

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

ROBERT L. SAVAGE
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville

The participation of citizens in the politics of the sundry levels of government in the United States receives much attention from political scientists and other scholars, and this attention has probably increased due to stronger demands from the national government for state and local decision makers to provide a role for greater popular "consultation." Yet, most of this effort, whether in scholarly research or governmental programs, presupposed an "agenda" for public action developed by policy makers and other political leaders and transmitted through the mass media. Citizen participation, then, is defined largely in terms of responses to rather specific stimuli--policies proffered by political leaders--with little regard for more basic policy values that may shape more general responses, especially evaluations by citizens of the adequacy of the community in responding to their needs and the competency of government more specifically to deal with such problems.

Where the literature does deal with such general policy values, it is generally focused upon the "policy maps" of political leaders (Eulau and Eyestone, 1968; Williams and Adrian, 1963; Adrian, 1972). Such research has demonstrated the utility of understanding basic images of the proper role and scope of governmental action in shaping political decision making. The research reported here attempts to carry similar conceptions to the perceptual responses of citizens by exploring the degree to which they, too, are constrained by such basic images.

Policy Valuation and the Local Community An Exercise in Political Imagery

In a study of four Michigan cities of similar size, Williams and Adrian (1963) found that the orientations of political elites toward the role and scope of governmental action tended to follow one or another of four basic types. The *caretaker* orientation would limit municipal government to providing essential services, especially fire and police protection and certain public works programs. The *social amenities* orientation would add to these essential services the provision of facilities that would heighten the life style of the community which require resources beyond the capabilities of private agencies or individuals. Libraries, swimming pools, and public television stations are examples of such amenities. The *broker* orientation stresses the role of government as a conductor-facilitator in arbitrating among conflicting interests within the community. Finally, the *booster* orientation would have local government involved in programs promoting economic advancement, particularly the attraction of industry to the area.

These orientations emerged from the data gathered by Williams and Adrian; they were not theoretical types which guided the design of the research. As a consequence, the types are described in terms rather specific to the four communities. Still, they are emergent empirical types of policy orientations that assisted greatly in explaining differences among the cities.

In examining the attributes of governmental policy differentially stressed by the four orientations, however, one basic dichotomy seems apparent. As Lasswell and Kaplan (1950; see also Brown et al., 1970) have argued, values can be grouped under two primal categories, deference and welfare. *Deference* refers to various values that point to differential social relationships such as power, respect, affection, and

rectitude. *Welfare* values, on the other hand, stress various aspects of material well-being such as physical security, enlightenment, wealth and skill.

The Williams-Adrian typology reflects this basic dichotomy in the pursuit of values. Both the caretaker and broker orientations stress social relationships within the community, particularly those having to do with the definition of social status in the community. Indeed, this is obvious in the case of the broker orientation with its concern for potential conflict among differing social interests. The caretaker orientation, however, stresses deference just as definitely with its insistence that government closely restrict its activities and not tamper with the existing social order. And just as clearly, the social amenities and booster orientations place stronger emphasis upon material welfare values, such as parks and libraries in the first case and economic development the second case.

The dimension of policy valuation does not sufficiently differentiate between the caretaker and broker orientations on the one hand and the social amenities and booster orientations on the other. Sociological theory, however, especially the work of Ferdinand Tonnies (1940, 1971), is instructive as the basic attributes of the four types suggest still another dichotomy that cuts across the value dimension and, in effect, recreates the four-fold typology. Tonnies noted that during the nineteenth century some communities retained the life-style of the small rural village to varying degrees, a life-style where ties among members of the community are based primarily upon *affect*, how they felt about one another. In other locations he noted a difference in these communal bonds, a growing tendency to exhibit *instrumental* concerns in social relationships. The broker and booster orientations tend to be characterized by this latter category while the caretaker and social amenities orientations seem concerned to retain affective bonds as the chief tie among citizens.

The four-fold typology reflecting these two dimensions of value objectives and communal bonds is graphically depicted in Figure 1. Each of the cells represents a distinctive *image* of what community life is, can be, or ought to be. Inasmuch as government action shapes such images, they are distinctive policy maps differentiated by the contours of policy valuation and communal bonds.

