ASCERTAINING THE PROBLEMS, NEEDS, AND INTERESTS OF STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA (1981)

By

KAREN S. BELL

Bachelor of Arts

Brooklyn College

Brooklyn, New York

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1981

ASCERTAINING THE NEEDS, PROBLEMS, AND INTERESTS

OF STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA (1981)

Thesis Approved:

Marshall E. Allen
Thesis Adviser

J. W. Rhea

Walter J. Ward

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study, a general public survey, was a partial fulfillment of the Federal Communication Commission's ascertainment requirement for KOSU-FM, a Public Radio station. KOSU-FM is licensed to Stillwater, Oklahoma and must survey the general public of that community. The general public survey can be completed any time within the station's three-year period before its license renewal application date. The primary objective of the general public survey is to ascertain the needs, problems, and interests of the community of license. The top ten problems thus ascertained are used by the radio station as topics for programming to meet the needs of their public.

I would like to express my appreciation to my thesis adviser, Marshall E. Allen and other committee members, Dr. Walter J. Ward and Dr. James W. Rhea. Their guidance and patience were invaluable to the completion of this project.

Especially I would like to express my gratitude to my husband, Timothy, who took time away from his own doctoral dissertation to give me much needed help with this survey. Finally, thanks go to my two sons, Ross and Drew, for their understanding, patience, and sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requires all noncommercial or public radio stations and all commercial and noncommercial television stations to formally ascertain the problems, needs, and interests of their community of license. This process includes ascertaining community leaders and the general public. The general public survey can be carried out any time within the three-year period before license renewal. Based on fulfilling these requirements, a station's license will either be renewed or denied.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the problems, needs, and interests of the general public in Stillwater, Oklahoma. This general public survey will partially fulfill the license renewal requirements for KOSU-FM, a public radio station licensed to Oklahoma State University in Stillwater.

The study uses a random sample drawn from the Stillwater telephone directory. This sample was contacted by telephone and administered a standardized questionnaire. The survey addressed two general research questions:

1. What problems do Stillwater residents perceive to be significant in their community?

2. How do these perceptions compare with those ascertained by community leaders?

In Chapter I the thesis reviews the development of the FCC's

ascertainment requirements and discusses literature critical of these requirements. The methdology of the survey will be discussed in Chapter II. The first part of the chapter will address the sample survey, construction of the questionnaire and the use of the telephone interviews as a method for data collection. The second part of the chapter will explain the statistical tests used to interpret the data supplied by the telephone interviews. Chapter III will present the findings, and Chapter IV the conclusions and limitations.

Development of the FCC Ascertainment Requirement

The ascertainment requirement for license renewal has caused confusion and much dialogue from both broadcasters and the Federal Communications Commission. The requirement grew from a loose and diverse statement reported by broadcasters, to a standardized and formal report.

Initially, ascertainment requirements were for commercial broadcasters only. However, in 1976, formal ascertainment requirements were adopted for noncommercial broadcasters. Now, when the formal ascertainment requirement has been recently mandated for public radio, it has been lifted for commercial radio. On April 3, 1981, the FCC deregulated commercial radio by removing the formal ascertainment and program logging requirements in their present form. This will be discussed later in the paper.

The deregulation of commercial radio does not affect the withdrawal of the ascertainment requirement for noncommercial broadcasters, but something else does. As part of an attempt to balance the federal budget and reverse inflationary trends, the current administration under President Ronald Reagan proposed to discontinue federal funding for

public radio and television. Without funding, it is highly questionable whether this system will continue and with it, of course, the ascertainment requirement. However, the requirement to ascertain the problems, needs, and interests of the community of license is currently in effect, and noncommercial broadcasters must comply with it.

A somewhat unusual parallel exists, since both public radio and television, and ascertainment requirements developed from unstructured beginnings to highly bureaucratized and seemingly established systems. Both now appear to be on the way out.

