



Leaders views about community development in south central Montana  
by Ellis Edwin Williams

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE in Agricultural Education  
Montana State University  
© Copyright by Ellis Edwin Williams (1970)

Abstract:

This study is intended to contribute to a clearer understanding of community development activities and related Cooperative Extension assistance in a seven county South Central Montana- area. Specific objectives were to determine how selected community leaders viewed community development and community development activities, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service in contributing to community development efforts.

The methodology for designing the study was to identify community leadership in the study area. Reputation for leadership, as defined by community informants, was the method employed. One hundred and two leaders were selected as the study population. Respondents were interviewed by interviewers using a forced answer questionnaire. Data was tabulated and presented by response frequencies and percentages. Data were then correlated to obtain significant relationships between study variables. It was found that attitudes of leaders about community development are important variables when attempting to measure- the- effectiveness of any community development program.

Seventy-seven point five -percent of the identified leaders were aware of existing development organizations, and of these, 76.5 percent had been or were members of such organizations. Leaders felt generally that their development organizations had accomplished some important-things; however, they generally did not feel they were ideally organized for community development. Leaders generally agreed that everyone benefits from programs of community development, and that one of the keys to successful development is to pay close attention to the wishes and opinions of people- affected by community development .

Involving and informing people were major problems of community development; however, leaders generally agreed that people in their communities do care enough to do something about problems- that need solving. Leaders felt that they, the community, carry out most community development-activities, and not people who were paid to carry-out community development. The Extension Service has supported organized community development, been cooperative, and quite, effective. However, as leaders' education, occupation, and income levels tended to increase, their evaluation of Extension's effectiveness tended to decrease.

Most leaders favored a multi-county approach to, community development, both to attempt problem solving, to problems that, cross county - boundaries, and to supplement local development efforts.

The majority of leaders favored some outside assistance with problem solving, and the more they favored multi-county development, the more they tended to desire outside assistance.

Urban and rural people did not tend to understand each others' problems to the extent desirable for them to cooperatively work together on community development.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Olis Edwin Williams

Date June 25, 1970

LEADERS' VIEWS ABOUT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT,

IN SOUTH CENTRAL MONTANA

by

ELLIS EDWIN WILLIAMS

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Education

Approved:

Mat S. Anderson  
Head, Major Department

Mat S. Anderson  
Chairman, Examining Committee

J. Goering  
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1970

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to those persons whose assistance has contributed to this study:

To his major advisor, Dr. Max L. Amberson, for his continuing interest and assistance in the conduct and writing of this study.

To Dr. William R. Lassey, Dr. M. E. Quenemoen, and Mr. Burl Winchester for their time spent serving on the writer's graduate committee.

To personnel from the Center for Planning and Development, and the Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State University, for providing assistance in data collection.

To Dr. Erwin P. Smith for his patient assistance in programming data for the Sigma 7 Computer.

To the Montana Cooperative Extension Service for valuable counsel and assistance throughout the study.

To the identified community leaders in the study area who so willingly provided the information for the study.

To his wife, Shirley, daughter, Kay, and son, Kent, for their encouragement and patience that enabled the writer to achieve the established goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VITA . . . . . ii  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . . iii  
LIST OF TABLES . . . . . iv  
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . . xi  
ABSTRACT . . . . . xii

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING . . . . . 1  
    Introduction  
    Definition of Terms  
    Review of Literature and Rationale for the Study  
    Major Objective of the Study  
    Specific Objectives  
    Limitations of the Study  
II. DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY . . . . . 11  
    Regional Project W-105  
    Leader Identification  
    Instrument Development  
    Data Collection  
    Analysis of Data  
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . . 19  
    Background Information of Respondents  
    Community Development and Community Development  
        Activities at the Local Level  
    Community Development and Community Development  
        Efforts at the Multi-County Level  
    Cooperative Extension Service, Governmental  
        Agencies, and Community Development  
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . . 87  
    Selection and Use of a Statistical Model  
    Analysis of Study Data

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

Chapter

V. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND  
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY . . . . . 130

    Major Conclusions  
    Implications  
    Recommendations  
    Recommendations for Further Studies

