



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."¹ 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 1975.²

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.

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

²Report 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.³ 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.⁴ 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."⁵

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.⁶ Lassey and Johnson as a result of their study made specific recommendations to assist community development efforts in those counties.

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

⁴Ibid., p. 29.

⁵Ibid., p. 24.

⁶Ibid., 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."⁷ 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.⁸ 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

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.⁹

Cooperative Extension has a legitimate role in helping people solve problems, wherever they may live.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ Their study stated that several projects are being developed which are general and of area wide interest. Thus far,

⁹Ibid., p. 233.

¹⁰A People and a Spirit, op. cit., p. 53.

¹¹Wm. 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.¹²

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.¹³ 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."¹⁴

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

¹² Ibid., p. 42.

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

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 28

broadly representative of all interests in the area be formed.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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."¹⁷ 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

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

¹⁶Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁷Wm. 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.¹⁸ It is believed:

¹⁸ 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.¹⁹

¹⁹Vernon 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.¹ 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.² 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.³

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

¹ 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.

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

³ 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.⁴

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

⁴Ibid., p. 1.

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

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.⁶

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.⁷

⁵Linton 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.

⁶Ibid., p. 190.

⁷Ibid., 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.⁸

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

Issue areas are selected that are related to current concerns within the community.¹⁰ 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,

⁸ Ibid., p. 191.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

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

Knowledgeables are interviewed by formulating questions to determine the reputed leaders of the community.¹² 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.¹³

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.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹² Ibid., p. 9.

¹³ 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.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

To facilitate presentation, data were divided into the following four major categories: (1) background information of respondents, (2) how respondents view community development and community development activities at the local level, (3) how respondents view community development and community development at the multi-county level, and (4) how respondents view Cooperative Extension Service assistance in community development.

Background Information of Respondents

The data collected provided essential background material about respondents. The population sampled was leaders, and the background information gave characteristics of this group. Thus the data allowed a comparison between leaders in each county, and the total for all leaders interviewed in the study area.

Table 1 summarizes the 1968 total family income of respondents before taxes. It points out that respondents' family income was the largest in Yellowstone County followed by Wheatland and Golden Valley Counties. Carbon and Sweet Grass County leaders had the lowest family income; however, three leaders did not respond to the income question in Sweet Grass County. Average income of all respondents was within the \$11,000-\$12,999 range.

TABLE 1

RANGES OF TOTAL FAMILY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BEFORE TAXES (1968)

N=102

		4		5		6		7		8		9		Mean category response
		\$5000 - \$6999		\$7000 - \$8999		\$9000 - \$10,999		\$11,000 - \$12,999		\$13,000 - \$14,999		\$15,000 and over		
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	3	25.0	4	33.4	1	8.3	1	8.3	3	25.0	6.75
Golden Valley	8	--	--	2	25.0	--	--	1	12.5	1	12.5	4	50.0	7.62
Musselshell	11	--	--	2	18.2	2	18.2	2	18.2	2	18.2	3	27.2	7.18
Stillwater	11	2	18.2	2	18.2	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--	5	45.4	6.91
Sweet Grass	8	--	--	1	12.5	4	50.0	1	12.5	--	--	2	25.0	6.75
Wheatland	9	--	--	1	11.1	1	11.1	1	11.1	2	22.2	4	44.5	7.78
Yellowstone	39	1	2.6	2	5.1	7	17.9	2	5.1	3	7.7	24	61.6	7.95
Total Response	98	3	3.1	13	13.2	19	19.4	9	9.2	9	9.2	45	45.9	7.46
No Response	4													
Total	102													

Of interest is the age of identified county leaders who are the respondents for this study. Table 2 points out that leaders are older

TABLE 2
AGE IN YEARS OF RESPONDENTS

N=102

County	N	26-35		36-45		46-55		56-65		Over 66		Mean category response
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	2	16.6	5	41.2	5	41.2	--	--	4.25
Golden Valley	8	--	--	1	12.5	4	50.0	2	25.0	1	12.5	4.37
Musselshell	11	1	9.1	3	27.3	6	54.5	--	--	1	9.1	3.73
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	6	50.0	3	25.0	2	16.7	--	--	3.50
Sweet Grass	11	2	18.2	4	36.3	2	18.2	3	27.3	--	--	3.54
Wheatland	9	--	--	2	22.2	2	22.2	3	33.4	2	22.2	4.55
Yellowstone	39	3	7.7	12	30.8	9	23.1	10	25.6	5	12.8	4.05
Totals	102	7	6.9	29	28.4	31	30.4	26	25.5	9	8.8	4.00

in Wheatland County, with the average age falling between forty-six and fifty-five. Leaders are younger in Stillwater, Sweet Grass, and Musselshell Counties. In these counties the respondents' average ages

fall within the thirty-six to forty-five years-of-age category. The average age for all respondents in the study falls within the middle of the forty-six through fifty-five years-of-age range.

How long have the people identified as leaders lived in a community before being identified as a leader? Table 3 indicates that,

TABLE 3

RESPONDENTS' LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN THEIR COMMUNITY

N=102

County	N.	3		4		5		6		7		Mean category response
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	3	25.0	5	41.7	2	16.7	5.50
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	25.0	6	75.0	6.75
Musselshell	11	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	5	45.4	4	36.4	6.18
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.8	4	33.3	4	33.3	5.75
Sweet Grass	11	2	18.2	--	--	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.2	5.36
Wheatland	9	--	--	--	--	1	11.2	4	44.4	4	44.4	6.33
Yellowstone	39	4	10.3	4	10.3	5	12.8	13	33.3	13	33.3	5.69
Totals	102	8	7.8	6	5.9	17	16.7	35	34.3	36	35.3	5.84

of all respondents, the average length of residency in their community is in the upper end of the ten through twenty year range. Leaders have lived longest in their community in Golden Valley County, followed by leaders in Whetland County. Length of residency is shortest in Sweet Grass County followed by leaders in Carbon County.

Respondents were asked if they would move from their communities. Table 4 shows that in three counties (Golden Valley, Musselshell, and

TABLE 4

RESPONDENTS' FEELING OF PERMANENCY IN THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY

N=102

County	N.	Would move		Uncertain		Permanent	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	1	8.3	--	--	11	91.7
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	8	100.0
Musselshell	11	--	--	--	--	11	100.0
Stillwater	12	--	--	1	8.3	11	91.7
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	1	9.1	10	90.0
Wheatland	9	--	--	--	--	9	100.0
Yellowstone	38	1	2.6	6	15.4	31	79.5
Totals	101	2	2.0	8	7.8	91	89.2
No. res.	1						
Total	102						

Wheatland), none of the respondents would move. They were all permanent members of their communities. In Carbon County 8.3 percent of the respondents would move followed by Yellowstone County with 2.0 percent. Of Yellowstone County respondents, 79.5 percent felt they were permanent members of their community. However, of the total respondents only two indicated they definitely would move and eight were uncertain.

Leadership is commonly suggested as being related to formal educational achievement. When leaders were checked as to their educational level, it was evident that leadership and educational achievement are related. Table 5 presents this information. This table points out that the average respondent had some education beyond high school. Of all respondents 17.6 percent have had some college, 24.5 percent had completed college and 19.6 percent had post college graduate education. The highest educational achievement level of respondents is noted in Wheatland County, followed by Carbon and Yellowstone Counties. In Wheatland County 44.4 percent of respondents have had college post-graduate experience compared to no leaders in Golden Valley and Stillwater Counties.