The ascertainment requirement for license application and renewal had its origin in the Radio Act of 1927 (Pember, 1977). Although the need for this regulation rose out of the chaos of early radio's channel interference, the new law also dealt with government regulations of programming, licensing and renewal. The rationale behind this government intervention stemmed from the philosophy that the airwaves are a limited resource which belongs to the public. Broadcasters are, therefore, users of this scarce public resource. It was established in this Act that broadcasters must act "in the public interest, convenience and necessity" (Blakely, 1979, p. 48). He says:

> . . . Congress delegated judgment concerning what is in the 'public interest' almost entirely to the commercial owners and operators of stations. But the law was broad enough to permit the regulatory authority eventually to make decisions that encouraged the development of a supplementary broadcasting system in which noncommercial institutions could share in determining what is in the 'public interest' (p. 48).

The Radio Act of 1927 was expanded in the Federal Communications Act of 1934 to include regulation of telegraph and telephone industries. In other ways, it was a reenactment of the 1927 Act. The vague terminology of "public interest, convenience and necessity" (Blakely, 1979, p. 48) led to the FCC developing ascertainment rules to determine

public interest (Pember, 1977).

A station's license comes up for renewal every three years. At this time the renewal application can be challenged by another applicant, licensed station and, as of 1966, private citizens (Pember, 1977). The denial of license renewal is the same as a termination of business. A station cannot operate without a license.

Formal ascertainment of the community's needs, problems, and interests is a FCC requirement for licensing and renewal, but now it affects only noncommercial radio and television broadcast stations. There are four basic procedures for fulfilling ascertainment as per the 1971 Primer (which has now been withdrawn for commercial radio).

1. Interviews must be conducted by station management with community leaders.

2. At least once during each license term and/or in six months preceding the filing for license renewal, each licensee (except some small-market stations) must conduct a random sample survey of community needs and program preferences.

3. A statement of needs ascertained by the two surveys is then developed. This statement of needs should interpret the data, and it is a sort of 'state of the community' consideration of the audience for the station.

4. A statement of the programming that will serve the identified needs is finally drawn up and implemented (Wood and Wylie, 1977, p. 154).

A standardization of ascertainment requirements and methods began when in 1960 the FCC issued the "Report and Statement of Policy re: Commission en banc Programming Inquiry"(FCC 60-970, July 29, 1929). In this statement, the Commission defined a station acting in the public interest as "the diligent, positive and continuing effort by the licensee to discover and fulfill the tastes, needs and desires of his community or service area, for broadcast service" (Fed. Reg. 25, 1960, p. 7295). To aid the Commission in determining whether a

station was indeed acting in the public interest, it then required an applicant or renewal applicant to prepare a statement on Part IV of the application form as to

1. The measures he has taken and the effort he has made to determine the tastes, needs and desires of his community or service area, and

2. The manner in which he proposes to meet those needs and desires (Fed. Reg. 25, 1960, p. 7275).

The Commission then outlined the methods to obtain this information. First a canvass of the general public, and second, consultations with community leaders. These leaders would represent such groups as educators, business, public officials, agriculture, professional and eleemosynary organizations, religions, the entertainment media, and "others who bespeak the interest which make up the community" (Fed. Reg. 25, 1960, p. 7296).

The en banc statement mentioned above left the actual methodology of the ascertainment process up to the individual broadcasters. To help clear up some confusions as to what was to be shown in fulfillment of Part IV of the application form, the FCC in August of 1968 issued a statement entitled "Broadcast Applicants re: Ascertainment of Community Needs."

This statement basically reiterated the requirements set out in the en banc "Notice of Inquiry." However,

> The Commission held that a survey of community needs is mandatory and that 'applicants despite long residence in the area, may no longer be considered ipso facto familiar with the programming needs and interest of the community' (Fed. Reg. 23, 1968, p. 12113).

The statement went on to clarify the community leader survey. These leaders should include a "representative range of groups." The leaders should be identified by "name, position and organization"

(Fed. Reg. 23, 1968, p. 112113). Moreover, these consultations should not deal with approval of existing or planned programming, but with community needs (Fed. Reg. 33, 1968.)

In December, 1969, in order to further clarify and standardize the ascertainment requirement, the FCC issued "Notice of Inquiry re: Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants." The Commission referred to this inquiry as the "Primer," and released it in a question-and-answer format.