APPENDIX A - LEADER INSTRUMENTS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION . . . 146

APPENDIX B - VALIDATION RESULTS . . . . . 186

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 197

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ranges of Total Family Income of Respondents Before axes (1968) . . . . .	20
2. Age in Years of Respondents . . . . .	21
3. Respondents' Length of Residency in Their Community . .	22
4. Respondents' Feeling of Permanency in Their Local Community . . . . .	23
5. Formal Educational Achievement of Respondents . . . .	24
6. Occupational Level of Respondents . . . . .	26
7. Number of Community Organizations to Which Respondents Belonged . . . . .	28
8. Number of Elective Offices Held by Respondents . . . .	29
9. Number of Monthly Community Improvement Meetings Attended by Respondents . . . . .	30
10. Is There a Community Development Organization in Respondents' County . . . . .	32
11. Number of Respondents Who Are Members of County-side Development Organizations . . . . .	33
12. Degree of Activeness of Respondents' in Development Organizations . . . . .	35
13. Length of Time Respondents Have Been Active in Their Community Development Organization . . . . .	36
14. Respondents' Rating of Community Development Organization Effectiveness . . . . .	37
15. The One Local Group Respondents Felt to be the Most Influential in Promoting the Development and Improvement of the Community . . . . .	39

## LIST OF TABLES - continued

Table	Page
16. Feelings of Respondents That Their Community is Well Organized for Community Development . . . . .	40
17. Respondents' Reaction About Their Local Community Development Organization Doing Some Important Things for Their Community . . . . .	41
18. Respondents' Reaction to Many Community Organizations Working Individually on Community Improvement, Rather Than Through One Central Organization . . . . .	43
19. Attitudes of Respondents About Getting People Involved and Informed of Community Development Efforts . . . . .	45
20. Respondents' Reaction to the Statement: - It Is Worthwhile and Necessary to Attempt Some Development Efforts, Even Though It Isn't Certain They Will Be Successful . . . . .	46
21. For the Most Part, Only a Few People Are Affected by Community Development Programs: Response to Statement . . . . .	48
22. Do Respondents Feel That Everybody in Their Community Can Benefit From Programs of Community Development . . . . .	49
23. A Key to Successful Development is to Pay Careful Attention to the Wishes and Opinions of the People Who Will be Effected: Reaction to Statement . . . . .	50
24. Respondents' Reaction to Statement That People of Their Community Are Usually Quick to Respond When Problems Arise Requiring Action . . . . .	51
25. Response to the Statement: "People in This Community Don't Care Enough About This Community to do Something About Problems That Need to be Solved . . . . .	53

## LIST OF TABLES - continued

Table	Page
26. Respondents' Reaction to Statement That Most Community Development Activities Are Carried on by People Who Are Paid to do Just That . . . . .	55
27. Respondents' Reaction to the Statement That Local People Should Assume Full Responsibility For Solving Community Problems, Without Assistance From Outsiders . . . . .	56
28. How Respondents Felt Toward Joining With Neighboring Counties and Communities to Plan Organized Development . . . . .	58
29. Respondents' Feelings About the Need for a Multi-County Development Organization to Deal With Problems That Cross County Boundaries . . . . .	59
30. Reaction to the Statement That There is a Need For Multi-County Efforts To Supplement Local Community Development Efforts . . . . .	61
31. Respondents' Awareness of the South Central Montana Development Federation . . . . .	63
32. Respondents' Reaction to Whether Area Problems Will Be Solved, Stay the Same, or get Worse In The Next Few Years . . . . .	64
33. Do Respondents' Feel That By Exchanging Ideas, Successes, Problems, One County Learns From Another How to Get Things Accomplished . . . . .	65
34. Do Respondents Feel That More Than One County Often Have to Be Heard From On Important Issues, Because Many Decisions Are Made on a Political Basis . . . . .	66
35. Do Respondents See Advantages to Their County In Supporting the Developments of a Proposed Industry In a Neighboring County . . . . .	68

