area is given in the counterpart of this section in the chapter on Parma. The relationships between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and the five items were tested under the X^2 test of significance and the Gamma measure of association. As a result, it was seen that with the exception of satisfaction with fringe residence and the head of family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work, relationships were found to be significant between socioeconomic status and all other items and gave substantial Gamma coefficients for these items. Stage in family life cycle was found to be significantly related with all items, with the exception of satisfaction with fringe residence. The Gamma coefficients of association were substantial for two and low for three items. The details of these results are discussed below.

Table 102 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and the head of family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant but the Gamma coefficient was low. The data indicated that the majority in each stage of the family

life cycle was very much satisfied with their residence to work location relationship. The percentage of very satisfied people increased with stage in family life cycle (52 percent to 60 percent and 74 percent for early to late stage). A sizeable proportion of those in the early and middle stages (39 percent and 33 percent respectively), however, categorized themselves in the satisfied category. Less than 10 percent of any stage thought they were dissatisfied.

Table 102. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Head's Satisfaction with Convenience of Driving to Work

Extent of satisfaction	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Dissatisfied	9.8%	7.0%	7.3%	7.5%
Satisfied	38.5	33.0	18.3	30.8
Very satisfied	51.7	60.0	74.4	61.7
Total	100.0% (122)	100.0% (506)	100.0% (164)	100.0% (792)

$X^2 = 19.11$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.24$

Table 103 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and attitude toward school taxes. The two variables were found to have statistically significant relationship and gave a substantial inverse Gamma coefficient.

It can be seen from the distribution that whereas almost everybody in the low socioeconomic class (93 percent) thought the school taxes were somewhat high or very high, only about two thirds of those in middle and

about one half of those in high socioeconomic class shared their opinion. Of the latter two classes, the respondents in middle class were almost equally divided over attitude toward school taxes, but one half of those in high class though the taxes were reasonable, and one third (35 percent) thought the taxes were somewhat high. In a way, it is the category of "very high" that conveys the attitude more aptly from socioeconomic status point of view.

Table 103. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Reasonable	6.7%	32.2%	51.4%	36.3%
Somewhat high	20.0	35.6	34.7	33.1
Very high	73.3	31.2	13.9	30.6
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 177.93$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.53$

Table 104 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and attitude toward school taxes. The two variables were found to have statistically significant relationship and gave a substantial Gamma coefficient. The data indicated that the majority of those in early stage thought the taxes were reasonable (59 percent), but the majority of those in late stage thought the taxes were very high (58 percent). Although the majority (58 percent) of respondents in middle stage considered the taxes were high, a fairly large proportion (42

percent) thought the taxes were reasonable. However, about one third of respondents (between 29 percent and 36 percent) in each case considered the taxes were somewhat high.

Table 104. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Reasonable	58.9%	41.8%	12.6%	36.3%
Somewhat high	29.5	35.5	29.4	33.1
Very high	11.6	22.7	58.0	30.6
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 154.63$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.56$

Table 105 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and attitude toward property taxes. The two variables showed a significant relationship and gave an inverse but substantial Gamma coefficient. It can be seen that respondents with low and high socioeconomic classes had opposite views on the reasonableness of property taxes. An overwhelming majority (82 percent) of the former considered the taxes were high or very high, while 56 percent of the latter considered the taxes were reasonable. Respondents with middle socioeconomic class were almost equally divided between those who considered the taxes as reasonable (42 percent) and those who considered them as somewhat high (37 percent). About one third in each case, however, agreed that the property taxes were somewhat high.

Table 105. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Reasonable	17.8%	42.1%	56.4%	44.1%
Somewhat high	35.5	36.9	30.8	34.4
Very high	46.7	21.0	12.8	21.5
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 88.71$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.39$

Table 106 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and attitude toward property taxes. The two variables showed statistically significant relationship but gave low Gamma coefficient of correlation. The data showed that respondents in early and middle stages of family life cycle were more alike in their attitude than those in late stage. Although the majority in each case considered that property taxes were high (between 52 percent and 65 percent), there were more, about two thirds, in late stage who thought so as compared to about one half of those in early and middle stages. Those in early stage were equally divided over the issue as 43 percent thought the taxes were reasonable and another 40 percent thought the taxes were somewhat high. More than one third (37 percent) of those in late stage considered property taxes as very high as compared to 16 and 17 percent respectively of middle and early stages of family life cycle.

Table 107 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of moves made in the past ten years. The

Table 106. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Reasonable	42.6%	48.3%	35.3%	44.1%
Somewhat high	40.3	35.9	28.2	34.4
Very high	17.1	15.8	36.5	21.5
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 47.63$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.20$

two variables showed a statistically significant relationship, and gave a substantial Gamma coefficient. It can be seen from the data that whereas the majority of those with low socioeconomic status had made no move at all in the past ten years (73 percent), the majority of middle and high classes (71 percent and 86 percent) had made one or more moves in the same period. Greater proportions of the latter two classes were in the categories of those who had moved once or three or more times. In this respect the respondents with high socioeconomic status were most mobile of all as they had the highest percentages in the categories of those who had moved twice or more often (53 percent).

Table 108 shows the mobility by stage in family life cycle. The two variables were found to be significantly related and gave an inverse but high Gamma coefficient of correlation. The data indicated higher mobility among those in earlier stages and lesser mobility among those in later stages of family life cycle. Almost everyone (99 percent) in early

Table 107. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Socioeconomic status scores: Low	Middle	High	Total
None	73.3%	29.5%	14.4%	30.0%
One	19.3	40.8	32.8	34.7
Two	4.4	8.7	14.4	10.3
Three or more	3.0	21.0	38.4	25.0
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 194.62$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.53$

Table 108. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Family life cycle stages: Early	Middle	Late	Total
None	0.8%	20.4%	66.3%	30.0%
One	46.5	39.2	18.8	34.7
Two	8.5	11.6	8.2	10.3
Three or more	44.2	28.8	6.7	25.0
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 252.08$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.60$

stage and about 80 percent of middle stage respondents had made at least one move in the past ten years as compared to 66 percent of those in late stage who had not made a single move during this period. Greater proportion of the former two classes were in the categories of those who had moved once or three or more times. However, those in early stage were most mobile of all as they had the highest percentages in the categories of those who had moved once (47 percent) and three or more times (44 percent).

The relationships between anomie, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle were tested under the X^2 test of significance and the Gamma measure of association. The relationships were found to be significant in both cases. The Gamma values were inverse and substantial for socioeconomic status but positive and low for stage in family life cycle.

Table 109 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and extent of anomie. The two variables were found to be significantly related and gave substantial Gamma coefficient of correlation. The data indicated that anomic attitude was greater among those in low socioeconomic class than among those in middle and high classes. The differences were substantial in the nonanomic and anomic categories because almost similar proportions (between 41 and 49 percent) of respondents in all classes was in the intermediate category. Whereas almost one half (46 percent) of those with low socioeconomic status were in the anomic category the proportion of respondents with middle and high status was as low as 27 percent and 15 percent respectively in this category.

Table 109. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie

Extent of anomie	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Nonanomic	6.7%	23.6%	43.6%	28.7%
Intermediate	47.4	49.3	41.1	46.0
Anomic	45.9	27.1	15.3	15.3
Total	100.0% (135)	100.0% (458)	100.0% (360)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 95.43$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.44$

Table 110 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and extent of anomie. The data showed a significant relationship between the two variables and gave positive but low degree of association.

It can be seen from the data that families in early and middle stages of life cycle were more alike and both differed from those in late stage. A much larger proportion of respondents in early and middle stages was nonanomic than of those in late stage. But, on the other hand, the difference was not too large in the proportion of respondents in the anomic category in all stages. About one third of those in early and middle stages (34 to 36 percent) were in the nonanomic category as compared to 15 percent of those in late stage. The percentage of respondents in the anomic category varied from 22 percent to 32 percent, showing a relative increase toward the later stages. A similar trend could be observed in the intermediate category.

Table 110. Percentage Distribution of the Clarence Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Extent of Anomie.

Extent of anomie	Family life cycle stages Early	Middle	Late	Total
Nonanomic	33.7%	33.6%	14.5%	28.7%
Intermediate	42.6	43.4	53.3	46.0
Anomic	21.7	23.0	32.2	25.3
Total	100.0% (129)	100.0% (569)	100.0% (255)	100.0% (953)

$X^2 = 35.42$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.24$

Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

Most respondents, irrespective of their socioeconomic status, were found to be very satisfied with fringe residence and with the convenience of driving to work. The degree of satisfaction with fringe residence was also unaffected by stage in the family life cycle. However, a greater proportion of the middle and late stages than the early stage respondents expressed greater degree of satisfaction with convenience of driving to work.

More respondents in the low socioeconomic class considered school and property taxes to be very high while more respondents in the middle and high classes considered these taxes to be reasonable. A higher rate of residential mobility was found more often among respondents in higher than in lower socioeconomic classes.

More respondents in the late than in the early and middle stages considered school and property taxes to be very high. Higher rate of

mobility was greater among those in the early than in the middle and late stages of the family life cycle.

Anomie was found to be higher among respondents in the low socio-economic class and among those in the late stage of the family life cycle than among those with middle and high status or those in the middle and late stages of the family life cycle.

Chapter VI

A COMMUNITY IN FINAL STAGE OF FRINGE DEVELOPMENT--CAMILLUS

The first part of this chapter treats certain selected characteristics of the Camillus residents, namely, residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle. Later sections present an analysis of the data on social interaction and institutional participation, attitude toward life in the fringe area, and anomie.

Characteristics of Camillus Residents

Residence-Orientation Typology

Table 111 gives the percentage distribution of respondents in Camillus by residence-orientation typology. About 90 percent of respondents were urban-oriented new and old residents and another 10 percent were rural-oriented new and old residents. Among urban-oriented residents, newcomers were more than twice the proportion of old residents (62 percent vs. 28 percent respectively). Among rural-oriented residents the newcomers were slightly less in proportion than old residents (4 percent vs. 6 percent respectively).

Table 111. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology

Community orientation	Length of residence		Total
	Under 10 years	10 years & over	
Rural-oriented	4.2	6.2	10.4
Urban-oriented	61.5	28.1	89.6
Total	65.7 (735)	34.3 (383)	100.0 (1118)

Community Orientation

Table 112 gives the percentage distribution of the Camillus respondents by community orientation score. Since the cut-off point differentiating between rural- and urban-oriented respondents was 3, it could be seen that an overwhelming majority of respondents was urban-oriented.

Details of the component items of community orientation index are given in Table 113. The data in this table give the percentage distribution by type of community in which each item of the index took place.

Table 112. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Community Orientation Score

Community orientation index scores	Percentage
0.01 - 1.49	0.2
1.50 - 2.49	1.8
2.50 - 3.49	24.8
3.50 - 4.49	57.9
4.50 - 5.00	15.3
Total	100.0 (1118)

Table 113. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Type of Community and Component Items of Community Orientation Index

Community orientation components	Type of community and score assigned					Total
	Farm (1)	Nonfarm open country (2)	Village/small town/medium size city (3)	Suburbs/new development areas (4)	Large city (5)	
1. Head's place of work	0.8%	0.1%	3.5%	40.6%	48.2%	100.0%* (1118)
2. Place respondent was brought up	5.1	5.1	43.9	11.9	34.0	100.0% (1118)
3. Place head was brought up	6.9	4.5	41.0	13.0	34.6	100.0% (1118)
4. Place of previous residence	1.4	4.2	32.8	25.0	36.4	100.0% (1118)
5. Place relatives visited most often	1.6	5.0	32.2	31.1	30.1	100.0% (866)
6. Place friends visited most often	0.2	3.8	20.1	50.7	25.2	100.0% (886)
7. Place prefer to move to	1.8	22.3	16.6	54.9	4.4	100.0% (1118)

*6.8 percent of the total number reported their job location as unspecified.

Length of Residence

Table 114 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by length of residence in Camillus. Two thirds (66 percent) of the respondents had lived there for less than 10 years; about 40 percent in the less than 5 years category and 26 percent in the 5 to 9 years category. Old residents comprised about one third of the total population; 18 percent having lived in the community for a period of 10 to 14 years and another 17 percent were there for more than 15 years.

Table 114. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Length of Residence

Length of residence	Percentage
Under 1 year	3.6
1 - 2 years	21.5
3 - 4 years	14.7
5 - 9 years	26.0
10 - 14 years	17.5
15 - 24 years	8.7
25 years or more	8.0
Total	100.0 (1118)

Socioeconomic Status

Table 115 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and socioeconomic status. It could be seen that although the majority of each type of resident fell in the

Table 115. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Socioeconomic Status Score

Socioeconomic status scores	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Low	12.8%	4.8%	30.4%	18.5%	10.6%
Middle	59.6	50.6	63.8	58.0	53.8
High	27.6	44.6	5.8	23.5	35.6
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 116.76$ $P < .01$

middle category of socioeconomic status (ranging from 51 to 64 percent), new residents of either orientation had larger proportions than oldtime residents in the high status category. Even among new residents, the proportion of urban-oriented families was considerably larger than rural-oriented families in the high status category (45 percent vs. 28 percent). Rural-oriented old residents had the largest and smallest proportions in the low and high status categories (30 percent and 6 percent respectively). The relationship between resident typology and socioeconomic status was found to be statistically significant.

Details of the component items of the index of socioeconomic status can be found in Tables 116 to 118.

Table 116. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Educational Attainment of the Head of Family and Wife

Number of years completed	Head	Wife
Under 8	1.2%	1.0%
8	5.3	3.1
9-11	10.8	12.9
12	31.5	45.8
13 or more	51.2	37.8
Total	100.0% (1118)	100.0% (1118)

Table 117. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Annual Family Income

Income group in dollars	Percentage
Under $1,000	0.0
1,000 - 2,999	1.4
3,000 - 4,999	3.4
5,000 - 6,999	21.3
7,000 - 9,999	39.4
10,000 - 19,999	32.6
20,000 - 29,999	1.5
30,000 or more	0.4
Total	100.0 (1118)

Table 118. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Occupation of the Head of Family

Occupation	Percentage	Occupational score
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	22.0	90
2. Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm	26.0	81
3. Clerical, sales and kindred workers	18.8	71
4. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	19.8	58
5. Operatives and kindred workers	9.6	45
6. Service workers, including private household; laborers, except farm and mine	2.9	34; 20
7. Farmers and farm managers	0.9	16
Total	100.0 (1118)	

Stage in Family Life Cycle

Table 119 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and stage in family life cycle. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

It can be seen that the majority of respondents (ranging from 62 to 71 percent) of each type of resident was in middle stage category. However, there were far more new than oldtime residents in the early stage and far more old than new residents in the late stage of family

life cycle, regardless of community orientation of respondents. The data, therefore, indicated that these differences in the family life cycle stages were related more to length of residence than community orientation of respondents.

Table 119. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Stage in Family Life Cycle

Stages in family life cycle	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Early	27.7%	30.5%	5.8%	3.2%	21.[illegible]
Middle	68.1	64.5	62.3	71.0	66
Late	4.2	5.0	31.9	25.8	[illegible]
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	(

$X^2 = 186.17$ $P < .01$

Social Interaction

The following analysis deals with social interaction of the Camillus residents as determined by an overall score and individual items used in a social interaction index. These items were, namely, number of families known in the neighborhood, frequency of visiting with them, frequency of visiting with friends and relatives, and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers.

For the description of a typical respondent having low, moderate or high intensity of social interaction, based on the total score, a

reference may be made to the counterpart of this section in the chapter on Parma.

Table 120 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and intensity of social interaction on the basis of total score. The two variables showed a statistically significant relationship. The data indicated a moderate intensity of interaction on the part of the majority of residents of each type (ranging from 62 percent to 81 percent). More than one third of rural-oriented new residents (38 percent) and urban-oriented old residents (34 percent) showed a high intensity of interaction. Only about 19 percent each of urban-oriented new and rural-oriented old residents were found in the category of high intensity. Not more than 3 percent of any type of resident were found in the low intensity category.

Relationship between total score on the index was also tested separately with community orientation score and length of residence. The

Table 120. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Low	0.0%	0.3%	2.9%	1.6%	0.8%
Moderate	61.7	80.5	78.3	64.3	75.0
High	38.3	19.2	18.8	34.1	24.2
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 42.1$ $P < .01$

results showed a statistically significant relationship between total score of interaction and length of residence and a substantial Gamma coefficient of correlation ($X^2 = 42.16$ df = 3, G = 0.31). This indicated that more oldtime than new residents interacted with greater intensity.

The relationship between total score on the index and community orientation score was not found to be statistically significant. The Gamma coefficient was inverse but negligible (G = -0.06). The data in this respect indicated that community orientation of respondents did not influence degree of social interaction.

Table 121 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and intensity of social interaction on the basis of total score. The two variables showed a statistically significant relationship but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was almost zero.

It can be seen that an overwhelming majority in each socioeconomic class (between 70 and 76 percent) interacted at moderate intensity level, and between 24 to 26 percent in each class interacted at high intensity level. These data therefore indicate that socioeconomic status had almost no effect on overall intensities of social interaction.

Table 122 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and intensity of social interaction on the basis of total score. The two variables showed a statistically significant relationship but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was low. The data indicated some differences between those in early stage of family life cycle and those in the middle or late stages. More of the early

Table 121. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Socioeconomic status scores			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
Low	4.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%
Moderate	69.5	75.7	75.6	75.0
High	26.3	23.6	24.4	24.2
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 21.47$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.03$

Table 122. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Social Interaction

Intensity of interaction	Family life cycle stages			
	Early	Middle	Late	Total
Low	0.0%	0.8%	2.2%	0.8%
Moderate	85.6	72.4	71.2	75.0
High	14.4	26.8	26.6	24.2
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 21.57$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.20$

than of middle or late stage families interacted at moderate intensity (86 percent vs. about 72 percent each of the latter two) and, conversely, fewer families in early stage interacted at high intensity than others (14 percent vs. 27 percent each of those in middle and late stages of family life cycle). These data, therefore, indicate that stage in family life cycle did affect to some extent the intensity level of social interaction as families in middle or late stages were more likely than families in early stage to have high intensity of social interaction. Relationships between intensity of social interaction and the two variables, socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle, were examined for each type of resident with the X^2 test but none of the values obtained were significant. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial for the relationship between socioeconomic status and intensity of interaction for rural-oriented new and old residents (0.31 and 0.41 respectively) but negligible for urban-oriented new and old residents (0.12 and 0.03 respectively). These results indicate differences between rural and urban-oriented residents. The Gamma values were negligible for the relationship between stage in family life cycle and overall intensity of social interaction for all types of resident, except rural oriented new residents. It may be pointed out that these Gamma values were higher for new residents (0.44 for rural-oriented and 0.16 for urban-oriented) than oldtime residents (0.04 for rural-oriented and 0.02 for urban-oriented) which suggest a difference between the new and oldtime residents in this respect.

Table 123 gives the results of X^2 test and Gamma coefficients of correlation between residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status score and component items of the index of social interaction. Table 124 gives similar results for stage in family life cycle and component items of the index for each type of resident.

The following is an analysis of those component factors of the index of social interaction which showed a significant relationship, under the X^2 test, or give substantial Gamma coefficients of correlation. These factors are first analyzed by residence-orientation typology, followed by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle. These relationships were further examined for each type of resident by using socioeconomic status score and stage in family life cycle as intervening variables and the component factors as the dependent variables.

Table 125 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and number of families known in the neighborhood. Relationship between the two variables was statistically significant.

The data did not indicate a pattern which could be attributed to either community orientation background or length of residence. It could be seen, however, that relatively more rural-oriented new and old residents knew fewer families (up to four) in the neighborhood than did urban-oriented counterparts (47 and 44 percent vs. 33 and 31 percent respectively). With the exception of urban-oriented new residents (39 percent), all types of resident were within a comparable range (between 23 and 30 percent) being in the category of those who knew between five and eight

Table 123. Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Component Itmes of the Index of Social Interaction, Camillus

Component items of social interaction index	Residence-orientation typology							
	Rural-new		Urban-new		Rural-old		Urban-old	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Total score on the index	N	.31	N	.12	N	.41	N	.03
Number of families known in the neighborhood	N	.44	S	.32	N	.06	N	.10
Frequency of visiting with neighborhood families	S	.80	S	.20	S	.31	S	.01
Frequency of visiting with friends	S	.36	N	.03	S	.29	N	.44
Frequency of visiting with relatives	N	-.39	S	-.46	N	.02	N	-.08
Amount of contact with farmers	N	-.30	N	.30	N	-.11	N	-.07
Amount of contact with village residents	S	-.20	N	.13	N	.52	S	.10
Amount of contact with newcomers	N	.43	S	.44	N	.50	S	.54

Col. 1: S = Significant at the .05 or .01 level under the X^2 test.
N = Not significant at the .05 or .01 level.

2: Coefficients of correlation of Goodman and Kurskal's Gamma.

Table 124. Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Component Items of the Index of Social Interation, Camillus

Component items of social interaction indes	Residence-orientation typology							
	Rural-new		Urban-new		Rural-old		Urban-old	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Total score on the index	N	.44	N	.16	N	.04	N	.02
Number of families known in the neighborhood	S	.61	S	.15	N	-.26	S	.19
Frequency of visiting with neighborhood families	S	.46	S	-.21	N	-.39	S	-.39
Frequency of visiting with friends	N	.05	N	-.04	N	-.28	N	-.03
Frequency of visiting with relatives	S	-.47	S	-.18	N	.01	N	.10
Amount of contact with farmers	N	-.45	N	-.16	N	.09	N	.09
Amount of contact with village residents	N	-.09	N	-.05	N	-.29	S	-.22
Amount of contact with newcomers	N	.54	S	-.07	N	-.29	S	-.27

Col. 1: S = Significant at the .05 or .01 level under the X^2 test.
N = Not significant at the .05 or .01 level.

2: Coefficients of correlation of Goodman and Kurskal's Gamma.

Table 125. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Residence-orientation typology			
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old
None to four	46.8%	33.1%	43.5%	31.2%
Five to eight	23.4	38.8	30.4	27.1
Nine or more	29.8	28.1	26.1	41.7
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)

$X^2 = 29.25$ $P < .01$

families. Urban-oriented old residents led others by a significant margin (42 percent vs. 26 to 30 percent for others) in the category of those who knew more than nine neighborhood families.

Table 126 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and number of families known in the neighborhood. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was low.

The data indicated that respondents with high socioeconomic status neighbored a little more than those with low or middle socioeconomic status. A greater percentage of the former knew more families, five or more, in the neighborhood than did the others. About 78 percent of the high status respondents knew more than five families in their neighborhood as compared to about 59 percent each of low and middle status respondents. A low rate of neighboring (knowing only up to four families) was

Table 126. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Socioeconomic status scores			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
None to four	41.5%	40.2%	21.9%	33.8%
Five to eight	28.0	31.1	41.2	34.4
Nine or more	30.5	28.7	36.9	31.8
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 40.03$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.21$

more prevalent among the low and middle status respondents (42 percent and 40 percent respectively) than among the high status respondents (22 percent).

Table 127 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and number of families known in the neighborhood. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was low.