For the first time the words "needs and interests of the people" in the broadcast community of license were defined as "words synonymous with community problems" (Fed. Reg. 34, 1969, p. 20282). However, a community's needs, other than problems, should not be overlooked--such as a need for more local news, etc. Also for the first time, a compositional breakdown of the community was required to aid in determining a representative range of groups for the community leader survey. As for the general public survey,

> The applicant should indicate by cross-sectional survey, statistically reliable sample or other valid method, that the range . . . (of) individuals consulted be truly representative of the economic, social, political, and other elements of the community (Fed. Reg. 34, 1969, p. 20282).

The purpose of the general public survey was outlined as one designed to elicit more information than gleaned from community leaders. "Groups with the greatest problems and needs may be the least organized and have the fewest recognized spokesmen; thus additional effort may be necessary to ascertain their needs and problems" (Fed. Reg. 34, 1969, p. 20283).

This "Primer" required the ascertainment procedure be concluded within six months of the renewal date, or filing an application for

assignment. All significant problems were required to be listed, whether or not the broadcaster chose to treat all through programming. It required program logging; that is, programs which are proposed to meet particular problems. The applicant must give the "title, time segment, duration, frequency of broadcast, and description of the program and the community problem which is to be treated by it" (Fed. Reg. 34, 1969, p. 20283). A station could use public service announcements only, but would have the burden of proof to show it as the most effective way of dealing with community problems (Fed. Reg. 34, 1969, p. 20284).

In 1971, the FCC adopted a revised Primer based on the one proposed in 1969. The Commission issued a "Primer on Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants: Report and Order." The philosophy behind this "Primer" was to

> . . . aid broadcasters in being more responsive to the problems of their communities, add more certainty to their efforts in meeting Commission standards, make available to other interested parties standards by which they can judge applications for stations licensed to their community, and aid our staff in applying our standards of uniformity (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4092).

As stated in the 1969 "Primer," community needs were defined as community problems, needs and interests, and not program preferences. The "Primer" retained the General public survey as a necessary method of gaining information perhaps not obtained in the community leader survey. A compositional breakdown of the community was required, and consultations with groups that were not formally organized. However, the community leaders consulted should represent a significant group.

The 1971 "Primer" also clearly defined acceptable methods for the community leader and general public survey. Management personnel would be responsible for consultations with community leaders. The

concept of joint ascertainment was presented and permitted as a reasonable method to obtain community leader information. The general public survey could be conducted outside the management level, or by professional research companies. However, the "Primer" did not mandate imposing rigid statistical requirements because of the costs involved.

> . . . a 'random sample' of the general public must be consulted. References to a 'representative range' or to a 'statistically reliable sampling' will be omitted. For our purposes a random selection may be taken from a city directory, or may be done on a geographical distribution basis (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4098).

This is the first time a method of sample selection was discussed by the FCC. The Commission further stated that a mail questionnaire for the general public would not be acceptable, unless the questionnaires were hand-collected. The rationale was that those questionnaires that were voluntarily returned by mail produce a response bias.

Program logging was retained in the 1971 "Primer" and the broadcast matter defined as "Matter to 'meet community problems.' We use the word 'meet' to include responsibility to meet, aid in meeting, be responsive to, or stimulate the solution for community problems" (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4099).

The Commission took a stronger stand than did the 1969 "Primer" against the sole use of public service announcements instead of programs by stating ". . . in our judgment, sole reliance on announcements raises a question as to the adequacy of the proposal" (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4102).

As per the 1969 "Primer," all community problems ascertained should be listed but amended to read "not those which are clearly frivolous" (Fed Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4102). The broadcaster did not have to program to meet all problems, but the extent to which they were met

through programming would be taken into consideration.

On November 7, 1967, the Public Broadcasting Act was signed by President Johnson. This event broadened the scope of instructional television and radio (Blakely, 1979). The shift toward a more public image for Educational Television (ETV) was later to bring increased demand for programming responsive to the various elements of the public.

Special interest groups, such as the National Association of Black Adult Educators, the National Black American Law Student Association, the National Association of Black Students, and Sandra W. Bennett, Ph.D., individually, on September 19, 1973, requested a revision of the application form for renewal of noncommercial broadcast license. The request was to

> . . . require all applicants for noncommercial educational broadcast licenses, including applicants for renewal of station authorizations, to ascertain community problems, needs and interests and to propose programming in response thereto (Fed. Reg. 38, 1973, p. 26212).

