DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 995 RC 007 107

AUTHOR Christenson, James A.; Dillman, Don A.
TITLE Rural-Urban Value Patterns.
PUB DATE 25 Aug 73
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings, College Park, Maryland, August 23-26, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Cultural Environment; Demography; *Ecological Factors; Occupations; Rural Population; *Rural Urban Differences; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Washington State

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess whether ecological or occupational rural-urban differences imply sociocultural differences as measured by public values. Data were gathered during 1970 in a random state-wide survey of Washington residents, N = 3101, response rate = 75%. Two indicators were selected to measure the ecological aspect of society: (1) relative degrees of population density and (2) size and place of residence. Three categories were selected to assess the occupational aspect. Major conclusions were that ecological and occupational rural-urban differences did not necessarily imply cultural differences and that analysis of the conservative-liberal overtones of studied values revealed no identifiable rural-urban orientation. (Author/PS)

Rural-Urban Value Patterns

by

James A. Christenson*

and

Don A. Dillman**

Paper read at
Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings
College Park, Maryland
August 25, 1973

*Extension Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27607.

***Associate Professor of Sociology and Chairman Rural Sociology Department, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99163.

Abstract

Much of the research undertaken by rural sociologists in the United States has been and still is premised upon the assumption that important differences exist between the rural and urban segments of American Society. This article assesses whether ecological or occupational rural-urban differences do in fact imply socio-cultural differences as measured by public values. Data was gathered during 1970 in a random state-wide survey of Washington residents (N=3101, response rate = 75%). The findings are contrary to recent findings and conclusions of Willits, Bealer, and Crider (1973) who suggest that the rural-urban variable is still viable for differentiating socio-cultural patterns as measured by attitudes. The present study finds no difference in value patterns among the rural and urban segments of the sample nor any indication of a more conservative orientation among the rural segment of the sample. The implications of these findings are explored.

RURAL-URBAN VALUE PATTERNS

Introduction

Almost a decade ago Bealer, Willits, and Kuvlesky (1965) delineated three aspects of the concept "rural." These aspects or dimensions of the concept include: (1) the ecological, primarily focusing on density and population size; (2) the occupational, focusing on agriculture; and (3) the socio-cultural, focusing on interaction and culture. Bealer and his associates state that much of the ambiguity surrounding the present usage of the concepts results from mixing of these three aspects. Dewey (1960: 63) had argued earlier that "the mixing of the influence of population factors per se [ecological] with contemporary cultural influences [socio-cultural] which are independent of population variations has led to the present amorphous condition of the concepts [rural-urban]."

Much of the research undertaken by rural sociologists in the United States has been and still is premised upon the assumption that important differences exist between the rural and urban aspects of American Society. Within the last decade many research efforts have asserted that rural-urban differences are diminishing (Taylor and Jones, 1964; Schnore, 1964; Taylor, 1968). However, Willits, Bealer, and Crider (1973) in a recent journal article show that the rural-urban variable is still viable for distinguishing attitudes concerning traditional morality. While both the rural and the urban segments of society have become more liberal over the last twenty years, the gap between the attitudinal orientations of the rural and urban youth in Pennsylvania are as wide today as they were twenty years ago (Willits et al., 1973).

Most will agree that ecological and occupational differences do exist among various segments of American Society because of relative exposure to population density and the existence of occupations which tend to isolate one from the larger society (e.g., farming, mining). These ecological and occupational distinctions have come to be typed urban and rural. The central question is whether these occupational and ecological differences do in fact imply socio-cultural differences.

Bealer and his associates (1965) distinguished two broad substantive components of the socio-cultural aspects - a social or interactional facet and a cultural component. They comment that the cultural component "usually connotes, not action per se, but rather the directives for action, the shared ideals of behavior, the value configurations by which means and ends ought to be selected" (Bealer et al., 1965: 263-264). While Willits and her associates (1973) focused on attitudes this paper focuses on the related concept values. Two questions are raised. First, do ecological and occupational differences imply value differences. And second, does that segment of society which is labeled "rural" espouse a more conservative set of values than that aspect of society labeled "urban." The values discussed in this article are called "public" in that the respondents were asked to express their conceived preference for the allocation of public funds. Such an assessment of public values has not been previously examined in a rural-urban context.