The data suggested an irregular pattern in the thre response categories for various stages of family life cycle. However, it could be seen that respondents in early stage of family life cycle tended to know either up to four or five to eight families, middle stage respondents tended to know five or more families, and respondents in late stage tended to know either few (up to four) or many (nine or more) families in the neighborhood.

Table 127. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Families Known in the Neighborhood

Number of families known	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None to four	44.7%	28.6%	43.2%	33.8%
Five to eight	37.1	36.1	20.1	34.4
Nine or more	18.2	35.3	36.7	31.8
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 45.14$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.17$

The relationship between socioeconomic status and number of neighborhood families known was also examined for each type of resident. The relationship was found to be significant for urban-oriented new residents only. The Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated a substantial relationship based more on length of residence than community orientation. The G values were 0.44 and 0.32 respectively for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation, while they were 0.10 or less for oldtime residents.

Similarly, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of neighborhood families known was examined for each type of resident. The X^2 test showed a significant relationship for all types, except for rural-oriented old residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation, however, were low for urban-oriented new and old residents (0.15 and 0.19 respectively), and of opposite nature for rural-oriented new and old residents (0.61 and -0.26 respectively). These Gamma values therefore did indicate some differences between rural- and urban-oriented residents.

Table 128 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and frequency of visiting with neighborhood families. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

Table 128. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Neighborhood Families

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Once a month or less	8.5%	5.7%	26.1%	11.2%	8.6%
Two to four times a month	21.3	13.1	24.6	16.6	15.0
More than once a week	70.2	81.2	49.3	72.6	76.4
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (699)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 50.92$ $P < .01$

The data indicated that, with the exception of rural-oriented old residents, the majority in each case (between 70 percent and 81 percent) visited families in the neighborhood more often than once a week (only 49 percent of rural-oriented old residents did so). More of rural- than of urban-oriented residents, both new and old in each case, visited neighborhoof families between two to four times a month (21 and 25 percent vs. 13 and 16 percent respectively). A greater percentage of oldtime residents, both rural- and urban-oriented, were found in the low frequency category,

middle and high socioeconomic status). Visiting between two to four times a month was more common among respondents with middle and high socioeconomic status than among those with low status (17 and 13 percent vs. 9 percent respectively).

Table 130 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with neighborhood families. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was inverse and substantial for the two variables.

Table 130. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Neighborhood Families

Visiting frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Once a month or less	1.7%	8.5%	20.9%	8.6%
Two to four times a month	15.6	13.9	20.1	15.0
More than once a week	82.7	77.6	59.0	76.4
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 47.56$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.32$

The data indicated that greater visiting frequency, more often than once a week, substantially decreased in later stages of family life cycle. The percentages dropped from 83 percent in early stage to 78 percent and

59 percent respectively for those in the middle and late stages. Conversely, there were about 21 percent of late stage respondents who visited families in the neighborhood only once a month or less as compared to 2 percent of those in early stage. Neighboring between two to four times a month was relatively more common among those in late stage (20 percent) than among those in early and middle stages (14 and 16 percent respectively) of the family life cycle.

The relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of visiting with families in neighborhood was also examined for each resident type. The relationship was found to be statistically significant for all types of residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial or high for rural oriented new and old residents (0.80 and 0.31 respectively) but low or negligible for urban-oriented residents (0.20 and 0.01 respectively). The high coefficient of correlation for rural-oriented new residents could have resulted from small number of observations (less than 5) in quite a few cells in various response categories. Therefore, no pattern could be established for the G values.

Similarly, the relationship between family life cycle and frequency of neighboring was examined for each type of resident. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant for all types of resident, with the exception of rural-oriented old residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally substantial. The relationships were inverse for all types of resident, with the exception of rural-oriented new residents. The results showed that frequency of neighboring decreased in later stages of family life cycle among

rural- and urban-oriented old residents and among urban-oriented new residents. This trend did not hold true for rural-oriented new residents (neighboring increased in later stages of family life cycle) which might have resulted from small number of observations in early and late stages of the family life cycle.

Table 131 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with friends. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

The data indicated that the majority of each type of respondent visited friends between two to four times a month, except rural-oriented old residents a majority of whom visited friends once a month or less often. Whereas the majority (57 percent) of rural-oriented old residents and a large proportion of urban-oriented new and old residents (42 percent each) visited friends only once a month or less often, only about 23 percent of rural-oriented new residents did so. Visiting friends more often than once a week was not very common, as even the highest percentage of those who did so was 9 percent in the case of rural-oriented old residents. This distributing did not point to a clear pattern on the basis of typology. However, one could note greater similarity between urban-oriented new and old residents than between their rural-oriented counterparts.

Table 132 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status score and frequency of visiting with friends. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was low (G = 0.14).

Table 131. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Friends

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Once a month or less	23.4%	42.0%	56.5%	42.3%	42.2%
Two to four times a month	70.2	51.0	34.8	51.0	50.8
More than once a week	6.4	7.0	8.7	6.7	7.0
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 14.62$ $P < .05$

Table 132. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Friends

Visiting frequency	Socioeconomic status scores: Low	Middle	High	Total
Once a month or less	55.1%	42.2%	38.4%	42.2%
Two to four times a month	40.7	50.8	53.8	50.1
More than once a week	4.2	7.0	7.8	7.0
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 10.69$ $P < .05$ $G = 0.14$

Relatively more respondents with middle and high socioeconomic status visited friends between two to four times a month (51 percent and 54 percent respectively) than did those with low socioeconomic status (41 percent). The majority (55 percent) of low status respondents visited friends once a month or less often but so did a large portion of those with middle and high status (42 percent and 38 percent respectively). Visiting the friends more often than once a week was not very common but the high status residents were on the top (8 percent) and low status residents at the bottom (4 percent).

The relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with friends was not found to be significant under the X^2 test and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was negligible (G = 0.06). These data are not presented here.

The relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of visiting with friends was found to be statistically significant only for rural-oriented new and old residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial or near substantial for old residents of rural- and urban orientation (G = 0.29 and 0.44 respectively) and for rural-oriented new residents (G = 0.36). These values indicated that differences among various socioeconomic classes in frequency of visiting with friends were related with community orientation rather than length of residence.

Similarly, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with friends was examined for each type of resident. The results did not give statistically significant values and the Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally inverse but negligible.

Table 133 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and frequency of visiting with relatives. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant.

Table 133. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Once a month or less	29.8%	34.3%	13.0%	24.5%	30.0%
Two to four times a month	42.5	45.5	60.9	41.7	45.3
More than once a week	27.7	20.2	26.1	33.8	24.7
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 34.93$ $P < .01$

The data show that the majority (61 percent) of rural-oriented old residents but large proportions (between 42 and 46 percent) of all other types of resident visited with relatives between two to four times a month. Similar proportions of rural oriented new and old residents (28 and 26 percent respectively) than of their urban oriented counterparts (20 and 34 percent respectively) visited with relatives more often than once a week. On the other hand, similar proportions of new than of old-time residents were found in the lowest visiting frequency. More of new

than of old residents visited relatives with lowest frequency (30 and 34 percent of rural- and urban-oriented new residents vs. 13 and 25 percent of old residents respectively).

It could, therefore, be seen that in some response categories similarities were greater between respondents of same community orientation background and in other categories similarities were greater between respondents with same length of residence.

Table 134 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status score and frequency of visiting with relatives. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was inverse and substantial for the two variables.

Table 134. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Once a month or less	14.4%	22.8%	45.7%	30.0%
Two to four times a month	49.2	49.8	37.2	45.3
More than once a week	36.4	27.4	17.1	24.7
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 79.45$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.36$

It could be seen that respondents in the low and middle classes visited relatives more often than did respondents in the high status class. Of the low and middle status respondents, 14 percent and 23 percent

respectively visited with relatives once a month or less as compared to 46 percent of the high status respondents. In the category of visiting between two to four times a month, the percentages were 49 percent, 50 percent and 37 percent respectively for the low, middle and high classes. In the highest visiting frequency, more often than once a week, those with low status led all others (36 percent vs. 27 percent and 17 percent respectively for those with middle and high status).

Table 135 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with relatives. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant, but the Gamma coefficient of correlation was zero.

The data did not indicate a consistent pattern between stage in family life cycle and visiting pattern. The majority of respondents in early stage (51 percent) visited two to four times a month and the remainder tended to be in the lowest or highest visiting frequency in

Table 135. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Visiting with Relatives

Visiting frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Once a month or less	23.2%	33.4	23.7%	30.0%
Two to four times a month	50.6	44.2	41.7	45.3
More than once a week	26.2	22.4	34.6	24.7
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 17.70$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.00$

similar proportions. Large proportions of those in middle and late stages (44 and 42 percent) also visited two to four times a month. However, of the remainder, more of the middle stage respondents tended to visit less frequently (once a month or less, 33 percent) while more of the late stage respondents tended to visit more frequently (more than once a week, 35 percent).

The relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of visiting with relatives was also examined for each type of resident. This relationship was found to be statistically significant only for urban-oriented new residents. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were inverse and substantial for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = -0.39 and -0.46 respectively), but low and opposite in direction for oldtime residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.02 and -0.08 respectively). These results, therefore, indicated that socioeconomic status was related inversely to visiting frequency in the case of new residents, regardless of orientation, to a greater degree than it was in the case of oldtime residents.

Similarly, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of visiting with relatives was examined for each type of resident. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant for rural- and urban-oriented new residents only. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were inverse and substantial for the former (G = -0.47) but low for the latter (-0.18). The G values were negligible for oldtime residents of either orientation. These results indicated that stage in family life cycle was related inversely to fre-

quency of visiting with relatives among new residents regardless of orientation, only that the degree was greater among rural- than urban-oriented new residents.

The relationships between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers is examined in Tables 136 through 142. The amount of contact with each group is first analyzed for each type of resident, followed by an analysis by socioeconomic status and/or stage in family life cycle depending upon the statistical significance of the relationships.

Tables 136 and 137 give the percentage distribution of respondents respectively by residence-orientation typology, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in both cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was low (0.17) for stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers.

It may be mentioned that relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with farmers was not found to be statistically significant and the Gamma coefficient was found to be inverse but low (G = -0.21).

The data in Table 136 indicate that the majority of all types of resident (between 57 and 93 percent) had little or no contact with farmers. However, a far greater proportion of urban-oriented new and old residents was gound in this category than of their rural-oriented counterparts (93 percent and 84 percent vs. 67 percent and 57 percent respectively). An almost equal proportion of rural-oriented new and old residents had a

Table 136. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
None or little (low)	66.7%	93.3%	56.5	83.7%	87.2%
Moderate	27.1	5.5	24.6	11.5	9.3
Much (high)	6.2	1.2	18.9	4.8	3.5
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 118.76$ $P < .01$

moderate amount of contact (27 percent and 25 percent respectively). As could be expected, more rural-oriented old residents than other types of resident had a great deal of contact with farmers (19 percent vs. a high of 6 percent among other types of resident).

The data in Table 137 indicate that an overwhelming majority (between 83 percent and 90 percent) of respondents in various stages of family life cycle had little or not contact with farmers. The proportion in this category, however, showed a slight decrease toward the later stages (from 90 percent in early stage to 83 percent in late stage). The proportions in the moderate and high categories of contact generally increased with stage in family life cycle, but the proportion of respondents in these categories was not more than 10 percent.

Tables 138 and 139 give respectively the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents. The relationships were

Table 137. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Farmers

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	89.9%	87.3%	82.7%	87.3%
Moderate	9.3	9.0	10.1	9.2
Much (high)	0.8	3.7	7.2	3.5
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 10.92$ $P < .05$ $G = 0.17$

found to be statistically significant in both cases. However, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with village residents did not show a statistically significant relationship. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were almost zero for both stage in family life cycle and socio-economic status with respect to amount of contact with village residents.

The data in Table 138 show that a majority in three of four resident types (51 percent each of oldtime residents and 75percent of urban-oriented new residents) had little or not contact with village residents. Rural-oriented new residents were equally divided among those who had little or no contact and those who had a moderate amount of contact (43 percent each) with village residents. About one third each of oldtime residents of rural- and urban-orientation (30 percent and 37 percent respectively) were in the moderate category. The distribution, therefore, indicated that oldtime residents were more alike and had greater amount of contact than newcomers with village residents. It may be pointed out

Table 138. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
None or little (low)	42.5%	75.3%	50.7%	51.3%	65.7%
Moderate	42.6	19.2	30.4	37.3	25.9
Much (high)	14.9	5.5	18.9	11.4	8.4
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 80.52$ $P < .01$

that amount of contact with village residents was greater than it was with farmers as there were comparatively fewer respondents in the low category and more in the moderate and high categories of amount of contact with village residents than there were with respect to farmers.

The date in Table 139 indicated that the relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with village residents was negligible. The majority in each socioeconomic class (between 62 percent and 75 percent) was in the low category and between 19 and 28 percent were in the moderate category. Respondents with low socioeconomic status differed from those with middle and high status in their levels of contact with village residents. More respondents of low than of middle and high socioeconomic status had little or no contact with village residents and, conversely, more of the latter than of the former had greater amount of contact with village residents.

Table 139. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Village Residents

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	74.6%	62.0%	68.6%	65.7%
Moderate	18.6	28.0	24.9	25.9
Much (high)	6.8	10.0	6.5	8.4
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 10.63$ $P < .05$ $G = -0.03$

Tables 140 to 142 give the percentage distribution of respondents respectively by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with newcomers. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in all cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial for relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact ($G = 0.51$), but inverse and low for relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with newcomers ($G = -0.22$).

The data in Table 140 indicated that the differences in amounts of contact with newcomers were based more on length of residence than community orientation. It can be seen that more of rural- and urban-orientation had little or no contact with newcomers (74 and 53 percent vs. 43 and 37 percent respectively). Furthermore, new than oldtime residents of rural- and urban-orientation were more likely to fall in the moderate or high categories of contact with newcomers. Not

Table 140. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None or little (low)	42.5%	36.6%	73.9%	53.2%	43.8%
Moderate	36.2	35.9	15.9	30.9	33.3
Much (high)	21.3	27.5	10.2	15.9	22.9
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 54.89$ $P < .01$

more than 10 percent of rural-oriented old residents were found in the high category while rural-oriented new residents were in almost as large a proportion as of urban-oriented new residents in the high category of amount of contact (21 percent and 28 percent respectively).

The data in Table 141 show a substantial relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with newcomers. An overwhelming majority of those with low socioeconomic status (79 percent) had little or no contact with newcomers. Substantial proportions of the middle status respondents had little or moderate amount of contact with newcomers (48 and 35 percent respectively) while more respondents of high status tended to have greater amount of contact (34 and 39 percent in the moderate and high categories).

The data in Table 142 suggest an inverse relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with newcomers. Those in late stage of the family life cycle differed significantly from those

Table 141. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None or little (low)	78.8%	48.0%	27.1%	43.8%
Moderate	19.5	35.4	34.2	33.3
Much (high)	1.7	16.6	38.7	22.9
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 145.22$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.51$

Table 142. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Contact with Newcomers

Amount of contact	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None or little (low)	39.3%	40.8%	67.6%	43.8%
Moderate	37.1	33.3	26.6	33.3
Much (high)	23.6	25.9	5.8	22.9
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 44.29$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.22$

in the middle and early stages. About two thirds of those in late stage had little or no contact while similar proportions of those in middle and early stages of family life cycle had moderate amount or great deal of contact with newcomers. Only 6 percent of the late stage respondents had much contact with newcomers as compared to 26 percent and 24 percent of those in the middle and early stages of family life cycle. However, it may be pointed out that a substantial proportion of those in early and middle stages also had little or no contact with newcomers (39 percent and 41 percent respectively).

The relationships between socioeconomic status and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers were examined for each type of resident. In the case of contact with farmers, the relationship was not found to be statistically significant for any type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation showed an inverse relationship for all types, except urban-oriented new residents. However, these coefficients were substantialy for only new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = -0.30 and 0.30 respectively).

In the case of contact with village residents, the relationship with socioeconomic status was statistically significant for rural-oriented new and urban-oriented old residents with inverse and low Gamma coefficient for the former (G = -0.20) and a positive low coefficient for the latter type of resident (G = 0.10). The generally low Gamma values and significant relationship for two different types of resident did not indicate a clear influence of community orientation or length of residence. Urban-oriented new and old residents had lower Gamma values than their counterpart rural-oriented residents.

In the case of contact with newcomers, relationship with socio-economic status was found to be statistically significant for only urban-oriented new and old residents. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial for all types of residents.

Similarly, the relationships between stage in family life cycle and amount of contact with farmers, village residents and newcomers were examined for each type of resident. In the case of contact with farmers, the relationship was not found to be statistically significant for any type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally negligible, except for rural-oriented new residents in which case it was substantial (G = -0.45). An inverse but low coefficient was observed for urban-oriented new residents too (G = -0.16). The coefficients were almost zero for oldtime residents. These results, therefore, indicated that stage in family life cycle and amount of contact were inversely though weakly related to stage in family life cycle.

In the case of contact with village residents, a significant relationship was observed for only urban-oriented old residents. The Gamma coefficients showed an inverse relationship for all types of resident. However, the coefficients were low for old residents both rural- and urban-oriented (G = -0.29 and -0.22) and almost zero for their counterpart new residents.

In the case of contact with newcomers, the relationship with stage in family life cycle was found to be statistically significant for only urban-oriented new and old residents. The Gamma coefficients indicated an inverse relationship for all types, except rural-oriented new residents

(G = 0.54). The low coefficients for rural- and urban-oriented old residents (G = -0.29 and -0.27 respectively) indicated a weak influence of community orientation rather than length of residence in this relationship.

Summary of Findings on Social Interaction

The level of social interaction was examined for various types of residents, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle. On the basis of overall scores, social interaction was found to be greater among rural-oriented new and urban-oriented oldtime residents than among their counterparts; it was not influenced by socioeconomic status but those in the early stage of the family life cycle had less interaction than others.

Of the various types of residents, more of urban-oriented old residents knew more neighborhood families than other types; more of urban-oriented residents visited neighbors more often; more of rural-oriented old residents had greater contact with farmers; and more of rural-oriented residents had greater contact with village residents than had urban-oriented residents. New residents of either orientation had greater contact with other newcomers than had the oldtime residents.

More of those with the high socioeconomic status knew more neighborhood families and had greater contact with other newcomers than those with the low and middle status; more of those with the middle and high status visited neighbors and friends more often than those with the low status; and more of those with the low and middle status visited relatives more often than those with the high status.

Differences in the family life cycle stages did not influence frequency of visiting friends or the amount of contact they had with farmers and village residents as the responses were similar. The frequency of visiting neighbors and newcomers was greater among those in the early and middle stages than among those in the late stage; more of the middle and late than of the early stage knew more neighborhood families; and more of the late than of the early and middle stages visited relatives more often.

Institutional Participation

The following is an analysis of institutional participation of residents of Camillus as measured by an index of institutional participation. The component items of the index and what would typify a respondent having low, moderate or high intensity of institutional participation have been discussed in the counterpart of this section in the chapter on Parma. The scoring system has been discussed in the chapter on Methodology.

Tables 143 through 145 examine the intensity of institutional participation as measured by total score on the index by residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle respectively. Relationships were found to be statistically significant in all these cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial for the relationship between socioeconomic status score and total score on the index, but it was almost zero for stage in family life cycle and total score on the index.

Table 143 gives the percentage distribution of respondents by residence-orientation typology and intensity of institutional participation. The data indicated that the majority of all resident types

(varying from 52 to 87 percent) participated at moderate intensity, and between 22 percent and 43 percent of three of the four resident types participated at high intensity level. Only 9 percent of rural-oriented new residents were found in the high intensity category. Not more than 10 percent of any type of resident were found in the low intensity category.

Table 143. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Low	4.3%	3.5%	10.2%	5.1%	4.4%
Moderate	87.2	66.7	68.1	51.9	63.5
High	8.5	29.8	21.7	43.0	32.1
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 42.20$ $P < .01$

It could be seen, however, that more of urban- than of rural-oriented residents, regardless of length of residence participated at high intensity (30 and 43 percent of urban-oriented new and old residents vs. 9 and 22 percent of rural-oriented new and old residents respectively). Conversely, more of rural- than of urban-oriented residents, regardless of the length of residence, participated at moderate intensity.

The relationships were also examined separately between total participation score and the two variables of community orientation score and

length of residence. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in both cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial for the total participation score and the orientation score, but low for the total participation score and length of residence ($X^2 = 9.21$ df = 1, G = 0.42, and $X^2 = 42.75$ df = 6, G = 0.17 respectively). Details of these data are not presented here.

The data in Table 144 indicate a positive association between socioeconomic status and intensity of institutional participation. The proportion of respondents in low and moderate intensity levels decreased from low to high status class, but the proportion in the high intensity level increased from low to high status. Of those with low socioeconomic status, 89 percent participated at low or moderate intensity, and 11 percent at high intensity. On the other hand, 71 percent of those in the middle socioeconomic class participated at low or moderate intensity, and 29 percent participated at high intensity. The percentages in this respect for high status respondents were 57 percent in the low and moderate intensities and 43 percent in high intensity.

The data in Table 145 did not indicate any direction in the relationship between stage in family life cycle and intensity of institutional participation. However, it could be seen that middle stage respondents different significantly from others. About one half of this group (58 percent) participated at moderate intensity and more than one third (39 percent) at high intensity level. On the other hand, participation at these two levels was similar among those in early and late stages of the family life cycle: 76 and 70 percent respectively participated at moderate

Table 144. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Socioeconomic status scores			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
Low	16.1%	4.1%	1.2%	4.4%
Moderate	72.9	66.8	55.8	63.5
High	11.0	29.1	43.0	32.1
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 85.00$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.41$

Table 145. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Intensity of Institutional Participation

Intensity of participation	Family life cycle stages			
	Early	Middle	Late	Total
Low	5.0%	3.1%	10.1%	4.4%
Moderate	76.4	58.2	69.8	63.5
High	18.6	38.7	20.1	32.1
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 53.31$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.08$

level, and 19 and 20 percent respectively at high intensity. This distribution indicated a significantly greater participation at the high intensity level on the part of middle stage respondents compared to those in the early and late stages, more of whom participated at moderate intensity.

Relationship between socioeconomic status and intensity of institutional participation was found to be statistically significant for each type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial for urban-oriented new and old residents (G = 0.36 and 0.55 respectively), and high for their rural-oriented counterparts (G = 0.64 and 0.95 respectively).

It may be added that high G values for rural-oriented new and old residents could result from small number of observations in the low and high status categories (6 and 13 respectively) of rural-oriented new and high status category (4) of rural-oriented old residents. This explanation will hold true in the subsequent analysis, too, whenever the G values for these two types of residents would show unusually high or a near perfect correlation coefficient.

Table 146 shows the statistical results (of X^2 text and the Gamma coefficients of correlation) of relationships between socioeconomic status and total score as well as all items of the index of institutional participation for each type of resident.