What are the occupations of community leaders? Do they tend to fall at the professional-technical end, or at the unskilled-service end of the continuum? Table 6 demonstrates that 19.7 percent of the respondents had professional or technical occupations and 69.6 percent

TABLE 5

FORMAL EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF RESPONDENTS

N=102

		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		
		Less than elem		Elem completed		Some high school		Completed high school		Some College		Completed College		Post Grad		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	16.7	4	33.3	5	41.7	1	8.3	5.417
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	1	12.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	2	25.0	--	--	4.750
Musselshell	11	--	--	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.4	--	--	2	18.2	2	18.2	4.545
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	41.7	3	25.0	4	33.3	--	--	4.917
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	4.909
Wheatland	9	--	--	1	11.2	--	--	2	22.2	--	--	2	22.2	4	44.4	5.556
Yellowstone	39	2	5.1	2	5.1	2	5.1	8	20.6	6	15.4	9	23.1	10	25.6	5.077
Total	102	2	2.0	5	4.9	6	5.9	26	25.5	18	17.6	25	24.5	20	19.6	5.029

were managers or proprietors. Three respondents reported being clerical or sales workers and they are located one each in Stillwater, Sweet Grass and Yellowstone Counties. There were no leaders identified with occupations in the craftsman, foreman, operative or unskilled service industries. Four housewives and four retired persons were identified as leaders.

TABLE 6

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

County	N.	Professional technical		Manager propri.		Clerical sales		Housewife		Retired	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	2	16.7	9	75.0	--	--	1	8.3	--	--
Golden Valley	8	--	--	8	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Musselshell	11	4	36.4	6	54.5	--	--	--	--	1	9.1
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	9	75.1	1	8.3	1	8.3	--	--
Sweet Grass	11	3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1	--	--	--	--
Wheatland	9	3	33.3	5	55.6	--	--	--	--	1	11.1
Yellowstone	39	7	18.0	27	69.2	1	2.6	2	5.1	2	5.1
Totals	102	20	19.7	71	69.6	3	2.9	4	3.9	4	3.9

The third approach to leadership identification as defined by Freeman, et al, "assumes that leadership is a necessary consequence

of social activity.¹ They conclude that the extent of activity in community organizations has an impact upon community change, and activists are leaders.

Powers reaches a similar conclusion when he states that "Power actors (community leaders) have been active in community affairs, have been or are members of community groups, and have held or do hold positions of formal authority in these groups."²

Tables 7, 8, and 9 report respondents' social activity in their communities.

Table 7 reports that on the average each respondent belongs to 5.84 community organizations. Respondents in Wheatland County belong to the most organizations -- 7.67 on the average. Identified leaders belonging to the least number of organizations were from Sweet Grass County with 4.82.

Table 8 indicates the number of elective offices held by respondents at the time of the interview. Of all the respondents 29.4 percent held one office, 24.5 percent held two offices, 13.7 percent held three offices, and 4.9 percent held more than four offices.

Identified leaders not holding an elective office accounted for 27.5 percent of the total. This data would indicate that in terms of

¹Linton C. Freeman, Thomas J. Fararo, et al, op. cit., p. 191.

²Ronald C. Powers, op. cit., p. 8.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH RESPONDENTS BELONGED

N=102

County	N.	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		Mean C. R.
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	--	--	1	8.2	2	16.7	2	16.7	3	25.0	2	16.7	--	--	2	16.7	5.92
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.13
Musselshell	11	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	2	18.2	1	9.1	4	36.3	--	--	1	9.1	2	18.2	5.91
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	2	16.7	2	16.7	2	16.7	3	25.0	1	8.2	2	16.7	--	--	5.42
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.3	2	18.2	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	4.82
Wheatland	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	11.1	1	11.1	1	11.1	3	33.3	3	33.3	7.67
Yellowstone	39	1	2.5	1	2.5	3	7.7	4	10.3	6	15.4	9	23.1	6	15.4	3	7.7	6	15.4	5.95
Total	102	1	1.0	3	2.9	8	7.9	13	12.7	18	17.7	26	25.5	10	9.8	10	9.8	13	12.7	5.84

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF ELECTIVE OFFICES HELD BY RESPONDENTS

N=102

County	N:	One office		Two offices		Three offices		Four offices		Five or more offices		Holds no offices	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	3	25.0	4	33.3	3	25.0	--	--	--	--	2	16.7
Golden Valley	8	2	25.0	1	12.5	2	25.0	1	12.5	--	--	2	25.0
Musselshell	11	3	27.3	2	18.2	2	18.2	--	--	2	18.2	2	18.2
Stillwater	12	3	25.0	4	33.3	2	16.7	--	--	--	--	3	25.0
Sweet Grass	11	4	36.4	3	27.3	1	9.0	--	--	--	--	3	27.3
Wheatland	9	5	55.6	1	11.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	33.3
Yellowstone	39	10	25.6	10	25.6	4	10.3	2	5.2	--	--	13	33.3
Totals	102	30	29.4	25	24.5	14	13.7	3	2.9	2	2.0	28	27.5

organizational leadership, 72.5 percent of the identifies leaders held one or more offices.

As some measure of social activity a question was asked to ascertain the number of meetings attended each month on the average by respondents. Table 9 suggests that respondents in Wheatland County

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF MONTHLY COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT MEETINGS
ATTENDED BY RESPONDENTS

N=102

County	N	2 One or less		3 Two		4 Three		5 Four		6 Five		7 Six or more		Mean- cate- gory re- sponse
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	5	41.7	1	8.3	3	25.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	4.50
Golden Valley	8	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.00
Mussel- shell	11	--	--	3	27.3	--	--	1	9.1	2	18.2	5	45.4	5.55
Still- water	12	2	16.7	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	1	8.3	5	51.7	5.17
Sweet Grass	11	2	18.2	4	36.3	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--	3	27.3	4.18
Wheat- land	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	6.56
Yellow- stone	39	1	2.5	6	15.4	4	10.3	7	17.9	1	2.6	20	51.3	5.56
Totals	102	8	7.8	21	20.6	10	9.8	15	14.7	7	6.9	41	40.2	5.18

attended the most meetings related to community improvement. They attended between five and six meetings each month. Identified leaders in Golden Valley County attended two meetings each month which was the lowest number of meetings attended in the area studied. The average of

all respondents was slightly over four meetings each month. Forty-one respondents attended six or more meetings each month related to community development. The data presented shows only meetings attended that were related to community improvement, and it is possible further social activity was achieved by meeting attendance at organizations not directed to some phase of community improvement.

Community Development and Community Development

Activities at the Local Level

A major concern of this study was to determine how identified leaders viewed community development as a concept, and how they viewed community development efforts.

It was thus important to ascertain how knowledgeable respondents were of county-wide development efforts in their counties.

Table 10 shows that when asked if a Development Organization existed in their county 77.5 percent of all leaders responded that there was such an organization. In Carbon, Musselshell, Stillwater, and Sweet Grass Counties all respondents indicated such an organization existed; it is true that such organizations did exist in these counties. However, a county-wide development organization did not exist in Golden Valley County and respondents were knowledgeable of this fact. The county-wide chamber program was operational in Wheatland County and 66.7 percent of the respondents were aware of

TABLE 10

IS THERE A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION
IN RESPONDENT'S COUNTY

N=102

		No		Uncertain		Yes	
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	--	--	--	--	12	100.0
Golden Valley	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	--	--
Musselshell	11	--	--	--	--	11	100.0
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	12	100.0
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	--	--	11	100.0
Wheatland	9	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7
Yellowstone	39	8	20.5	4	10.3	27	69.2
Totals	102	15	14.7	8	7.8	79	77.5

this. Twenty-seven respondents, or 69.2 percent indicated a county-wide organization existed in Yellowstone County.