Data for this study was gathered during the Summer of 1970. Respondents names were drawn systematically from telephone listings for every community in the State

and proportioned to the population of the area covered by each directory. In the State of Washington, 93 percent of the households had phone service in 1967 (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1967). Of the original mailing, 363 respondents were deleted for reasons of being deceased, physically incapable, having moved out of the State, or having moved without leaving a forwarding address. Of the remainder, 3101 (75 percent) returned usable questionnaires.

The State of Washington manifests considerable heterogeneity in population composition. The Cascade Mountains divide the State of Washington into two relatively distinct areas. In the western part of the State approximately 57 percent of the State's population live in four contiguous counties which comprise little more than 7 percent of the total land area (and much of this land is so mountainous that it cannot be used for dwellings). In 1968 the population density for Western Washington was 97.2 persons per square mile while it was 21.0 for Eastern Washington (Schmid & Schmid, 1969: 11). Twelve of Eastern Washington's 20 counties contained no city of 5000 population in 1969.

Methodological Procedure

Two indicators were selected to measure the ecological aspect of society. The first, commonly employed since Wirth's (1938) article, measures relative degrees of population density. The two extremes manifest aspects of rural-urban differences - i.e., relative isolation. The second measure of the ecological aspect focuses on size and place of residence. A six point scale for place of residence was utilized in order to present a broad spectrum of rural-urban differences in community size and to avoid needless debate concerning the cut-off point between rural and urban aspects to the U. S. Society.[1]

In order to assess the occupational aspect, three occupational categories were selected. Beers (1953) assumed that farmers more than any other occupational category should manifest rural values. Schnore (1966: 132) commented that rural communities are usually thought of as agricultural in character while urban communities are considered to be centers of manufacturning, trade and service. The first category manifests the value hierarchy for all occupations and serves as a standard. The other two occupational categories focus on the value hierarchies for farm owners and managers and the value hierarchy for proprietors and managers (except farm). This provides a comparison of 2 related occupations, the former primarily confined to rural areas and the latter more prevalent in urban areas.[2]

Bealer and his associates (1965: 264) comment that values are a central consideration for understanding the socio-cultural aspect of rural society. Theoretically value is a central aspect of culture. Values are standards by which courses of actions are selected and goals are determined (Parsons, 1937; Kluckhohn, 1951; Williams, 1969). The values which are shared by society, or any sub-group of society, together with the relative importance attached to them, gives a culture or sub-culture its orientation. The values discussed here are called "public" in that the respondents were asked to express their conceived preferences for the allocation of public funds to various government services and programs (cf Dillman and Christenson, 1973).

Both values and attitudes imply conceptions of the desirable but these concepts are different in two important aspects. Values are more general in nature than attitudes and imply hierarchical ordering (Nye, 1967; Catton, 1966;

Kluckhohn, 1956; Dillman and Christenson, 1972). A particular value may encompass several specific concerns and attitudes. For example, while it is considered appropriate to speak on one's value for the American political process, one's reaction to a particular United States Senator or the President himself would more appropriately be considered an attitude.

In order to make rural-urban comparisons in a socio-cultural context, value dimensions comprising 51 specific government services and programs were studied. These value dimensions were derived through the mathematical ordering of several related government activities by factor analysis and the ranking of the value dimensions (factors) in order of priority. Using the varimax rotation, 12 factors (i.e., value dimensions) were revealed with eigen values equal to or greater than unity. Together these factors accounted for 57 percent of the total variation among the items.[3]

Findings

Analysis of four levels of density (ecological aspect) reveals strong overall consensus in value patterns (socio-cultural aspect). The value dimensions as delineated by the factor analysis shows that "law and order" and "pollution control" clearly stand at the top of the value hierarchy irrespective of population density. On a four point scale, these public values rank consistently between 3.4 and 3.6.

(Table 1 about here)

Five value dimensions rank medium-high (2.7 to 3.1) along all four degrees of density. The values include "protection of nature," "public education," "employment opportunities," "personal health and security," and "urban problems." Slight differences in

Table 1: Value patterns for population density by county: mean ranks for factor groupings and their component items.