## LIST OF TABLES - continued

Table	Page
36. Do Respondents Feel That Rural People Understood the Problems of the Towns and Cities in Their Area . . .	69
37. Do Respondents Feel That the Town and City People Understand the Problems of the Rural People in Their Area . . . . .	70
38. Do Respondents Feel That Developments That Help the Surrounding Small Towns and Rural Areas Have a Positive Effect on Billings . . . . .	72
39. Do Respondents Feel That Developments That Help Billings Have a Positive Effect on the Surrounding Small Towns and Rural Areas . . . . .	73
40. Do Respondents Feel That the Cooperative Extension Service Has Been Effective in Helping to Make the Area a Better Place to Live . . . . .	75
41. Respondents' Response to Had the Cooperative Extension Service Assisted With Organized Development Efforts in Their Community . . . . .	76
42. Respondents' Rating of Cooperative Extension Service Assistance to Organized Community Development . . .	78
43. Respondents' Response to Whether Extension Cooperated With or Tended to Dominate Community Development Efforts . . . . .	79
44. Respondents' Reaction to: Whenever Local Groups Try to Cooperate With Federal Agencies on Development Programs, the Federal Agency Usually Winds up Dominating the Situation . . . . .	80
45. Do Respondents Feel That Federal Agencies Are Largely Ineffective in Dealing With the Problems of Their Community . . . . .	81

LIST OF TABLES - continued

Table	Page
46. Do Respondents Feel That State Agencies Are Largely Ineffective in Dealing With the Problems of Their Community . . . . .	83
47. Do Respondents Feel That Community Needs Should Be Met By Government Agencies . . . . .	84
48. Relationships Existing Between the Forty-eight Study Variables . . . . .	92

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Number of Community Development Theory Factors Respondents Feel Necessary For Community Development to Take Place . . . . .	85

## ABSTRACT

This study is intended to contribute to a clearer understanding of community development activities and related Cooperative Extension assistance in a seven-county South Central Montana area. Specific objectives were to determine how selected community leaders viewed community development and community development activities, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service in contributing to community development efforts.

The methodology for designing the study was to identify community leadership in the study area. Reputation for leadership, as defined by community informants, was the method employed. One hundred and two leaders were selected as the study population. Respondents were interviewed by interviewers using a forced answer questionnaire. Data was tabulated and presented by response frequencies and percentages. Data were then correlated to obtain significant relationships between study variables.

It was found that attitudes of leaders about community development are important variables when attempting to measure the effectiveness of any community development program.

Seventy-seven point five percent of the identified leaders were aware of existing development organizations, and of these, 76.5 percent had been or were members of such organizations. Leaders felt generally that their development organizations had accomplished some important things; however, they generally did not feel they were ideally organized for community development.

Leaders generally agreed that everyone benefits from programs of community development, and that one of the keys to successful development is to pay close attention to the wishes and opinions of people affected by community development.

Involving and informing people were major problems of community development; however, leaders generally agreed that people in their communities do care enough to do something about problems that need solving.

Leaders felt that they, the community, carry out most community development activities, and not people who were paid to carry out community development.

The Extension Service has supported organized community development, been cooperative, and quite effective. However, as leaders' education, occupation, and income levels tended to increase, their evaluation of Extension's effectiveness tended to decrease.

Most leaders favored a multi-county approach to community development, both to attempt problem solving to problems that cross county boundaries, and to supplement local development efforts.

The majority of leaders favored some outside assistance with problem solving, and the more they favored multi-county development, the more they tended to desire outside assistance.

Urban and rural people did not tend to understand each others' problems to the extent desirable for them to cooperatively work together on community development.

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

#### Introduction

"Among all the forms of government, democracy appears to offer the best opportunity to each citizen to satisfy most adequately some of his strongest drives."<sup>1</sup> For a democracy to function effectively, however, certain conditions must be fulfilled. Citizens must have the necessary machinery, or structure, at the local or area level to carry out democratic processes. This study was undertaken to evaluate how identified community leaders view community development, and the community development concept.

"A People and a Spirit," a report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension, recommends that the work in community and resource development by the Cooperative Extension be expanded nearly three times that of the present level by 1975.<sup>2</sup>

In 1966 a Community Development Specialist for the Montana Cooperative Extension Service was assigned to the task of facilitating and accelerating community development activities in an eight county South Central Montana area.