Table 11 demonstrates that seventeen respondents did not answer the question concerning membership in a county-wide development organization. Table 10 shows that fifteen respondents indicated that there was no such organization in their community, and these fifteen were not invited to answer the question summarized by Table 11. (Appendix A, Schedule C, Question 32). In addition two leaders did not respond.

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF
COUNTY-WIDE DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

N=102

		No-have never been a member		Have been a member		Presently a member	
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	2	16.7	---	--	10	83.3
Golden Valley	2	1	50.0	--	--	1	50.0
Musselshell	11	3	27.3	---	--	8	72.7
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	2	16.7	9	75.0
Sweet Grass	11	3	27.3	2	18.2	6	54.5
Wheatland	6	--	---	---	---	6	100.0
Yellowstone	31	10	32.3	5	16.1	16	51.6
Total Response	85	20	23.5	9	10.6	56	65.9
No Response	17						
Total	102						

This left only eighty-five respondents to the question.

As shown in Table 11, 76.5 percent of the respondents who were aware of organized county-wide development had been or were at the time of the interview members of such organizations. This implies that a fairly high level of the identified leadership had been involved in community development activities.

Reviewing Table 10 and 11 it can be ascertained that the two respondents in Golden Valley County who were reported uncertain in Table 10 were just not aware of what organized community development was.

Table 12 shows that the twenty respondents who replied negatively in Table 11 as to their membership, were added to the list of non-respondents in Table 12. This left a balance of sixty-five identified leaders to rate their degree of participation in development organizations.

As presented in Table 12, 35.4 percent of all identified community leaders, who had been, or were members of community development organizations, rated their participation as active, and 32.3 percent rated their participation as very active. The one response from Golden Valley County was ignored because there was no development organization in that county. By this measure, Wheatland County respondents were the most active while Sweet Grass County respondents were the least active.

Of the sixty-five identified community leaders who were members of community development organizations, sixty-three responded by listing their length of service to such organizations.

Table 13 displays that on the average all respondents had been active in their community development organization three years. Ignoring Golden Valley County, Wheatland County respondents had the longest tenure, and Stillwater leaders had the shortest tenure. All identified leaders who knew there was a county-wide development

their organizations as somewhat effective and 7.1 percent rated their organizations as very effective. The degree of effectiveness was rated highest in Wheatland County, followed by Musselshell and Sweet Grass Counties. Carbon and Yellowstone Counties were the least effective as rated by identified leaders. Again, the one Golden Valley response was ignored since there was no organization in this county.

Respondents were asked to select the one local group, or agency that they felt to be the most influential in promoting the development and improvement of the community. Table 15 displays this data. In this table community development organizations (county-wide) were the one organization most often named, Chambers of Commerce were second followed by service clubs. The Community Development Organization approach was ranked highest in Musselshell and Sweet Grass Counties. The Chamber of Commerce was most often listed in Yellowstone County. In Wheatland County the county-wide approach to community development shared equal recognition with service clubs. The five respondents that answered in the other category mentioned individuals, private groups, local businessmen and ranchers, a specific service club, and local citizens.

Table 16 explains that when respondents were asked to react to the statement that "their community is well organized for community development," 27.4 percent of all respondents agreed and 4.9 percent agreed strongly.

TABLE 15

THE ONE LOCAL GROUP RESPONDENTS FELT TO BE THE MOST INFLUENTIAL
IN PROMOTING THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE COMMUNITY

N=102

County	N.	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	4	33.4	--	--	--	--	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	--	--	2	16.7	--	--	1	8.3	2	16.7
Golden Valley	8	3	37.5	--	--	--	--	2	25.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	12.5	2	25.0	--	--	--	--
Musselshell	11	7	63.6	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	1	9.1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Stillwater	12	3	25.0	--	--	--	--	3	25.0	--	--	1	8.3	--	--	2	16.7	1	8.3	--	--	2	16.7
Sweet Grass	11	6	54.5	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1
Wheatland	9	4	44.4	--	--	1	11.2	--	--	--	--	4	44.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Yellowstone	39	3	7.7	4	10.3	18	45.8	2	5.2	1	2.6	5	12.9	1	2.6	4	10.3	--	--	1	2.6	--	--
Total	102	30	29.5	4	3.9	21	20.7	8	6.9	2	1.9	13	12.7	3	2.9	10	9.8	3	2.9	3	2.9	5	4.9

TABLE 16

FEELINGS OF RESPONDENTS THAT THEIR COMMUNITY IS
WELL ORGANIZED FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

N=102

		1		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree strongly		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	category response
Carbon	12	1	8.3	5	41.7	4	33.3	2	16.7	--	--	3.08
Golden Valley	8	--	--	6	75.0	2	25.0	--	--	--	--	2.25
Musselshell	11	--	--	5	45.4	--	--	3	27.3	3	27.3	3.36
Stillwater	12	--	--	7	58.3	3	25.0	2	16.7	--	--	2.58
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	--	--	3.45
Wheatland	9	1	11.1	2	22.2	2	22.2	3	33.4	1	11.1	3.11
Yellowstone	39	2	5.1	18	46.1	6	15.4	12	30.8	1	2.6	2.79
Totals	102	4	3.9	44	43.2	21	20.6	28	27.4	5	4.9	2.86

Mean category response indicated leaders from Sweet Grass County felt they were best organized for community development, followed by Musselshell and Wheatland Counties. Golden Valley agreed least that

they were well-organized. This was expected as they did not have a county-wide community development organization.

When asked if they thought their local community development organization had done some important things for their community, respondents generally agreed.

Table 17 indicates that identified leaders generally felt that their organizations had accomplished some important things in their respective communities. A total of sixty-nine respondents agreed and seven agreed strongly that this was true. Respondents were most positive about accomplishments in Wheatland County, followed by Musselshell and Weeet Grass Counties. There was more disagreement about accomplishments in Golden Valley, Carbon and Yellowstone Counties and in that order. There were no counties where disagreement was stronger than agreement that development organizations had done some important things.

Should many organizations in a community work individually on community improvement, or should this be channeled through one central community organization? When asked this question, respondents generally felt that the one central organizational approach was more desirable. Table 18 shows that 60.8 percent of the total respondents agreed that central organization approach was superior to a more fragmental approach and 2.9 percent agreed strongly. Stillwater County leaders felt strongest in this regard. Yellowstone County respondents felt it was the least important. However, all counties were relatively similar in response as indicated by mean category responses.

TABLE 18

RESPONDENTS REACTION TO MANY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
WORKING INDIVIDUALLY ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT,
RATHER THAN THROUGH ONE CENTRAL ORGANIZATION

N=102

County	N.	1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	8	66.7	--	--	4	33.3	--	--	2.67
Golden Valley	8	--	--	6	75.0	--	--	2	25.0	--	--	2.50
Mussel-shell	11	1	9.1	6	54.5	--	--	3	27.3	1	9.1	2.73
Still-water	12	1	8.3	9	75.0	--	--	2	16.7	--	--	2.25
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	6	54.5	3	27.3	2	18.2	--	--	2.64
Wheat-land	9	--	--	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2	--	--	2.67
Yellow-stone	39	1	2.6	22	56.4	5	12.8	10	25.6	1	2.6	2.69
Totals	102	3	2.9	62	60.8	10	9.8	25	24.5	2	2.0	2.62

It is often heard that getting people involved in and informed about community development efforts are major problems. Identified

144

community leaders were asked if they thought this was a major problem in their communities. Table 19 demonstrates that 70.6 percent of all respondents agreed that informing people of development activities and involving them in these activities were major problems.