Similarly, the relationship between stage in family life cycle and total score on the index of participation was examined for each type of resident. The relationship between the two variables was found to be

Table 146. Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Socioeconomic Status Score and Component Items of the Index of Institutional Participation, Camillus

Component items of institutional participation index	Residence-orientation typology.							
	Rural-new		Urban-new		Rural-old		Urban-old	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Total score on the index	S	.64	S	.36	S	.95	S	.55
Number of organizations to which belonged	S	.92	S	.42	N	.59	S	.48
Number of organizations in which office was held	S	.89	S	.53	S	.88	S	.32
Frequency of attendance at meetings	S	.81	S	.36	S	.63	S	.47
Amount of interest in local affairs	N	.30	S	.18	S	.54	S	.39
Frequency of church attendance	N	.20	S	.15	N	.48	S	.28

Col. 1: S = Significant at the .05 or .01 level under the X^2 test.
N = Not significant at the .05 or .01 level.

2: Coefficients of correlation of Goodman and Kurskal's Gamma.

statistically significant for each type of residents except the rural-oriented new residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were high but of opposite nature for rural-oriented new and old residents (G = 0.61 and -0.67 respectively) and of different level and direction for urban-oriented new and old residents (G = 0.22 and -0.30 respectively). It could be seen, however, that the relationship was inverse for old residents but it was direct for new residents, of either orientation in both cases. Furthermore, the coefficients of correlation were greater in the case of the former (oldtime residents) and also greater for rural- than urban-oriented residents. These results therefore indicate that intensity of institutional participation decreases among oldtime residents in late stage of the family life cycle.

It may be added that high G values for rural-oriented new and old residents could result from small number of observations in the early and late stages (13 and 2 respectively) of rural-oriented new and early stage (4) of rural-oriented old residents. This explanation will hold true in the subsequent analysis, too, whenever the G values for these two types of residents would show unusually high or a near perfect correlation coefficient.

Table 147 shows the statistical results (of X^2 test and the Gamma coefficients of correlation) of relationships between stage in family life cycle and total score as well as all items of the index of institutional participation for each type of resident.

The following is an analysis of those component items of the index of institutional participation which showed a significant relationship

Table 147. Statistical Results of Relationships Between Residence-Orientation Typology, Stage in Family Life Cycle and Component Items of the Index of Institutional Participation, Camillus

Component items of institutional participation index	Residence-orientation typology							
	Rural-new		Urban-new		Rural-old		Urban-old	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Total score on the index	N	.61	S	.22	S	-.67	S	-.30
Number of organization to which belonged	S	.50	S	.27	S	-.53	S	-.27
Number of organizations in which office was held	N	.47	S	.36	S	-.59	N	-.03
Frequency of attendance at meetings	S	.44	S	.25	S	-.53	S	-.37
Amount of interest in local affairs	S	.85	S	.11	S	-.40	S	-.04
Frequency of church attendance	S	-.09	S	-.11	N	-.17	S	-.37

Col. 1: S = Significant at the .05 or .01 level under the X^2 test.
N = Not significant at the .05 or .01 level.

2: Coefficients of correlation of Goodman and Kurskal's Gamma.

under the X^2 test and or gave substantial or high Gamma coefficients of correlation. These items are first analyzed under residence-orientation typology, followed by socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle.

Tables 148 through 150 examine the relationships respectively between residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, and stage in family life cycle and number of organizations to which they belonged. Relationships were found to be statistically significant in all these cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial for relationship between socioeconomic status score and number of organizations to which respondents belonged (G = 0.41), but it was negligible for stage in family life cycle and number of organizations to which respondents belonged (G = 0.13).

The data in Table 148 did not render a clear pattern between resident types and number of organizations to which bhey belonged. The differences were not great between those with similar orientation or length of residence. However, it could be seen that more or rural- and urban-oriented new than of their counterpart old residents were nonmembers (45 and 32 percent vs. 33 and 26 percent respectively). Almost similar proportions of each type of resident belonged to one or two organizations (varying between 44 and 54 percent), but more urban- than rural-oriented residents, regardless of length of residence, were members of three or more organizations (20 and 30 percent of new and old urban-oriented vs. 6 and 13 percent of rural-oriented residents respectively). These results, therefore, indicate that more of urban-oriented residents were likely to be members of three or more organizations while more of rural-oriented residents were likely to be nonmembers.

Table 148. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations to Which They Belonged

Number of organizations	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
None	44.7%	32.4%	33.4%	26.4%	31.3%
One or two	48.9	47.8	53.6	43.6	47.1
Three or more	6.4	19.8	13.0	30.0	21.6
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 25.47$ $P < .01$

The data in Table 149 indicated a substantial relationship between socioeconomic status and number of organizations to which respondents belonged. More respondents with low socioeconomic status were nonmembers (58 percent) than were those with middle and high socioeconomic status (35 percent and 18 percent). The converse was true in the categories of those who belonged to one or two organizations and those who belonged to three or more. One half of the high socioeconomic class and 47 percent of middle class respondents belonged to one or two organizations as compared to 37 percent of those with low socioeconomic status. More respondents in high socioeconomic class belonged to three or more organizations (31 percent) than did those in the middle and low socioeconomic classes (19 percent and 5 percent respectively).

The data in Table 150 showed a negligible relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of organizations to which they

cycle and number of organizations in which respondents held an office. Relationships were found to be statistically significant in all these cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial for the relationship between socioeconomic status and number of organizations in which respondents held an office (G = 0.41), but it was low for the relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of organizations in which respondents held an office (G = 0.22).

The data in Table 151 do not show a pattern in the relationship between resident types and number of organizations in which they held an office. The overwhelming majority in each type (ranging from 76 percent to 90 percent) did not hold office in any organization, and for those who did, this fact did not seem to be clearly related to either community orientation background or length of residence. However, it may be pointed out that the category of nonholders of an office included those who did not belong to any organization. The exact proportion of these respondents could be ascertained from Table 148. Rural-oriented new residents

Table 151. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
None	76.6%	84.5%	89.9%	75.8%	82.0%
One	21.3	13.2	7.2	17.2	14.3
Two or more	2.1	2.3	2.9	7.0	3.7
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 22.39$ $P < .01$

had the largest proportion (21 percent) of all types of resident who held office in at least one of the organizations to which they belonged. They were followed by urban-oriented old and new residents (17 percent and 13 percent respectively), the last being rural-oriented old residents (7 percent). Among those who held offices in two or more organizations, urban-oriented old residents led all others, but the percentages were low in all cases, ranging from 2 to 7 percent.

The data in Table 152 show a substantial positive relationship between socioeconomic status and number of organizations in which respondents held an office. The percentage of office holders increased from the low to the high socioeconomic status. In this respect it can be seen that the combined figures of those holding office in one or more organizations were 6 percent, 15 percent and 27 percent in the low, middle and high status classes, respectively. It may be pointed out that nonmembers formed part of the high figures in the category of those who did not hold an office in an organization.

Table 152. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was held

Number of organizations	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
None	94.1%	85.5%	73.1%	82.0%
One	3.4	12.3	20.6	14.3
Two or more	2.5	2.2	6.3	3.7
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 40.96$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.42$

The data in Table 153 show a low relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of organizations in which respondents held an office. It can be seen that middle stage respondents were more active than others, though the respondents in late stage of the family life cycle followed closely. Of the middle and late stage respondents, 22 percent and 15 percent respectively held office in one or more organizations to which they belonged compared to 9 percent of those in early stage. A slightly higher percentage of respondents in late stage held office in two or more organizations than did those in middle stage.

Relationship between socioeconomic status and number of organizations in which respondents held an office was also found to be statistically significant for each type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial or high for all types (G = 0.53 and 0.32 for urban-oriented new and old residents and 0.88 and 0.89 for rural-oriented new and old residents respectively). The possible reason for

Table 153. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Organizations in Which Office Was Held

Number of organizations	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None	91.5%	78.4%	84.9%	82.0%
One	7.2	17.4	10.1	14.3
Two or more	1.3	4.2	5.0	3.7
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 23.98$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.22$

high G values in the case of rural-oriented residents has earlier been explained in this section.

Relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of organizations in which respondents held an office was found to be statistically significant for only two types of residents: urban-oriented new and rural-oriented old residents. The Gamma coefficients were substantial for all types, except the urban-oriented old residents. It may be noted, however, that the coefficients were inverse for old residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = -0.59 and -0.03 respectively), but direct for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.47 and 0.36 respectively).

Tables 154 and 155 examine the relationships respectively between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and frequency of attendance at meetings. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in both cases. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial for socioeconomic status and frequency of attendance at meetings (G = 0.39) but negligible (G = 0.09) for stage in family life cycle and the latter variable.

The relationship between residence-orientation typology and frequency of attendance at meetings was not found to be statistically significant. The data did not show significant difference between new and oldtime residents or between rural- and urban-oriented residents. However, some differences could be noticed between rural-oriented new residents and other resident types. The proportions attending meetings up to three times a month ranged from 49 percent to 54 percent in the case of three

types of resident, while only 39 percent of rural-oriented new residents were in this category. The proportions attending more than four meetings a month did not differ from one type of resident to another as between 13 and 21 percent of each type was found in this category.

It can be seen from the data in Table 154 that the proportion of respondents attending meetings as well as frequency of attendance increased with socioeconomic status. Of those with low, middle and high socioeconomic status, 38 percent, 48 percent and 56 percent respectively attended meetings as frequently as up to three times a month. Similarly, the proportions attending meetings once a week or more increased with socioeconomic status (4 percent, 17 percent and 26 percent respectively).

Table 154. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Nonmembers	57.6%	34.4%	18.2%	31.1%
Up to 3 times a month	38.1	48.2	55.8	49.8
Once a week or more often	4.3	17.4	25.9	19.1
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 80.12$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.39$

The data in Table 155 show the percentage distribution of respondents by stage in family life cycle and frequency of attendance at meetings. The relationship though statistically significant gave an almost zero coefficient of correlation. However, middle stage respondents differed in the

attendance pattern from those in early and late stages of family life cycle. The majority (55 percent) of the former but only 38 and 45 percent of respondents in the latter two stages attended meetings up to three times a month. More middle than early and late stage respondents attended meetings once a week or more (24 percent vs. 12 and 6 percent respectively). Nonmembership was of an almost equal magnitude among respondents in early and late stages of family life cycle but far less among middle stage respondents (50 and 49 percent vs. 22 percent).

Table 155. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

Attendance frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Nonmembers	49.8%	21.8%	48.9%	31.1%
Up to 3 times a month	38.0	54.6	44.6	49.8
Once a week or more often	12.2	23.6	6.5	19.1
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 97.38$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.09$

Relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of attendance at meetings was found to be statistically significant for each type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial for urban-oriented new and old residents (G = 0.36 and 0.47 respectively) and high for rural-oriented new and old residents (G = 0.81 and 0.63 respectively.

Similarly, relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of attendance at meetings was found to be statistically significant for each type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally substantial, with the exception of urban-oriented new residents in which case it was low. It may be added that the relationship was inverse for old residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = -0.53 and -0.37 respectively) while it was direct for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = 0.44 and 0.25 respectively).

Tables 156 to 158 show, respectively, the relationships between residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs. Relationships were found to be statistically significant in all these cases. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was low for the relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of interest (G = 0.21) and negligible for stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs (G = 0.14).

The data in Table 156 show that of the four resident types, a greater proportion of rural- than of urban-oriented new and old residents were found in the slightly interested category (60 and 44 percent of rural-oriented new and old vs. 38 and 28 percent of urban-oriented new and old residents respectively). Almost similar proportions of all resident types (varying from 36 to 45 percent) were found to be interested in local affairs. However, greater proportions of urban- than of rural-oriented new and old residents said they were very interested in local affairs (17 and 32 percent of urban-oriented new and old vs.

Table 156. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Residence-orientation typology				Total
	Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	
Slightly interested	59.6%	38.2%	43.5%	28.3%	36.7%
Interested	36.2	44.6	44.9	39.8	42.9
Very interested	4.2	17.2	11.6	31.9	20.4
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 48.09$ $P < .01$

4 and 12 percent of rural-oriented new and old residents respectively). Some differences in certain response categories could be seen between new and oldtime residents which indicates some influence of length of residence, too.

The data in Table 157 show a greater similarity of response among respondents of middle and high socioeconomic status compared to that of low socioeconomic status. The majority with middle and high socioeconomic status was either interested or very interested in local affairs 64 percent and 59 percent respectively), while the majority (59 percent) of low socioeconomic status respondents expressed only a slight interest. More respondents of middle and high than of low socioeconomic status said they were very interested in local affairs (20 and 24 percent vs. 11 percent).

Table 157. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Slightly interested	59.3%	36.1%	30.9%	36.7%
Interested	29.7	44.0	45.2	42.9
Very interested	11.0	19.9	23.9	20.4
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 33.18$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.21$

Table 158 shows the relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs. Amount of interest differed at various stages of the family life cycle. Of those in early and late stages, a larger proportion (46 percent and 45 percent respectively) showed only a slight interest as compared to 32 percent of those in middle stage. More respondents of middle than of early and late stage of the family life cycle said they were either interested or very interested in local affairs (68 percent vs. 54 and 55 percent respectively). More respondents of early and middle than of late stage were in the category of interested people, but more of middle and late stage than of early stage respondents were in the category of very interested.

Relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of interest in local affairs was found to be significant for each type of respondent, with the exception of rural-oriented new residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally substantial, with the exception of urban-oriented new residents in which case it was low. The coefficients were

Table 158. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Amount of Interest in Local Affairs

Amount of interest	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Slightly interested	46.4%	31.9%	45.3%	36.7%
Interested	43.5	44.9	31.7	42.9
Very interested	10.1	23.2	23.0	20.4
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 33.83$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.14$

higher for oldtime residents (G = 0.54 and 0.39 respectively) for rural- and urban-oriented residents) than for new residents (G = 0.30 and 0.18 for rural- and urban-oriented residents respectively). However, since the coefficients of correlation for urban-oriented residents of either length of residence were lower than their counterpart rural-oriented residents, it seems that community orientation rather than length of residence had greater influence on amount of interest in local affairs.

Relationship between stage in family life cycle and amount of interest in local affairs was found to be statistically significant for each type of resident. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were inverse for oldtime residents (G = -0.40 and -0.04 for rural- and urban-oriented respectively) and positive for new residents (G = 0.85 and 0.11 respectively for rural- and urban-oriented residents). The negligible coefficients for urban-oriented new and old residents as compared to their rural-oriented counterparts, tend to indicate greater influence of community orientation background than length of residence.

Tables 159 to 161 show, respectively, the relationships between residence-orientation typology, socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance. Relationships were found to be statistically significant in each case. The Gamma coefficient of correlation was positive for the relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance, but was inverse for the relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance. The coefficients were low in both cases (G = 0.24 and -0.20 respectively).

Table 159 shows the relationship between residence-orientation typology and frequency of church attendance. It can be seen that although the majority in each case attended church once a week, more of urban- than of rural-oriented residents did so (more than 70percent each of the former vs. 55 percent each of the latter). Of the remainder, rural-oriented new and old residents were more likely than their urban-oriented counterparts to visit church once or twice a month (30 and 23

Table 159. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Residence-Orientation Typology and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Residence-orientation typology: Rural-new	Urban-new	Rural-old	Urban-old	Total
Only on important days	14.9%	10.2%	21.7%	12.4%	11.7%
Once or twice a month	29.8	15.3	23.2	15.3	16.4
Once a week	55.3	74.5	55.1	72.3	71.9
Total	100.0% (47)	100.0% (688)	100.0% (69)	100.0% (314)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 20.92$ $P < .01$

percent vs. 15 percent each). More of oldtime than new residents of either orientation tended to visit church only on important days 22 and 12 percent vs. 15 and 10 percent respectively). These data, therefore, seemed to indicate that frequency of church attendance was related more to community orientation than length of residence.

Table 160 shows the relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance. Respondents with low socioeconomic status differed from both middle and high socioeconomic status respondents. Though the majority in each socioeconomic class attended church once a week, the proportion in low socioeconomic class was much less than of other two classes (50 percent vs. 73 and 76 percent). Of the remaining one half of low socioeconomic class, a slightly higher proportion (26 percent) attended church only on important days than of those who attended once or twice a month (24 percent). However, considerably smaller proportions of middle and high than of low status respondents were found in these lower frequencies of church attendance.

Table 160. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Only on important days	26.3%	11.3%	8.0%	11.7%
Once or twice a month	23.7	15.4	15.6	16.4
Once a week	50.0	73.3	76.4	71.9
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 39.52$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.24$

Table 161 shows a low inverse relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance. The data indicated that respondents in late stage of family life cycle differed from both early and middle stage respondents in frequency of church attendance. While an overwhelming majority of early and middle stage respondents attended church once a week, only a little more than one half of late stage respondents did so (73 and 75 percent vs. 54 percent). More late stage than of early and middle stage respondents attended church once or twice a month (22 percent vs. 19 and 15 percent respectively) or only on important days (24 percent vs. 8 and 11 percent respectively).

Table 161. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Frequency of Church Attendance

Attendance frequency	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Only on important days	8.0%	10.5%	24.4%	11.7%
Once or twice a month	18.6	14.7	21.6	16.4
Once a week	73.4	74.8	54.0	71.9
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 34.40$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.20$

Relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of church attendance was found to be statistically significant for only urban-oriented new and old residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were generally low, with the exception of rural-oriented old residents (G = 0.15 and 0.28 for urban-oriented new and old and 0.20 and 0.48 for

rural-oriented new and old residents respectively). These values indicated a low relationship between the two variables, and that community orientation background rather than length of residence seemed to have greater influence on frequency of church attendance.

Relationship between stage in family life cycle and frequency of church attendance was found to be statistically significant for each type of resident, except rural-oriented old residents. The Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated an inverse relationship for all types of resident, though the coefficient was substantial for only urban-oriented old residents. However, the coefficients were higher for old than for new residents of rural- and urban-orientation (G = -0.17 and -0.37 vs. -0.09 and -0.11 respectively). These values do indicate a greater influence of length of residence than of community orientation on frequency of church attendance. It was shown earlier than late stage families differed from early and middle stage respondents, and that oldtime than new residents had a greater proportion in late stage of family life cycle.

Summary of Findings on Institutional Participation

The level of institutional participation was examined for each type of resident, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle. On the basis of overall scores, participation was found to be greater among urban-oriented than among rural-oriented residents, among respondents of high status than of the low and middle status, and among the middle stage than among the early and late stages of the family life cycle.

It was found that more of the urban-oriented new and old residents belonged to greater number of organizations, had greater interest in local

affairs, and attended church with greater frequency compared to their counterpart rural-oriented residents. The frequency of attendance at meetings and holding of an office in an organization was not influenced, or was influenced irregularly, by the resident typology.

It was found that more of the high socioeconomic status respondents belonged to greater number of organizations, held offices in greater number of organizations to which they belonged, and attended meetings more often compared to those with the middle and the low status. More of those with middle and high status showed greater interest in local affairs and visited church more often than did those with the low status.

It was found that more of those in the middle stage of the family life cycle exhibited similar characteristics as above regarding number of organizations to which they belonged, number of organizations in which they held an office and the frequency of attendance at meetings than those in the early and late stages. Greater amount of interest in local affairs was found more among those in the middle and late stages than among those in the early stage. Those in the early and middle stages of the family life cycle were more likely to be attending church with greater frequency than were those in the late stage.

Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

Socioeconomic status score and stage in family life cycle showed statistically significant relationships with most of the items representing attitude toward conditions of life in the fringe area. Satisfaction with fringe residence showed a negligible inverse relationship with both socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle (G = -0.03 and -0.13 respectively). These relationships were not found to be statistically significant either. Relationship between stage in family life cycle and the head of family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work was also not found to be statistically significant and had negligible coefficient of correlation (G = 0.11).

Table 162 presents the percentage distribution of respondents by socioeconomic status and the head of family's satisfaction with convenience of driving to work. Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was inverse but low (G = -0.26). It could be seen that respondents with low socioeconomic status expressed an attitude different from that expressed by both middle and high status respondents. The majority (62 percent) of low status respondents were very satisfied as compared to only 39 percent and 31 percent respectively of middle and high status respondents who were found in this category. More of middle and high than of low status respondents were found in the satisfied category (44 percent each of the former two classes vs. 32 percent of the latter class). More respondents of middle and high than of low socioeconomic class said

they were dissatisfied with driving convenience (19 and 24 percent vs 6 percent respectively).

Table 162. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Head's Satisfaction with Convenience of Driving to Work

Extent of satisfaction	Socioeconomic status scores			Total
	Low	Middle	High	
Dissatisfied	6.3%	16.8%	24.4%	18.7%
Satisfied	31.7	43.9	44.4	43.1
Very satisfied	62.0	39.3	31.2	38.2
Total	100.0% (79)	100.0% (542)	100.0% (356)	100.0% (977)

$X^2 = 32.90$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.26$

Tables 163 and 164 examine the relationship respectively between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and attitude toward school taxes. Both of the former two variables showed a statistically significant relationship with attitude toward school taxes. The Gamma coefficient of correlation showed an inverse but low degree of relationship between socioeconomic status and attitude toward school taxes ($G = -0.25$), but was substantial for stage in family life cycle and attitude toward school taxes ($G = 0.32$).

The data in Table 163 indicated that while the majority of respondents with high socioeconomic status (52 percent) considered school taxes to be reasonable, there were fewer respondents of low and middle socioeconomic status in this category (31 and 40 percent respectively).

Table 163. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socio-economic Status Score and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Reasonable	30.5%	40.2%	51.5%	43.2%
Somewhat high	40.7	33.6	35.7	35.1
Very high	28.8	26.2	12.8	21.7
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 36.43$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.25$

On the other extreme, those who considered the taxes to be very high, more respondents of low and middle than high socioeconomic status were found in this category (29 and 26 percent vs. 13 percent respectively). Almost similar proportion (varying from 34 to 41 percent) of respondents in each class considered the school taxes to be somewhat high. These data, therefore, show that a majority of respondents in both low and middle socio-economic class considered the taxes to be somewhat high or very high, while the majority of respondents in high class considered the taxes to be reasonable.

The data in Table 164 show a substantial relationship between stage in family life cycle and attitude toward school taxes. It can be seen that the majority of respondents in early stage considered the school taxes were reasonable, but a majority of those in middle and late stage of family life cycle considered the taxes to be somewhat high or very high. The proportions in the reasonable category were 54 percent vs. 43 and 25

percent of early, middle and late stage respectively, and the proportions in the very high category were 14 percent, 20 percent, and 45 percent respectively for the three stages in family life cycle. Similar proportions (varying from 30 to 37 percent) of respondents in each class considered the taxes to be somewhat high.

Table 164. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward School Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Reasonable	54.4%	43.0%	25.2%	43.2%
Somewhat high	32.1	36.9	30.2	35.1
Very high	13.5	20.1	44.6	21.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(237)	(742)	(139)	(1118)

$X^2 = 61.4$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.32$

Tables 165 and 166 examine the relationship respectively between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle and attitude toward property taxes in Camillus. Though the relationships were found to be statistically significant, the Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated a low degree of inverse relationship in each case (G = -0.15 for socioeconomic status and G = -0.25 for stage in family life cycle).