Heretofore, ascertainment as a requirement for license applications and license renewals was confined to commercial broadcast properties. In the above request, which appeared in the "FCC Notice of Inquiry and Proposed Rule Making," the petitioners' reasons for this ascertainment request were because

> The evident change in emphasis to public programming demonstrates the need to impose formal ascertainment requirements on educational broadcasters to insure programming responsive to the general educational and cultural interests of communities and to the special problems of minority groups (Fed. Reg. 38, 1973, p. 26212).

The Black associations mentioned above defined "public" programming as programming "which attempts to present news, public affairs, and cultural offerings to the community at large" (Fed. Reg. 38, 1973,

p. 26212). They also defined "instructional" programming as "programming directed toward the student" (Fed. Reg. 38, 1973, p. 26212).

The FCC agreed with the petitioners:

> And noncommercial broadcasters have increasingly recognized their duty to serve, to a significant extent, as outlets for local expression. When noncommercial frequencies were first allocated, applications by educational institutions seeking to meet their own institutional needs predominated. The present profile of noncommercial educational stations, however, is quite different, as petitioners have pointed out. Although many stations still devote a portion of their broadcast day to instructional programming, the major part of that day, particularly evening hours and weekends, is occupied by programming which is aimed at a broad spectrum of community problems, needs and interests (Fed. Reg. 38, 1973, p. 26213).

In the 1971 "Primer," one can detect the stirrings of the future dialogue concerning ascertainment and noncommercial broadcasters. The "Primer"makes it a point to mention educational and noncommercial stations are exempt from ascertainment, as a response to a religious station's challenge for exempt status. The station alleged religious stations have specialized religious programming similar to specialized educational programming (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971).

The year 1973 marks the beginning of the Commission's interest in expanding the ascertainment requirement to include noncommercial or public broadcasting. The "Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking re: Educational Broadcast" mentioned above, considered the comments of special interest groups, especially Black associations which felt their needs were not being met by public broadcasting. Also, public broadcasting had recently changed its image from an instructional medium to an instructional, informational, and entertainment medium.

In the Fall of 1975, the FCC issued a statement announcing that noncommercial stations would be required to follow the ascertainment

procedures currently defined for commercial broadcasters. However, there would be some flexibility. On March 25, 1976, the FCC issued a "Primer" for noncommercial broadcasters in Docket No. 19816. The "Primer" sets out specific guidelines for noncommercial broadcasters. Although basically the same in concept as the commercial "Primer," it allows more involvement of volunteers in ascertaining community leaders, and more informal methods for the general public survey. The rationale for these differences is based on the limited funds with which public stations operate. In fact, public radio stations were given a large range of flexibility by permitting them to "ascertain by any reasonable methods designed to provide them with an understanding of the problems, needs, and interests of their service areas" (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 12428). Instructional programming was considered best served by those knowledgeable in education, and those stations dealing with in-school formats were exempt from ascertainment.

In 1976, the FCC issued two primers, one for noncommercial broadcasters, as mentioned above, and the other for commercial broadcasters. The primers added new concepts to the ascertainment requirement. Surveys were previously conducted within six months prior to license renewal. Now broadcasters were to ascertain all though the license period. This concept of continuous ascertainment divided the task over three years. According to the FCC: "Our aim . . . was to enable the licensee to report the same single, continuous effort in three annual segments instead of one voluminous exposition near the end of the license term" (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 1373).

The general public survey, however, need be conducted only once during this three-year period, the time period chosen at the broadcaster's own discretion.

As a result of continuous ascertainment, instead of broadcasters submitting proposed programming to meet community problems, the program logging would illustrate programs already aired.

> The retrospective nature of the suggested problems-program list . . . is one means of evaluating periodically the effectiveness of an ascertainment's programming results. This yearly look backward at problems and illustrative programming which treated them is, we believe, particularly appropriate for renewal applicants who must 'run on their records' (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 1373).

New applicants must still comply with an ascertainment survey completed within a six-month period prior to the license application.

To aid broadcasters in choosing representative community leaders, and to further standardize ascertainment, the primers included a community leader checklist. This list is part of the form returned to the FCC and includes categories of diverse groups that are present in most areas. A broadcaster simply finds persons representing each group (if they are present in the community), interviews, then checks them off the list and tallies the numbers interviewed. The primers also provide a table suggesting the total number of leaders interviewed per total population. The number of leaders interviewed in each category is left to the discretion of the broadcasters.