Twenty-two leaders or 21.6 percent agreed strongly that these were major problems. In three counties, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, and Wheatland, 100 percent of the leaders felt this to be major problem. All counties were quite close and positive in their reaction to the problem of involving and informing people.

Respondents were asked if they thought it was important to attempt some development efforts, even though it wasn't certain they would be successful.

Table 20 indicates that 76.2 percent of all respondents agreed it was worthwhile and necessary to attempt development efforts, even with the final development effort outcome uncertain while 14.9 percent agreed strongly. Wheatland, Musselshell, and Stillwater County respondents agreed most often to this as indicated by mean category responses. In Musselshell and Stillwater Counties 100.0 percent of the identified leaders agreed. Carbon and Golden Valley Counties had the most relative disagreement. However, all counties reacted positively to attempting some development efforts even though outcomes may be unsuccessful.

TABLE 19

ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS ABOUT GETTING PEOPLE INVOLVED AND
INFORMED OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

N=102

		1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		Disagree strongly		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	1	8.3	--	--	--	--	8	66.7	3	25.0	4.00
Golden Valley	8	--	--	1	12.5	1	12.5	5	62.5	1	12.5	3.75
Missel- shell	11	--	--	1	9.1	--	--	8	72.7	2	18.2	4.00
Still- water	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	91.7	1	8.3	4.08
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	81.8	2	18.2	4.18
Wheat- land	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	66.7	3	33.3	4.33
Yellow- stone	39	--	--	2	5.1	2	5.1	25	64.2	10	25.6	4.10
Totals	102	1	1.0	4	3.9	3	2.9	72	70.6	22	21.6	4.09

Is everyone affected by community development programs or are only a few people affected? Respondents were asked if they felt that for the most part, only a few people were affected by community development programs. Table 21 shows that of all respondents, 49.1 percent disagreed that only a few people were affected by community development programs. Disagreeing strongly were 12.7 percent of the leaders. Wheatland and Sweet Grass County leaders disagreed most that only a few people are affected by community development efforts.

The question reported in Table 21 was asked differently to obtain respondents' reaction to whether they thought everybody in their community can benefit from programs of community development. As shown in Table 22, sixty-seven leaders agreed that everybody benefits from community development programs. Twenty-three respondents or 22.5 percent agreed strongly that everybody benefits. Indications were that leaders agreed more that everybody benefits, than they disagreed that only a few benefit.

A key to successful development using the democratic process is giving careful attention to the wishes and opinions of the people who are to be affected. Respondents were asked if they felt that this was a key to successful development.

TABLE 21

FOR THE MOST PART, ONLY A FEW PEOPLE ARE AFFECTED BY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS:
RESPONSE TO STATEMENT

N=102

		1		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree strongly		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	3	25.0	1	8.3	7	58.4	1	8.3	3.50
Golden Valley	8	1	12.5	2	25.0	--	--	4	50.0	1	12.5	3.25
Mussel- shell	11	2	18.2	6	54.5	--	--	2	18.2	1	9.1	2.45
Still- water	12	3	25.0	4	33.3	2	16.7	3	25.0	--	--	2.42
Sweet Grass	11	1	9.1	7	63.6	1	9.1	2	18.2	--	--	2.36
Wheat- land	9	1	11.1	6	66.7	--	--	2	22.2	--	--	2.33
Yellow- stone	39	5	12.8	22	56.4	2	5.1	9	23.1	1	2.6	2.46
Total	102	13	12.7	50	49.1	6	5.9	29	28.4	4	3.9	2.62

TABLE 22

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT EVERYBODY IN THEIR COMMUNITY CAN
BENEFIT FROM PROGRAMS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

N=102

		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	2	16.7	---	---	10	83.3	---	---	3.67
Golden Valley	8	2	25.0	---	---	6	75.0	---	---	3.50
Musselshell	11	---	---	---	---	5	45.5	6	54.5	4.54
Stillwater	12	---	---	---	---	9	75.0	3	25.0	4.25
Sweet Grass	11	---	---	1	9.1	9	81.8	1	9.1	4.00
Wheatland	9	---	---	1	11.2	4	44.4	4	44.4	4.33
Yellowstone	39	1	2.6	5	12.8	24	61.5	9	23.1	4.05
Total	102	5	4.9	7	6.9	67	65.7	23	22.5	4.05

Table 23 indicates that 65.7 percent of the total respondents agreed that one of the keys to successful community development was to pay careful attention to the wishes and opinions of people who would be affected by such programs. Twenty-three leaders or 22.5 percent agreed strongly. Identified leaders felt strongest about

TABLE 23

A KEY TO SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT IS TO PAY CAREFUL ATTENTION TO
THE WISHES AND OPINIONS OF THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE
AFFECTED: REACTION TO STATEMENT

N=102

		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	1	8.3	11	91.7	--	--	3.92
Golden Valley	8	--	--	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	4.00
Musselshell	11	1	9.1	2	18.2	6	54.5	2	18.2	3.82
Stillwater	12	--	--	2	16.7	10	83.3	--	--	3.84
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	1	9.1	7	63.6	3	27.3	4.18
Wheatland	9	--	--	--	--	5	55.6	4	44.4	4.44
Yellowstone	39	4	10.3	3	7.7	24	61.5	8	20.5	3.92
Total	102	5	4.9	10	9.8	69	67.6	18	17.7	3.98

this factor in Wheatland, Sweet Grass and Golden Valley Counties, in that order. Respondents agreed from a low of 72.7 percent in Musselshell County to a high of 100.0 percent in Wheatland County that the wishes and opinions of those affected by development programs was a key to successful development.

TABLE 24

RESPONDENTS' REACTION TO STATEMENT THAT PEOPLE OF THEIR COMMUNITY
ARE USUALLY QUICK TO RESPOND WHEN PROBLEMS
ARISE REQUIRING ACTION

N=102

		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	3	25.0	4	33.3	5	41.7	--	--	3.17
Golden Valley	8	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	1	12.5	3.62
Musselshell	11	--	--	5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.0	3.65
Stillwater	12	5	41.7	2	16.6	5	41.7	--	--	3.00
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	2	18.2	9	81.8	--	--	3.82
Wheatland	9	--	--	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	4.22
Yellowstone	39	11	28.2	2	5.1	22	56.4	4	10.3	3.49
Total	102	20	19.6	18	17.6	55	53.9	9	8.9	3.52

Do people in communities respond quickly when problems arise requiring action? Respondents were asked if people in their communities were usually quick to respond when problems arose which required action. Table 24 demonstrates that 53.9 percent of all respondents agreed that people in their community responded quickly when problems arose requiring action. Nine leaders or 8.9 percent, agreed strongly. Identified

leaders in Wheatland County agreed at the highest level, and leaders in Stillwater County responded at the lowest level. It appeared that 50.0 percent or more respondents in all counties, except Stillwater and Carbon, agreed that people in their counties did respond when problems arose requiring action. There was considerable amount of uncertainty reported in response to this question.

Generally, people in local communities must care enough about their community to do something about problems, if democratically structured community development is to occur. With this in mind, respondents were asked if they thought that the people in their communities cared enough about their community to do something about problems that needed to be solved.