The data in Table 165 indicate that more respondents of high than of middle and low socioeconomic status considered the property taxes were reasonable (60 percent vs. 50 and 45 percent respectively). The converse of this was observed in the two categories of somewhat high and very high

(26 percent vs. 33 and 37 percent respectively in the former category and 14 percent vs. 17 and 18 percent respectively in the latter category). It could be seen, therefore, that more respondents of low and middle than high socioeconomic class considered the taxes to be somewhat high or very high.

Table 165. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
Reasonable	44.9%	50.3%	59.8%	53.1
Somewhat high	37.3	32.9	26.4	31.1
Very high	17.8	16.8	13.8	15.8
Total	100.0% (1118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 12.29$ $P < .05$ $G = -0.15$

The data in Table 166 indicated that a gradually decreasing proportion of early, middle and late stage respondents considered the property taxes to be reasonable (65 percent, 52 percent and 40 percent respectively). However, more of middle and late than of early stage respondents considered taxes were somewhat high (34 and 32 percent vs. 22 percent) or very high (15 and 27 percent vs. 13 percent). In the latter category, however, late stage respondents were noticeably more than middle and early stage respondents. However, it could be seen that, while the majority of respondents in early stage considered the taxes to be reasonable, a majority of middle and late stage respondents considered the taxes to be somewhat or very high.

Table 166. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Attitude Toward Property Taxes

Attitude	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
Reasonable	65.4%	51.6%	40.3%	53.1%
Somewhat high	21.9	33.7	32.4	31.1
Very high	12.7	14.7	27.3	15.8
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 33.18$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.25$

Tables 167 and 168 examine the relationship respectively between socioeconomic status, stage in family life cycle, and number of residential moves made during the past ten years. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in each case. The Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated a substantial relationship between socioeconomic status and number of residential moves (G = 0.44), and a substantial inverse relationship between stage in family life cycle and number of residential moves (G = -0.57).

The data in Table 167 show that greater number of residential moves were made by respondents with high than middle or low socioeconomic status. It could be seen that a majority (61 percent) of respondents with low socioeconomic status had not made a single move in the past ten years, whereas much larger proportions of respondents with middle and high socioeconomic status had moved at least once (78 and 88 percent respectively). The differences were especially large in the proportions of those who had

Table 167. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Socioeconomic status scores Low	Middle	High	Total
None	61.0%	22.1%	12.3%	22.7%
One	24.6	32.5	25.9	29.4
Two	7.6	19.3	15.8	16.8
Three or more	6.8	26.1	46.0	31.1
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 163.84$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.44$

made three or more moves (7 percent vs. 26 and 46 percent of low, middle and high class respectively). Furthermore, more of middle and high than of low socioeconomic status respondents had made two moves in the past ten years (19 and 16 percent vs. 8 percent).

The data in Table 168 show greater past mobility among early and middle than late stage respondents. Respondents in early stage of the family life cycle were the most mobile and those in late stage were the least mobile of all. The proportions of respondents in early, middle and late stages of family life cycle who had made three or more residential moves were 51 percent, 30 percent and 4 percent respectively. The majority of late stage respondents (63 percent) had not made a single move while a majority of those in early stage (70 percent) and a large proportion of those in middle stage (48 percent) had made two or more residential moves in the past ten year.

Table 168. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Number of Moves Made in Past Ten Years

Number of moves	Family life cycle stages			Total
	Early	Middle	Late	
None	3.4%	21.3%	63.3%	22.7%
One	26.2	31.0	25.9	29.4
Two	19.8	17.8	6.5	16.8
Three or more	50.6	29.9	4.3	31.1
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 214.52$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.57$

Table 169 shows the relationship between socioeconomic status score and extent of anomie. The relationship was statistically significant and the Gamma coefficient of correlation indicated a substantial inverse relationship (G = -0.32).

The data showed that the proportion of anomic respondents decreased gradually from low to high class, and that the proportion of nonanomic respondents increased gradually from low to high class. The proportion of anomic respondents in low, middle and high classes was 39 percent, 23 percent and 11 percent respectively, and the proportion of nonanomic respondents was 23 percent, 33 percent and 47 percent respectively in the three socioeconomic classes. Slightly larger proportions of middle and high than of low socioeconomic class respondents were found in the intermediate category (43 and 42 percent vs. 38 percent respectively).

Table 169. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Socioeconomic Status Score and Extent of Anomie

Extent of anomie	Socioeconomic status scores: Low	Middle	High	Total
Nonanomic	22.9%	33.2%	46.7%	36.9%
Intermediate	38.1	43.4	42.2	42.4
Anomic	39.0	23.4	11.1	20.7
Total	100.0% (118)	100.0% (602)	100.0% (398)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 58.70$ $P < .01$ $G = -0.32$

Table 170 shows the relationship between stage in family life cycle and extent of anomie. The relationship was statistically significant and the Gamma coefficient of correlation was substantial (G = 0.30).

Table 170. Percentage Distribution of the Camillus Respondents by Stage in Family Life Cycle and Extent of Anomie

Extent of anomie	Family life cycle stages: Early	Middle	Late	Total
Nonanomic	45.2%	37.9%	18.0%	36.9%
Intermediate	42.6	42.4	41.7	42.4
Anomic	12.2	19.7	40.3	20.7
Total	100.0% (237)	100.0% (742)	100.0% (139)	100.0% (1118)

$X^2 = 52.43$ $P < .01$ $G = 0.30$

The data showed that there were more anomic respondents in late than in early and middle stages, and that there were more nonanomic respondents in early than in middle and late stages of family life cycle. The proportion of anomic respondents in early, middle and late stage of family life cycle was 12 percent, 20 percent and 40 percent respectively. The proportion of nonanomic respondents in early, middle and late stages of family life cycle was 45 percent, 38 percent and 18 percent respectively. Almost equal proportion of respondents of each stage was found in the intermediate category (varying from 42 to 43 percent).

Summary of Findings on Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe and Anomie

The differences in socioeconomic status or stage in the family life cycle of respondents did not influence the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence (most of them were very satisfied). More of those with the middle and the high status were less satisfied with convenience of driving to work than were those with the low status, but the degree of satisfaction did not differ much from one stage of the family life cycle to the other.

More respondents of the low and middle socioeconomic classes considered school taxes to be very high compared to those with high socioeconomic class. More respondents in the middle and high socioeconomic classes considered property taxes to be reasonable compared to those in the low class. A higher rate of residential mobility was found in higher socioeconomic classes than in the low class.

More respondents in the late than in the early and middle stages of the family life cycle considered school and property taxes to be very high. A greater mobility rate was found in the early than in the middle and late stages of the family life cycle.

Anomie was found to be higher among respondents in the low socioeconomic class and among those in the late stage of the family life cycle than among those in the middle and high socioeconomic classes, or those in the middle and late stages of the family life cycle.

Chapter VII

LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS: SIMILARITIES AND CONTRASTS IN THE THREE FRINGE AREAS

This chapter examines various sets of hypotheses relating to social interaction, institutional participation, attitude toward conditions in the fringe areas, and anomie in the three study areas. Each of these substantive areas is preceded by a listing of its sets of hypotheses. The possible implications of differences in levels of development of the three fringe areas have also been considered in various hypotheses.

Social Interaction

Hypotheses

(a):--Intensity of social interaction and participation in recreational activities increases in higher socioeconomic classes but decreases in advanced stages in the family life cycle.

(b):--Urban-oriented residents have closer social relationships in the neighboring suburbs or central city than within their community of residence.

(c):--Rural-oriented oldtime residents have greater social interaction than any of the other types of residents.

(d):--Rural-oriented residents have greater social interaction than urban-oriented residents.

(e):--Oldtime residents have greater social interaction than new residents.

Hypothesis (a):--Intensity of social interaction and participation in recreational activities increases in higher socioeconomic classes but decreases in advanced stages in the family life cycle.

Reissman[1] had found that the higher socioeconomic classes showed a higher degree of participation in leisure time activities and in social interaction. The first part of our hypothesis aims at testing Reissman's findings in our study areas, while the latter part, the influence of stage in family life cycle, is an extension of his findings.

Relationships between socioeconomic status score, stage in family life cycle and intensity of social interaction are examined first in the following paragraphs, followed by an analysis of the relationships between socioeconomic status score, stage in family life cycle and extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities.

The data did not indicate a statistically significant relationship between socioeconomic status and intensity of social interaction in any fringe area, with the exception of Camillus. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were also negligible or almost zero in all areas (G values ranged from -0.03 to 0.10).

The majority of each socioeconomic class (in most cases as much as two thirds or more) in each fringe area interacted at a moderate level of intensity and about one third in each class interacted at the high intensity level. Of the three fringe areas, Clarence had the highest percent-

1. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 73.

age of respondents in the category of high intensity of social interaction in each socioeconomic class and Camillus had the least (ranging from 35 to 39 percent and from 24 to 26 percent respectively in the moderate and high intensities). Of the three areas, Camillus had the largest proportion in each socioeconomic class interacting at a moderate level of intensity (ranging from 70 to 76 percent).

Relationship between stage in family life cycle and intensity of social interaction was found to be statistically significant only in Clarence and Camillus. The Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated an inverse relationship between the two variables only in Clarence, but the values were low in all areas (G = -0.19 in Clarence, 0.20 in Camillus and 0.02 in Parma).

In Clarence, the data indicated a lesser degree of interaction among respondents in middle and late stages than among respondents in early stage. Although the majority of each stage in the family life cycle was in the moderate intensity level, the proportion showed slight increases toward later stages (55 percent, 59 percent and 68 percent of early, middle and late stage respondents). Conversely, the proportions in the high intensity level decreased slightly toward later stages (45 percent, 38 percent and 30 percent of early, middle and late stages respectively).

In Camillus, the majority of each stage in family life cycle was also in the moderate intensity level. More of the early than of later stages were found in this category (86 percent vs. 72 and 71 percent of middle and late stages respectively). Conversely more of middle and late

than of early stage respondents were found in the high intensity level (27 percent each of middle and late stages vs. 14 percent of early stage). In Parma, too more of early than of middle and late stage respondents were found in the moderate intensity level (71 percent vs. 58 and 60 percent of middle and late stage respectively), and more of middle and late than of early stage respondents were found in the high intensity level (39 and 35 percent vs. 29 percent respectively).

The above data, therefore, do not support the hypothesis that intensity of social interaction is greater among people of higher than lower socioeconomic classes. This could possibly be a unique factor of the fringe areas which have relatively large proportions of middle and high socioeconomic status people.

The data also indicated that advanced stages in the family life cycle did not substantially influence the intensity level of social interaction, though some differences could be seen between the early and middle or late stage respondents. Generally, more of the former than of the latter two interacted at a moderate level, but more of the latter two than of the former scored in the high intensity of social interaction. However, it is quite possible that since most items of the index of social interaction related to neighboring, more of the middle and late stage respondents, whose children are between six and seventeen years of age, did more neighboring than did those in early stage of the family life cycle. Another possible reason could be that, as explained in greater detail in the following analysis, more of early stage respondents than others scored high on the extent and intensity of participation

in recreational activities. The types of activities of younger families could possibly be such as could be undertaken outside their neighborhood and, therefore, more of them scored in the moderate than high level of social interaction.

Extent and Intensity of Participation in Recreational Activities

The number of recreational activities (extent) and frequency of participation (intensity) were defined respectively as the sum total of all such activities and the frequency with which respondents participated in them together with the head of family or with other members of the family.

The number of activities was grouped into three classes: 0 to 3, 4 to 6, and 7 or more. Frequency of participation (intensity) was grouped into five classes:

None: No recreational activity

Low: Once a month to three times a month

Medium: Four to ten times a month

High 1: Eleven to twenty times a month, and

High 2: Twenty-one times a month or more often

It was found that both socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle had substantial relationship with extent and intensity of participation in all fringe areas. The relationship was inverse in the case of family life cycle but positive in the case of socioeconomic status. The Gamma coefficients of correlation obtained indicated that socioeconomic status was a relatively better predictor of the extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities than was family life cycle.

The relationship between socioeconomic status and both extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities was found to be statistically significant in all fringe areas, with the exception of relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of participation in Parma. However, a substantial relationship was observed between socioeconomic status and extent of recreational activities in all areas (G = 0.41, 0.59 and 0.39 in Parma, Clarence and Camillus respectively).

The relationship between socioeconomic status and frequency of participation in recreational activities was substantial in both Parma and Clarence (G = 0.30 and 0.45 respectively), but low in Camillus (G = 0.26).

In Parma, the respondents with low socioeconomic status differed substantially from those with middle and high status. The latter two showed greater similarities in their distribution patterns. None of the respondents with low socioeconomic status participated in seven or more activities while 10 and 11 percent respectively of the middle and high status respondents did. A much larger proportion of low than of middle and high socioeconomic status participated in only three or fewer activities (84 percent vs. 49 and 56 percent respectively).

Much larger proportions of middle and high than of low socioeconomic status respondents participated in recreational activities with high frequency (42 and 50 percent vs. 19 percent respectively). Conversely, more of low than of middle and high socioeconomic status respondents participated with low frequency (39 percent vs. 19 and 22 percent respectively). The latter figures included 19 percent, 11 percent and

percent respectively of low, middle and high status respondents who participated in no recreational activity at all.

In Clarence, the respondents in the three socioeconomic classes differed significantly from one another in extent of recreational participation. The proportion participating in seven or more activities increased substantially toward higher socioeconomic classes. Conversely, the proportions participating in three or fewer activities decreased toward higher socioeconomic classes. In the former category, the proportions of the low, middle and high classes were 2 percent, 16 percent and 32 percent respectively, and in the latter category the proportions were 89 percent, 45 percent and 23 percent respectively.

Much larger proportions of the Clarence respondents of middle and high than of low socioeconomic status participated with high frequency (47 and 55 percent vs. 10 percent respectively). An overwhelming majority (75 percent) of the low status respondents was found in the low frequency of participation compared to about 20 percent each of the middle and high status respondents. The latter figures included 42 percent, 17 percent and 2 percent respectively of the three socioeconomic classes who participated in no recreational activity.

The extent of recreational participation in Camillus was generally similar to that of the other two areas. The proportion participating in highest number of activities increased toward higher socioeconomic classes (4 percent to 24, and 36 percent respectively in the low, middle and high socioeconomic classes). Conversely, the proportion participating in least number of activities (3 or fewer) decreased toward higher socio-

economic classes (72 percent to 31 and 22 percent, respectively, of low, middle and high socioeconomic classes).

More of the Camillus respondents of middle and high than of low socioeconomic status participated with high frequency (58 and 63 percent vs. 25 percent respectively), and more of low than of middle and high socioeconomic classes participated with low frequency (31 percent vs. 11 and 7 percent respectively). The latter include 22 percent, 2 percent, and 1 percent respectively of the three socioeconomic classes who participated in no recreational activity at all.

The relationship between stage in family life cycle and both extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities was also found to be statistically significant in all fringe areas. The Gamma coefficients of correlation indicated an inverse relationship, generally of substantial or near substantial rank order, between stage in family life cycle and both extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities in all areas. The coefficients were G = -0.45, -0.44 and -0.27 for the extent of participation and G = -0.17, -0.28 and -0.13 for the intensity of participation in Parma, Clarence and Camillus, respectively.

The following are the comparative figures regarding extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities for the three areas. Of those in early stage, only 7 percent, 14 percent, and 21 percent respectively in Parma, Clarence, and Camillus participated in seven or more activities compared to 48 percent, 39 percent, and 29 percent who participated in three or fewer activities. Of those in middle stage, only

11 percent, 29 percent, and 32 percent respectively in Parma, Clarence and Camillus participated in seven or more activities compared to 44 percent, 30 percent, and 32 percent respectively who took part in three or fewer activities. Of those in late stage, about 2 percent each in Parma, Clarence and Camillus participated in seven or more activities while between 73 and 90 percent of them participated in three or fewer activities.

Similarly, an overall comparison of intensity of participation in recreational activities in the three areas showed that of those in early stage, 32 percent, 29 percent, and 47 percent respectively in Parma, Clarence and Camillus participated with high frequency. The proportion in the low frequency of participation was 26 percent, 34 percent and 12 percent respectively in the three fringe areas. The latter figures included 3 percent each in Parma and Camillus and 11 percent in Clarence of those who did not participate in any activity.

Of those in middle stage, 48 percent, 50 percent and 64 percent respectively in Parma, Clarence and Camillus participated with high frequency. The proportion in low frequency was 14 percent, 21 percent and 8 percent respectively in the three fringe areas. The latter figures included 10 percent, 8 percent and 2 percent respectively of those in each fringe area who did not participate in any activity.

Of those in late stage, 23 percent in each fringe area participated with high frequency, while the proportion in low frequency was 40 percent, 60 percent and 36 percent respectively in Parma, Clarence and Camillus. The latter figures included 28 percent, 34 percent and 20 percent respectively in each area who did not participate in any activity.

Our data, therefore, supported Reissman's findings on the relationships between socioeconomic classes and the extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities in all of our study areas. Furthermore, the data indicated that the higher the level of development of a fringe area, the greater was the extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities in each socioeconomic class.

Our data also indicated that number of recreational activities was substantially affected, in an inverse manner, by advanced stage in the family life cycle, but the inverse effect on intensity of participation was not regular. It could be seen from the data presented here that more of middle stage than early or late stage respondents were found in the high frequency category in all areas. It was observed that though similar proportions of early and late stage respondents were found in some response categories, generally more of the latter than of the former were in the low frequency and vice versa in the high frequency categories of participation. These data, therefore, supported our hypothesis of inverse relationship between stage in family life cycle and both extent and intensity of participation in recreational activities.

Hypothesis (b):--Urban-oriented residents have closer social relationships in the neighboring suburbs or central city than within their own community of residence.

Gist[2] had reported that the decentralized families had much closer affiliations with city groups than nondecentralized families, and that the former type of families visited their friends and relatives in the city

2. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 58.

more than in the country while the opposite was true in the case of non-decentralized families. Kurtz and Smith[3] reported that their data indicated a greater social interaction oriented toward the central city on part of those who had moved from the city, and that this phenomenon could be viewed as an extension of the social city.

The data from our three fringe areas showed that an overwhelming majority of urban-oriented new and old residents but only small proportions of their rural-oriented counterparts visited with relatives in the city or suburbs of the city. The percentages in this respect were 70 and 52 percent vs. 21 and 18 percent respectively in Parma, 82 and 83 percent vs. 16 and 27 percent respectively in Clarence, and 72 and 58 percent vs. 6 and 21 percent respectively in Camillus. These data, therefore, indicate greater influence of community orientation than of length of residence on the location where relatives were visited.

The data regarding the location where friends were visited also indicated greater influence of community orientation than of length of residence, but in Parma the location was noncity and nonsuburban. In Clarence and Camillus an overwhelming majority of urban-oriented new and old residents but only a small proportion of their rural-oriented counterparts visited friends in the city or suburbs of the city. The percentages in this respect were 69 and 74 percent vs. 22 and 6 percent respectively in Clarence, and 85 and 75 percent vs. 18 and 36 percent respectively in Camillus. In Parma, a majority of each type of resident visited friends in farm, nonfarm open country or village type of area (73 and 83 percent

3. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 70.

of urban-oriented new and old residents, and 74 and 98 percent of rural-oriented new and old residents, respectively). Only small proportion of each type visited friends in the city or suburbs of the city (27 and 17 percent, and 26 and 2 percent respectively of the urban- and rural-oriented new and old residents). However, it could be seen that more of urban- than of rural-oriented residents visited friends in the city or the suburbs.

It could be concluded from these data that although our findings are generally in agreement with previous findings, the differences between new and oldtime residents in some cases do indicate some influence of length of residence with respect to the locations where relatives and friends are visited.

Relationships between residence-orientation typology and types of areas where relatives and friends were visited were found to be statistically significant in the three fringe areas.

Hypothesis (c):--Rural-oriented oldtime residents have greater social interaction than any of the other types of residents.

Kurtz and Smith[4] had reported that longtime residents of rural background who were committed to the area participated more frequently than those who exhibited converse characteristics. McKain and Burnight[2] reported their being in the process of developing an acceptance-rating scale to determine the degree to which an urban-newcomer, as an individual or a family, was admitted to the informal groups of other urban newcomers and the oldtimers.

4. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 69.
5. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 66.

Relationship between residence-orientation typology and intensity of social interaction has been treated in detail in individual chapters on Parma, Clarence and Camillus in the section on social interaction. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in all of our study areas. Since detail is available in appropriate chapters, the findings are discussed here briefly and are limited to a comparison within the category of high intensity of social interaction (reference Tables 16, 49, and 120 on Parma, Clarence, and Camillus respectively).

In both Parma and Clarence, more of rural-oriented oldtime residents than of any other type of residents were found in the high intensity category, but in both cases urban-oriented oldtime residents were quite close to the proportions of the former (51 percent vs. 48 percent in Parma and 44 percent vs. 39 percent in Clarence). Furthermore, in these two areas more oldtime than new residents of either orientation were found in this category, and similarities in proportions seemed to be greater among residents of similar length of residence than among residents of similar orientation. The proportions of rural- and urban new residents in the high intensity category were 19 and 25 percent respectively in Parma, and 37 and 34 percent respectively in Clarence.

In Camillus, however, rural-oriented new residents were more likely than any other type of residents to be found in the high intensity category (38 percent vs. 34 percent of urban-oriented old residents and 19 percent each of rural-oriented old and urban-oriented new residents).

This distribution does not offer any regularity as no similarities can be found on the basis of either orientation or length of residence.

Although the data from two areas supported the hypothesized relationship of greater social interaction on the part of rural-oriented old residents, the differences between this type of residents and some other types were not always substantial. The data from the third area did not support the hypothesized relationship in the high intensity category. It could further be observed that differences in proportions in this category were greater between various types of residents in Parma, less in Clarence and were unclear in Camillus. This could possibly indicate that the greater the level of development of a fringe area, the more universal is the intensity of social interaction. In other words, in a more developed area the intensity of social interaction is not influenced by one's community orientation background or length of residence in the area.

Hypothesis (d):--Rural-oriented residents have greater social interaction than urban-oriented residents.

Hypothesis (e):--Oldtime residents have greater social interaction than new residents.

These hypotheses aim at testing the influence of community orientation background and of length of residence on the intensity levels of social interaction.

(d) The relationship between community orientation score and intensity of social interaction was not found to be statistically significant in any of the three fringe areas. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were almost zero in Clarence and Camillus (G = 0.03 and -0.06) but indicated an inverse relationship of low degree in Parma (G = -0.23).

The data from Parma indicated that more of rural- than of urban-oriented residents interacted at high intensity (43 percent vs. 32 percent). Conversely, fewer of the former than of the latter residents were found in the combined low and moderate categories (57 percent vs. 68 percent).

In Clarence and Camillus, both rural- and urban-oriented residents interacted in much the same way. The proportions in the high intensity category were 36 and 37 percent respectively in Clarence and 26 and 24 percent respectively in Camillus. The proportions in the combined low and moderate categories in the two areas were 64 and 63 percent respectively of rural- and urban-oriented residents in Clarence and 74 and 76 percent respectively in Camillus.