Factor	Item Number	100 and Over* (1877)** Item Mean	100 and Over* (1877)** Factor Mean	100 and Over* (1877)** Rank	50 - 99.9 (363) Item Mean	50 - 99.9 (363) Factor Mean	50 - 99.9 (363) Rank	15 - 49.9 (593) Item Mean	15 - 49.9 (593) Factor Mean	15 - 49.9 (593) Rank	0 - 14.9 (222) Item Mean	0 - 14.9 (222) Factor Mean	0 - 14.9 (222) Rank
Law and Order	28	3.56			3.60			3.60			3.64		
	37	3.58			3.58			3.59			3.60		
	07	3.65	3.50	1	3.67	3.59	1	3.66	3.59	1	3.68	3.56	1
	41	3.40			3.57			3.55			3.49		
	33	3.33			3.51			3.54			3.39		
Pollution Control	24	3.45			3.44			3.36			3.38		
	48	3.66			3.62			3.58			3.60		
	35	3.27	3.48	2	3.18	3.44	2	3.09	3.38	2	3.16	3.34	2
	46	3.47			3.40			3.36			3.03		
	12	3.54			3.56			3.52			3.51		
Protect Nature	20	2.77			2.74			2.56			2.44		
	08	3.35	3.14	3	3.32	3.12	3	3.17	3.01	4	3.13	2.96	4
	29	3.28			3.28			3.15			3.13		
	38	3.16			3.15			3.17			3.12		
Public Education	02	3.04	3.04	5	3.06	3.06	4	3.02	3.02	3	3.05	3.05	3
Employment Opportunities	39	3.02			2.93			2.97			2.96		
	21	2.95			2.87			2.83			2.84		
	09	3.22	3.03	4	3.16	2.97	6	3.18	2.97	5	3.20	2.78	6
	49	2.85			2.78			2.78			2.77		
	44	3.10			3.10			3.09			3.03		
Personal Health and Security	04	3.23			3.28			3.22			2.96		
	16	3.16			3.16			3.20			2.99		
	01	3.23	2.98	6	3.21	2.99	5	3.14	2.96	6	2.95	2.85	5
	05	2.92			3.06			3.04			2.98		
	19	2.38			2.23			2.30			2.34		
	06	2.98			2.98			2.84			2.89		

Table 1: (continued)

Urban Problems	23	2.62			2.56			2.43			2.41		
	11	2.87	2.74	7	2.76	2.67	7	2.80	2.64	7	2.82	2.66	7
	27	2.74			2.70			2.70			2.74		
College Youth Concerns	36	2.57			2.55			2.54			2.49		
	32	2.77	2.38	8	2.78	2.34	8	2.80	2.33	9	2.82	2.32	10
	51	1.81			1.70			1.66			1.65		
National Defense	30	2.58			2.64			2.61			2.62		
	22	2.61			2.65			2.62			2.54		
	10	2.36	2.34	9	2.43	2.34	8	2.48	2.36	8	2.39	2.33	9
	26	2.09			1.96			2.00			2.02		
	42	1.92			1.89			1.92			1.87		
	34	2.49			2.50			2.55			2.56		
Assistance to agriculture	50	2.21			2.24			2.38			2.43		
	43	2.00	2.16	10	2.06	2.20	10	2.08	2.29	10	2.18	2.34	8
	14	2.28			2.30			2.42			2.41		
Aid to foreign countries	03	1.54			1.48			1.46			1.51		
	18	2.04	1.94	11	1.98	1.84	12	1.99	1.86	11	1.98	1.83	11
	47	2.23			2.05			2.12			2.00		
Space exploration	40	1.66			1.70			1.55			1.47		
	15	1.96	1.85	12	1.97	1.86	11	1.87	1.74	12	1.81	1.69	12
	45	1.94			1.92			1.79			1.80		

*number of persons per square mile
**number of respondents in category

trends can be noted in the values concerning public education and protection of nature. But the factor means are so close that differences within this medium-high range seem minimal. The next break in the hierarchical value pattern focuses on three value dimensions in the medium-low range (2.2 to 2.4). These include "college youth concerns," "national defense," and "assistance to agriculture." Again minor trends can be seen in the ordering - e.g., rural areas are a bit more concerned about agriculture. Finally two values lie at the bottom of the ranking (1.7 to 1.9). These include "aid to foreign countries," and "space exploration." The most important fact to point out is the absence of overlap within these value ranges from low to high. The ordering of value patterns is extremely similar irrespective of population density. Using Kendall's coefficient of concordance no significant difference (at .01 level) was found in the rank ordering of the value patterns (cf, Siegel, 1956; 229-239).

The second indicator of the ecological aspect (place of residence) yielded essentially the same results when compared with the socio-cultural aspect. The values fell into the same patterns of high, medium-high, medium low, and low.