**FIGURE 1
THE UNDERLYING DIMENSIONS OF THE WILLIAMS-ADRIAN
TYPOLOGY**

COMMUNAL BONDS:

<u>Policy Valuations</u>	<u>Affective (a)</u>	<u>Instrumental (b)</u>
<u>Deference (c)</u>	Caretaker (ac)	Broker (bc)
<u>Welfare (d)</u>	Social Amenities (ad)	Booster (bd)

But while such images appear to characterize the outlooks of local political leaders, this may not be the case for ordinary citizens. Assuredly, anthropologists and sociologists have found the affective-instrumental distinction in communal bonds to have considerable utility in explaining differences within and among communities.¹ Yet, their findings have had little impact upon political research. The

one example of empirical analysis of "policy images" beyond scattered measures of isolated traits--such as liberalism-conservatism or radicalism-traditionalism--is the work of Wilson and Banfield (1963, 1964, 1971) who have argued that certain population groups in American cities tend to follow one or the other of two orientations toward public affairs in the local community. Their term for such policy images, "ethos," refers essentially to a culturally-validated image. The two image alternatives they describe are labeled "unitary" (or "public-regardingness") and "individualist" (or "private-regardingness"). However, these tend to overlap the Lasswellian categories of welfare-deference, at least in terms of the Williams-Adrian typology, even though they are conceptually distinct. Thus, the Wilson-Banfield contribution cannot be directly incorporated into the experimental design that guides the research effort reported here.

Certain questions arise, then, when these disparate analytical and empirical strands are woven together. Do citizens tend to share a small number of distinctive images of the proper role and scope of community action? Does the individual image an ideal community in the same terms as the community he resides in? Do the empirically-established images, or policy maps, of citizens correspond to the theoretical typology emerging from studies of policy makers? And if such empirical types vary from this expectation, what are the salient dynamics of such images and what are the implications of this variation? The research reported here is an exploratory effort to probe such images of the political community in one Southern city.

Measuring Images of Community Action: An Exploratory Q-Sort Design

In order to test for the emergence of typical images of the role and scope of local community action among citizens, this study employs Q-technique and utilizes a small sample (n=40) of residents of a small Southern city (population 42,500) balanced to meet the criteria of experimental needs rather than those of large-sample survey research. The person sample is composed of two categories of such residents. Persons living in privately-owned housing constitute half of the respondents; the other twenty persons reside in public housing projects.

These categories were selected in order to maximize the likely variation in responses. While there is no incontrovertible evidence to this point, it seems likely that given the social desirability of privately-owned housing in the United States, persons living in such housing are on the one hand less dependent upon governmental action but on the other hand more centered in the mainstream of the community's social-psychological space (Milbrath, 1965).² Still, a caveat should be kept in mind--the person-sample is not necessarily representative of the city's population in general nor either of the subpopulations.³

Following Q-sort procedure each respondent sorted statements according to specified instructions. The statements (n=48) in the Q-sample represent the dimensionalities described above as underlying the Williams-Adrian typology and presented in Figure 1. Each of the possible combinations--affective-deference (ac), affective-welfare (ad), instrumental-deference (bc), and instrumental-welfare (bd)--is represented by twelve statements, comprising the total of 48 statements.

The 48 statements, typed one to a card, were randomly shuffled and given to each respondent with the instruction to sort the statements from "most like" to "least like" the "City as it Ideally Should Be" and again the "City as It Actually Is." Each respondent performed both sorts but the order of presentation was varied across

respondents; no order effects were found. Respondents were required to place statements in a forced distribution for which the scores and distribution are as follows:

		(most like)				(least like)			
Score	+4	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	-4
Frequency	$\frac{3}{3}$	$\frac{4}{4}$	$\frac{5}{5}$	$\frac{8}{8}$	$\frac{8}{8}$	$\frac{5}{5}$	$\frac{4}{4}$	$\frac{3}{3}$	$\frac{3}{3}$

Images of Two Communities: The Actual and the Ideal

For each sort condition the 40 Q-sorts are intercorrelated, Q-factored, and rotated to simple structure by the Varimax method.⁴ A four-factor solution is extracted for each sort condition to test for the hypothesized typology rather than to use some recognized but equally arbitrary statistical criterion. Analysis of variance is used to test the strength of the theoretical components with image (factor score) arrays. Moreover, the degree of association among image types (clusters of persons sorting the statements in basically similar ways) across both the actual and ideal community sorts and similarly among the image arrays (the modal distributions of statements for the various image types) is determined.