It appears, therefore, that the influence of community orientation on intensity of social interaction is reduced to almost zero in the more developed fringe areas.

(e) The relationship between length of residence and intensity of social interaction was found to be statistically significant in all areas. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial in Parma and Camillus (G = 0.45 and 0.31 respectively) but negligible in Clarence (G = 0.13). The data from each fringe area indicated that oldtime residents interacted at high intensity more often than new residents. The differences were substantial in Parma and Camillus but less in Clarence.

In Parma, more of the residents of 10 to 14 years and 15 years or over than residents of less than 5 years or 5 to 9 years were found in the high intensity category (48 and 53 percent vs. 18 and 34 percent

respectively). The remainder of each class were in the combined categories of low to moderate intensity.

In Clarence, the proportions of the residents of 10 to 14 years and 15 years or over were 41 and 39 percent respectively compared to those of less than 5 years and 5 to 9 years (31 and 40 percent respectively). The remainder of each class were in the combined categories of low to moderate intensity--a majority in each case.

In Camillus, too, the proportions of oldtime residents were larger than new residents in high intensity of interaction (30 and 33 percent of the residents of 10 to 14 years and 15 years or over vs. 14 and 30 percent of the residents of less than 5 years and 5 to 9 years respectively).

These data, therefore, demonstrate that more oldtime than new residents tended to have high intensity of social interaction. However, it was seen that the differences in intensity of interaction between new and oldtime residents were greater in Parma, the less developed of the three fringe areas, than they were in Clarence and Camillus. In the latter two areas, all residents of more than 5 years showed greater similarities among each other than with those of less than 5 years' residence. In Parma, however, a much smaller proportion of residents of less than 5 years than others of longer periods was found in the high intensity category. These differences indicated a more rapid acceptance of newcomers in the more developed areas than in the less developed areas.

Institutional Participation

Hypotheses

(a):--Intensity of institutional participation increases in higher socioeconomic classes but decreases in advanced stages in the family life cycle.

(b):--Institutional participation at high level increases in fringe areas with larger proportions of high socioeconomic status residents.

(c):--Urban-oriented new residents have greater institutional participation than any of the other types of residents.

(d):--Urban-oriented residents have greater institutional participation than rural-oriented residents.

(e):--New residents have greater institutional participation than oldtime residents.

(f):--Intensity of institutional participation increases with greater degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

(g):--Intensity of institutional participation increases with greater amount of interest in local affairs.

Hypothesis (a):--Intensity of institutional participation increases in higher socioeconomic classes but decreases in advanced stages in the family life cycle.

Rodehaver[6] had reported that the extent and intensity of organizational and political participation of those who had moved to the fringe from rural places was lower than of those who had moved from urban places. These differences, he said, could probably be attributed to the differ-

6. Refer to Chapter II, footnotes 49 and 50.

ences in socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle at which the move was made. Martin[7] reported a relationship between socioeconomic status and formal social participation (closer to our concept of institutional participation). Similar findings were reported by Reissman.[8]

Our hypothesis is aimed at testing these relationships in our study areas, especially the relationship between stage in family life cycle and intensity of institutional participation as only Rodehaver had mentioned this relationship. These relationships have earlier been treated in detail in the chapters on Parma, Clarence and Camillus in the section on institutional participation (Tables 28 and 29 in Parma, Tables 78 and 79 in Clarence, and Tables 144 and 145 in Camillus on socioeconomic status and stage in family life cycle respectively in each case). Therefore, the results are discussed here briefly.

Relationship between socioeconomic status score and intensity of institutional participation was found to be statistically significant only in Clarence and Camillus, but the Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial in all areas (G = 0.35 in Parma, 0.42 in Clarence and 0.41 in Camillus).

The data from the three fringe areas showed that larger proportion of respondents in middle and high than low socioeconomic class participated at high intensity level. The differences were substantial in the proportions of low, middle and high status respondents participating at various intensity levels.

---

7. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 54.

8. Refer to Chapter II, footnotes 73 and 74.

These findings, therefore, support the previous findings that the higher the socioeconomic class the greater is the intensity of institutional participation.

Relationship between stage in family life cycle and intensity levels of institutional participation was found to be statistically significant in both Clarence and Camillus but not in Parma. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were negligible in all areas (G = 0.05 in Parma, -0.13 in Clarence and 0.08 in Camillus). These results indicated an irregular influence as will be seen below.

In Parma, middle and late stage respondents showed greater similarities with each other and both were substantially more than early stage respondents in the high intensity level. In Clarence, more of middle than of late and early stage respondents, in the same order, participated at high intensity level, but differences were substantial in proportions of each stage. In Camillus, the distribution was similar to that obtained in Clarence, except that the early and late stage respondents showed greater similarities with each other than with middle stage respondents.

The data indicated that participation at high intensity level was greater among respondents of middle and late than of early stage of the family life cycle in all fringe areas, and that middle stage respondents were more likely than others to be participating at this level. It was also seen that the proportion of middle stage respondents in the high intensity category was larger in the more developed areas (Clarence and Camillus) than it was in the less developed area (Parma).

It may be recalled that the majority of all types of residents, regardless of their length of residence, was in middle stage of the family life cycle in all areas, with the exception of rural-oriented oldtime residents of Parma and Clarence (reference Tables 15, 48 and 119). Also, more often than not, the proportion of rural-oriented respondents in middle stage was found to be larger than that of any other type of residents. Therefore, in view of the greater participation on the part of middle stage respondents, Rodehaver's conclusion regarding the influence of stage in the family life cycle on the extent of participation among families who moved from rural places could not be supported by our data. This aspect is further examined in hypothesis (c).

Hypothesis (b):--Institutional participation at high level increases in fringe areas with larger proportions of high socioeconomic status residents.

Bell and Force[9] had reported that people living in high status neighborhoods showed greater participation than those living in lower status neighborhoods. They noted further that generally this kind of difference was found between lower and higher status individuals even in neighborhoods of similar status.

Our study areas contained varying proportions of residents in low, middle and high socioeconomic classes. Clarence and Camillus had larger proportions of high socioeconomic class respondents than Parma (38 and 36 percent vs. 11 percent respectively). Parma had more respondents in middle and low socioeconomic classes than Clarence and Camillus had (69

9. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 76.

and 20 percent, 48 and 14 percent, and 54 and 11 percent in the middle and low classes respectively).

It was shown in the preceding hypothesis that in each fringe area, respondents with high socioeconomic status participated at high level in much larger proportions than did those with middle and low socioeconomic status. These data also support the relationship hypothesized here that participation at high level would be greater in fringe areas with larger proportion of residents with high socioeconomic status. It was found that more residents of Clarence and Camillus than of Parma participated at high level (31 and 32 percent vs. 18 percent).

Hypothesis (c):-Urban-oriented new residents have greater institutional participation than any of the other types of residents.

Rodehaver[10] found that the extent and intensity of organizational and political participation were related to whether the family had moved to the fringe from a rural or urban area. Those from rural areas scored low on participation. He concluded that the families from rural areas appeared to be less a part of the community than were the families from urban areas. Martin[11] had reported the existence of relationships between formal social participation (closer to our index of institutional participation) and length of residence in the community, location of the job of the head of family and location of previous residence. He had concluded that the extent of participation was not influenced by the last two of the above mentioned factors.

---

10. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 50.

11. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 54.

Hypotheses (c), (d) and (e) are aimed at testing the relationships respectively by residence-orientation typology, community orientation, and length of residence.

Relationship between residence-orientation typology and intensity of institutional participation has earlier been treated in detail in the chapters on Parma, Clarence and Camillus in the section on institutional participation (Tables 27, 77, and 143 respectively). The following discussion is, therefore, limited to a comparison of participation at high levels among various types of residents. The relationships were found to be statistically significant in both Clarence and Camillus but not in Parma.

In Parma, more of rural-oriented new and oldtime than of their urban-oriented counterparts were found in the high level (19 and 26 percent vs. 16 and 9 percent respectively). Thus, rural-oriented oldtime residents were more likely than any other type of residents to be participating at high level. Proportionately, urban-oriented new residents ranked third among the four types participating at high level.

In Clarence, more of new than of oldtime residents, regardless of community orientation, were found participating at high level (46 and 32 percent of rural- and urban-oriented new residents vs. 21 and 29 percent of rural- and urban-oriented oldtime residents respectively). Proportionately, urban-oriented new residents ranked second among the four types of residents participating at high level.

In Camillus, more of urban- than of rural-oriented residents, regardless of length of residence, were found participating at high level

(43 and 30 percent of urban-oriented oldtime and new residents vs. 22 and 9 percent of rural-oriented oldtime and new residents respectively). Thus, proportionately urban-oriented new residents ranked second among the four types of residents participating at high level.

Although these data indicate greater similarities on the basis of orientation than length of residence in Parma and Camillus, it can be seen that participation at high level was greater among rural- than urban-oriented residents in Parma but was converse in Camillus. In Clarence, participation at high level was not always greater among urban- than rural-oriented residents. These results indicate neither a regular pattern nor a possible explanation for the differences on the basis of levels of development of the fringe areas.

Hypothesis (d):--Urban-oriented residents have greater institutional participation than rural-oriented residents.

The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant only in Camillus, for which area a substantial Gamma coefficient of correlation was also observed (G = 0.42). The Gamma coefficient of correlation indicated an inverse relationship (G = -0.16) for Parma and a positive but almost no relationship in Clareance (G = 0.04).

It was found that an overwhelming majority of both rural- and urban-oriented residents fell in the combined category of low to moderate level of participation in all areas. The remainder were in the high level. The proportions of rural- and urban-oriented residents in high level were 22 and 16 percent in Parma, 30 and 31 percent in Clarence and 17 and 33 percent in Camillus, respectively.

Although community orientation influenced the levels of institutional participation only slightly in two of the three fringe areas, it could be seen that among rural-oriented residents participation at high level was slightly greater than urban-oriented residents in the less developed of the three areas. The converse was true in the two more developed areas, indicating also a substantial difference in the most developed of the three areas. It could possibly mean a greater participation on the part of urban-oriented residents as an area became more urbanized and more developed.

Hypothesis (e):--New residents have greater institutional participation than oldtime residents.

Relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant in both Clarence and Camillus but not in Parma. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were low or negligible in all areas (G = 0.15 in Parma, -0.12 in Clarence and 0.17 in Camillus). These results, therefore, indicated only a slight influence of the length of residence on level of institutional participation.

The proportions of the Parma respondents in the high level were 2 and 24 percent for residents of less than 5 years and of 5 to 9 years respectively vs. 15 and 26 percent for residents of 10 to 14 years and 15 years or more respectively. Differences in proportions are not substantial among residents of different standings, with the exception of residents of less than 5 years.

In Clarence, a somewhat larger proportion of new than of oldtime residents participated at the high level. The respective proportions in

the four lengths of residence were 31 and 38 percent vs. 25 and 33 percent.

In Camillus, a somewhat larger proportion of oldtime than of new residents participated at high level. The respective proportions in the four lengths of residence were 23 and 37 percent vs. 43 and 35 percent.

It could be seen that in both Parma and Camillus, slightly larger proportions of oldtime than of new residents participated at high level, but for some unexplained reason the converse was true in Clarence. The results do not indicate any possible implications for the differences in the levels of development of the three areas.

The findings reported under hypotheses (d) and (e) were similar to those reported with respect to intensity of social interaction. Intensity of institutional participation was generally not affected much by community orientation or length of residence of a person. The factor which influenced the intensity levels substantially was socioeconomic status, and to a small degree, stage in the family life cycle as discussed elsewhere.

Hypothesis (f):--Intensity of institutional participation increases with greater degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

According to Martin[12] it was possible to expect a wide range of reactions to life in the fringe in view of high mobility rates and the accompanying process of adjustment and readjustment to the fringe areas. But, he concluded, adjustment to fringe residence was not significantly related to the extent of formal social participation.

---

12. Refer to Chapter II, footnotes 53 and 54.

For the purpose of testing this hypothesis, the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence and amount of interest in local affairs have been taken by us as indicators of degree of adjustment to fringe. Relationships of both these factors to intensity of institutional participation are examined below individually.

Relationship between degree of satisfaction with fringe residence and intensity of institutional participation was found to be statistically significant only in Camillus. The Gamma coefficients of correlation was low for the Camillus data (G = 0.20). The G value for Parma was also low (G = 0.18) and was almost zero for Clarence (G = -0.02).

In each of the three fringe areas, an overwhelming majority said they were very satisfied with the community of present residence (82 percent each in Parma and Clarence and 70 percent in Camillus). About 13 percent each in Parma and Clarence and 25 percent in Camillus expressed their attitude as being somewhat satisfied. Not more than 5 percent of the respondents in any area said they were dissatisfied with the community of present residence.

The data showed that in Parma and Camillus slightly larger proportions of those who were very satisfied with fringe residence than of those who were somewhat satisfied or dissatisfied were found in the high level of institutional participation (19 percent vs. 14 percent each of the somewhat satisfied and dissatisfied category in Parma, and 35 percent vs. 27 and 22 percent respectively in Camillus). In Clarence, fewer of those who were dissatisfied with fringe residence than of those who were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied participated at high level (27 percent vs. 32 and 31 percent respectively).

It was further observed that regardless of the degree of satisfaction, a majority in each case and within a close range of each other, participated at moderate levels (varying from 71 to 72 percent in Parma, 61 to 64 percent in Clarence and 62 to 68 percent in Camillus).

These data, therefore, indicate that generally the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence was not significantly related with intensity of institutional participation, and where the relationship was found to be statistically significant the degree of correlation was of low order. Since the Gamma coefficients of correlation did not indicate a regularity in the three fringe areas, they did not offer any implication for the differences in the levels of development of these areas.

The second indicator of adjustment to fringe residence was the amount of interest in local affairs. Relationship between amount of interest in local affairs and intensity of institutional participation was found to be statistically significant and gave high Gamma coefficients of correlation in all of our study areas (G = 0.74 in Parma, 0.73 in Clarence and 0.86 in Camillus).

The data from each area showed that those who had expressed greater interest in local affairs were more likely than others to be participating at high level. The proportion in high levels of participation on the part of much interested, somewhat interested and slightly interested respondents were 32 percent, 28 percent and 3 percent respectively in Parma, 65 percent, 36 percent and 10 percent respectively in Clarence and 80 percent, 32 percent and 6 percent respectively in Camillus.

It was also found that of those respondents who were very interested or somewhat interested in local affairs, none was found participating at low intensity while 22 percent, 15 percent and 12 percent of the slightly interested respondents of Parma, Clarence and Camillus respectively did participate at low intensity.

These findings, therefore, indicate greater institutional participation on the part of those who show greater interest in local affairs than others. These data also suggest a relationship between the level of development of a fringe area and the level of institutional participation by those who had shown greater interest in local affairs than others. The proportions participating at high intensity increased in the more developed fringe areas.

Attitude Toward Life in the Fringe

Hypotheses

(a):--The higher the socioeconomic status the greater is the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

(b):--The more advanced the stage in the family life cycle the greater is the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

(c):--Urban-oriented residents are more satisfied with fringe residence than are rural-oriented residents.

(d):--The more friendly the residents perceive their neighborhood the more satisfied they are with it.

(e):--The higher the socioeconomic status the greater the rate of residential mobility.

(f):--The rate of residential mobility is higher among families in the early than in the later stages in the family life cycle.

(g):--The greater the rate of residential mobility the lesser the amount of interest in local affairs.

Hypothesis (a):--The higher the socioeconomic status the greater is the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

Hypothesis (b):--The more advanced the stage in the family life cycle the greater is the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

Hypothesis (c):--Urban-oriented residents are more satisfied with fringe residence than are rural-oriented residents.

Hypothesis (d):--The more friendly the residents perceive their neighborhood the more satisfied they are with it.

According to Martin's[13] findings regarding the social-psychological aspects of adjustment to fringe residence, the attitude of females tended to vary with socioeconomic status, young and the elderly were less satisfied with fringe residence than those in their thirties and forties, and previous place of residence was associated with attitude toward fringe residence. Gist[14] had found that both "decentralized" and "nondecentralized" (those who had moved out of the central city, and those who had always lived there or had moved from other places to the open country) expressed an overwhelming satisfaction toward their present way of life.

We have examined these relationships in our study areas, as stated

---

13. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 57.

14. Refer to Chapter II, footnote 58.

in hypotheses (a), (b) and (c). We have further hypothesized (d) that the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence is influenced by a general perception regarding friendliness of one's neighborhood. Our findings regarding these hypotheses are presented below in sequence.

(a) . Relationship between socioeconomic status and degree of satisfaction with fringe residence was not found to be statistically significant in any of our study areas and the Gamma coefficients of correlation were also negligible or almost zero (G = 0.12 in Parma, 0.01 in Clarence and -0.03 in Camillus).

It was found that in Parma, between 81 and 89 percent of respondents, irrespective of their socioeconomic status, said they were very satisfied with their area of residence and not more than 6 percent said they were dissatisfied. In Clarence, between 79 and 83 percent of respondents were very satisfied and not more than 6 percent expressed dissatisfaction. In Camillus, the percentage of very satisfied respondents varied from 69 percent to 71 percent under the three status categories and not more than 6 percent were dissatisfied with their area of residence.

The percentage of respondents who were only somewhat satisfied with their area of residence showed a gradual increase in the fringe areas which were at later stages of development. The respective percentages in this category under the three status classes ranged from 6 to 16 percent in Parma, from 13 percent to 16 percent in Clarence, and from 25 to 27 percent in Camillus.

It could also be seen that, contrary to Martin's finding that

attitude toward fringe residence varied with the socioeconomic status, our findings point out a great similarity in response of various socio-economic classes.

(b) The data did not support the hypothesized relationship between stage in the family life cycle and degree of satisfaction with fringe residence in any of the three fringe areas. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were negligible, suggesting an inverse association in Parma (G = -0.13). The values were almost zero in Clarence and Camillus.

In Parma, Clarence and Camillus, between 81 to 83 percent, 79 to 83 percent and 64 to 74 percent, respectively of respondents in various stages of family life cycle said they were very satisfied with their community of residence. Proportionately, the percentage of very satisfied respondents increased slightly toward the later stages of family life cycle in Parma (by 2 percent), but it decreased slightly in this direction in Clarence and Camillus (by 2 percent and 10 percent respectively).

These findings, therefore, do not indicate substantial differences in the degrees of satisfaction of respondents in various stages of the family life cycle. However, it could be seen that proportions of very satisfied residents decreased in the more developed fringe areas.

(c) The relationship between community orientation and degree of satisfaction with fringe residence was found to be statistically significant only in Clarence. The Gamma coefficients of correlation, however, were substantial and inverse for Parma (G = -0.36) but were low or negligible for Clarence and Camillus (G = 0.20 and 0.13 respectively).

In Parma, an overwhelming majority of both rural- and urban-oriented residents were very satisfied with their present residence, the former were proportionately more than the latter (89 percent vs. 79 percent respectively). Of the rural-oriented residents, 10 percent expressed their attitude as somewhat satisfied and 2 percent as dissatisfied. On the other hand, 6 percent and 15 percent of urban-oriented residents were in the somewhat satisfied and dissatisfied categories respectively.

In Clarence and Camillus, proportionately more of urban-oriented than of rural-oriented respondents said they were very satisfied with their community of residence. Although the proportions represented a majority of the respondents in these two communities, too, the percentages were slightly less than those found in Parma. In Clarence, 75 percent of rural- and 83 percent of urban-oriented respondents were very satisfied, while in Camillus the respective percentages were 65 percent and 71 percent.

Of rural-oriented respondents in Clarence, 23 percent and 2 percent were found in the somewhat satisfied and dissatisfied categories, while 12 percent and 5 percent of urban-oriented respondents were found in these two categories. In Camillus, the proportions in these two response categories were 28 percent and 7 percent of the rural-oriented and, 25 percent and 4 percent of the urban-oriented respondents.

These data, therefore, support the findings reported by Gist as an overwhelming majority of both rural- and urban-oriented residents were very satisfied with fringe residence. However, it was indicated by

our data that there were more residents of either orientation who were very satisfied with their community of residence in Parma, the less developed of the three fringe areas, than there were in Clarence and Camillus, the more developed of the three areas.

(d) The relationship between respondent's perception regarding friendliness of the neighborhood and satisfaction with residence was found to be statistically significant in both Clarence and Camillus but not in Parma. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were also substantial for the former two (G = 0.58 and 0.56 respectively) but was almost zero in Parma (G = 0.06).

In Parma, of those who perceived their neighborhood as very friendly or somewhat friendly, 82 and 84 percent respectively were also very satisfied with the community. In Clarence, of those who perceived their neighborhood as very friendly, 90 percent were very satisfied with their community. Of those who perceived their neighborhood as somewhat friendly, 75 percent were very satisfied and 29 percent were satisfied. In Camillus, of those who perceived their neighborhood as very friendly or somewhat friendly, 82 percent and 55 percent respectively said they were very satisfied, while 17 percent and 37 percent respectively were only somewhat satisfied with their community of present residence.

It may be mentioned that an overwhelming majority in each fringe area perceived their neighborhood as either very friendly or somewhat friendly, the latter being far less than the former except in Parma. The respective percentages in these two categories were 47 percent each in Parma, 62 percent and 33 percent in Clarence and 62 percent and 29 percent

in Camillus. Proportionately, those who perceived their neighborhood as indifferent or unfriendly did not exceed 10 percent in any of the three fringe areas (6 percent in Parma, 5 percent in Clarence, and 9 percent in Camillus).

Similarly, most of the respondents were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their community of present residence, an overwhelming majority being in the former category. The respective percentages in these two categories were 84 percent and 13 percent in Parma, 83 percent and 14 percent in Clarence, and 7 percent and 25 percent in Camillus. Proportionately, those who were dissatisfied with their community of present residence did not exceed 5 percent in any of the three fringe areas (3 percent each in Parma and Clarence and 4 percent in Camillus).

These data, therefore, support the hypothesized relationship in Clarence and Camillus. However, it may be pointed out that a greater similarity of response was observed in Parma than in other two areas. Regardless of their perception regarding friendliness of the neighborhood, almost same proportion of the Parma respondents said they were very satisfied with fringe residence, while substantial differences were found in Clarence and Camillus in this respect.

It was also observed that of those respondents who perceived their neighborhood as somewhat friendly, the proportion in the very satisfied category decreased in the more developed fringe areas (84 percent in Parma, 75 percent in Clarence, and 55 percent in Camillus). This could

possibly indicate some influence of the differences in the levels of development of the three areas.

Hypothesis (e):--The higher the socioeconomic status the greater the rate of residential mobility.

The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant and the Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial in all of our study areas (G = 0.47, 0.53, and 0.44 in Parma, Clarence, and Camillus respectively). This relationship has been discussed in greater detail in the chapters on Parma, Clarence and Camillus (Tables 37, 107, and 167 respectively).

Hypothesis (f):--The rate of residential mobility is higher among families in the early than in the later stages in the family life cycle.

The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant and the Gamma coefficients of correlation were substantial indicating an inverse relationship in all areas (G = -0.64, -0.60, and -0.57 in Parma, Clarence and Camillus respectively). Details regarding the data could be found in Tables 38, 108 and 168.