(Table 2 about here)

One instance of overlap between the categories occurred. Those that lived on farms gave a higher rank ordering to "assistance to agriculture" than did other places of residence. But this should be expected since there is a built-in occupaticnal bias. Using Kendall's coefficient of concordance again no significant difference in rank ordering was apparent.

Table 1: Value patterns for place of residence: mean ranks for factor groupings and their component items.

Factor	Item Number	Large City 100,000+ (1030)* Item Mean	Large City 100,000+ (1030)* Factor Mean	Large City 100,000+ (1030)* Rank	Small City 25 to 100,000 (465) Item Mean	Small City 25 to 100,000 (465) Factor Mean	Small City 25 to 100,000 (465) Rank	Large Town 2,500 - 25,000 (595) Item Mean	Large Town 2,500 - 25,000 (595) Factor Mean	Large Town 2,500 - 25,000 (595) Rank	Small Town Less than 2,500 (186) Item Mean	Small Town Less than 2,500 (186) Factor Mean	Small Town Less than 2,500 (186) Rank	Rural Area Non-Farm (549) Item Mean	Rural Area Non-Farm (549) Factor Mean	Rural Area Non-Farm (549) Rank	Farm (159) Item Mean	Farm (159) Factor Mean	Farm (159) Rank
Law and Order	28	3.58			3.54			3.57			3.58			3.61			3.61		
	37	3.62			3.55			3.55			3.54			3.58			3.58		
	07	3.63	3.49	1.5	3.65	3.53	1	3.55	3.52	1	3.62	3.56	1	3.69	3.58	1	3.68	3.61	1
	41	3.35			3.45			3.50			3.54			3.54			3.64		
	33	3.27			3.45			3.44			3.50			3.48			3.54		
Pollution Control	24	3.45			3.48			3.42			3.34			3.46			3.18		
	48	3.68			3.64			3.60			3.52			3.66			3.49		
	35	3.31	3.49	1.5	3.18	3.47	2	3.21	3.43	2	3.08	3.36	2	3.18	3.46	2	3.01	3.21	2
	46	3.51			3.41			3.37			3.39			3.47			3.06		
	12	3.34			3.62			3.54			3.48			3.51			3.31		
Protect Nature	20	2.74			2.70			2.66			2.63			2.77			2.51		
	08	3.32	3.13	3	3.34	3.10	4	3.25	3.06	3	3.11	2.98	5	3.33	3.14	3	3.10	2.99	3
	29	3.29			3.24			3.23			3.07			3.24			3.20		
	38	3.18			3.10			3.11			3.12			3.22			3.14		
Public Education	02	3.06	3.06	4.5	3.11	3.11	3	3.03	3.03	4	3.04	3.04	3	2.99	2.99	4	2.79	2.79	6
Employment Opportunities	39	3.04			3.05			2.94			3.04			2.92			2.50		
	21	2.99			2.93			2.88			2.91			2.80			2.72		
	09	3.24	3.06	4.5	3.28	3.04	5	3.17	2.96	5	3.18	3.01	4	3.13	2.94	6	3.11	2.81	4
	49	2.91			2.85			2.79			2.84			2.73			2.67		
	44	3.13			3.09			3.03			3.08			3.11			3.07		
Personal Health and Security	04	3.23			3.27			3.15			3.14			3.27			2.97		
	16	3.17			3.19			3.06			3.12			3.22			3.04		
	01	3.25	3.01	6	3.26	3.01	6	3.09	2.90	6	3.10	2.93	6	3.20	2.97	5	2.93	2.80	5
	05	2.92			2.96			2.93			2.95			3.05			3.02		
	19	2.48			2.34			2.27			2.33			2.21			2.23		
	06	3.02			3.02			2.90			2.94			2.85			2.63		

Table 2: (cont'nued)