Table 25 shows that 25.8 percent of all respondents strongly disagreed that people in their communities didn't care enough about their community to do something about problems needing to be solved. Sixty leaders, or 59.4 percent, agreed. All identified leaders in Golden Valley and Sweet Grass Counties responded that their people did care enough to do something about problems that needed solving. Carbon County respondents felt least positive about their citizens' reaction to problem solving.

Do community leaders feel that most community development activities are carried on by people who are paid to do those types of jobs? Respondents were asked this question and Table 26 indicates that of all respondents, 74.2 percent did not feel that most community development activities were carried on by people paid to do just that. Thirteen leaders or 12.9 percent disagreed strongly. Wheatland, Stillwater, Sweet Grass and Musselshell County respondents felt quite strongly that this was not the case. Carbon, Golden Valley, and Yellowstone County disagreed, but not so strongly as leaders from the other four counties.

Respondents were asked if they felt local people should assume full responsibility for solving community problems, without assistance from outsiders. Table 27 points out that of all respondents, 64.7 percent disagreed, 3.9 percent disagreed strongly, and 4.9 percent were undecided. Twenty-one point six percent agreed and 4.9 percent agreed strongly. Responses were quite similar between counties, and all counties had respondents on both sides of this issue.

Tables 1 through 27 present data on community development and community development activities at the local level.

TABLE 27

RESPONDENTS' REACTION TO THE STATEMENT THAT LOCAL PEOPLE SHOULD
ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOLVING COMMUNITY
PROBLEMS, WITHOUT ASSISTANCE FROM OUTSIDERS

N=102

		1		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree strongly		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	1	8.3	8	66.8	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	2.42
Golden Valley	8	--	--	5	62.5	--	--	2	25.0	1	12.5	2.87
Musselshell	11	--	--	9	81.8	--	--	1	9.1	1	9.1	2.45
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	8	66.8	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	2.42
Sweet Grass	11	1	9.1	7	63.6	--	--	3	27.3	--	--	2.45
Wheatland	9	--	--	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	--	--	2.44
Yellowstone	39	1	2.6	23	58.9	1	2.6	13	33.3	1	2.6	2.74
Total	102	4	3.9	66	64.7	5	4.9	22	21.6	5	4.9	2.5

Community Development and Community Development EffortsAt the Multi-County Level

Considerable emphasis is being devoted to encouraging multi-county development in Montana. Therefore, in addition to viewing community development and community development activities at the local level, it was desirable to view these at the area level. Of initial concern was to inquire of respondents how they felt toward joining with neighboring counties to plan organized development programs.

Table 28 indicates that of all respondents, 51.0 percent thought that it is always important to join with neighboring counties to plan organized development programs. Depending on the development project another 40.2 percent thought that it was important. It appeared that approximately 50.0 percent of the respondents considered the concept to be important, and another 40.0 percent considered development by the multi-county approach important only in view of the project or crisis. Sweet Grass and Golden Valley Counties were the only two counties with no opposition to the multi-county approach. However, Sweet Grass County had the highest reserved response, 72.7 percent depending on the development project. Golden Valley County had the highest positive response with the fewest reservations.

Do problems stop at county boundaries? If not, is there a need for a multi-county development organization to deal with those problems? Respondents were asked to respond to this question. The results

TABLE 28

HOW RESPONDENTS FELT TOWARD JOINING WITH NEIGHBORING COUNTIES
AND COMMUNITIES TO PLAN ORGANIZED
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

N=102

County	N.	No		Yes, but depends on development project		Yes, always important	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.7
Golden Valley	8	--	--	1	12.5	7	87.5
Musselshell	11	2	18.2	3	27.3	6	54.5
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.4
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	8	72.7	3	27.3
Wheatland	9	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
Yellowstone	39	4	10.3	19	48.7	16	41.0
Total	102	9	8.8	41	40.2	52	51.0

are shown in Table 29. There was general agreement among all respondents that there was a need for a multi-county development organization to deal with problems that crossed county boundaries. Of all respondents, 52.6 percent thought "yes" there was a need, and 25.8 percent definitely did not think so. Identified leaders from Yellowstone and Sweet Grass Counties ranked lowest in their feelings for needing such

an organization; however, a positive need was still felt. Stillwater County respondents indicated a 100.0 percent positive response.

In addition to problems crossing county boundaries local (county-wide) development organizations may feel a need for supplemental help from a larger member organization. Respondents were asked if they felt there was a need for multi-county efforts to supplement local community development efforts. Table 30 indicates that there was not strong agreement for multi-county efforts to supplement local efforts; however, positive agreement exists in all counties. In Golden Valley County, 111 percent of the respondents agreed, but non agreed strongly. In total, only one respondent felt strongly that multi-county efforts are not needed to supplement local community development efforts and seven more felt they were not necessary.

In February, 1969, approximately one year previous to this study a multi-county development organization was formed in the study-area. Citizen representatives of the various county-wide development organizations comprised executive level leadership. The organization was officially known as the South Central Montana Development Federation. Identified leaders were asked if they had heard of this organization. As shown in Table 31, of all respondents 69.8 percent were aware of this organization.

TABLE 30

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR MULTI-COUNTY
EFFORTS TO SUPPLEMENT LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

N=102

County	N.	1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	--	--	2	16.7	10	83.3	--	--	3.83
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	8	100.0	--	--	4.00
Mussel- shell	11	--	--	--	--	1	9.1	7	63.6	3	27.3	4.18
Still- water	12	--	--	1	8.3	1	8.3	8	66.7	2	16.7	3.91
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	--	--	3	27.3	8	72.7	--	--	3.73
Wheat- land	9	--	--	1	11.1	1	11.1	6	66.7	1	11.1	3.77
Yellow- stone	39	1	2.6	5	12.8	4	10.3	27	69.2	2	5.1	3.61
Total	102	1	1.0	7	6.9	12	11.8	74	72.5	8	7.8	3.79

Table 31 indicates that all respondents in Musselshell County were aware of the South Central Montana Development Federation. However, only 43.6 percent were aware in Yellowstone County. With Yellowstone County and Billings leadership centered around Billings, it would appear there were implications for an educational endeavor in this area.

Respondents were asked if they thought area problems in the next few years would be solved, would stay the same, or would get worse. This question was asked to gain some understanding as to how optimistic leaders felt toward the future, and their problem solving processes. Data regarding this area appears in Table 32. In general Table 32 shows that 14.0 percent of all respondents were uncertain as to what they thought would happen to problems in the next few years. Seventeen percent thought they would get worse, while 27.0 percent thought problems would stay the same, and 42.0 percent thought that problems confronting the area would be solved.

Many times neighboring counties have quite similar problems. Is it beneficial for counties and their development groups to exchange ideas, successes, and problems with their neighboring counties? Table 33 summarizes respondents reactions to this question. As shown in this table, there was strong agreement that by exchanging ideas, successes, and problems one county often learns from another how to get things accomplished. Yellowstone County respondents did not feel strongly about this proposition, but their reactions were still of a positive nature.