Images of the Actual City as a Political Community

The most striking conclusion to be drawn from the Q-sorts of statements about political life in this Southern city is the high degree of idiosyncrasy, or particularity, of these images. A four-factor solution, as shown in Table 1 (at end of paper), explains only 41.6% of the total variance. Moreover, communalities for many individuals are extremely low. Citizens are also spread rather evenly across the four factors. In other words, there is no evidence of anything like a consensual image of the community.

There are no apparent socio-demographic regularities associated with the loadings of persons on the factors. This is obviously the case with type of residency, public or private housing. Moreover, among those respondents who live in private housing there is no indication that homeowners are distinctive from renters. Nor do sex or education have any bearing upon the image types. Finally, such attitudinal-behavior traits as partisanship, ideology, and voting participation are unrelated to the factor-analytic results.

What then are these images of the city? Table 2 presents modal scores across the array of statements for each image type. Persons of Type I perceive this city as a highly "privatized" community; indeed, while government is active (statement 32), there is no social conscience underlying its policies and programs (e.g., 15, 16, 17, 19, 23). Moreover, the government is generally conservative (7). The Type I image, then, is generally that of a *caretaker* government located in a community where there exists already a considerable degree of social and economic inequality. If inequities are to be adjusted here, only the actions of individuals and private groups can be looked to.

The other images are not so easily characterized although the Type II image does roughly approximate a *booster* orientation (37, 38, 42). Yet, the person perceiving the city in this way seemingly recognizes a disturbing lack of security, physical and emotional, in community life (7, 10, 14, 22, 24) that may derive from the inadequacies of local leadership (4, 5, 29, 35).

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

The Type III image, on the other hand, stresses the high degree of orderliness in the community (14, 24, 27). And while government is not oriented toward promotion of economic advancement, it is open and effective (8, 29, 34, 35, 39). Generally, the Type III image corresponds roughly to a *gemeinschaft* type of community with its relatively higher degree of social integration as compared to the other image arrays.

This contrasts with Type IV in which physical security seems guaranteed (9, 21, 40) and political life exhibits strong affective bonds (2, 4, 10) but where political leaders have largely failed to provide effective government (26, 27, 41, 43, 45, 46). Type IV, then, is a *static* community where life is tolerable but where collective goals are not reached even if they are formulated.

Images of the Ideal Political Community

Where there is somewhat greater consensus in images of the ideal community, the difference is not great (see Table 3). The four-factor solution explains only 49.5% of the total variance, and for several respondents communalities are less than 25%. However, eighteen respondents have their heaviest loadings on Factor 1 and six others have statistically significant secondary saturations on the factor. This contrasts with the relatively even spreading of respondents across the factors underlying the sorts describing the actual community.

As seen in Table 4, the Type I image stresses welfare values, particularly physical security (14, 24, 40) and an egalitarian order with a high volume of communication (1, 3, 31, 39). And with the noticeably greater support for educational and cultural facilities even at the risk of higher taxes (20), the image may appropriately be labeled an *egalitarian amenities* orientation toward the desirable community.

The Type II image of the ideal community differs from all the other factors in that certain social characteristics are relatively common among the people who constitute the image type. They are far more likely to be homeowners and are generally better educated, usually with at least some college work. As a consequence, the typical array of Q-statements shows one marked similarity with the ideal Type I image array--an even stronger emphasis upon communication between citizens and leaders (8, 28, 34, 39). On the other hand, the Type II person is much less concerned about equality (12, 17, 31). The image also clearly stresses the importance of a strong, effective government generally (27, 29, 41, 47), and the public promotion of economic growth specifically (37). The image, then, is more than just a booster orientation; it points to a community governed with *responsive strength*.

The Type III image stresses equality and welfare values similarly to ideal Type I (5, 9, 15, 21, 31, 48) but deemphasizes the role of citizen-leader communications (2, 8, 28, 39) contrary to both Types I and II. And also unlike ideal Type II, the Type III person is not as concerned about strong governmental action. A *social welfare* orientation pervades the image.

Finally, the Type IV image suggests both the privatization (rugged individualism?) of the actual city Type I image and the conservatism in the actual city Type IV image, but the ideal Type IV image is not just a caretaker orientation (38) nor an idealized status quo (46, 47). Rather, the ideal Type IV image corresponds to what Elazar (1984) calls a "traditionalistic" orientation. Government serves to maintain the existing social order in the *traditionalist* community. Hence, "people have an equal say in determining" the final products of governmental action (31) but this is a philosophic stance of rule by the "General Will." Citizens are assuredly not encouraged to complain about specific actions (28, 34).