Hypothesis (g): The greater the rate of residential mobility the lesser the amount of interest in local affairs.

This hypothesis aimed to find out if the more mobile people would have a kind of detached attitude toward what was happening in their community of residence. The relationship was found to be statistically significant in Clarence and Camillus, but not in Parma. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were negligible in all areas (G = 0.03 in Parma, 0.12 in Clarence and -0.08 in Camillus).

In Parma, greater similarities were found between those respondents who had moved once and those who had not moved at all. About 46 percent of each said they were only slightly interested, 31 percent and 36 percent respectively were somewhat interested, and 23 and 18 percent said they were very interested in the local affairs. Of those who had moved three times or more, the respective percentages in the three response categories were 29 percent, 61 percent, and 10 percent. The respondents with this mobility rate, therefore, showed a substantial difference from others. The number of respondents who had made two moves was not large enough to give a meaningful distribution. It could be seen, however, that fewer of those who had made two or more moves than others with lesser mobility had shown much interest in local affairs.

In Clarence, the distribution pattern within the two extremes of the mobility rate was not regular. All those who had moved once or more were substantially different in their response from those who had made no move in the past ten years. The majority (53 to 55 percent) of the former said they were somewhat interested in local affairs compared to 43 percent of those who had not moved at all. Between 29 to 34 percent of the former (one or more moves) compared to 45 percent of the latter (no move at all) said they were only slightly interested in local affairs. However, the response in the much interested category did not differ much among respondents with different mobility rates (between 12 and 17 percent of respondents in each group were found in this category).

In Camillus of those who were the least mobile (no move in the past ten years), a greater proportion had expressed much interest in

local affairs (29 percent) than of those who were the most mobile of all, three moves or more (18 percent). Conversely, the percentage of respondents expressing only a slight interest in local affairs was proportionately less (34 percent) among the least mobile and more (38 percent) among the most mobile. Although the difference in the latter response category was not much, the decrease was gradual. A large proportion (varying from 37 to 50 percent) of respondents with different mobility rates, however, said they were only somewhat interested in local affairs.

These data, therefore, indicate that the rate of mobility did not have much influence on the amount of interest in local affairs, although the relationship was statistically significant.

Anomie

Hypotheses

(a):--The greater the anomie the lower the level of social interaction.

(b):--The greater the anomie the lower the level of institutional participation.

(c):--The greater the anomie the lower the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

(d):--The lower the educational attainment the higher the anomie.

(e):--The greater the anomie the less favorable the attitude toward school or property taxes.

Hypothesis (a):--The greater the anomie the lower the level of social interaction.

The hypothesized relationship was found to be statistically significant only in Clarence and Camillus. However, the Gamma coefficients of correlation were low in all areas (G = -0.18 for Parma, -0.07 for Clarence, and -0.27 for Camillus).

In Parma, some differences were seen between those in the anomic category and those in the nonanomic and intermediate categories. It was found that of the anomic respondents, 77 percent interacted at low to moderate levels and the rest (23 percent) interacted at a high level. Of those in nonanomic and intermediate categories, 60 and 61 percent respectively interacted at low to moderate levels while 40 and 39 percent respectively interacted at a high level.

In Clarence, the data did not indicate any substantial differences in the proportions interacting at various levels. A slightly higher proportion of those in nonanomic and intermediate categories interacted at high level than of those in anomic category (40 and 36 percent vs. 35 percent respectively). Conversely, the proportions of the former two categories interacting at low to moderate levels were less than the proportion for the anomic respondents.

In Camillus, the data indicated greater differences in patterns of interaction between the nonanomic and anomic than between those in intermediate and anomic categories. Of the nonanomic, intermediate and anomic categories, 31 percent, 23 percent and 15 percent respectively interacted at a high level. Of the three categories, the respective percentages interacting at low to moderate levels were 69 percent, 77 percent and 85 percent.

These data, therefore, indicate some influence of anomie on the levels of social interaction but the relationship was not of a substantial degree in any area. It would be of interest to note that extent of anomie was not characteristic of any one fringe area. The proportions in nonanomic, intermediate and anomic categories in the three fringe areas did not vary significantly from each other. The respective proportions in the three categories were 30 percent, 50 percent and 20 percent in Parma, 29 percent, 46 percent and 25 percent in Clarence, and 37 percent, 42 percent and 21 percent in Camillus. It could be seen, though, that the proportion of nonanomic respondents was highest (37 percent) in Camillus, while Parma had the highest proportion (50 percent) in the intermediate category.

Hypothesis (b):--The greater the anomie the lower the level of institutional participation.

The hypothesized relationship was found to be statistically significant only in Clarence and Camillus. The Gamma coefficients of correlation were inverse but low in all areas (G = -0.20 in Parma, -0.21 in Clarence, and -0.27 in Camillus).

In Parma, more of the anomic than of the intermediate and nonanomic categories participated at low to moderate levels (87 percent vs. 84 percent and 75 percent). Conversely, a larger proportion of the nonanomic than of the other categories participated at high level (25 percent vs. 16 percent and 13 percent respectively).

In Clarence, the levels of institutional participation showed a clearer distinction between those in the anomic category and those in

the intermediate and nonanomic categories. Only 20 percent of the former participated at high level compared to 33 percent and 38 percent respectively of the latter two. The majority in each case, though, participated at low to moderate levels (90 percent vs. 67 percent and 62 percent respectively).

In Camillus, the patterns of institutional participation of those in the anomic and intermediate categories were similar to each other, but were noticeably different from the nonanomic respondents. Of the former two categories, 24 percent and 29 percent respectively participated at high level compared to 40 percent of those in the nonanomic category. However, the majority in each category participated at low to moderate levels, though a relatively greater proportion of the former two than of the latter was found participating at these levels.

These findings were somewhat similar to those regarding the level of social interaction. Extent of anomie did influence the level of institutional participation but not substantially. It may, however, be pointed out that the coefficients of correlation increased slightly with the higher level of development of an area.

Hypothesis (c):--The greater the anomie the lower the degree of satisfaction with fringe residence.

The hypothesized relationship was found to be statistically significant in Clarence and Camillus and showed substantial Gamma coefficients of correlation for the two areas (G = -0.34 and -0.32 respectively). The Gamma coefficient for Parma was almost zero (-0.04) and the relationship was not statistically significant.

In Parma, a majority of respondents under various anomie categories (varying from 71 to 90 percent) said they were very satisfied with fringe residence. Those in the intermediate category had the largest proportion (90 percent) in the very satisfied category, followed by those in the nonanomic (77 percent) and anomic (71 percent) categories. Of those in anomic category, 10 percent said they were dissatisfied compared to a high of less than 5 percent in other categories

In Clarence, proportionately more of the nonanomic (89 percent) than of the intermediate (83 percent) and anomic categories (71 percent) were very satisfied with fringe residence. Conversely, there were fewer of the nonanomic than of the intermediate and anomic categories who said they were somewhat satisfied or dissatisfied with fringe residence. The highest proportion in the latter two responses was of those with anomic attitude. The dissatisfied respondents were not more than 10 percent in any category (10 percent of anomic vs. a high of 3 percent of others).

The data from Camillus indicated a pattern similar to that found in Clarence. Of the nonanomic, intermediate and anomic categories, 80 percent, 69 percent and 57 percent respectively said they were very satisfied with fringe residence. A considerable proportion of the intermediate and anomic categories said they were somewhat satisfied (29 and 34 percent respectively) compared to a much smaller proportion (17 percent) of the nonanomic respondents. The highest proportion of dissatisfied respondents was in the anomic category (10 percent).

These findings, therefore, indicate that although a majority of respondents did express great satisfaction with fringe residence, the

degree of satisfaction was influenced by their anomic attitude. This relationship showed substantial statistical evidence in the two fringe areas which were at a higher level of development compared to the one at an early stage of development. It, however, may be added that, as pointed out earlier in hypothesis (a) of this section, no one study area had substantially less or more anomic or nonanomic residents.

Hypothesis (d):--The lower the educational attainment the higher the anomie.

It was hypothesized that the less educated will have greater anomie than the more educated. This relationship was found to be statistically significant and showed substantial Gamma coefficients of correlation in all of our study areas (G = -0.33 in Parma, -0.38 in Clarence, and -0.39 in Camillus). The data indicated in all areas that more of those who had received some college education or were high school graduates were nonanomic while more of those who were not high school graduates or had completed only up to 8 years of education were anomic.

In Parma, 37 and 36 percent respectively of the two higher educational levels were in the nonanomic category and 16 and 11 percent in the anomic category. On the other hand, 20 and 9 percent respectively of the two lower educational levels were in the nonanomic category and 35 and 39 percent respectively in the anomic category. The proportions in the intermediate category did not vary much from one educational level to the other though slightly larger proportions of the more educated respondents were found in this category (percentages varied from 45 to 53 percent).

In Clarence, the proportions of the two higher educational levels in the nonanomic category were 38 and 26 percent and 16 and 27 percent respectively in the nonanomic category. Of the two lower educational levels, 6 and 16 percent were in the nonanomic category and 36 and 55 percent in the anomic category.

In Camillus, 50 percent and 34 percent respectively of the two higher educational levels were in the nonanomic category and 13 and 19 percent respectively in the anomic category. Of the two lower educational levels, 16 and 15 percent respectively were in the nonanomic category and 42 and 45 percent respectively in the anomic category.

Hypothesis (e):--The greater the anomie the less favorable the attitude toward school or property taxes.

The relationships between extent of anomie and more or less favorable attitude toward school and property taxes were found to be statistically significant only in Clarence and Camillus. The Gamma coefficients of correlation, however, were substantial or near substantial in all areas (G = 0.28 in Parma, 0.36 in Clarence, and 0.28 in Camillus regarding school taxes and G = 0.19 in Parma, 0.30 in Clarence, and 0.27 in Camillus regarding property taxes). The data showed that in all areas more respondents with anomic than nonanomic attitude considered the taxes to be very high.

In Parma, a majority of respondents, regardless of their anomic category, considered the school taxes to be reasonable. However, proportionately more respondents of nonanomic (75 percent) than of the intermediate and anomic categories (59 percent and 58 percent respectively)

thought so. On the other hand, a substantially larger proportion of the anomic and intermediate categories (29 percent and 19 percent respectively) than of the nonanomic category (6 percent) thought the school taxes were very high. Nineteen and 23 percent of the nonanomic and intermediate categories but only 13 percent of the anomic category considered the taxes were somewhat high.

Regarding property taxes in Parma, it was seen that regardless of the anomie category, between 80 to 92 percent thought that these taxes were reasonable. The proportion was, however, slightly higher in the nonanomic than the anomic and intermediate categories, in this order.

In Clarence, a greater proportion of the nonanomic and intermediate categories than of the anomic category considered school taxes were reasonable (52 and 33 percent vs. 25 percent respectively). Conversely, only 16 percent of the nonanomic respondents thought the taxes were very high compared to 30 percent and 48 percent in the intermediate and anomic categories. Proportionately, fewer respondents in anomic (27 percent) than nonanomic (32 percent) and intermediate (37 percent) categories agreed that school taxes were only somewhat high.

Regarding property taxes, a majority of the Clarence respondents in the nonanomic category (57 percent) considered the taxes to be reasonable compared to 45 percent and 28 percent of the intermediate and anomic categories. Only 11 percent of the nonanomic compared to 25 and 27 percent of those in intermediate and anomic categories thought the taxes were very high. This response category, therefore, distinguishes the anomic from those in the intermediate or anomic categories. More of those

in the anomic category than of those in the intermediate or nonanomic categories considered taxes to be somewhat high (45 percent vs. 30 and 32 percent respectively).

In Camillus, the pattern of response was generally similar to that found in Clarence. Of the nonanomic, intermediate and anomic categories, 52 percent, 44 percent and 29 percent respectively considered school taxes to be reasonable. Substantially more of the anomic (39 percent) than of the intermediate (19 percent) and nonanomic categories (15 percent) thought the taxes were very high. The remainder of each category (from 32 to 37 percent) considered taxes were somewhat high.

Regarding property taxes in Camillus, more of the anomic than of the intermediate and nonanomic categories considered these taxes to be very high (25 percent vs. 15 and 12 percent respectively). A majority of the nonanomic and intermediate categories than of the anomic category considered these taxes to be reasonable (62 and 55 percent vs. 34 percent respectively). More of the anomic than of the intermediate and nonanomic categories considered these taxes to be somewhat high.

These data, therefore, show that in all areas generally a majority of the nonanomic respondents considered the school and property taxes to be reasonable, but substantial proportions of the anomic respondents considered these taxes to be very high. The similarities in the Gamma coefficients of correlation in all areas regarding school and property taxes do not suggest a possible influence of the differences in the levels of development of the three fringe areas.

CONCLUSIONS

The present day urban sprawl on the peripheries of metropolitan areas is often astonishingly rapid and uncontrolled. Various factors have been associated with this rapid growth such as pressure of population in the central cities and reduced possibilities for further growth in the suburbs, and greater affluence and the accompanying demands for better living conditions. All of these factors have contributed to this expansion over the past three decades. This phenomenon has drawn the attention and concern of many who are interested equally in the rural and urban future of the nation.

With a diminishing capacity to hold the outpour of the central city, the suburbs have experienced the same pressures. The fringe areas have had to meet the demand for various reasons such as availability of land, less stringent on ever nonexistent building controls and zoning, and quicker profits to the developer. New housing construction on the edges of the cities is of course inevitable if the growing population of the United States is to be housed.

With the movement of people from the urban areas to the rural fringe, the fringe areas seem to be undergoing the same cycle of growth as the suburbs did in the past. A progression from rural to mixed rural-urban to suburban land use brings in its wake in the fringe areas an

urbanized life style different from the past. (The crucial point is not that the areas become "suburbs" but that they become integrated with the city.)

A concern has been expressed by some that the fringe areas are another of the "bedroom" suburbs rather than communities. They do not think the people who have moved to the fringe areas become part of the community. Questions have been raised regarding whether or not social life would be disrupted in rapidly growing fringe communities. Would social interaction continue with friends and relatives in the place of origin or will new patterns rapidly develop? Such questions are of great importance for an understanding of the current trends in present fringe and for planning of future development.

Since these communities undergo a change in their character while in the process of transformation from rural to "suburban," it is believed that changes also take place in the amount and nature of social interaction in these communities. A change in the composition of population, an infusion of people of different backgrounds, new aspirations and needs can bring in new patterns of interaction.

In view of the preceding considerations, this study analyzed social interaction in the context of three different communities at various levels of fringe development. One of these areas was in an early stage of development, another one in an advanced stage and the third area was in the final stage of development toward suburbanization and integration into the metropolitan area.

It is to be expected that the amount of social interaction in the fringe is influenced by one's community orientation background (rural or urban) and length of residence in an area. It is known that rural- and urban-oriented people have differences in the amount and type of social interaction they engage in, and that over a period of time not only do the fringe areas develop in terms of changes in social patterns but the level of interaction also changes for individual residents with increased time in the area.

The amount of interaction and institutional participation has usually been found to be influenced by one's socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle and, therefore, these are also taken into account.

This study examines the amount of social interaction and institutional participation on the part of rural- and urban-oriented newcomers and long-time residents of the three selected fringe areas.

It was found that in general the length of residence had greater influence on the amount of social interaction than community orientation. In the most developed of the three areas, even this distinction faded out. Generally, socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle had only small effect on the amount of interaction in these areas. However, in some specific aspects of social interaction, variations were found arising from differential community orientation and length of residence.

It was seen, for example, that regardless of community orientation long-time residents knew more neighborhood families and visited friends, relatives and neighbors more often than new residents. In the more de-

veloped areas, urban-oriented residents visited friends and neighbors more often than the rural, rural-oriented residents had greater contact with farmers and village residents than the urban; and new residents had greater contact with other newcomers than the long-time residents. Similarly, differences in socioeconmic status and stage in the family life cycle influenced some of these specific aspects of social interaction.

Amount of institutional participation showed some interesting results. The levels of institutional participation in the least developed areas of all showed great similarities among all types of residents, only that rural-oriented residents had slightly greater participation than the urban. On the other hand, in the more developed areas, newcomers and urban-oriented residents showed greater institutional participation than the others.

Generally, in all areas studied, people in the high socioeconomic class showed greater institutional participation than those in the middle or low classes. In the more developed areas, the middle aged people showed greater institutional participation than the young and the aged. However, in the less developed area, participation levels showed an irregular influence of differential family life cycle stage.

Differences were found in some specific aspects of institutional participation which arose due to differences in community orientation and length of residence. In the least developed area of all, rural-oriented residents had greater organizational participation than the urban. In the area in an advanced stage of development, new residents showed greater interest in local affairs than long-time residents. In the most developed

of the three areas, the urban-oriented residents, regardless of length of residence, showed greater interest in local affairs, had more organizational membership and more frequent church attendance than the rural-oriented group. Similarly, some differences were observed in various specific aspects of institutional participation arising from differential socioeconomic status and stage in the family life cycle.

Most people, regardless of community orientation, socioeconomic class or stage in the family life cycle, expressed great satisfaction with fringe residence. Regardless of one's community orientation, socioeconomic class and stage in the family life cycle, an overwhelming majority regarded their neighborhoods as very friendly, and residents of one fringe area were not found to be less or more anomic than the other. However, differential socioeconomic class, stage in the family life cycle and anomie did produce some expected responses regarding attitude toward property and school taxes in all of our study areas.

In conclusion, the evidence shows that in spite of the great influx of the urbanite and a high growth rate, the urban-rural fringe areas are alive socially. The present day fringe area is far from being an "institutional desert." Those who have opted to live there become part of the community to a great extent. Long-time residents seemed to be more active in the social life of the area while newcomers were more active in its institutional life. The greater development of a community has shown to have reduced the differences in various specific aspects of social interaction and institutional participation among rural- and urban-oriented residents.

A P P E N D I X

E 5254

311

Job 20-15

Survey Schedule

Town of Camillus

Schedule number
(Office use)

Group
(Office use)

STUDY OF

HOUSING IN RAPIDLY GROWING

URBAN-RURAL FRINGE AREAS

1965

Interviewer: Please fill in

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Sample Area # _____

Date of interview:

Department of Housing and Design
New York State College of Home Economics
a Contract College of the State University
at Cornell University

in cooperation with the
Cornell Center for Housing and
Environmental Studies

Ithaca, New York

Time started:

_____ A.M.

_____ P.M.

Time completed:

_____ A.M.

_____ P.M.

Interviewer:

Appendix

SURVEY SCHEDULE: STUDY OF HOUSING IN RAPIDLY GROWING URBAN-RURAL FRINGE AREAS--1965

Instructions to Interviewer

The instructions reproduced below originally appeared on the left-hand margin of the schedule, aligned with their respective questions.

The schedule reproduced in this appendix was used in the town of Camillus in 1965. This schedule includes most of the questions asked earlier (1964) in Parma and Clarence and the additional questions which were asked in the revisit of Parma and Clarence in 1966. The Camillus schedule includes all questions which have been treated in the present analysis.

Question number	Instructions
1.	Household composition Record everyone in the hh. even if they are not related. Specify relationship to head of hh. Do not list names. Include: children in college living at home; children below college level who are away at school; infants or member in hospital except those in institutions or sanitariums; member away on vacation. Do not include: member in Armed Forces; children away at college or returning to college in September. If roomers exceed 4, end interview. Check sex of hh. members.
2.	Age Ask age at last birthday.

Question number	Instructions
	When listing children, start with oldest.
3.	Education
	Ask only of husband, wife, and children.
	Record highest year completed.
	Include: work toward diploma or college degree.
	Do not include: trade, correspondence, adult education, on-the-job training unless being counted for credit in regular school system. For children in school, year completed in June 1965. Check if still in school and whether public or private.
	Record number of years couple has been married.
4a.	Employed includes those who are self-employed (as farmer or man in business or profession for himself) or those employed by others.
c.	Part-time is less than 35 hours per week.
d.	If "housewife," do not ask Q 5.
	If "other" write in complete explanation.
5.	Record major occupation.
a.	State in detail, including name of job and type of business.
	Be sure to get occupation (job worked at most of life) for retired, disabled, unemployed, plus other information.
b.	If self-employed, give address of business, office, or for farm--their home address.
c.	If less than 1 year, ask previous major occupation.
6a.	If "yes," get information on the occupation, the number of hours and months. Include name of job and type of business.
b.	Probe for part-time farming.

Question number	Instructions
c.	If respondent doesn't know, ask her to estimate which of the categories most closely approximates hours per week and months per year.
7.	Hand card # 7. We want combined wife and husband's income only. Do not include other family members. For farmers, net farm income. For those in business, profits from business. Include dividends, interest, etc. (See definitions) Include income from secondary sources, e.g., farming for those who list this as a second occupation.
8a.	An acre is approximately 208 ft. x 208 ft. For farmers, this includes acreage owned jointly, but not any acres rented from someone else.
b.	This refers to sales made from this place during 1964 by anyone. Probe for sales if any acreage rented out.
c.	Pin down to these 3 groups: (check) Less than $50 _____(1) $50 to $249 _____(2) $250 or more _____(3)
d.	"Full-time" is 11 months a year and no nonfarm job.
e.	Pin down relationship . . . joint owner (son, etc.), renter, tenant, etc.
9a.	Q. 9 is to be asked of everyone with 1 acre or more.
b.	Probe, but do not read responses. May check more than 1 answer.
c.	If "2" or "3," ask "What did you decide."
d.	Read responses.

Question number	Instructions
e.	Pin down. Do not accept qualified answer unless R. really doesn't know.
10a.	Public water system is water supplied by a municipal water department.
11a.	Note: Orchard Park and Thornton Manor development have a private sewer system serving the development.
c.	Hand card #11.
	Take back card #11.
12.	Refers to date original construction was completed, not to any later remodeling.
	If R. doesn't know, write in your estimate after Int. est.
13.	Count whole rooms suitable for living purposes including finished attic and basement rooms. Do not count bathrooms or halls.
14.	If R. cannot give an estimate, help her by suggesting some figures that approximate what it might be worth. If R. doesn't know, write in your estimate after Int. est.
15a.	This house or any other house in the Town of Camillus.
b.	Hand card # 15.
	Take back card # 15.
16a.	Emphasize house.
	Year present occupancy began.
b.	Probe for location.
c.	Hand card # 16-19.
	Take back card # 16-19.
18.	This includes all changes in residence even within the same community.

Question number	Instructions
19.	Hand card # 16-19. We are interested in where each spent most of his childhood, even if abroad. If moved frequently, try to pin down to one type of area which generally describes where most of childhood was spent. If unable to decide on a single area, write in age when lived in each of the areas. Take back card # 16-19.
20.	Pin down to two most important. These may be either issues which have been solved or issues still pending.
21b.	Read each group below before going to c.
d.	Read each group and record answer before going to next group. Do not read "none of these." Record answers for b under "supported" and d under "opposed."
22b.	Read each group before going to c.
d.	Read each group and record answer before going to next group. Do not read "none of these." Record answers for b under "supported" and d under "opposed."
24.	Hand card # 24-26. Read and circle appropriate response SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree ? = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree
26.	Take back card # 24-26.
27a.	Pin down. Do not accept a DK for Q 27 or 28 unless you cannot pin R. to one of the groups.