TABLE 31

RESPONDENTS AWARENESS OF THE SOUTH CENTRAL
MONTANA DEVELOPMENT FEDERATION

N=102

County	N.	No		Uncertain		Yes	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	2	16.7	1	8.3	9	75.0
Golden Valley	8	2	25.0	--	--	6	75.0
Musselshell	11	--	--	--	--	11	100.0
Stillwater	12	1	8.3	--	--	11	91.7
Sweet Grass	11	2	18.2	--	--	9	81.8
Wheatland	9	--	--	1	11.1	8	88.9
Yellowstone	39	20	51.3	2	5.1	17	43.6
Total	102	27	26.4	4	3.8	71	69.8

TABLE 33

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT BY EXCHANGING IDEAS, SUCCESSES, PROBLEMS
ONE COUNTY LEARNS FROM ANOTHER-HOW TO GET THINGS ACCOMPLISHED

N=102

		2		3		4		
		Very seldom		Sometimes		Definitely		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	2	16.7	10	83.3	4.83
Golden Valley	8	--	--	2	25.0	6	75.0	4.75
Musselshell	11	--	--	1	9.1	10	90.9	4.91
Stillwater	12	--	--	1	8.3	11	91.7	4.92
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	3	27.3	8	72.7	4.73
Wheatland	9	--	--	3	33.3	6	66.7	4.67
Yellowstone	39	2	5.1	15	38.5	22	56.4	4.46
Total	102	2	2.0	27	26.5	73	71.5	4.68

It is believed that many decisions affecting local communities are made in the political arena. Respondents were asked if they felt that more than one county often had to be heard from on important issues, because many decisions were made on a political basis. Data relative to this question appears in Table 34. As is pointed out in

TABLE 34

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT MORE THAN ONE COUNTY OFTEN HAS TO
BE HEARD FROM ON IMPORTANT ISSUES BECAUSE MANY
DECISIONS ARE MADE ON A POLITICAL BASIS

N=102

		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		Very little		Uncertain		Somewhat		Definitely		
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	8	66.7	4.42
Golden Valley	8	--	--	--	--	2	25.0	6	75.0	4.75
Musselshell	11	--	--	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	4.45
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	2	16.7	10	83.3	4.83
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	--	--	4	36.4	7	63.6	4.64
Wheatland	9	--	--	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	4.56
Yellowstone	39	1	2.5	4	10.3	15	38.5	19	48.7	4.33
Totals	102	2	2.0	7	6.8	31	30.4	62	60.8	4.50

Table 34 there was definite agreement as indicated by the fact that 2.0 percent seemed to disagree, 30.4 percent somewhat agreed, and 60.8 percent definitely agreed that more than one county did have to be heard from. Yellowstone County identified leaders felt less this way than leaders from the smaller, surrounding, more rural areas.

Do advantages accrue to one county by supporting the development of a proposed industry in a neighboring county? Respondents were asked this question and the findings are presented in Table 35. Of all respondents, 58.8 percent agreed definitely that there were advantages to supporting a proposed industry in a neighboring county. Agreeing somewhat that it would be beneficial were 29.4 percent of all respondents. Sweet Grass and Golden Valley County leaders were least definite in their feelings of advantage to their counties, than were the remaining five counties.

Respondents were asked if they felt that rural people understood the problems of the towns and cities in their area. The question was reversed to see if town and city people understood the problems of the rural area.

Table 36 points out that only 6.9 percent of all respondents felt that the rural people definitely understood the problems of the towns and cities in their area. Replying that they somewhat understood the urban problems were 51.0 percent while 30.3 percent indicated rural people understood these problems very little.

Table 37 shows that when asked if the town and city people understood the problems of the rural people in their areas the response pattern was very similar to that in Table 36. It would appear that rural people understood the problems of the town and city to about the same degree that town and city people understood the problems of the

TABLE 35

DO RESPONDENTS SEE ADVANTAGES TO THEIR COUNTY SUPPORTING THE
DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPOSED INDUSTRY IN A NEIGHBORING COUNTY

N=102

	1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response	
	Not at all		Very little		Uncertain		Some- what		Definitely			
County	N	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	2	16.7	6	50.0	3.92
Golden Valley	8	---	---	1	12.5	---	---	4	50.0	3	37.5	4.12
Mussel- shell	11	---	---	---	---	1	9.1	3	27.3	7	63.6	4.54
Still- water	12	---	---	---	---	---	---	4	33.3	8	66.7	4.67
Sweet Grass	11	---	---	2	18.2	---	---	6	54.5	3	27.3	3.91
Wheat- land	9	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	22.2	7	77.8	4.78
Yellow- stone	39	---	---	3	7.7	1	2.6	9	23.0	26	66.7	4.49
Totals	102	1	1.0	7	6.9	4	3.9	30	29.4	60	58.8	4.38

TABLE 36

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT RURAL PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEMS OF THE TOWNS AND CITIES IN THEIR AREA

N=102

	1		2		3		4		5			
	Definitely		Some- what		Uncertain		Very little		Not at all		Mean category response	
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	4	33.3	--	--	7	58.4	1	8.3	3.42
Golden Valley	8	2	25.0	4	50.0	--	--	2	25.0	--	--	2.25
Mussel- shell	11	2	18.2	7	63.6	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--	2.09
Still- water	12	--	--	8	66.7	1	8.3	3	25.0	--	--	2.58
Sweet Grass	11	1	9.1	6	54.5	2	18.2	2	18.2	--	--	2.45
Wheat- land	9	1	11.1	4	44.5	1	11.1	3	33.3	--	--	2.67
Yellow- stone	39	1	2.6	19	48.7	5	12.8	13	33.3	1	2.6	2.85
Totals	102	7	6.9	52	51.0	10	9.8	31	30.3	2	2.0	2.70

TABLE 37

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT THE TOWN AND CITY PEOPLE UNDERSTAND
THE PROBLEMS OF THE RURAL PEOPLE IN THEIR AREA

N=102

County	N	1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	4	33.3	--	--	8	66.7	--	--	3.33
Golden Valley	8	--	--	3	37.5	--	--	5	62.5	--	--	3.25
Mussel-shell	11	--	--	9	81.8	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--	2.27
Still-water	12	--	--	4	33.3	1	8.3	7	58.4	--	--	3.25
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	8	72.7	1	9.1	2	18.2	--	--	2.45
Wheat-land	9	2	22.2	3	33.3	1	11.1	3	33.4	--	--	2.55
Yellow-stone	39	1	2.6	21	53.8	--	--	14	35.9	3	7.7	2.92
Totals	102	3	2.9	52	51.0	4	3.9	40	39.3	3	2.9	3.88

rural areas, as rated by respondents. In neither case was the understanding of each others problems very positive.

Respondents were asked if they thought developments that helped the surrounding small towns and rural areas had a positive effect on Billings. Conversely they were asked if they thought developments that helped Billings had a positive effect on the surrounding areas. This data is presented in Tables 38 and 39.

Table 38 indicates that there was definite agreement that developments that helped the surrounding small towns and rural areas had a positive effect on Billings. No leaders responded that there would be a detrimental effect to Billings, and 73.5 percent responded that these developments would have a positive effect on Billings.

Table 39 points out that there was not the definite agreement about developments that helped Billings having a positive effect on the rural areas, as was the response to rural area developments helping Billings. Of all respondents 36.6 percent thought that Billings developments had a definite positive effect on rural areas. This compared to 73.5 percent who responded that rural area developments had a definite positive effect on Billings. No respondents thought that Billings developments would be very detrimental to the rural areas; however, 8.0 percent thought they could be somewhat detrimental.