The Ideal and the Actual Communities Compared

While it is to be expected that images of an actual community will vary from those of a more abstract ideal community, it also is reasonable to expect that attributes of both communities should cluster to represent essentially similar objects. Yet, these forty citizens appear to be describing rather dissimilar objects in the two Q-sorts. Correlation analysis confirms this differentiation.

The degree of similarity of the image arrays was determined through the use of the Pearsonian correlation coefficient. As Table 5 (at end of paper) shows, correlations of ideal image arrays among themselves, and similarly those for image arrays describing the actual city, are stronger and more often positive than those measuring the degree of association between ideal and actual images.

Moreover, persons having a similar image of the ideal community do not generally share the same image of the actual community as the very weak measures of correlation across image types in Table 5 demonstrate. A further bit of evidence that the two communities are dissimilar objects is the degree of association between the two Q-sorts for each person. Residents of public housing have a mean correlation between the two sorts of -0.13 (with a range of -0.63 to 0.45); residents of private housing have a mean correlation of 0.01 (range=- 0.58 to 0.92).⁵ For residents of public housing, then, to the extent that the ideal community is related at all to the actual community, that relationship is typically negative. For those living in private housing there tends to be no association at all--the ideal and the actual are two different worlds as these people image them.

Hypothesized and Empirical Images

One of the great values of the Q-sort procedure is that it allows the respondent to organize his/her perceptions in his/her own terms even when the selection of statements is determined by theoretical design. Assuredly, relatively straight-forward versions of two types from the Williams-Adrian typology emerged from the actual city Q-sorts--the caretaker and booster orientations. And a modified version of the social amenities orientation emerged from the ideal sorts. Still, the preponderance of evidence precludes the extension of this image typology from political elites to typical citizens.

Of more utility, however, would be an assessment of the strength of the theoretical components--policy values and communal bonds--in shaping such community images. Analysis of variance of the 2 x 2 design contained within each of the eight image arrays provides such a test.⁶ However, in only one instance, the Type IV image array of the actual city, is there a pronounced effect. Policy values have a statistically significant effect ($F= 8.0, p \leq 0.01$) in that the image of this Southern city as a static community assigns greater weight to statements indicating deference values rather than to welfare values. Yet, before concluding that the theoretical components are of little or no utility in differentiating images of the community, note should be taken of the "...greater, but not" statistically significant, weight of policy values over communal bonds for the other seven image types as well.

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

Bridging the Gap Between the Existent and the Desirable

To summarize, then, the findings support the following conclusions:

1. Distinctively different images of the proper role and scope of community action are shared by small clusters of citizens. However, individual images exhibit much particularity.
2. Images of the actual community do not coincide with those of the city as it ideally should be.
3. If the policy map typology emerging from studies of political elites has empirical validity generally, then citizens tend to imagine the political community in rather different terms.
4. The dynamics of such citizen images are not at all apparent. Still, the role of substantive policy values (deference versus welfare) requires more study. Moreover, radicalism-traditionalism may be an important dimension in such imagery.

Two caveats must be noted, however. In the first place, it bears repeating that the sample of persons examined here is a purposive one and not a representative sample. Secondly, the city in which the study was conducted is by no means representative of other cities. Perhaps citizens in other communities are more attuned to the perceptual categories of their leaders. The work of Prewitt and Eulau (1959) suggests that this Southern city may not be atypical in this regard, however.

A final note must be directed to those who are concerned with the possibility of widespread dissatisfaction with their life-styles among the citizens of this small city. Anyone who visits the city will find little evidence of civic unrest. The one political cleavage of potential importance is between those who tend to place a high value upon environmental protection and those who are more concerned about the economic vitality of the community and region. These interests are not mutually exclusive and have not been organized as political groups in active opposition to one another. How, then, do citizens reconcile their not-too-ideal images of the political community and their frequently rhapsodic descriptions in everyday discourse of the delights of the city as a place to live? Perhaps because the city's government rules, as Prewitt and Eulau would suggest, *unobtrusively*, the citizens are not forced to bridge that gap.

Endnotes

¹The *gemeinschaft-gesellschaft* typology, with its emphasis upon this distinction between affective and instrumental relationships, has had a checkered career, nomologically speaking. Benvenuti (1972), Lerner (1958), and Alford (1969), for example, use the terms "modernism-traditionalism." Emery and Oeser (1958) and Vucinich (1960), on the other hand, prefer "urban-nonurban," whereas Redfield (1941, 1947, 1956), and Wirth (1938) use the terms "urban-folk." Redfield (1956) also distinguishes between the "Great Tradition" (urban) and the "Little Tradition" (rural). A related, although by no means equivalent, concept is "cosmopolitanism-localism" (Merton, 1949; Coleman, et al., 1966).