Urban Problems	23	2.66			2.58			2.50			2.41			2.52			2.36		
	11	2.92	2.80	7	2.91	2.73	7	2.84	2.67	7	2.81	2.66	7	2.71	2.63	7	2.44	2.46	8
	27	2.83			2.71			2.66			2.77			2.67			2.58		
College Youth Concerns	36	2.63			2.58			2.52			2.53			2.48			2.46		
	32	2.78	2.43	8	2.75	2.36	8	2.76	2.33	9	2.86	2.33	8	2.77	2.31	9	2.89	2.30	10
	51	1.88			1.76			1.70			1.61			1.68			1.56		
National Defense	30	2.54			2.56			2.62			2.61			2.65			2.74		
	22	2.57			2.64			2.65			2.56			2.63			2.63		
	10	2.31	2.31	9	2.41	2.32	9	2.40	2.37	8	2.39	2.31	9	2.43	2.39	8	2.52	2.42	9
	26	2.09			2.01			2.05			2.00			2.04			2.01		
	42	1.93			1.88			1.92			1.86			1.92			1.96		
	34	2.44			2.40			2.55			2.44			2.64			2.69		
Assistance to	50	2.24			2.21			2.25			2.35			2.22			2.65		
Agriculture	43	2.00	2.17	10	2.02	2.18	10	2.03	2.19	10	2.10	2.27	10	2.	?.18	10	2.47	2.57	7
	14	2.28			2.30			2.29			2.43			2.			2.59		
Aid to Foreign	03	1.57			1.53			1.51			1.44			1.45			1.39		
Countries	18	2.09	1.99	11	2.03	1.89	11	2.04	1.90	11	1.90	1.80	11	1.9	.82	11	1.89	1.77	11
	47	2.30			2.10			2.15			2.06			2.0,			2.05		
Space Exploration	40	1.68			1.61			1.65			1.44			1.63			1.52		
	15	1.96	1.87	12	1.94	1.79	12	1.94	1.87	12	1.79	1.65	12	1.93	1.81	12	1.82	1.70	12
	45	1.97			1.84			1.92			1.72			1.88			1.76		

*number of respondents in category

When comparing the occupation aspect to the socio-cultural aspect again the same results occur. The occupational indicator reveals a slightly more divergent socio-cultural pattern than did the two ecological aspects of rural-urban society. The major difference comes in regard to "assistance to agriculture" which again has strong occupational overtones. But other than this value, the overall value

(Table 3 about here)

hierarchy for farm owners and managers and non-farm managers appears essentially the same. A difference of means test can be used to determine significant differences between specific dimensions. For example, the difference between the mean for farm owners and the mean for managers (except farm) is significant at the .01 level. However, in most instances, the significance of such differences must be interpreted in light of the large sample size which tends to make even a slight difference significant.

It was quite interesting to the authors that the value patterns for small towns and large cities and the value patterns for farm managers and non-farm managers were essentially identical. It has been, more or less, assumed since Wirth's 1938 article that the value patterns of such different segments of American Society would be quite different. Willits and Bealer (1963) present a more recent synopsis of this position. In a word, they describe how relative isolation tends to strengthen previously held values and to enhance more conservative orientations. In light of the strong similarity of value patterns for both the rural and urban aspects of this study, one final check was made to see whether the rural segment of this study leaned toward more conservative values than the urban aspect of this study.

Table 3. Occupation value patterns: Mean Ranks for Factor Groupings and Their Component Items.

Factor	Item Identification Number	ALL OCCUPATIONS (3104)* Item Mean	Factor Mean	Factor Rank	FARM OWNERS AND MANAGERS (105) Item Mean	Factor Mean	Factor Rank	MANAGERS (except farm) (451) Item Mean	Factor Mean	Factor Rank
Law and Order	28	3.58			3.61			3.65		
	37	3.58			3.67			3.67		
	07	3.66	3.53	1	3.60	3.61	1	3.74	3.61	1
	41	3.46			3.64			3.52		
	33	3.40			3.54			3.45		
Pollution Control	24	3.43			3.04			3.40		
	48	3.63			3.36			3.61		
	35	3.22	3.45	2	2.81	3.05	2	3.15	3.40	2
	46	3.43			2.85			3.36		
	12	3.54			3.19			3.48		
Protect Nature	20	2.70			2.35			2.74		
	08	3.29	3.10	3	2.93	2.82	3	3.25	3.06	3
	29	3.24			3.03			3.20		
	38	3.16			2.98			3.06		
Public Education	02	3.04	3.04	4	2.58	2.58	7	2.93	2.93	4.5
Employment Opportunities	39	2.99			2.70			2.98		
	21	2.91			2.70			2.93		
	09	3.21	3.00	5	2.99	2.81	4	3.16	2.93	4.5
	49	2.82			2.63			2.76		
	44	3.09			3.02			2.81		
Personal Health & Security	04	3.21			2.65			2.98		
	16	3.15			2.77			2.98		
	01	3.19	2.97	6	2.73	2.52	6	2.93	2.75	6
	05	2.96			2.89			2.75		
	19	2.34			2.17			2.10		
	06	2.94			2.52			2.77		