---

<sup>1</sup>Rensis Likert, Democracy in Agriculture-Why and How?, The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1940, United States Printing Office, p. 996.

<sup>2</sup>Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension, A People and a Spirit, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, November, 1968, p. 55.

This was the first, and has been the only, area extension assignment of its kind in Montana. By 1970 seven of the eight counties were formally organized for community development. In addition, a multi-county development organization exists in the area and is known as the South Central Montana Development Federation.

#### Definition of Terms

Eight County Area - Refers to the geographic area surrounding Billings, Montana, including Yellowstone, Big Horn, Musselshell, Golden Valley, Wheatland, Sweet Grass, Stillwater, and Carbon Counties.

Study Area, Seven County Area - Refers to the seven counties in the eight county area that are included in the study and that comprise the South Central Montana Development Federation.

South Central Montana Development Federation - The multi-county development organization comprising all counties in the study area.

EDA-District, Economic Development Administration District - An area of high unemployment designated by the Federal Government for special economic development assistance. Big Horn County is included in an EDA District and excluded from the study because it is not a member of the South Central Montana Development Federation.

Identified Leaders - Community leaders identified in the study and who comprise the population for the study.

Cooperative Extension Service, Cooperative Extension, Extension, or CES - Refers to the Cooperative Extension Service, the off campus

educational arm of Montana State University. Specific Extension personnel involved in the study area will be the County Extension Agents in the seven counties, and the area Community Development Specialist.

Community Resource Development, or Community Development - The democratic process whereby a community, or area, defines problems and needs, initiates action, and carries out action to bring about desired change.

Citizens or Participating Citizens - Those local community citizens who have actively participated in community development efforts.

Executive Council - The elected (usually nine) and appointed (usually six) men and women who serve as the executive committee of the county-wide community development organization.

Respondents, Leaders - Those identified community leaders whose response to questions relative to the study are categorized throughout the study.

Study Variables - Those forty-eight responses selected from the survey questionnaire to analyze the data which seemed to lend itself to the study objectives.

#### Review of Literature and Rationale for the Study

"Consultations in Community Planning and Development" (funded through the Federal Higher Education Act) was cooperatively initiated by Montana State University and the University of Montana in 1968. The consultations program was designed specifically to work with selected

areas in discovering how to deal effectively with change.<sup>3</sup> Lassey and Johnson evaluated this program during the second year of activity by interviewing those individuals with some record of participation in the program. Open-ended questions were used, and forty leaders in four counties were interviewed. The findings revealed that (1) the program had made considerable progress during the first year, (2) very few action projects had been completed, and (3) substantial learning had taken place, both for community leaders and university staff members.<sup>4</sup> The results of their study further indicated that "a broader public understanding of the planning process, and its role in development were necessary if local people were to have sufficient patience for the process to work effectively."<sup>5</sup>

In two of four counties included in their study, local leaders expected a great deal more initiative from the outside consultants than leaders expected in the other two counties.<sup>6</sup> Lassey and Johnson as a result of their study made specific recommendations to assist community development efforts in those counties.

---

<sup>3</sup>Wm. Lassey and Hans Johnson, "Balancing Community Development Theory and Practice," (paper presented at the Community Development Seminar, Cut Bank, Montana, September, 1969), p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

Moe, in discussing problems of development, states that "the basic problem in development arises out of a kind of institutional underdevelopment or the lack of social machinery people have available through which to attack the problems which currently confront them."<sup>7</sup> This would imply that community development organizations might form part of the needed social machinery through which community problem solving could be attacked. The organizational approach to community development in the study area or the problem solving machinery should be examined.

Research to provide information for traditional Extension programs in the physical and biological sciences has been effectively carried out in controlled laboratories, plots, and pens - - entirely separate from Extension workers, their audience, and programs.<sup>8</sup> This kind of control and research setting seems impractical, however, for sociological research as it pertains to community development. Henderson and Bond point out, however, that new knowledge can be gained from soliciting responses from identified community leaders as to their feeling about community development. The concept of evaluation of community development is little different in purpose or need from any

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward O. Moe, A Sociological Approach to Development, Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development, (North Carolina State University: Agricultural Policy Institute), Raleigh, North Carolina, API Series 39, p. 115.