²Some internal evidence strongly supports this contention. The respondents were asked about their level of interest in local politics. The results were as follows:

	Private Housing Residents	Public Housing Residents
Not interested	--	3
Slightly interested	1	5
Somewhat interested	9	8
Very interested	10	4

This is further supported by responses to questions asking if the person had voted in the most recent city election and if currently registered to vote:

	Private Housing Residents	Public Housing Residents
Voted in latest election	11	7
Currently registered to vote	16	12

³Still, a strong effort was made to avoid any social characteristics, beyond the obvious, that cut across and thereby confound type of housing as the experimental source of variation. Thus, public housing residents ranged in age from 19 to 83 and those in private housing ranged from 18 to 63. Males were more easily obtained as respondents among those in private housing (50%) than in public housing (25%). Somewhat surprising, perhaps, is the relatively high educational level of the public housing respondents as shown in the following frequency table:

	Private Housing Residents	Public Housing Residents
Less than high school	1	3
High School	3	4
Some College	9	6
College	7	7

Except as is noted in the discussion of the findings, however, none of these characteristics is of any significance in shaping the results.

⁴All factor analyses reported here were accomplished with the aid of QUANAL, a factor-analytic computer program devised by Norman van Tubergen. See Rummell (1970) for a discussion of factor analysis as a statistical procedure, especially pp. 195-196 on Q-factor analysis and pp. 368-394 on Varimax rotation.

⁵The twelve homeowners, however, have a mean correlation between ideal and actual sorts of 0.17 (range = -0.22 to 0.92), suggesting the important association of one's stake in the community represented by housing conditions with the perceived centrality-peripherality of community life.

⁶Absolute values were used in the ANOVA computations as the psychological direction of a number of statements were reversed. Moreover, the concern here is with the *stress* placed upon the theoretical components.

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

References

- Adrian, C.R. (1972). "A Comparative Typology of Urban Government Images," in *City Classification Handbook: Methods and Applications*, B.J.L. Berry, ed. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Alford, R.R. (1969). *Bureaucracy and Participation: Political Cultures in Four Wisconsin Cities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Benvenuti, B. (1962). *Farming in Cultural Change*. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Brown, S.R., et al. (1970). "Three Contributions to a Theory of Political Subjectivity," unpublished manuscript.
- Coleman, J.S., et al. (1966). *Medical Innovation; A Diffusion Study*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Elazar, D.J. (1974). *American Federalism: A View from the States*. Third Edition. New York: Harper and Row.
- Emery, F.E., and Oeser, O.A. (1958). *Information, Decision and Action: A Study of the Psychological Determinants of Changes in Farming Techniques*. Carlton, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Eulau, H., and Eyestone, R. (1968). "Policy Maps of City Councils and Policy Outcomes: A developmental Analysis," *American Political Science Review*. 62: 124-143.
- Lasswell, H.D. and Kaplan, A. (1950). *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lerner, D. (1958). *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R.K. (1949). "Patterns of Influence: A Study of Interpersonal Influence and of Communications Behavior in a Local Community," in *Communications Research, 1948-49*, P.F. Lazarsfeld and F.N. Stanton, eds. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Milbrath, L.W. (1965). *Political Participation: How and Why do People Get Involved in Politics?* Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Prewitt, K. and Eulau, H. (1969). "Political Matrix and Political Representation: Prolegomenon to a New Departure from an Old Problem," *American Political Science Review* 63: 427-441.
- Redfield, R. (1941). *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____ (1947). "The Folk Society," *American Journal of Sociology* 52:293-311.
- _____ (1956). *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rummel, R.J. (1970). *Applied Factor Analysis*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Tonnies, F. (1940). *Fundamental Concepts of Sociology*. C.P. Loomis, translator. New York: American Book Company.
- _____ (1971). *On Sociology: Pure, Applied and Empirical*. W.J. Cahnman and R. Heberle, editors. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vucinich, A. (1960). "Soviet Ethnographic Studies of Cultural Change," *American Anthropologist* 62: 867-877.
- Williams, O.P., and Adrian, C.R. (1963). *Four Cities: A Study in Comparative Policy Making*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wilson, J.Q., and Banfield, E.C. (1963). *City Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- _____ (1964). "Public-Regardingness as a Value Premise in Voting Behavior," *American Political Science Review* 58: 876-887.
- _____ (1971). "Political Ethos Revisited," *American Political Science Review* 65: 1048-1062.
- Wirth, L. (1938). "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44: 1-24.