Question number	Instructions
28a.	Hand card # 28. Read and circle appropriate response. VG = Very Good G = Good F = Fair P = Poor VP = Very Poor DK = Don't Know
h.	Take back card # 28.
29.	Fairmount Fair and Camillus Shopping Plaza are in the Town of Camillus.
a-d.	Pin down to 1 of the 4 groups.
30a.	Include station wagons. Do not count dismantled or immobile cars.
31a.	If own car, driven by hh. member check #1.
b.	Hand card # 31. Cost includes car upkeep, parking, as well as gas. Convenience includes traffic as well as parking. Pin down. Take back card # 31.
32a.	NYS eligibility: In state - 1 year In county - 1 month In district - 30 days by election day
c.	Ask "c" of everyone. Pin down. If they will not name a party, but only "vote for the man," check "none."
d.	Does not have to be registered in the local district to have voted in the national election.
e.	If did not live in Town of Camillus last July, check "Not eligible."

Question number	Instructions
33.	Hand card # 33.
	Take back card # 33.
34a.	This should be answered whether or not they are a member.
c.	Hand card # 34.
	Take back card # 34.
36a.	Use number from list instead of writing out each activity. 1 - Parks 2 - Picnics 3 - Swimming, water skiing 4 - Boating 5 - Fishing 6 - Hunting 7 - Bowling 8 - Golf 9 - Ballgames 10 - Movies 11 - Concerts 12 - Plays 13 - Card playing 14 - Skiing 15 - Tobaggoning 16 - Riding in car 17 - Camping, hiking 18 - Horse races, stock car races 19 - Horseback riding 20 - Tennis 21 - Ice skating If any other, write in.
	Take back card # 35-36.
37a.	Include evenings and weekends. Do not include phone calls.
	Hand card # 37a.
	These are relatives other than those living with R.
b.	Turn card over to # 37b.
	Pin down. If unable to select 1 area, put a "1" in the blank for those they visit most, a "2" for the next, etc.

Question number	Instructions
38a.	Turn card over to # 38a.
c.	Hand card # 38c.
39a.	Turn card over to # 39a.
b.	Turn card over to # 39b.
	Take back card # 39b.
40.	Hand card # 40.
41.	Turn card over to # 41.
	Pin down.
42.	Turn card over to # 42.
	Take back card # 42.
45.	Hand card # 45.
	Pin down.
a.	Read and circle appropriate response. SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree ? = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree
e.	Take back card #45.

INTERVIEWER: Ask all questions printed in CAPITALS on right of double line. Note and understand instructions on left.

Questions and Responses

Household member (Specify relation to head)	Sex M	Sex F	Age in years	Years of schooling completed	
Husband (Head of household)	X				Number of years married_____
Wife (Respondent)		X			

Children 0 None (circle)	Check if in school and whether public or private: In school Yes	In school No	Public	Private
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Other relatives			
1			
2			
3			
4			

Nonrelatives			
1			
2			
3			
4			

4a. ARE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) EMPLOYED?

	Wife	Husband	
Yes.....	____	____	(ask b and c)
No.....	____	____	(ask d)

b. IS THIS SELF-EMPLOYED... ____ ____
OR DO YOU (DOES HE)
WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE?.. ____ ____

c. IS THIS FULL TIME..... ____ ____
OR
PART TIME..... ____ ____

d. ARE YOU (IS HE)

UNEMPLOYED, LOOKING FOR WORK.....	____(5)	____(5)
DISABLED.....	____(6)	____(6)
RETIRED.....	____(7)	____(7)
STUDENT.....	____(8)	____(8)
HOUSEWIFE.....	____(8)	
OTHER (specify below)...	____	____

Wife _____

Husband _____

5. WHAT IS YOUR (YOUR HUSBAND'S) MAJOR OCCUPATION? WHERE DO YOU (HE) WORK AND WHAT IS THE ADDRESS?

a. Wife _____
(occupation, only if employed)

_____
(name of company)

_____
(street address and city)

b. Husband _____
(occupation)

_____
(name of company)

_____
(street address and city)

c. HOW LONG HAVE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) BEEN EMPLOYED IN THIS JOB?

Wife _____ _____
(number of years) (previous occupation)

Husband _____ _____
(number of years) (previous occupation)

6a. DOES YOUR HUSBAND HAVE ANY OTHER JOB?

Yes.... ____(1) (ask b and c)
No..... ____(2) (go to Q 7)

b. WHAT DOES HE DO? WHERE DOES HE WORK AND WHAT IS THE ADDRESS?

Husband _____
(occupation)

_____
(name of company)

_____
(street address and city)

c. ON THIS JOB, ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DOES HE WORK? HOW MANY MONTHS PER YEAR?

Hours per week		Months (weeks) per year	
Less than 5...	(1)	Less than 3 months (13 weeks or less).....	(1)
5 - 9.....	(2)	3-5 mo. (14-26 wks.).....	(2)
10 - 14.....	(3)	6-8 mo. (27-39 wks.).....	(3)
15 - 19.....	(4)	9-10 mo. (40-47 wks.).....	(4)
20 - 24.....	(5)	10½-11 mo. (48-49 wks.)....	(5)
25 - 29.....	(6)	12 mo. (50-52 wks.).....	(6)
30 - 34.....	(7)		
Don't know....	(x)	Don't know.....	(x)

7. INTO WHICH OF THESE GROUPS DOES YOUR AND YOUR HUSBAND'S INCOME FALL BEFORE TAXES OR OTHER DEDUCTIONS (THIS INCLUDES WAGES, DIVIDENDS, INTEREST, ETC.)? JUST TELL ME THE GROUP # ON THE CARD.

Less than $20 per week	Less than $1000 per year	(1)
$ 20 - 58 per week	$ 1,000 - 2,990 per year	(2)
$ 59 - 96 per week	$ 3,000 - 4,990 per year	(3)
$ 97 - 135 per week	$ 5,000 - 6,990 per year	(4)
$136 - 193 per week	$ 7,000 - 9,990 per year	(5)
$194 - 383 per week	$10,000 - 19,900 per year	(6)
$384 - 575 per week	$20,000 - 29,900 per year	(7)
$576 - 960 per week	$30,000 - 49,900 per year	(8)
$961 per week or more	$50,000 per year or more	(9)

Don't know/Refusal..... (x)

8a. HOW MANY ACRES ARE THERE ON THIS PLACE?

Less than 1 acre..... _____(1) (go to Q 10)
1 to 10 acres..... _____(2) (ask b)
More than 10 acres... _____(3) (ask how many, then b)

HOW MANY? _____
(total number of acres)

b. IN 1964, WERE ANY CROPS, LIVESTOCK OR OTHER FARM PRODUCTS SOLD FROM THIS PLACE?

Yes..... _____(1) (ask c)

No..... _____(2) (go to Q 9)

c. WHAT WERE THE TOTAL GROSS SALES FROM THIS PLACE?

Actual amount.....$_____

d. DOES YOUR HUSBAND WORK THE FARM...

FULL TIME.. _____(1)

PART TIME.. _____(2)

OR

NOT AT ALL. _____(3)

e. DOES ANYONE ELSE WORK THE FARM FULL TIME OR PART TIME?

Yes..... _____(1) (ask who)

No..... _____(2)

WHO? (Full time) _____

_____

WHO? (Part time) _____

_____

9a. HAVE YOU SOLD OFF (OR GIVEN AWAY) ANY PART OF THIS PLACE DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS?

Yes...___(1) HOW MANY ACRES?_____(ask b)
(number of acres)

No....___(2) (go to c)

b. FOR WHAT PURPOSE(S) WAS THE PROPERTY SOLD (OR GIVEN AWAY)?

Farming.....___(0)
1 house.....___(1)
More than 1 house.....___ HOW MANY?____
Lots for future development.....___(6)
Road.....___(8)
School.....___(9)
Apartment building(s).....___
Commercial use.....___
Industrial use.....___
Other (specify) _____

c. HAVE YOU HAD ANY OFFERS TO BUY ALL OR PART OF THIS PLACE DURING THE LAST 3 YEARS (IN ADDITION TO ANY SOLD, IF SOLD)?

No offers.....___(1)
Offers for all....___(2) WHAT DID YOU DECIDE? _____
Offers for part...___(3) _____

d. WHAT ARE YOUR PLANS FOR THIS PLACE FOR THE NEXT 3 YEARS?

To continue as is.....___(1)
To increase the sales of products..___(2)
To decrease the sales of products..___(3)
To sit and wait for the best offer.___(4)
To sell all of the place.....___(5)
HOW SOON? _____

_____

To sell part of the place.....___(6)
HOW SOON? _____

_____

HOW MANY ACRES? _____

e. DO YOU THINK YOUR LAND IS INCREASING OR DECREASING IN VALUE OR REMAINING ABOUT THE SAME?

Increasing.....___(1)
Decreasing.....___(2)
Same.....___(3)
Qualified (write in) _____

_____

10a. WHAT IS THE SOURCE OF WATER FOR YOUR HOUSE?

Public water system..... ___(1)
Private water company supplying more than 5 houses..... ___(2)
Individual well..... ___(3)

Other (specify) _____

_____

b. IS THE SUPPLY ADEQUATE?

Yes..... ___(1)

No..... ___(2) WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU HAD?

_____

11a. WHAT TYPE OF SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM IS YOUR HOUSE CONNECTED TO NOW?

Public sewer..... ___(1) (go to Q 12)
Private sewer system serving this development..... ___(2) (go to Q 12)
Septic tank or cess pool..... ___(3) (ask b and c)
Don't know..... ___(0) (go to Q 12)

b. WILL YOUR HOUSE BE CONNECTED TO A PUBLIC SEWER LINE SHORTLY?

Yes... ___(1) HOW SOON? _____

No.... ___(2) (go to Q 12)

c. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE NEW PUBLIC SEWER SYSTEM? IS IT....

A VERY GOOD IDEA..... ___(1) (ask why)
A GOOD IDEA..... ___(2) (ask why)
IT'S ALL RIGHT..... ___(3) (go to Q 12)
A POOR IDEA..... ___(4) (ask why)
A VERY POOR IDEA..... ___(5) (ask why)

(1,2,4, or 5) WHY? _____

_____

_____

12. ABOUT WHEN WAS THIS HOUSE ORIGINALLY BUILT?

_____ (year)

_____ (year) Interviewer estimate

13. HOW MANY ROOMS ARE IN YOUR HOUSE? (circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

14. ABOUT HOW MUCH DO YOU THINK THIS PROPERTY WOULD SELL FOR ON TODAY'S MARKET? (FOR FARMERS, INCLUDING LAND AND BUILDINGS)

Market value $ _____

Interviewer estimate $ _____

15a. IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU MOVE INTO THIS COMMUNITY?

_____ (year)

Always lived here _____ (1)

b. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES DO YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBES THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE NOW LIVING?

Large city (over 100,000)..... ____(1)
Suburb of a large city..... ____(2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000)..... ____(3)
Suburb of a middle size city..... ____(4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000)..... ____(5)
Village (under 2,500)..... ____(6)
Open country, but not a farm..... ____(7)
Farm..... ____(8)

16a. IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU MOVE INTO THIS HOUSE?

_____(year)

Born in this house _____(1) (go to Q 20)

b. WHERE DID YOU LIVE JUST PRIOR TO MOVING INTO THIS HOUSE?

Different house in the Town of Camillus.. ____(1)
Same county, different community..... ____(2)
Same state, different county..... ____(3)
Out of state..... ____(4)
Out of country..... ____(5)

c. WHICH ONE OF THESE BEST DESCRIBES WHERE YOU LIVED BEFORE?

Large city (over 100,000)..... ___(1)
Suburb of a large city..... ___(2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000)..... ___(3)
Suburb of a middle size city..... ___(4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000)..... ___(5)
Village (under 2,500)..... ___(6)
Open country, but not a farm..... ___(7)
Farm..... ___(8)

17a. IS THIS THE ONLY HOUSE YOU'VE OWNED?

Yes... ___(1) (go to Q 18)

No.... ___(2) HOW MANY HAVE YOU OWNED? _____ (ask b)
(including this one) (number)

b. DID YOU OWN OR RENT YOUR LAST RESIDENCE?

Own..... ___(1)
Rent..... ___(2)
Lived rent free... ___(3)
Other (specify) _____

18. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU MOVED IN THE LAST 10 YEARS (SINCE 1954)? (circle)

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

19. IN WHICH TYPE OF AREA DID YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) GROW UP, THAT IS, SPEND MOST OF YOUR CHILDHOOD? (UP TO AGE 18)

	Wife	Husband
Large city (over 100,000).....	___(1)	___(1)
Suburb of a large city.....	___(2)	___(2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000).	___(3)	___(3)
Suburb of a middle size city.....	___(4)	___(4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000).	___(5)	___(5)
Village (under 2,500).....	___(6)	___(6)
Open country, but not a farm.....	___(7)	___(7)
Farm.....	___(8)	___(8)

20. NOW WE'D LIKE TO HAVE YOU THINK ABOUT THE TOWN OF CAMILLUS AND GIVE US SOME OF YOUR REACTIONS TO THINGS HERE. WHEN WE SPEAK ABOUT THE TOWN WE MEAN THE ENTIRE TOWNSHIP.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT HAVE BEEN THE TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES OR PROBLEMS WHICH THE TOWN OF CAMILLUS HAS FACED DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS?

ISSUE #1: _____

ISSUE #2: _____

21a. NOW ABOUT (ISSUE #1)...WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS DO YOU THINK HAVE HAD THE MOST INFLUENCE IN SUPPORT OF (#1)?

_____

_____

_____

b. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS WERE THE GREATEST NUMBER OF PEOPLE SUPPORTING (ISSUE #1)?

c. WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS DO YOU THINK HAVE HAD THE MOST INFLUENCE IN OPPOSITION TO (ISSUE #1)?

_____

_____

_____

d. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS WERE THE GREATEST NUMBER OF PEOPLE OPPOSING (ISSUE #1)?

		b. Supported	d. Opposed
GROUP #1:	FARMERS.....	____(1)	____(1)
	VILLAGERS.....	____(2)	____(2)
	NEW PEOPLE.....	____(3)	____(3)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)
GROUP #2:	YOUNGER PEOPLE.....	____(1)	____(1)
	OLDER PEOPLE.....	____(2)	____(2)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)
GROUP #3:	LOCAL POLITICIANS.....	____(1)	____(1)
	CIVIC GROUPS (PTA, etc.).....	____(2)	____(2)
	LOCAL OFFICIALS (school, town).....	____(3)	____(3)
	AVERAGE PEOPLE LIKE US	____(4)	____(4)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)

e. WHERE DID YOU STAND ON (ISSUE #1)?

Supported it.....___(1)
Opposed it.....___(2)
Unaffected.....___(3)
Undecided.....___(4)

f. HAS THE ISSUE BEEN SETTLED YET?

Yes... ___(1) WHAT WAS THE OUTCOME? _____

No.... ___(2) _____

22a. NOW ABOUT (ISSUE #2)...WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS DO YOU THINK HAVE HAD THE MOST INFLUENCE IN SUPPORT OF (#1)?

_____

_____

_____

b. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS WERE THE GREATEST NUMBER OF PEOPLE SUPPORTING (ISSUE #2)?

c. WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS DO YOU THINK HAVE HAD THE MOST INFLUENCE IN OPPOSITION TO (ISSUE #2)?

_____

_____

_____

d. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS WERE THE GREATEST NUMBER OF PEOPLE OPPOSING (ISSUE #2)?

		b. Supported	d. Opposed
GROUP #1:	FARMERS.....	____(1)	____(1)
	VILLAGERS.....	____(2)	____(2)
	NEW PEOPLE.....	____(3)	____(3)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)
GROUP #2:	YOUNGER PEOPLE.....	____(1)	____(1)
	OLDER PEOPLE.....	____(2)	____(2)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)
GROUP #3:	LOCAL POLITICIANS.....	____(1)	____(1)
	CIVIC GROUPS (PTA, etc.).....	____(2)	____(2)
	LOCAL OFFICIALS (school, town).....	____(3)	____(3)
	AVERAGE PEOPLE LIKE US	____(4)	____(4)
	None of these.....	____(0)	____(0)

e. WHERE DID YOU STAND ON (ISSUE #2)?

Supported it....___(1)
Opposed it.....___(2)
Unaffected.....___(3)
Undecided.....___(4)

f. HAS THE ISSUE BEEN SETTLED YET?

Yes... ___(1) WHAT WAS THE OUTCOME? _____

No.... ___(2) _____

23a. WHICH ONE OF THESE 3 GROUPS DO YOU THINK HAS THE MOST INFLUENCE IN LOCAL POLITICS...(THE FARMERS, THE RESIDENTS IN THE VILLAGE, OR THE NEW PEOPLE WHO HAVE MOVED HERE RECENTLY)? WHICH GROUP DO YOU THINK HAS THE LEAST INFLUENCE?

	Most influence	Least influence
Farmers.....	_____(1)	_____(1)
Villagers.....	_____(2)	_____(2)
New people.....	_____(3)	_____(3)

b. NOW WHAT ABOUT THE LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD... WHICH GROUP DO YOU THINK HAS THE STRONGEST INFLUENCE? WHICH GROUP DO YOU THINK HAS THE LEAST INFLUENCE?

	Strongest influence	Least influence
Farmers.....	_____(1)	_____(1)
Villagers.....	_____(2)	_____(2)
New people.....	_____(3)	_____(3)

HERE ARE SOME STATEMENTS ABOUT THE FARMERS, THE RESIDENTS IN THE VILLAGE, AND THE NEW PEOPLE WHO HAVE MOVED HERE RECENTLY. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO THESE STATEMENTS. WE ARE SIMPLY INTERESTED IN WHICH RESPONSE BEST EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION ABOUT THEM.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
24. THE FARMERS IN THIS COMMUNITY ARE INCLINED TO BE ...					
a. PROGRESSIVE... WOULD YOU SAY YOU..	SA	A	?	D	SD
b. CLANNISH.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
c. NARROW-MINDED.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
d. HAVE TOO MUCH TO SAY ABOUT OUR COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
25. THE VILLAGERS IN THIS COMMUNITY ARE INCLINED TO BE ...					
a. PROGRESSIVE... WOULD YOU SAY YOU..	SA	A	?	D	SD
b. CLANNISH.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
c. NARROW-MINDED.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
d. HAVE TOO MUCH TO SAY ABOUT OUR COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
26. THE NEWCOMERS IN THIS COMMUNITY ARE INCLINED TO BE ...					
a. PROGRESSIVE... WOULD YOU SAY YOU..	SA	A	?	D	SD
b. CLANNISH.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
c. NARROW-MINDED.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
d. HAVE TOO MUCH TO SAY ABOUT OUR COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.....	SA	A	?	D	SD

NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR REACTIONS TO CONDITIONS HERE IN THE TOWN OF CAMILLUS.

27a. DO YOU CONSIDER THE SCHOOL TAXES TO BE ...

VERY HIGH..... ____(1)
SOMEWHAT HIGH..... ____(2)
REASONABLE ..... ____(3)
Don't know..... ____(0)

b. DO YOU CONSIDER THE OTHER TAXES ON YOUR PROPERTY TO BE ...

VERY HIGH..... ____(1)
SOMEWHAT HIGH..... ____(2)
REASONABLE..... ____(3)
Don't know..... ____(0)

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(0)
28a.	DO YOU CONSIDER THE ROADS IN THIS AREA TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
b.	DO YOU CONSIDER POLICE PROTECTION (INCLUDING SHERIFF'S OFFICE, STATE POLICE) IN THIS AREA TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
c.	DO YOU CONSIDER FIRE PROTECTION IN THIS AREA TO BE..	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
d.	DO YOU CONSIDER THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
e.	DO YOU CONSIDER THE SCHOOL STAFF TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
f.	DO YOU CONSIDER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
g.	DO YOU CONSIDER SHOPPING FACILITIES TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
h.	DO YOU CONSIDER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES TO BE.....	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK

29. AS A RULE, WHERE DO YOU GO ...

	In Camillus	In Syracuse	Somewhere Else	No Single Area
a. TO BUY CLOTHING, SUCH AS A SUIT OR COAT?...	____(1)	____(2)	____(3)	____(4)
b. FOR RECREATION OR ENTERTAINMENT?.....	____(1)	____(2)	____(3)	____(4)
c. TO BUY GROCERIES?....	____(1)	____(2)	____(3)	____(4)
d. FOR MEDICAL OR HEALTH SERVICES?.....	____(1)	____(2)	____(3)	____(4)

30a. NOW ABOUT YOUR TRANSPORTATION... HOW MANY AUTOMOBILES ARE OWNED BY PERSONS WHO LIVE IN THIS HOUSE?

No auto..... ____(0)
1 ..... ____(1)
2 ..... ____(2)
3 or more..... ____(3)

b. DOES ANYONE USE A COMPANY CAR (OR TRUCK)?

Yes..... ____(1)
No..... ____(2)

c. DO YOU OWN ANY TRUCKS THAT ARE USED REGULARLY?

Yes..... ____(1)
No..... ____(2)

d. DO YOU DRIVE?

Yes..... ____(1)
No..... ____(2)

e. (Ask only of those with 1 auto or 1 means of transportation) DO YOU FIND IT A PROBLEM HAVING ONLY 1 CAR (1 MEANS) OR ARE YOU ABLE TO MAKE SATISFACTORY ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION?

It is a problem..... ____(1)
Make satisfactory arrangements..... ____(2)

f. WHAT KIND OF TRANSPORTATION DO YOU <u>USUALLY</u> USE TO DOWNTOWN SYRACUSE?

Own car..... ____(1)
Bus..... ____(2)
Go with someone else..... ____(3)

Other (specify) _____

31a. WHAT KIND OF TRANSPORTATION DOES YOUR HUSBAND USUALLY USE TO AND FROM WORK?

Own car, drives self	___(1)	
Own car, as part of car pool	___(2)	
Rides with someone else and pays	___(3)	
Company car (truck)	___(4)	
Bus	___(5)	
Walks	___(6)	(go to Q32)
Works at home	___(7)	(go to Q32)
Retired	___(8)	(go to Q32)

b. WOULD YOU TELL ME WHICH OF THESE DESCRIBES HOW YOUR HUSBAND FEELS ABOUT THE TIME IT TAKES HIM TO GO TO WORK. IS HE ...
NOW ABOUT THE COST. IS HE ...
AND ABOUT THE CONVENIENCE. IS HE ...

	Time	Cost	Convenience
Very satisfied	___(1)	___(1)	___(1)
Somewhat satisfied	___(2)	___(2)	___(2)
It's all right	___(3)	___(3)	___(3)
Somewhat dissatisfied	___(4)	___(4)	___(4)
Very dissatisfied	___(5)	___(5)	___(5)

32a. ARE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN THIS DISTRICT?

	Wife	Husband	
Yes	___(1)	___(1)	(ask b)
No	___(2)	___(2)	(go to c)
Don't know	___(3)	___(3)	(go to c)

b. ARE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) REGISTERED?