<sup>8</sup> H. A. Henderson and B. J. Bond, "Evaluating Development Programs," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Extension Journal, Inc., Volume IV, No. 4, (Winter, 1966), p. 236.

educational or action program. However, evaluation of existing programs is the primary source of knowledge in community development.<sup>9</sup>

Cooperative Extension has a legitimate role in helping people solve problems, wherever they may live.<sup>10</sup> Expanded resources will be required if Extension is to fully meet public needs in community resource development.

In studying multi-county development areas in Montana, Lassey, Williams, and Huffman stated that the seven county area in South Central Montana, toward which this particular study is directed, has most of the characteristics of a visable area. They state that (1) there is a lack of involvement of Billings citizens and leaders, and (2) that the major citizen impetus seemed to come from rural or small-town people. They concluded that it is questionable whether an area organizational approach can be successful without full involvement of Billings leadership on one hand; and yet, domination by Billings might be equally inappropriate. They leave this as an issue that needs careful consideration.<sup>11</sup> Their study stated that several projects are being developed which are general and of area wide interest. Thus far,

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 233.

<sup>10</sup>A People and a Spirit, op. cit., p. 53.

<sup>11</sup>Wm. Lassey, Anne Williams, and Howard Huffman, Multi-County Development Areas in Montana, Department of Sociology, Center for Planning and Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, July, 1969, p. 154-155.

however, most activity has been on a local county basis. They further report that no formal evaluation attempts have been made and the actual detailed planning and action processes used to accomplish goals have had little existing documentation.<sup>12</sup>

DeBree's study of "Community Development Efforts in All of Montana," discussed the area extension specialist and the eight county area in South Central Montana.<sup>13</sup> His study relates historically to Cooperative Extension's involvement in community development efforts from 1966 to 1969 in the area. However, his report is of Extension's involvement, as viewed by Extension itself, and does not relate to how community leaders in the area view the program's effectiveness. DeBree concluded that "there has been considerable progress in Montana in the way people relate to the developments of their state. There has been continuity and progress in the educational programs of the Extension Service which have contributed to the public affairs and community development efforts."<sup>14</sup>

The President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty recommended that to fight rural poverty community development councils

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>13</sup> James O. DeBree, Community Development Efforts in Montana, Cooperative Extension Service, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, August, 1969, p. 22-24.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 28

broadly representative of all interests in the area be formed.<sup>15</sup> In Montana, this would mean giving educational and organizational assistance to many communities not presently organized in this manner. This report further suggested that Cooperative Extension restructure local Cooperative Extension Service programs on an area development basis.<sup>16</sup> Before considering such restructuring in Montana, it would seem desirable to first study the only area currently structured in this manner.

Lassey, Williams, and Huffman in their multi-county study stated "Cooperative Extension and other University specialists are providing guidance in social action and community development processes. No formal attempt has been made to evaluate the effectiveness of community development activities, and little documentation exists related to the detailed planning and action processes actually used to accomplish goals."<sup>17</sup> One can conclude from their study that a general need does exist for research to determine the relative effectiveness of community development activities now underway in Montana. Specifically, there is a need for evaluation of the approach in the seven county area. Evaluation is needed to provide implications for Cooperative Extension to

---

<sup>15</sup>Report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind, (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., September, 1967), p. 127.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 129.

<sup>17</sup>Wm. Lassey, Anne Williams and Howard Huffman, op. cit., p. 42.

better serve community development efforts in the area. This study will provide data for program determination if and when Cooperative Extension places increased emphasis on community development in other Montana areas.

#### Major Objective of the Study

This study is intended to contribute to a clearer understanding of community development activities and related Cooperative Extension assistance in a seven county South Central Montana area.

#### Specific Objectives

1. To determine how selected community leaders view community development and community development activities.
2. To evaluate the effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service in contributing to community development efforts.