Table 1: Types of Perceptions of the Actual Political Community: Q-Factor Matrix*

Person	Factor				h ²
	I	II	III	IV	
Residents of Private Housing:					
1.	72	13	-32	21	0.67
4.	71	-10	-00	05	0.52
8.	70	13	03	07	0.50
17.	61	-08	35	03	0.50
38.	61	15	-01	12	0.40
24.	45	08	32	14	0.33
18.	05	58	28	-22	0.47
37.	-06	58	17	-01	0.37
29.	09	55	-22	-09	0.37
15.	04	54	24	-10	0.36
5.	39	43	06	29	0.43
33.	40	43	33	41	0.62
6.	37	38	01	-11	0.29
34.	-23	04	66	19	0.52
9.	01	-07	59	-01	0.35
7.	34	42	44	-00	0.49
10.	-03	12	43	15	0.23
23.	33	06	41	-03	0.28
13.	31	16	32	08	0.23
30.	06	-20	07	26	0.12
Residents of Public Housing:					
3.	65	-03	35	-14	0.57
31.	65	-05	11	14	0.45
2.	61	-13	-25	25	0.51
19.	54	34	26	-15	0.50
21.	54	12	-08	-49	0.56
36.	52	38	-13	-07	0.43
25.	41	62	-17	-09	0.59
28.	-16	61	08	16	0.43
35.	01	56	05	11	0.33
22.	32	53	03	28	0.47
20.	03	53	30	-07	0.37
32.	11	22	66	-19	0.53
39.	03	-05	48	-52	0.50
14.	13	-10	01	63	0.42
12.	20	-03	30	57	0.46
16.	29	17	-50	47	0.58

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

40.	-03	40	-15	46	0.38
11.	27	29	24	16	0.24
26.	21	-08	-23	-21	0.15
27.	19	02	34	07	0.16

Cumulative percentages of total variance are:

18.7	28.2	35.7	41.6
------	------	------	------

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings (FL). $FL \geq 0.37$ are statistically significant with $p \leq 0.01$.

Table 2.
Typal Arrays of Perceptions of the Actual Political Community

Q-Statement	Typal Array			
	I	II	III	IV
AFFECTIVE-DEFERENCE				
1. All lawbreakers are dealt with equally.	-4	-3	-2	-4
2. A political candidate must be open, honest and friendly if he expects to win here.	-2	1	-2	3
3. Only taxpayers should be allowed to vote.	-1	-3	-4	0
4. Snobbish city officials are replaced.	0	-2	-1	2
5. An individual's income is unimportant in determining his political standing here.	-2	-3	-3	-2
6. Lawbreakers are dealt with firmly.	3	-1	0	-3
7. Laws do not change very often here.	4	0	1	4
8. Anyone can talk to our city officials.	-1	1	3	2
9. There is little insecurity here; people know they have a place in the community.	-2	-1	-1	0
10. Fighting between groups in our city is very rare.	1	-3	-2	3
11. Members of the community are loyal to it.	0	0	1	-3
12. No one puts on airs here.	-1	-4	-1	1
AFFECTIVE-WELFARE				
13. City employees do a full day's work for a full day's pay.	2	-1	-3	-1
14. Our town is peaceful and orderly.	2	-2	4	1
15. Handicapped people are looked after with special care for their safety.	-3	2	0	3
16. Most of the people in our city expect the elderly to be cared for by their relatives.	3	0	-1	4
17. Upper class people in our city are concerned about the welfare of their poorer neighbors.	-4	-2	-2	-1
18. People join together in clubs to help the community.	3	4	4	2
19. We look after ourselves first.	4	1	-3	2
20. We have high tax rates to provide good educational and cultural facilities.	1	3	0	-2
21. No one is allowed to go hungry here.	-3	-1	-3	3
22. Our children are disciplined and know where they will go in life.	0	-2	-1	2
23. Our government is for law-making not for giving money to the poor.	3	1	1	-2
24. The streets are so safe that policemen are needed only for traffic control.	-1	-4	0	-4