	Wife	Husband
Yes	___(1)	___(1)
No	___(2)	___(2)
Don't know	___(3)	___(3)

c. WHAT IS YOUR (YOUR HUSBAND'S) POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE?

	Wife	Husband
Republican	___(1)	___(1)
Democrat	___(2)	___(2)
Liberal	___(3)	___(3)
Conservative	___(4)	___(4)
None (Independent)	___(5)	___(5)
Don't know	___(6)	___(6)

Other (specify) _____

32d. DID YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) VOTE IN THE 1964 NATIONAL ELECTION?

	Wife	Husband
Yes	___(1)	___(1)
No	___(2)	___(2)
Don't know	___(3)	___(3)
Not eligible or registered	___(0)	___(0)

e. DID YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) VOTE IN THE SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION LAST JULY?

	Wife	Husband
Yes	___(1)	___(1)
No	___(2)	___(2)
Don't know	___(3)	___(3)
Not eligible or registered	___(0)	___(0)

33. HOW INTERESTED WOULD YOU SAY YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) ARE IN LOCAL AFFAIRS IN GENERAL? DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF (YOUR HUSBAND) ...

	Wife	Husband
VERY INTERESTED	___(1)	___(1)
INTERESTED	___(2)	___(2)
SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	___(3)	___(3)
NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	___(4)	___(4)
Don't know	___(0)	___(0)

34a. WHAT IS YOUR (YOUR HUSBAND'S) RELIGION?

	Wife	Husband
Protestant	___(1)	___(1)
Catholic	___(2)	___(2)
Jewish	___(3)	___(3)
No formal religion	___(4)	___(4)

Other (specify) _____

_____

b. ARE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) A CHURCH MEMBER?

	Wife	Husband
Yes	___(1)	___(1)
No	___(2)	___(2)

c. HOW OFTEN DO YOU ATTEND CHURCH SERVICES?

	Wife	Husband
At least once a week	___(1)	___(1)
About twice a month	___(2)	___(2)
About once a month	___(3)	___(3)
Mainly on important holidays	___(4)	___(4)
Never or almost never	___(5)	___(5)

35 a. WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) BELONG TO (HAVE MEMBERSHIP
b. ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES A MONTH DO YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) GO TO EACH
(Hand card #35-36)
c. ARE YOU (YOUR HUSBAND) AND OFFICER IN ANY? WHICH?

a. Name of organization	b. Number of times a month					c. Office	
	2 or 3 times a week (10)	Once a week (04)	2 or 3 times a month (02)	Once a month (01)	Less often (00)	Yes	No
Wife							
Husband							

If type of organization is not clear from name, ask what it's purpose is.

Organizations include: Civic, Community service, Business, Professional, Union, Social, Church, Veteran's, Political clubs, Volunteer Fireman Organizations, Fraternal, Farm, etc.

36 a. WHAT RECREATION AWAY FROM HOME DO YOU (YOUR HUSBAND, YOUR FAMILY) PARTICIPATE AT LEAST ONCE A MONTH IN SEASON?

b. ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES A MONTH FOR EACH?

a. Number from list	b. Number of times a month				
	2 or 3 times a week (10)	Once a week (04)	2 or 3 times a month (02)	Once a month (01)	Less often (00)
Wife alone					
Husband alone					
Husband & Wife					
Family					

NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO TALK ABOUT VISITING WITH RELATIVES, NEIGHBORS, AND FRIENDS. THIS MIGHT BE A SHORT CHAT, FOR EXAMPLE WITH YOUR NEIGHBOR OUT IN THE YARD, OR A DROP-IN CALL AT A RELATIVES.

37a. LET'S TAKE RELATIVES FIRST... ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU AND YOUR RELATIVES VISITED EACH OTHER IN THE LAST MONTH?

At least once a day.....	____ (1)	
2 or 3 times a week.....	____ (2)	
Once a week.....	____ (3)	
2 or 3 times a month.....	____ (4)	
Once a month.....	____ (5)	
Less often than once a month.....	____ (6)	(go to Q 38)
No relatives close by.....	____ (7)	(go to Q 38)

b. IN GENERAL, IN WHICH ONE OF THESE AREAS ARE MOST OF THE RELATIVES YOU VISITED THIS LAST MONTH LOCATED?

Large city (over 100,000).....	____ (1)
Suburb of a large city.....	____ (2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000).	____ (3)
Suburb of a middle size city.....	____ (4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000).	____ (5)
Village (under 2,500).....	____ (6)
Open country, but not a farm.....	____ (7)
Farm.....	____ (8)

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT NEIGHBORS...

38a. ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU AND YOUR NEIGHBORS VISITED EACH OTHER IN THE LAST MONTH?

At least once a day.....	____ (1)
2 or 3 times a week.....	____ (2)
Once a week.....	____ (3)
2 or 3 times a month.....	____ (4)
Once a month.....	____ (5)
Less often than once a month.....	____ (6)

b. HOW MANY FAMILIES IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD DO YOU KNOW WELL ENOUGH TO CALL ON? (circle)

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

38c. WOULD YOU SAY THE PEOPLE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ARE...

VERY FRIENDLY.....____(1)
SOMEWHAT FRIENDLY.....____(2)
INDIFFERENT.....____(3)
SOMEWHAT UNFRIENDLY.....____(4)
VERY UNFRIENDLY.....____(5)
Can't say.....____(6)

39a. NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR FRIENDS OTHER THAN THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE NEIFHBORHOOD. ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS VISITED EACH OTHER THIS LAST MONTH?

At least once a day.....____(1)
2 or 3 times a week.....____(2)
Once a week.....____(3)
2 or 3 times a month.....____(4)
Once a month.....____(5)
Less often than once a month.....____(6) (go to Q39a.)

b. IN GENERAL, IN WHICH ONE OF THESE AREAS ARE MOST OF THE FRIENDS YOU VISITED THIS LAST MONTH LOCATED?

Large city (over 100,000).....____(1)
Suburb of a large city.....____(2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000)..____(3)
Suburb of a middle size city.....____(4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000)..____(5)
Village (under 2,500).....____(6)
Open country, but not a farm.....____(7)
Farm.....____(8)

c. HOW MANY OF YOUR FRIENDS LIVE RIGHT HERE IN CAMILLUS? WOULD YOU SAY...

MOST.....____(2)
SOME.....____(1)
NONE.....____(0)

40. HOW MUCH CONTACT HAVE YOU HAD WITH THE FOLLOWING GROUPS...

	A LOT	SOME	A LITTLE	NONE
a. FARMERS.....	____(3)	____(2)	____(1)	____(0)
b. VILLAGERS.....	____(3)	____(2)	____(1)	____(0)
c. NEWCOMERS.....	____(3)	____(2)	____(1)	____(0)

41. HOW DO YOU YOURSELF FEEL ABOUT LIVING IN THIS AREA? OVERALL WOULD YOU SAY YOU ARE...

Very satisfied.....___(1)
Somewhat satisfied.....___(2)
It's all right.....___(3)
Somewhat dissatisfied.....___(4)
Very dissatisfied.....___(5)
Don't know.....___(0)

42. IF YOU HAD TO MOVE FROM HERE, TO WHICH TYPE OF AREA WOULD YOU MOST PREFER TO MOVE?

Large city (over 100,000).....___(1)
Suburb of a large city.....___(2)
Middle size city (10,000 to 100,000)___(3)
Suburb of a middle size city.....___(4)
Small city or town (2,500 to 10,000)___(5)
Village.....___(6)
Open country, but not a farm.....___(7)
Farm.....___(8)

43. IF YOU COULD FIND A NICE, MODERN APARTMENT OF THE RIGHT SIZE AND RENT FOR YOUR FAMILY, CLOSE TO DOWNTOWN SYRACUSE, WHICH WOULD YOU PREFER...

TO RENT DOWNTOWN.....___(1)
TO OWN YOUR OWN HOME OUT HERE.....___(2)

44a. MORE AND MORE AMERICANS ARE OWNING A SECOND HOUSE OF SOME KIND, SUCH AS A SUMMER COTTAGE. DO YOU HAVE ONE?

Yes..... ____(1) (ask b)
No..... ____(2) (ask c)

b. WHERE IS YOUR SECOND HOUSE LOCATED?

_____

_____

c. DO YOU PLAN TO ACQUIRE ONE IN THE NEXT 5 YEARS?

Yes..... ____(1)
No..... ____(2)

45. FINALLY, I HAVE SOME STATEMENTS HERE THAT OTHER PEOPLE HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR OPINIONS ABOUT. HOW DO THESE FIT IN WITH SOME OF YOUR BELIEFS? LOOKING AT THIS CARD WOULD YOU TELL ME WHICH COMES CLOSEST TO YOUR OPINION?

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. MOST PUBLIC OFFICIALS ARE NOT REALLY INTERSTED IN THE PROBLEMS OF THE AVERAGE MAN. WOULD YOU SAY YOU.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
b. THESE DAYS A PERSON DOESN'T REALLY KNOW WHOM HE CAN COUNT ON. WOULD YOU SAY YOU.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
c. NOW DAYS A PERSON HAS TO LIVE PRETTY MUCH FOR TODAY AND LET TOMORROW TAKE CARE OF ITSELF. WOULD YOU SAY YOU.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
d. IN SPITE OF WHAT SOME PEOPLE SAY, THE LOT OF THE AVERAGE MAN IS GETTING WORSE, NOT BETTER. WOULD YOU SAY YOU.....	SA	A	?	D	SD
e. MOST PEOPLE DON'T REALLY CARE WHAT HAPPENS TO THE NEXT FELLOW. WOULD YOU SAY YOU.....	SA	A	?	D	SD

INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Race (circle)

1 White

2 Nonwhite

3 _____ (describe)

Interviewer _____

Date _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Decent Home. Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing. Edgar F. Kaiser, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Alexander, Frank, and Carl F. Kraenzel. Rural Social Organization of Sweet Grass County, Montana. Montana State Coll. Ag. Exp. Sta., Bulletin 490, Nov. 1953.

Almack, Ronald B., and Lawrence M. Heffle. Rural Social Organization in Dent County, Missouri. Columbia, Missouri, AES, Research Bulletin 458, Aug. 1950.

Anderson, A. H; and C. J. Miller. The Changing Role of the Small Town in Farm Areas: A Study of Adams, Nebraska. U. of Nebraska, AES, Bulletin 419, May 1953.

_____. The 'Expanding' Rural Community: Adjustment Problems and Opportunity. Univ. of Nebraska, AES, SB 464, Sept. 1961.

Anderson, W. A. A Study of the Values in Rural Living: Part I, A Scale for the Measurement of the Values in Rural Living. Cornell AES, Memoir 277, Nov. 1967.

_____. A Study of the Values in Rural Living: Part II, The Opinions of Youth and Adults. Cornell AES, Memoir 286, Aug. 1949.

_____. A Study of the Values in Rural Living: Part V, The Opinions of University Students. Cornell AES, Memoir 302, Nov. 1950.

_____. Rural Social Participation and the Family Life Cycle: Part I, Formal Participation. Cornell AES, Memoir 314, 1952.

_____. Rural Social Participation and the Family Life Cycle: Part II, Informal Participation. Cornell AES, Dept. of Soc., Memoir 318, Jan. 1953.

_____. Social Change in a Central New York Rural Community. Cornell AES, Bulletin 407, Dec. 1954.

_____. Fringe Families and Their Social Participation. Cornell University Agr. Exp. Sta., Bull. 909, 1955.

_____. The Flight to the Fringe: Opportunities for Extension Activities. Dept. of Rural Soci., Cornell University, Pub. 46, March 1956.

_____. The Social Participation of Fringe Families: A Stcond Study. Dept. of Soc. Publication 50, Cornell University, Feb. 1957.

_____. The Characteristics of New York State Population. Cornell AES, Bulletin 925, Feb. 1958.

_____, Olaf F. Larson, and Fathalda A. S. Halloul. Social Change in the Slaterville Springs- Brooktondale Area of Tompkins County, N.Y. 1926-51: Part I, Population, Communication and Participation. Cornell AES, Bulletin 920, April 1956.

Andrews, Richard B. "Elements in the Urban Fringe Pattern." Journal of Land and Public Utilization Economics, XVIII (May, 1942), 169-183.

Angell, Robert C. "Discussion." Rural Sociology, XVII, No. 2 (June, 1953), 119-20.

Beegle, J. A. "Characteristics of Michigan's Fringe Population." Rural Sociology, XII, No. 3 (September, 1947), 254-63.

_____, and Widick Schroeder. Social Organization in the North Lansing Fringe. Michigan AES Techn. Bull. 251, 1955.

Belser, Karl. "Misuse of Land in Fringe Areas and Inadequate Subdivision Standards" in Problems of Decentralization in Metropolitan Areas. Dept. of City and Regional Planning, University of California, 1954. (Mimeographed)

_____. "Inadequate Subdivision Standards and Fringe Area Land Misuse." Western City Magazine (July, 1953).

Bell, Wendell, and Maryanne T. Force. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations." American Sociological Review, XXI (August, 1956), 25-34.

_____ and _____. "Social Structure and Participation in Different Types of Formal Association." Social Forces, XXXIV (May, 1956), 345-350.

Beyer, Glenn H. Housing and Society. New York: Macmillan Company, 1965.

Blizzard, Samuel W. "Discussion." Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), 118-119.

Bogue, Donald J. The Structure of the Metropolitan Community. Ann Arbor: Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, 1949.

Boskoff, Alvin. The Sociology of Urban Regions. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.

Bouma, Donald H. An Analysis of the Social Power Position of the Real Estate Board in Grand Rapids, Michigan (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State College, 1952).

Chapin, Stuart F., Jr., and Shirley F. Weiss, editors. Urban Growth Dynamics in a Regional Cluster of Cities. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Dewey, Richard S. Peripheral Expansion of Population in Metropolitan Milwaukee, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1946. "Peripheral Expansion in Milwaukee County," American Journal of Sociology, LIV (Sept., 1948), 118-125

_____. "The Neighborhood, Urban Ecology, and City Planners." American Sociological Review, XV (Aug., 1950), 502-507.

Duncan, Otis Dudley and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ind., 1956.

_____ and _____. "Suburbs and Urban Fringe." The Suburban Community, edited by William M. Dobriner. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.

Elias, C. E., Jr., James Gilles, and Svend Riemer. Metropolis: Values in Conflict. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1964.

Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Fava, Sylvia Fleis. "Suburbanism as a Way of Life." American Sociological Review, XXI (August, 1956), 34-37.

Firey, Walter. "Ecological Considerations in Planning for Rurban Fringes." American Sociological Review, XI (Aug., 1946), 411-423.

_____. Social Aspects of Land Use Planning in the Country-City Fringe: The Case of Flint, Michigan (Special Bulletin 339). East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station, 1946.

Ford, Thomas R., and Willis A. Sutton, Jr. "The Impact of Change on Rural Communities and Fringe Areas: Review of a Decade's Research." Our Changing Rural Society: Perspective and Trends, edited by James H. Copp. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.

Form, William H. "The Place of Social Structure in the Determination of Land Use: Some Implications for a Theory of Urban Ecology." Social Forces, XXXII, No. 4 (May, 1954).

Freeman, Linton C. Elementary Applied Statistics: For Students in Behavioral Science. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ind., 1968.

Freeman, Howard E., Edwin Novak, and Leo G. Reeder. "Correlates of Membership in Voluntary Associations." American Sociological Review, XXII (October, 1957), 528-33.

Gans, Herbert G. "Planning and Social Life: Friendship and Neighbor Relations in Suburban Communities." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, XXVII (May, 1961.

_____. "The Balanced Community: Homogeneity or Heterogeneity in Residential Areas." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, XXVII (August, 1961), 176-84.

Gist, Noel P. "Ecological Decentralization and Rural-Urban Relationships." Rural Sociology, XVII, No. 4 (December, 1952), 328-35.

_____ and Sylvia Fleis Fava. Urban Society, 5th ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1964.

Hart, V. B. "Suggestions to Persons Who Plan to Farm or to Live in the Country." N. Y. State College of Agr. Extension Bulletin 652. June 1944, reprint July 1955.

Hatt, Paul K. "Discussion." Rural Sociology, XVII, No. 2 (June, 1953), 117-118.

_____ and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., editors. Cities and Society: The Revised Reader in Urban Sociology, 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.

Hepple, Lawrence M., and Margaret L. Bright. Social Changes in Shelby County, Missouri. University of Missouri, AES, Res. Bulletin 456, March 1950.

Higbee, Edward. The Squeeze: Cities Without Space. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1960.

Hoffer, Charles R., and Walter Freeman. Social Action Resulting from Industrial Development. Michigan State University, AES, Special Bulletin 401, Sept. 1955.

Jehlik, Paul J., and J. Edwin Losey. Rural Social Organization in Henry County, Indiana. Purdue University, AES, Station Bulletin 568, Nov., 1951.

Kaufman, Harold F. Prestige Classes in a New York Rural Community. Cornell AES, Memoir 260, March 1944.

Kimball, Solon T. "A Case Study of Township Zoning." Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan Quarterly Bulletin, Vol. 28, No. 4 (May, 1946), 253-69.

_____. The New Social Frontier: The Fringe. Michigan State Agr. Exp. Sta. Special Bulletin 360, 1949.

Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Kolb, John H. and Leroy J. Day. Interdependence in Town and County Relations in Rural Society: A Study of Trends in Walworth County, Wisconsin - 1911-13 to 1947-48. University of Wisconsin, AES, Res. Bull. 172, Dec. 1950.

Kraenzel, Carl L. The Rural Community and the Agricultural Program. Montana State College, AES, Bulletin 552, June 1960.

Kurtz, Richard A., and Joanne B. Eicher. "Fringe and Suburbs: A Confusion of Concepts." Social Forces, XXXVII (October, 1958), 32-37.

_____ and Joel Smith. "Social Life in the Rural-Urban Fringe." Rural Sociology, XXVI (March, 1961), 24-38.

Lively, Charles E. "Introduction." Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), 101.

McKain, Walter D., Jr., and Robert G. Burnight. "The Sociological Significance of the Rural-Urban Fringe: From the Rural Point of View." Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), 108-117.

Martin, Walter T. "A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents." American Sociological Review, XVII (Dec. 1952), 687-94.

_____. The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location. Eugene, Oregon: University Press, 1953.

_____. "Some Socio-psychological Aspects of Adjustment to Residence Location in the Rural-Urban Fringe." American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), 248-53.

_____. "The Structuring of Social Relationships Engendered by Suburban Residence." American Sociological Review, XXI (August, 1956), 446-53.

_____. "Ecological Change in Satellite Rural Areas." American Sociological Review. XXII (April, 1957), 173-83.

_____. "Ecological Change in Satellite Rural Areas" (1957) in Studies in Human Ecology. Edited by George A. Theodorson. New York: Row, Peterson & Co., 1961.

Meier, Dorothy L., and Bell Wendell. "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals." American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959), 189-201.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research. Illinois: The Free Press of Clencoe, 1951.

Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Miller, Paul A. "The Process of Decision-Making Within the Context of Community Organization." Rural Sociology, 17 (1952), 153-61.

Mowrer, Ernest R. "Sequential and Class Variables of the Family in the Suburban Area." Social Forces, 40 (Dec. 1961), 107-12.

Myers, Richard B., and J. Allen Beegle. "Delineation and Analysis of the Rural-Urban Fringe." Applied Anthropology, VI (Winter, 1947), 14-22.

McKenzie, R. D. The Metropolitan Community. New York: McGraw Hill, 1933.

National Resources Committee. "The Process of Urbanization: Underlying Forces and Emerging Trends." Cities and Society. Edited by Paul K. Hatt, and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., 2d ed. Chicago, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.

Pearson, John E. "The Significance of Urban Housing in Rural-Urban Migration." Land Economics, XXIX (Aug., 1963), 231-239.

Pratt, Samuel. "Metropolitan Community Development and Change in Sub-Center Economic Functions." American Sociological Review, XXII (1957), pp. 434-60.

Queen, Stuart A., and David B. Carpenter. "The Sociological Significance of the Rural-Urban Fringe: From the Urban Point of View." Rural Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (1953), 101-08.

Ramsey, Charles E., and Robert A. Danley. Some Effects of the Fringe Migration on Channels of Communication. Dept. of Rural Sociology Bulletin No. 51, Cornell Agricultural Experiment Station, April 1957.

Ramsey, Charles E., and W. A. Anderson. Migration of the N. Y. State Population. Cornell A.E.S. Bull. No. 929, June 1958.

Reissman, Leonard. "Class, Leisure, and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, XIX (February, 1954), 76-84.

_____. The Urban Process: Cities in Industrial Societies. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Rodehaver, Myles William. "The Rural-Urban Fringe: An Interstitial Area--A Study of Transitional Area Surrounding the Urban Center of Madison, Wisconsin." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1946.

_____. "Fringe Settlement as a Two-Directional Movement." Rural Sociology, XII, No. 1 (March, 1947), 49-57.

Rodwin, Lloyd., Ed. The Future Metropolis. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960.

Schaffer, Albert. "A Rural Community at the Urban Fringe." Rural Sociology, XXIII (1958), 277-85.

Schnore, Leo F. "The Functions of Metropolitan Suburbs." American Journal of Sociology, 61 (March, 1956), 453-58.

_____. "Metropolitan Growth and Decentralization." American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (September, 1957), 171-80.

_____. "The Growth of Metropolitan Suburbs." American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (April, 1957), 165-73.

_____. "Satellites and Suburbs." Social Forces, Vol. 36 (Dec., 1957), 121-29.

Stansberry, Robert R., Jr. "The Rural Fringe and Urban Expansion: A Case Study of Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, Maryland." Agricultural Economic Report No. 43. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic and Statistical Analysis Division, Economic Research Service, 1963.

Stein, Maurice R. The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Taylor, Lee, and Arthur R. Jones, Jr. Rural Life and Urganised Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Theodorson, George A., ed. Studies in Human Ecology. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.

Thompson, Wayne E. "The Urban Fringe: First Thoughts on Sociological Perspectives." Problems of America's Expanding Metropolitan Fringe Areas: Report of the Conference Held at Cornell University, June 15-16, 1961. Ithaca, New York, July 1961 (mimeographed), 1-12.

_____ and John E. Horton. "Political Alienation as a Force in Political Action." Social Forces, Vol. 38, March 1960.

U.S. Congress, House. Building the American City. Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Congress and to the President of the United States. Paul H. Douglas, Chairman. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Wehrweing, George S. "The Rural-Urban Fringe." Urban Geography, 18 (July, 1942), 217-228.

_____. "The Rural-Urban Fringe." Economic Geography, 18 (July, 1942), 217-28.

Wheaton, William L. C., Grace Milgram, and Margy Ellin Meyerson, editors. Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Woodbury, Coleman, ed. The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966 (4th ed.)

Zimmer, Basil, and Amos H. Hawley. "The Significance of Membership in Associations." American Journal of Sociology, 65 (Sept., 1959), 196-201.

_____ and _____. "Approaches to the Solution of Fringe Problems: Preferences of Residents in the Flint Metropolitan Area." Studies in Human Ecology. Edited by George A. Theodorson. Evanston, Ill: Row, Peterson and Co., 1961.