#### Limitations of the Study

There are certain limitations which are inherent when conducting a study of this type and which affect the study to some degree. The following factors are considered limitations of the study.

1. It is recognized that voluntary community development organizations have relatively intangible major goals, and to measure goal attainment of such organizations is difficult.<sup>18</sup> It is believed:

---

<sup>18</sup> Keith W. Warner, "Problems in Measuring the Goal Attainment of Voluntary Organizations," Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development, Agricultural Policy Institute, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, API Series 39, p. 301.

a. that leaders in the Billings area have had sufficient involvement in community development to have feelings that can be identified.

b. that citizens will respond to questions about their community, their community needs, and community experiences.

2. It is recognized that this study measures leaders feelings at one point in time only and does not give a basis for measuring change in people's feelings over time.

3. It is recognized that the study results are limited to the feelings of identified community leaders, and does not give responses of all citizens, or cross representation thereof.

4. It is recognized that the public stereotype of Extension is quite traditional and that identified community leaders may not visualize an extensive role on the part of Extension in community resource development.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup>Vernon W. Larsen, "Social Psychology and Community Development," Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development, Agricultural Policy Institute, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, API Series 39, p. 138.

## CHAPTER II

### DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

#### Regional Project W-105

The methodology for designing this study was closely related to that of Regional Project W-105, Phase II, funded by the Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.<sup>1</sup> Methodology was also influenced by the Cooperative Extension Service, employing institution of the researcher, and the Department of Agricultural Education at Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

Phase I of the Ten State Regional Project W-105 examined the variety of multi-county and special development organizations in Montana.<sup>2</sup> As a result of this study the eight county area in South Central Montana, and specifically the seven counties in the area comprising the South Central Montana Development Federation, was selected for the Phase II segment of the ten-state study.<sup>3</sup>

Phase II of the Regional Project, as funded, contemplated interviews of approximately 100 leaders in the study area. The interview

---

<sup>1</sup> RESEARCH PROJECT STATEMENT, Regional Project W-105, Phase II, Project Title: Criteria for Defining Rural Development Areas, filed in office of Center for Planning and Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, December, 1969.

<sup>2</sup> Wm. Lassey, Anne Williams, and Howard Huffman, op. cit., p. 1-4.

<sup>3</sup> RESEARCH PROJECT STATEMENT, op. cit.

contents generally defined by the regional technical committee involved questions relating to the characteristics of the community leaders and their viewpoints toward area development. The regional study is particularly concerned with definitions of understanding of multi-county development concept, and suggestions for procedure in an area development approach.<sup>4</sup>

The method of determining the population sample was dictated by the Regional Project; however, much latitude was granted in interview question formulation to allow the researcher to develop questions that would correspond with the objectives of this study.

#### Leader Identification

Approximately 100 leaders in the study area were the proposed population for the study. Therefore, the first phase of the study was determining the community leadership.

Freeman, et al, when discussing the location of decision makers at the community level, state that "Polsby has translated the comments of the critics into a set of operational guides for research. He (Polsby) has suggested that a satisfactory study of community leadership must

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

involve a detailed examination of the whole decision-making process as it is exhibited over a range of issues."<sup>5</sup>

This approach would necessitate specifying each issue, all persons involved, all persons' intentions, and the extent and nature of all persons' influence, if any. This approach represents an ideal that might be used as a tool to think about the process of community leadership. However, as a research strategy this approach raises many problems for empirical application entailing elaborate observational procedures of behavior and cost.<sup>6</sup>

Freeman suggests that most authors of community leadership studies have been willing to make basic assumptions in order to achieve a workable research design to determine community leadership. Common basic assumptions are as follows:

- (1) Active participation in decision making is leadership.
- (2) Formal authority is leadership.
- (3) Leadership is a necessary consequence of social activity.
- (4) Reputation for leadership is superior to examining leadership as such, because of the complexities of leadership.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Linton C. Freeman, Thomas J. Fararo, et al, "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some-Alternative Approaches," The Search for Community Power, edited by Willis D. Hawley and Frederick M. Wirt, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, p. 190.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 190.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 190-191.