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

INSTRUMENTAL-DEFERENCE

25.	People of various minorities have initial problems here that are soon smoothed over if they will participate in community service groups.	-3	-1	1	-3
26.	Our government is effective because leading people in the community are consulted.	0	1	0	-1
27.	The city council keeps things running smoothly.	0	2	-1	0
28.	City employees respond to citizen complaints and suggestions.	2	4	-1	-1
29.	We have many capable leaders, all of whom command the respect of the people.	0	2	1	2
30.	Our city manager puts efficiency before friendliness.	-2	0	0	-1
31.	People have an equal say in determining what the government does.	3	1	4	3
32.	Our government has its nose in just about everything.	-4	-4	-4	-4
33.	We have a proud heritage and do all we can to show it; that heritage spurs greater community efforts.	-2	0	0	-1
34.	All citizens are provided with opportunities to speak out on issues that affect them.	3	3	1	-1
35.	Our voting commissioners are honest and there is no chance of a contested election.	1	0	-1	1
36.	Because we care about our fellow citizens, our government will try to tackle just about any problem.	1	0	-1	-3

INSTRUMENTAL-WELFARE

37.	Local leaders do much of the economic advancement of the community.	-1	2	0	0
38.	We believe private industry can do a better job at providing services than can public agencies.	-3	0	2	-2
39.	If you want to know anything about our city government, that information is easy to come by.	2	3	-2	-2
40.	The city tries to provide self-help opportunities for its youth.	2	-1	2	-1
41.	At-large elections are held so as to attract the most capable persons to governmental service.	-1	1	-1	1
42.	Many private groups that will provide the manpower for community services are supported by local government.	-1	0	1	-3
43.	Providing services to the people is the most important function of our government.	3	4	2	-1
44.	Community leaders worry about major problems and let the minor ones work themselves out.	-2	-1	-3	-4

Robert L. Savage

45.	Our government and its agencies seek outside advice on policies affecting service to the people.	-1	-1	1	-1
46.	Our leaders work to see that our community reaches its goals.	0	1	-1	1
47.	The community has a strong, vigorous government.	-1	4	1	1
48.	Our government will help business and people who need and deserve assistance.	0	0	2	-2

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

Table 3: Types of Perceptions of the Ideal Political Community: Q-Factor Matrix*

Person	Factor				h ²
	I	II	III	IV	
Residents of Private Housing:					
23.	74	01	25	-13	0.63
8.	73	22	33	-13	0.70
30.	70	02	09	06	0.50
33.	69	20	18	19	0.58
1.	67	01	33	-02	0.56
6.	57	-05	43	29	0.60
4.	57	04	56	17	0.67
29.	52	27	29	12	0.44
38.	51	31	31	-21	0.49
15.	05	69	09	-19	0.53
13.	04	64	21	-27	0.53
9.	-19	61	16	23	0.49
17.	48	57	-00	19	0.59
37.	51	54	03	13	0.57
18.	14	53	-20	27	0.41
5.	30	22	57	04	0.46
7.	39	04	45	18	0.39
10.	24	36	44	45	0.58
24.	27	-03	17	34	0.22
34.	28	22	15	-46	0.36
Residents of Public Housing:					
2.	79	25	07	-04	0.70
3.	71	01	31	23	0.65
22.	69	-11	35	02	0.61
16.	63	34	39	-01	0.66
19.	62	24	29	09	0.53
27.	59	53	01	03	0.62
25.	55	29	-06	31	0.48
28.	53	32	04	-20	0.42
20.	52	06	-15	08	0.30
39.	37	72	14	20	0.70
14.	14	47	35	-14	0.38
31.	16	15	72	-04	0.57
21.	37	-10	56	25	0.53
32.	47	42	53	25	0.73
11.	-22	18	52	00	0.35
36.	-11	09	-06	62	0.41
26.	18	37	13	42	0.36

Robert L. Savage

35.	22	00	15	37	0.21
12.	-01	00	07	08	0.01
40.	36	07	22	31	0.27

Cumulative percentages of total
variance are:

31.6 38.9 44.4 49.5

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings (FL). $FL \geq 0.37$ are statistically significant with $p \leq 0.01$.

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

Table 4.