To further standardize and to clarify the list of problems ascertained, the primers requested the list should contain no more than ten significant problems found within the year, and to place the list in the public file. Previously, all problems ascertained were to be listed (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976).

> 'Significant' strikes the desirable balance between meaningful recording of service rendered and the licensed discretion to evaluate not only the significance of a problem but the feasibility of treatment by the licensee's particular station (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 1373).

Along with this more rigid approach to ascertainment is a loosening of former requirements. The compositional breakdown of the community can be replaced by a demographic breakdown provided by the U. S. Census. In addition, non-management, or non-principals, may conduct fifty percent of the community leader interviews.

If one compares the 1976 commercial "Primer" with the noncommercial "Primer," one uncovers one basic difference. That is, the flexibility with which public broadcasters can fulfill the ascertainment requirement. Community leaders can be interviewed by " . . . a group of on-the-air interviews, townhall setting, chance encounters, telephone interviews . . . call-in shows" (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 12420). Commercial radio broadcasters were encouraged to conduct face-to-face interviews. The noncommercial "Primer" also permits experimentation for the general public survey, but requires new applicants to comply with the 1971 "Primer."

> Renewal applicants also may seek the views of the general public through periodic call-in programs or public meetings - the frequency to be a reasonable function of continuity - or some combination of these two basic methods. We stress that these may be treated as genuine 'record' alternatives, and not merely as supplements to the traditional random sampling (Fed. Reg. 41, 1976, p. 12429).

The remainder of the requirements, such as continuous ascertainment, community leader checklist, and program problems list containing ten significant problems, parallels the commercial "Primer."

Summary

The Federal Communications Commission ascertainment requirement began as a formal standardized report by broadcasters in 1971. The 1976 noncommercial "Primer" marked the beginning of formal ascertainment for public television and radio stations. Both commercial and

noncommercial broadcasters had to:

1. conduct a continuous ascertainment survey;

2. interview community leaders as per the community leader checklist;

3. conduct a general public survey;

4. list ten significant problems and programs aired to meet them (PSAs not allowed to fulfill requirement);

5. provide a demographic breakdown of the community as provided by the U. S. Census Bureau.

Public television and radio stations are allowed more flexibility and experimentation in conducting the community leader and general public surveys. The rationale behind the flexibility is the limited funds with which noncommercial broadcasters operate.

Criticism of Ascertainment Requirements

The ascertainment process is a rigorous ritual for broadcasters. Most cannot spare the time or the staff to fulfill the requirements with optimum results. The diversity of reports is a result of time and money spent to garner this information. There is a growing opinion that because of this diversity in methodology and data interpretation the benefit of an ascertainment survey is questionable. By deregulating commercial radio, the FCC seems to be in agreement.

Program logging can have limited scrutiny by the FCC because of First Amendment rights, and license challenges get lost in a giant understaffed bureaucracy called the FCC. Perhaps the deregulation of commercial radio will pave the way for elimination of ascertainment for all broadcast stations.

The 1976 primers are far superior to the 1971 "Primer" in

delineating the procedures for an ascertainment. More descriptive language has somewhat clarified the vague terminology used previously. However, the primers are far from explicit. Although a checklist is provided to choose leaders from various socio-economic, political, cultural, and other elements of the community, how one qualifies as a community leader is not described.

> A rationale for deciding who is a community leader and why he is a community leader was never discussed. There was no indication within any application that the station grappled with the question of 'figurehead' leaders, 'task' leaders versus 'emotional' leaders, 'general community' leaders versus 'special group' leaders, etc. . . . Thus, this whole area of identifying community leaders is methodologically non-existent (Surlin and Bradley, 1973-4, p. 98).

The authors also point out that interviewing a leader may indicate formal stands and not the various attitudes of those within the group who are not elevated to the office. Foley (1972) proposes that because a leader's comments are on public file, his comments might intend to be more cautious.