The reasoning of the proponents of research design built around assumption (4) suggests that all of the more direct approaches neglect one or another key dimension of the leadership process. They turn to informants from within the community itself. Steps are taken to insure that informants are indeed informed. For example, positional leaders are questioned to develop a list of reputed leaders or influentials; then the reported influentials are polled to determine top leaders. In such cases it is reasonable to suppose the grossly uninformed do not get included.<sup>8</sup>

Powers lists steps in determining community leaders by the reputational technique. First, knowledgeable must be selected, then interviewed, and interviews summarized, or tallied.<sup>9</sup>

Issue areas are selected that are related to current concerns within the community.<sup>10</sup> Normally these are agriculture, education, industrial development, and general community affairs. In every case the researcher seeks information about those persons who are perceived to have power in the general affairs of the community. Knowledgeables (informants) usually include bankers, editors, extension workers,

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 191.

<sup>9</sup> Ronald C. Powers, Identifying the Community Power Structure, North Central Regional Extension Publication No. 19, NCRS-5 Leadership Series No. 2, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, November, 1965, p. 8-10.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

secretaries of chambers of commerce or similar organizations, local government officials and the like.<sup>11</sup>

Knowledgeables are interviewed by formulating questions to determine the reputed leaders of the community.<sup>12</sup> After they have been interviewed, the names of the reputed power actors for each issue area are tallied. Depending on the number of knowledgeable interviewed, the names of those showing at least twice and preferably three or more times, are considered power actors (or leaders) in the community.

Reliability of this method can be checked by interviewing the top leadership named by knowledgeable with the same questions used to determine reputed leaders. If persons named by the leaders closely duplicate the list already tallied, Powers says you can assume the identified leaders list to be quite accurate.<sup>13</sup>

#### Instrument Development

The interview instrument (Schedule C - Appendix A) was designed around the central purpose and the nature of the specific objectives outlined in Chapter I. The specific nature of Regional Project W-105, Phase II, discussed previously in this chapter, influenced the design of the instrument to accomplish data collection for this study.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

The interview instrument (Schedule C - Appendix A) was pre-tested with three county agents and four citizens in the study area and with two fellow graduate students. It was also reviewed by personnel of the Center for Planning and Development, Montana State University. While pre-testing the instrument, the interview process was timed to determine projected interview length, and whether instrument length adjustments would be necessary. Forty-five to sixty minutes appeared to be the range of interview time required. It was determined that this length would not be prohibitive.

#### Data Collection

Data was collected by the use of the interview instrument (Schedule C, Appendix A). The instrument was completed by interviewers who interviewed community leaders selected for the study population.

Seven interviewers were hired and trained. All interviewers resided in the study area; however, they did not interview respondents in their immediate area with whom they were acquainted. Two days were spent training the seven interviewers in the art of asking questions, probing, editing, and interview completion. Toward the end of the training, practice sessions were arranged with strangers who were non-study respondents. Evaluation of training and trainee's progress was a necessary part of the training. The Center for Planning and Development took major responsibility for the training.

Training was completed on February 13, 1970, and interviewers began obtaining interviews on February 16, 1970. All interviewers were checked at the end of their first or second completed interview by the supervisor of field work. All were given evaluation and suggestions before completing their assignments at this time. All interviews were obtained by the end of the first week except in one county, where they were completed the following week.

The field supervisor attempted to contact approximately 33% of all respondents with a follow-up short interview (Schedule D - Appendix A) either in person or by telephone to validate the original interview. Those selected for the follow-up interview were randomly chosen from those interviews completed by the interviewers. Validation was completed on some completed interviews as soon as possible following completion to insure interviewer competence.

Analysis of study procedure is shown in table form in Appendix B.

#### Analysis of Data

To increase the speed with which statistical calculations could be made, the interview schedules (Schedules C and D, Appendix A) were coded in Fortran for the Sigma 7 Computer. All data were coded and placed on code sheets; then data cards were punched directly from the code sheets.

The program used provided frequency distribution of data and percent of each, means of data, and standard deviations of means. First,

analysis was made of this data, and table analysis completed to provide a basis for selecting further tests to check for correlations and determine significance of correlations.













































































































































































































































































































































