TABLE 38

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT DEVELOPMENTS THAT HELP THE SURROUNDING
SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL AREAS HAVE A POSITIVE EFFECT ON BILLINGS

N=102

		1		2		3		
		Definitely positive		Somewhat		Uncertain		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	7	58.3	5	41.7	--	--	1.42
Golden Valley	8	4	50.0	4	50.0	--	--	1.50
Musselshell	11	8	72.7	3	27.3	--	--	1.27
Stillwater	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	--	--	1.08
Sweet Grass	11	7	63.6	3	27.3	1	9.1	2.45
Wheatland	9	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1	1.33
Yellowstone	39	31	79.5	8	20.5	--	--	1.21
Total	102	75	73.5	25	24.5	2	2.0	1.28

Cooperative Extension Service, Governmental
Agencies and Community Development

One objective of this study was to obtain feedback from respondents regarding the Cooperative Extension Service as related to community development in the area. Questions were asked to obtain responses about Federal and State government community participation to have a basis for comparison with the Extension Service.

Table 40 presents the results when respondents were asked if they thought the Cooperative Extension Service had been effective in helping make the area a better place to live. Only 5.0 percent of the respondents felt that the Extension Service had not been effective in making the area a better place to live. Fifty-eight percent agreed that they had helped make the area a better place to live and 19.0 percent agreed strongly. All identified leaders interviewed in Stillwater County reacted positively to Extension's assistance in helping make the area a better place to live.

Respondents were asked if the Cooperative Extension Service had assisted organized development efforts in their community. As shown in Table 41, of all respondents 66.0 percent said that Extension had assisted with organized development efforts. Ten percent of the leaders said Extension had not assisted, and 24.0 percent did not know. Golden Valley County, without an organized approach to community development, and Wheatland County without a local county Extension Agent accounted for much of the negative response.

TABLE 41

RESPONDENTS RESPONSE TO HAD THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
ASSISTED WITH ORGANIZED DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS IN THEIR COMMUNITY

N=102

		No		Uncertain		Yes	
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Carbon	12	2	16.7	--	--	10	83.3
Golden Valley	8	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5
Musselshell	11	--	--	2	18.2	9	81.8
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	12	100.0
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	3	27.3	8	72.7
Wheatland	9	3	33.3	4	44.5	2	22.2
Yellowstone	37	2	5.4	13	35.1	22	59.5
Total Response	100	10	10.0	24	24.0	66	66.0
No Response	2						
Total	102						

Respondents were asked to rate Cooperative Extension's assistance to organized community development. As shown in Table 42, in Carbon and Stillwater Counties all respondents thought Extension's assistance had been beneficial or most beneficial. Of all respondents 50.6 percent thought Extension assistance to organized community development had been beneficial and 27.2 percent thought their assistance had been most beneficial.

In order to ascertain whether or not Extension's assistance to community development efforts were dominerring, or cooperative, leaders were asked if they thought the Extension Service had dominated development efforts.

As indicated in Table 43, of all respondents 70.0 percent thought Extension had cooperated with development efforts most of the time. Leaders in Stillwater County responded positively at the 100 percent level.

Do federal agencies dominate the situation when local groups try to cooperate with them on development programs? Respondents were asked this question and results from data are presented in Table 44 which reveals that 28.7 percent of all respondents disagreed that federal agencies dominated the situation when local groups tried to cooperate with them. However, 58.4 percent agreed that federal agencies tend to dominate and 12.9 percent were uncertain. The highest agreement was experienced in Musselshell County. Their high agreement could

TABLE 43

RESPONDENTS RESPONSE TO WHETHER EXTENSION COOPERATED WITH OR
TENDED TO DOMINATE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

N=102

		1		3		4		5		
		Dominated most of time		Uncertain		Cooperated some of time		Cooperated most of time		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	10	--	--	--	--	2	20.0	8	80.0	4.80
Golden Valley	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	3.40
Musselshell	11	--	--	--	--	2	18.2	9	81.8	4.82
Stillwater	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	100.0	5.00
Sweet Grass	11	--	--	3	27.3	1	9.1	7	63.6	4.36
Wheatland	3	--	--	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.4	4.00
Yellowstone	28	--	--	7	25.0	7	25.0	18	64.3	4.39
Total Res.	80	1	1.2	12	15.0	12	15.0	56	70.0	4.51
No Response	22									
Total	102									

could be related to the fact that they have had some degree of frustrations trying to obtain federal supported financing for their proposed mushroom industry

TABLE 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

N=102

		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	4	33.4	1	8.3	6	50.0	1	8.3	3.33
Golden Valley	8	--	--	2	25.0	6	75.0	--	--	3.75
Musselshell	11	1	9.1	--	--	6	54.5	4	36.4	4.18
Stillwater	12	3	25.0	--	--	8	66.7	1	8.3	3.58
Sweet Grass	11	3	27.3	2	18.2	5	45.4	1	9.1	3.36
Wheatland	9	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.4	--	--	3.00
Yellowstone	38	15	39.5	5	13.2	16	42.0	2	5.3	3.13
Total Res.	101	29	28.7	13	12.9	50	49.5	9	8.9	3.39
No Response	1									
Total	102									

To further explore leaders attitudes relative to the Federal Government's participation in dealing with community problems, respondents were asked if they thought Federal Agency participation was largely ineffective. Table 45 presents this data. Of all respondents 39.2

TABLE 45

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT FEDERAL AGENCIES ARE LARGELY INEFFECTIVE
IN DEALING WITH THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR COMMUNITY

N=102

		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	7	58.4	1	8.3	3	25.0	1	8.3	2.83
Golden Valley	8	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5	--	--	3.37
Musselshell	11	2	18.1	--	--	6	54.6	3	27.3	3.91
Stillwater	12	4	33.3	3	25.0	4	33.3	1	8.4	3.16
Sweet Grass	11	4	36.4	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.0	3.10
Wheatland	9	6	66.7	1	11.1	2	22.2	--	--	2.56
Yellowstone	39	15	38.5	12	30.8	10	25.6	2	5.1	2.97
Total	102	40	39.2	21	20.6	33	32.3	8	7.9	3.09

percent felt strongly that they were ineffective, and 20.6 percent were uncertain. Response toward federal agency effectiveness was closely split.

It was felt desirable to view State Agencies as well as the Cooperative Extension Service and Federal Agencies. The Extension

Service is supported financially by County, State and Federal funds thus is neither a straight-line Federal or State Agency, however related.

Next respondents were asked if they thought state agencies were largely ineffective in dealing with the problems of their community. Table 46 presents this data.

There was more agreement that state agencies were ineffective in assisting local communities than there was for federal agencies, as indicated by the fact that 43.0 percent disagreed that state agencies were ineffective and 39.2 percent indicated disagreement when asked the same question regarding Federal Agencies. Of all respondents 26.4 percent agreed that State Agencies were ineffective, compared to 32.3 percent who felt Federal Agencies were ineffective. In Sweet Grass County 63.6 percent of the respondents were uncertain as to state agencies effectiveness in dealing with problems of their community.

Table 47 presents the feelings of leaders when asked if they thought community needs should be met by government agencies. As indicated 50.0 percent of all respondents felt that community needs should not be met by government agencies, and 9.8 percent felt strongly that they should not be met. There was a relatively high degree of uncertainty (21.6 percent) in response to this question.

Eleven factors, commonly referred to as theory factors, were listed (Question 21, Schedule C, Appendix A). These factors were developed from many of the principles of community development that Moe and others

TABLE 46

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT STATE AGENCIES ARE LARGELY INEFFECTIVE
IN DEALING WITH THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR COMMUNITY

N=102.