A basic flaw in the "Primer" is that individual broadcasters can define the word problem in many ways. In Bell and Miller (1980) some broadcasters considered problems as quite general problems, such as crime, drugs, etc. According to them, problems so defined did not seem to fluctuate from year to year. However, other broadcasters defined problems in more specific terminology, and the broadcasters felt the problem did fluctuate from year to year. This is backed up by Foley's study in 1972.

In Bell and Miller (1980) and Foley (1972), the question is raised as to how much more information is gained through an ascertainment than is intuitively known by local broadcasters about their own community.

Walker and Rudelius (1976) point out the difficulty in contacting

members of groups which are not organized, though the FCC mandates their ascertainment. Members of these groups would not be on the community leader checklist, and perhaps not included in the sample of the general public survey. They called these groups "voiceless" (p. 90).

> It is also questionable whether the kinds of general information obtained from public surveys is sufficient for a detailed understanding of the specific needs of these 'voiceless' groups; particularly since the social stigma attached to some of their problems may make group members reluctant to participate in surveys or give detailed responses to open-ended questions (p. 90).

The following groups were considered voiceless and therefore excluded from ascertainment surveys:

> hard of hearing
> elderly persons on fixed incomes
> mental patients in rehabilitation programs
> women prisoners
> teenage expectant mothers
> run-away teenagers
> venereal disease victims
> American Indians
> Black teenagers
> Asian immigrants
> physically disabled

The authors contacted members of these groups and concluded that although they seem diverse, they had needs in common. They posit it is essential to find "common problems and needs of various groups" (p. 98) and state

> It may be impossible for a single broadcaster to be responsive to all such groups, particularly since some constitute a rather small proportion of community residents . . . it is a problem inherent in the very concept of community need-ascertainment and the social responsibility of broadcasters (p. 98).

The report of data analysis techniques is not required by the FCC. Therefore Foley (1972) postulates that there is no way to determine accurately how a station arrives at its problem list. Few stations, in his study, compared community leaders with the general public.

Stations which did, found significant disagreement about the importance of community problems.

McGuire (1979) suggests the agenda-setting theory of McCombs and Shaw (1972) might influence the validity of the general public survey. The theory is that the public will consider an issue important in proportion to the amount of media coverage it receives.

Ascertainment and Program Logging

The surveillance of the broadcast industry by the federal government is unique in a country where First Amendment rights are enjoyed by the press and others in the media. According to Rivers and Schramm (1969):

> To understand the atmosphere of broadcasting, one must imagine newspapers, book publishers, and film companies as being required to obtain a federal license before going into business, and to renew it - giving proof of good public service - every three years. Such a requirement would be intolerable, and it would be bitterly resisted as contrary to our concept of free communication and undoubtedly in violation of the First Amendment (p. 68).

Broadcast channels were defined as a scarce commodity, and the government has stepped in to protect the public's interest. To tell a broadcast station what to program, however, would violate First Amendment rights. However, the ultimate good derived from an ascertainment is the programming aired, which the FCC describes as the "obligation to meet, aid in meeting, be responsive to or stimulate the solution for community problems" (Fed. Reg. 36, 1971, p. 4094). The FCC cannot determine from an ascertainment the quality of a program aired or whether it can help solve a community problem. Most broadcasters feel they cannot solve problems; at best they can make the public more informed. Nor can the FCC determine whether a program

attracted an audience (Foley, 1972). Nor should it. In 1976, FCC Commissioner O. Robinson stated:

> The bald truth is that, without being deeply involved in programming supervision, it is difficult to ensure that licensees are responsive to community needs. Especially when one considers the dangers of government control in an area so circumscribed by free speech considerations, no apology need be made for a clear and forthright recognition that some things lie largely beyond our control (McGuire, 1979, p. 23).

With these considerations, he suggested an abandonment of ascertainment.

Bell and Miller (1980) found that those broadcasters interviewed in Stillwater and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, believed that ascertainment should not be a requirement of the FCC. Concerned broadcasters will be ascertaining their communities either formally or informally without the requirements. These broadcasters agreed the marketplace or public would ultimately determine what broadcase properties stay in business. "Ascertainment may prove helpful, but it is no final solution; it brings no certainty. Neither does any other regulatory device that touches on the area of program content" (Krasnow and Quale, 1974, p.12).