Typal Arrays of Perceptions of the Actual Political Community

Q-Statement	Typal Array			
	I	II	III	IV
AFFECTIVE-DEFERENCE				
1. All lawbreakers are dealt with equally.	4	1	0	3
2. A political candidate must be open, honest and friendly if he expects to win here.	1	2	1	2
3. Only taxpayers should be allowed to vote.	-4	-3	-4	-4
4. Snobbish city officials are replaced.	0	-2	-1	0
5. An individual's income is unimportant in determining his political standing here.	2	1	3	0
6. Lawbreakers are dealt with firmly.	-2	-1	-3	2
7. Laws do not change very often here.	-3	-2	-2	0
8. Anyone can talk to our city officials.	1	3	0	0
9. There is little insecurity here; people know they have a place in the community.	1	1	4	4
10. Fighting between groups in our city is very rare.	0	--1	-0	-2
11. Members of the community are loyal to it.	-1	-1	1	3
12. No one puts on airs here.	-1	-4	-1	1
AFFECTIVE-WELFARE				
13. City employees do a full day's work for a full day's pay.	0	3	0	4
14. Our town is peaceful and orderly.	3	2	3	2
15. Handicapped people are looked after with special care for their safety.	2	-1	3	0
16. Most of the people in our city expect the elderly to be cared for by their relatives.	-3	-2	-3	-2
17. Upper class people in our city are concerned about the welfare of their poorer neighbors.	1	-2	-2	3
18. People join together in clubs to help the community.	-1	1	2	1
19. We look after ourselves first.	-3	-4	0	1
20. We have high tax rates to provide good educational and cultural facilities.	1	-3	-4	-3
21. No one is allowed to go hungry here.	4	-3	4	-1
22. Our children are disciplined and know where they will go in life.	4	-3	41	-1
23. Our government is for law-making not for giving money to the poor.	-1	-1	-1	4
24. The streets are so safe that policemen are needed only for traffic control.	4	1	3	1

INSTRUMENTAL-DEFERENCE

25.	People of various minorities have initial problems here that are soon smoothed over if they will participate in community service groups.	1	-1	-2	-2
26.	Our government is effective because leading people in the community are consulted.	-2	0	0	-3
27.	The city council keeps things running smoothly.	1	0	1	-4
28.	City employees respond to citizen complaints and suggestions.	-1	4	1	-1
29.	We have many capable leaders, all of whom command the respect of the people.	-2	-2	1	0
30.	Our city manager puts efficiency before friendliness.	12	1	1	1
31.	People have an equal say in determining what the government does.	-4	-1	--4	-3
32.	Our government has its nose in just about everything.	4	1	-4	1
33.	We have a proud heritage and do all we can to show it; that heritage spurs greater community efforts.	0	0	2	0
34.	All citizens are provided with opportunities to speak out on issues that affect them.	-3	3	3	1
35.	Our voting commissioners are honest and there is no chance of a contested election.	0	-4	2	0
36.	Because we care about our fellow citizens, our government will try to tackle just about any problem.	-2	0	-1	0

INSTRUMENTAL-WELFARE

37.	Local leaders do much of the economic advancement of the community.	2	3	0	0
38.	We believe private industry can do a better job at providing services than can public agencies.	1	-1	-1	1
39.	If you want to know anything about our city government, that information is easy to come by.	0	-1	3	-1
40.	The city tries to provide self-help opportunities for its youth.	-1	4	0	4
41.	At-large elections are held so as to attract the most capable persons to governmental service.	-1	0	2	0
42.	Many private groups that will provide the manpower for community services are supported by local government.	2	3	2	1
43.	Providing services to the people is the most important function of our government.	2	2	3	-2
44.	Community leaders worry about major problems and let the minor ones work themselves out.	1	1	-2	-1

Images of Community Action in a Southern City

45.	Our government and its agencies seek outside advice on policies affecting service to the people.	0	2	-1	-1
46.	Our leaders work to see that our community reaches its goals.	1	2	4	-1
47.	The community has a strong, vigorous government.	1	0	0	1
48.	Our government will help business and people who need and deserve assistance.	-1	2	2	-2

Table 5: Correlations of Image Types and Image Arrays*

	Ideal Community Image Type				Actual Community Image Type			
Ideal Type I								
Ideal Type II	.45							
Ideal Type III	.57	.36						
Ideal Type IV	.29	.33	.30					
Actual Type I	-.65	-.17	-.37	-.17				
Actual Type II	-.12	.18	-.03	-.30	.26			
Actual Type III	.14	.46	.05	.07	.17	.36		
Actual Type IV	-.21	-.23	.06	-.18	.20	.17	-.04	

*Correlations of image types (factor loadings) are presented in the upper right-hand diagonal of the table; correlations of image arrays (factor scores) are shown in lower left-hand diagonal.