		2		3		4		5		
		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly		Mean category response
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	8	66.7	2	16.7	1	8.3	1	8.3	2.58
Golden Valley	8	7	87.5	--	--	1	12.5	--	--	2.25
Musselshell	11	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	54.5	1	9.1	3.54
Stillwater	12	5	41.6	2	16.6	5	41.8	--	--	3.00
Sweet Grass	11	3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1	--	--	2.82
Wheatland	9	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2	--	--	2.67
Yellowstone	39	19	48.8	7	17.9	13	33.3	--	--	2.85
Total	102	49	48.0	22	21.6	29	28.4	2	2.0	2.84

TABLE 47

DO RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT COMMUNITY NEEDS SHOULD
BE MET BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

N=102

	1		2		3		4		5		Mean category response	
	Disagree strongly		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Agree strongly			
County	N.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Carbon	12	--	--	6	50.0	4	33.3	2	16.7	--	--	2.67
Golden Valley	8	--	--	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	--	--	3.12
Mussel- shell	11	1	9.1	2	18.2	2	18.2	4	36.3	2	18.2	3.36
Still- water	12	4	33.3	7	58.4	1	8.3	--	--	--	--	1.75
Sweet Grass	11	1	9.1	8	72.7	1	9.1	1	9.1	--	--	2.18
Wheat- land	9	1	11.2	4	44.4	4	44.4	--	--	--	--	2.33
Yellow- stone	39	3	7.7	22	56.4	7	17.9	5	12.9	2	5.1	2.51
Total	102	10	9.8	51	50.0	22	21.6	15	14.7	4	3.9	2.53

have written about.³

FIGURE 1

NUMBER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THEORY FACTORS RESPONDENTS
FEEL NECESSARY FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO TAKE PLACE

County	Average Number of Factors Checked											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Carbon (N=12)												(9.67)
Golden Valley (N=8)												(6.67)
Musselshell (N=11)												(8.11)
Stillwater (N=12)												(5.92)
Sweet Grass (N=11)												(9.33)
Wheatland (N=9)												(8.88)
Yellowstone (N=39)												(7.72)
Total Ave. Res. (N=102)												(8.15)

All factors positively influence successful community development as a democratically structured process. It was assumed that the more factors checked by respondents, the greater their understanding of the community development process. The effectiveness of community development educational endeavors is assumed to be related to the number of factors checked. As shown in Figure 1, respondents in Carbon and Sweet Grass Counties appeared to have the more sophisticated knowledge of the

³Edward O. Moe, Some Principles In Community Development, Paper from Bureau of Community Development, Department of Sociology, Utah University, Salt Lake City, 1966.

process and Stillwater respondents have the least.

As educational institutions, the Extension Service and others could look at this type of data to ascertain past community development educational effectiveness, and draw implications for future educational endeavors.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Selection and Use of a Statistical Model

Selection of a method to facilitate interpreting collected data was made jointly by the researcher and his graduate advisor. The data was programmed for automatic data processing, utilizing the Sigma 7 Computer at Montana State University.

Associated with every statistical test is a model and a measurement requirement. If the model and the measurement requirement satisfy certain conditions, then the test is valid under these conditions. Often, it is possible to test whether the conditions of a particular statistical model are met. More often, one has to assume that they are met. Therefore, the conditions of the statistical model of the test are often referred to as assumptions.¹

A parametric statistic can be used when the following assumptions can be made about the data, the population, and the sample from which the data were drawn:

- (a) Independent observations exist in the population.
- (b) Observations are drawn from a normally distributed population.
- (c) The observations must have the same variance, or a known ratio of variance.

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1956) p. 18.

- (d) The variables involved must have been measured in at least an interval scale.²

The entire population was interviewed (i.e., those identified community leaders). Therefore, assumptions (e), the existence of independent observations, and (b), observations drawn from a normally distributed population, were both satisfied.

Assumption (c), relating to a known variance, was satisfied for specific, determined variables by obtaining individual respondent data for the following: (1) income, (2) age, (3) length of residency, (4) community permanency, (5) formal education, (6) occupational level, (7) measured social activity by organizational membership, elective offices held, and meetings attended. This actual data was collected and ultimately correlated to determine specific variance, thus partially satisfying assumption (c).

Assumption (d), dealing with measurement of variables on at least an interval scale, was satisfied to the point that questions asked of respondents were scaled for response (Appendix A, Schedule C). In many cases, the data collected indicated that subjects responded to more or less of a given characteristic than another, and the actual how much, or less, was not known.

The Norton study, as reported by Linquist, indicated that the F-test can be used in experimental situations in which there is serious

²Ibid., p. 19.

doubt about the underlying assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance.³ Lindquist further states that "unless the departure from normality is so extreme that it can be easily detected by mere inspection of the data, the departure from normality will probably have no appreciable effect on the validity of the F-test, and the probabilities read from the F-table may be used as close approximations to the true probabilities."⁴

A non-parametric correlation may be more statistically sound; however, because the non-parametric correlation is a weaker test, the use of the F-test, with given limitations of statistical accuracy, may give as precise a test.⁵

Dr. Richard C. Lund recommended that the researcher proceed with the use of an F-test, with known limitations constantly in mind.⁶

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation test was used to test for significance. This test, indexes two properties of a relationship. The first of these is the magnitude of the relationship -- that is, the degree to which the variables vary together. The second is the

³ E. F. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1953, p. 86.

⁴ Ibid., p. 86.

⁵ Conference with Dr. Wm. Lassey, (Center for Planning and Development, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, May 4, 1970).

⁶ Conference with Dr. Richard C. Lund, (Mathematics Department, Montana State University, May 4, 1970).

direction of the relationship, whether the variables vary together (positively), or whether they vary inversely (negatively). Correlation, then, characterizes the existence of a relationship between variables. While there may be many reasons for a relationship, correlation says nothing about these reasons.⁷

Confidence limits used to determine significance were set at the .05 level. This is the accepted level of significance for similar sociological research. Barnes points out that because of the relatively rough measuring instruments we must use in this type of research, the five percent level of significance is as stringent a level as practicable.⁸ He further stated, "The level at which the researcher chooses to set significance should be determined by his estimate of the importance or practical significance of his findings."⁹

The researcher decided to accept as significant all values at the .05 level. This decision was in keeping with the study objectives and acceptable research practices.

⁷ Frederick Williams, Reasoning With Statistics, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, 1968, p. 127-128.

⁸ Fred P. Barnes, Practical Research Processes, (Springfield, Ill., Illinois Curriculum Program, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1958), p. 80.

⁹ Ibid., p. 81.

With the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, all r values that exceed .195 will be significant at the .05 level.¹⁰

Analysis of Study Data

In order to provide the reader with an early overview of the data, Table 48 shows all the relationships existing in the study as tested by the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Using a linear regression model, all forty-eight variables are compared to each other. As mentioned earlier, all values exceeding .195 are significant at the .05 level.

In all positive relationships, the measures vary together; the two variables thus are moving together in a positive direction, or together in a negative direction. In all negative relationships, variables move in opposite directions to each other.¹¹ For example, if age-in-years and length of residence in the community both vary in the same direction, the magnitude of the measurement would be positive.

Background Information of Respondents

Respondents' income level. - When comparing respondents' income level with the other forty-seven variables, a significant positive relationship existed between leaders' income level and the number of organizations that respondents belonged to; formal educational

¹⁰ George W. Snedecor and William Cochran, Statistical Methods, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1967, p. 174.

¹¹ Frederick Williams, op. cit., p. 127.