Table 3:(continued)

Urban Problems	23	2.56			2.23			2.57		
	11	2.84	2.70	7	2.47	2.41	8	2.72	2.63	7
	27	2.73			2.53			2.59		
College Youth Concerns	36	2.56			2.36			2.40		
	32	2.78	2.36	8	2.86	2.28	10	2.61	2.23	9
	51	1.76			1.62			1.68		
National Defense	30	2.60			2.72			2.73		
	22	2.62			2.69			2.74		
	10	2.39	2.35	9	2.44	2.37	9	2.35	2.42	8
	26	2.05			2.02			2.13		
	42	1.91			1.91			2.08		
	34	2.51			2.45			2.49		
Assistance to Agriculture	50	2.26			2.78			2.03		
	43	2.04	2.21	10	2.59	2.72	5	1.87	2.00	10
	14	2.32			2.78			2.11		
Aid to Foreign Countries	03	1.51			1.41			1.52		
	18	2.02	1.90	11	1.84	1.72	11	1.97	1.89	11
	47	2.17			1.92			2.17		
Space Exploration	40	1.62			1.34			1.69		
	15	1.93	1.82	12	1.63	1.53	12	1.95	1.87	12
	45	1.89			1.61			1.98		

*Number of respondents in category

A correlation matrix was developed including the twelve value dimensions and the respondents self-classification of his political orientation (conservative, middle of the road, liberal). Two value dimensions were identified as indicating

(Table 4 about here)

more conservative overtones (table 4). These value dimensions included "national defense" and "law and order." Analysis of tabie 1 to 3 reveals that "law and order" ranks first in all value patterns irrespective of rural-urban distinction. Farm managers and owners and non-farm managers manifest the same intensity of concern with identical overall factor means of 3.61. The ecological rural-urban distinctions also manifest similar means. Looking at "national defense" one finds no consistent trend toward conservatism among the rural segment of this study. Finally, analysis of the value dimensions which manifested more liberal overtones reveal no consistent leaning toward the urban segment of the study.

Conclusion

In summary, ecological and occupational rural urban differences do not necessarily imply cultural differences. The ecological variables utilized in this analysis to differentiate various degrees of the rural-urban continuum do not of themselves indicate rural-urban socio-cultural differences as measured by public values. Likewise, the occupational categories utilized to distinguish traditional rural-urban orientations do not of themselves indicate any socio-cultural differences. Finally, analysis of the conservative-liberal overtones of the studied values reveal no identifiable rural-urban orientation.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix for Political Orientation and Value Dimensions.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Political Orientation	1												
Employment Opportunities	2	24*											
Urban Problems	3	20	64										
Personal Health & Security	4	18	44	64									
Aid to Foreign Countries	5	18	40	38	12								
Public Education	6	17	30	26	22	23							
College Youth Concerns	7	16	50	42	32	43	60						
Pollution Control	8	12	33	35	15	30	16	30					
Protect Nature	9	12	25	27	12	24	17	30	53				
Space Exploration	10	03	-02	06	-10	24	06	08	06	13			
Assistance to Agriculture	11	02	28	26	32	20	20	36	13	17	02		
National Defense	12	-19	-03	02	-00	07	-11	-01	02	04	44	13	
Law and Order	13	-20	09	07	07	-07	-06	04	19	08	04	10	40

*A minus sign between political orientation and a value dimension indicates a more conservative orientation. A plus sign indicates a more liberal orientation.

In short, analysis of the findings lead one to draw contrary conclusion to the recent study of Willits, Bealer, and Crider (1973). While they demonstrate that the rural-urban variable is still viable for differentiating socio-cultural aspects of American Society as measured by attitudes toward traditional morality, the conclusion reached in this paper supports the "Mass Society" theorists. The rural-urban variable does not seem to serve as a meaningful variable for differentiating aspects of society along socio-cultural lines as measured by public values.

The inevitable implication of such a comparison between the two studies seems to be that the results are either very dependent upon the referent or upon the sample. Either Pennsylvania youth are very different from the general populous in the State of Washington or studying attitudes presents a very different result from studying values. These divergent finds demonstrate again the need for a large scale, broad range national study of rural-urban socio-cultural differences. So much of rural sociological research and writing is premised upon the existence of cultural differences that it is imperative to explore in detail the existence of, the extent of, and the meaningfulness of socio-cultural rural-urban differences.

Footnotes

[1]The rationale for determining the break between urban and rural is open to debate. The U. S. Bureau of Census designates a population of 2,500 as the cut-off point between urban and rural. Gibbs and Davis (1966: 511) suggests that a population of 10,000 represents a more satisfactory cut-off point for international comparisons. Keyes (1958), Hauser and Schnore (1965: 10) argue for higher cut-off points. In short, little agreement exists upon the rationale for selection of the cut-off point.

[2]A comparison of vslue patterns for all occupational categories utilized by the Bureau of the Census can be found in Christenson and Dillman, 1972.

[3]Items with uniformly high loadings on the same factor were grouped as follows. Each item was included in only one factor grouping, that being the one for which its highest loading existed. Items whose highest loading was below a moderate, but arbitrary, cut-off of .40 was excluded from all the factor groupings. Only four of the 51 items did not load on at least one factor at or above the cut-off point. Most loadings tended to be rather strong, in the 60's and 70's. Virtually no cross loading existed, there being only three instances of items loading on as many as 2 factors at the .40 level or greater. The rationale for using unity as the cutting point in the factor analysis is presented in R. J. Rummel, 1970. For a listing of all component items and factor tables see Dillman and Christenson, 1972.

References

Bealer, Robert C.
1966 "A discussion of Leo F. Schnore, "The rural-urban variable: an Urbanite's Perspective;" Rural Sociology 31: 144-148.

Bealer, Robert, Fern Willits, and William Kuvlesky
1965 "The meaning of "Rurality" in American Society: Some implications of alternative definitions," Rural Sociology 30: 255-266.

Beers, Howard "Rural-urban differences: Some evidence from public opinion
1953 polls," Rural Sociology 18: 1-11.

Catton, William R.
1966 From Animistic to Naturalistic Sociology. New York, McGraw Hill.

Christenson, James A., and Don A. Dillman
1972 "Value orientations of occupational groups toward areas of governmental activities," Scientific paper No. 3941, Agriculture Research Center, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Dewey, Richard
1960 "The urban-rural continuum: Real but relatively unimportant," American Journal of Sociology, 66: 60-66.

Dillman, Don A. and James A. Christenson
1972 "The public value for pollution control," in W. A. Burch, N. Cheek, and L. Taylor (eds.) Social Behavior, Natural Resources, and the Environment. New York: Harper and Row.

1973 "Towards an assessment of public values," Public Opinion Quarterly (forthcoming).

Gibbs, Jack P., and Kingsley Davis
1958 "Conventional versus metropolitan data in the international study of urbanization," American Sociological Review 23: 504-514.

Hauser, Philip M., and Leo F. Schnore
1965 The Study of Urbanization. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Keyes, Fenton
1958 "The Correlation of Social Phenomena with Community Size," Social Forces, 36: 311-15.

Kluckhohn, Clyde
1951 "Value and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification," In T. Parsons and E. Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nye, F. Ivan
1967 "Values, family, and a changing society," Journal of Marriage and the Family 27: 241-248.

Parsons, Talcott
1937 The Structure of Social Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rummel, R. J.
1970 Applied Factor Analysis, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Schmid, Calvin F., and Stanton E. Schmid
1969 Growth of Cities and Towns: State of Washington, Olympia: Washington State Planning and Community Affairs Agency.

Schnore, Leo F.
1966 "The rural-urban variable: an urbanite's perspective," Rural Sociology 31: 131-143.

Siegel, Sidney
1956 Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, Lee and Arthur Jones
1964 Rural Life and Urbanized Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census
1967 Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1967 (88th edition), Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Williams, Robin M.
1969 "Individual and group values," In B. Gross (ed.), Social Intelligence for America's Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Willits, Fern K., and Robert C. Bealer
1963 "The utility of residence for differentiating social conservatism in rural youth." Rural Sociology 28 (March): 70-80.

Willits, Fern K., Robert C. Bealer, and Donald M. Crider
1973 "Leveling of attitudes in mass society: rurality and traditional morality in america," Rural Sociology 38 (Spring): 36-45.

Wirth, Lewis
1938 "Urbanism as a way of life," American Journal of Sociology 44: 8-20.