Ascertainment and License Challenges

Apparently the real good derived from an ascertainment is a basis to judge a station's social responsibility when its license is challenged at renewal time. At that time, the FCC will pull the file on a station and read its ascertainment report. According to one station manager interviewed by Bell and Miller (1980):

> If you could see the FCC public document room and library of the FCC it would seem so obvious that nobody reads this /ascertainment/. They have rooms where . . . /the forms/ are literally stacked on the floor and tables, reams and reams of paper (p. 10).

Foley (1972) compared ascertainment studies filed before and after

the 1971 "Primer," and found the greatest difference was the volume of papers produced and not the quality of the reports.

As a result of an understaffed FCC and mountains of ascertainment reports, most renewals are automatically accepted. The FCC is a bureaucracy. It takes years for a decision to withdraw a license. By then, the stations have corrected their situation. Pember (1977) says:

> In 1975, the Commission voted to strip the licenses from all the public television stations in Alabama because they had discriminated against blacks in the late 1960s. Their renewal applications were denied in spite of the fact that by 1975 the stations had solved discrimination problems of the 1960s and offered a broad range of programming for the black citizens of the state. In fact, many persons looked to public television in Alabama as a model for a broadcasting operation which both employed minority group members and served the minority community with high-quality programming (p. 395).

In some cases, Pember adds that withdrawal of a license might be warranted, but the station has continued in operation as long as ten years before the final decision was handed down. Because of growing speculation concerning the worthiness of the ascertainment process, the FCC and members of Congress are beginning discussions to rewrite the Communications Act of 1934.

Rewrite Proposals for Communications Act

In May, 1979, Lionel Van Deerlin (D-Cal) held hearings to determine provisions of a rewrite of the Federal Communications Act of 1934. At these hearings, opinions were presented by broadcasters and citizens groups with respect to the deregulation of television and radio in the areas of ascertainment and program logging. Proposed along with deregulation of television was a spectrum fee which rewrite author Van Deerlin has predicted would produce $150 million ("All

This Rewrite Talk," May 28, 1979).

Citizens' groups voiced opposition to the deregulation of television. Ralph M. Jennings, of the Office of Communications of the United Church of Christ, and Nolan Bower, of the Citizens' Communication Center, led the attack:

> The proposal to deregulate television after 10 years is based on the assumption that scarcity is becoming less of a factor in the industry. 'But if that is true,' said Bower, 'Why are the profits so high?' He argues that the marketplace is an inadequate device to inspire stations to deal with moral, cultural, and other social issues (p. 67).

A broadcaster, William Dilday of WLBT (TV), Jackson, Mississippi, associated himself with the citizens' groups' position.

> While defending his station's record - he touted his news and public affairs programming as going far beyond the FCC's requirements - he was skeptical about what other stations might do if deregulated. If there were no FCC requirement for television stations to carry local news, some stations might find it to their financial advantage to substitute syndicated fringe programs such as game shows, which would probably cost less than 20% of the news budget (p. 68).

At that time in May, 1979, FCC Commissioner James H. Quello was in favor of the House's Communications Act rewrite.

> In written comments to the Communications Subcommittee, the Commissioner repeated his feeling that the deregulatory provisions for broadcasting should be carried to the limit, removing all regulatory and First Amendment restraints from televison as well as radio (p. 70).

In September, 1979, the FCC came out with its own proposal for deregulation of radio.

> The Commission has listed three options warranting consideration in the area of ascertainment: retaining the status quo; eliminating all federally mandated requirements and leaving it to marketplace forces to insure that programming is supplied to meet the needs and demands of each station's listening audience; requiring that ascertainment be conducted by licensees, but permitting them to decide how best to conduct it ("FCC Takes a Final Step Forward Setting

Radio Free," September 10, 1979, p. 27).

In addition, the staff of the FCC would like to see the mandates lifted and the market place determine standards. Commissioner James Quello, a radio broadcaster for 30 years, said at the FCC meeting:

> All the officials and public groups interviewed want a better public perception of themselves and their jobs. It has been foisted on broadcasters by this Commission, and it's time we get rid of it ("FCC Takes a Final Step Toward Setting Radio Free," September 10, 1979, p. 28).

Commissioner Tyrone Brown was also in favor of eliminating the ascertainment requirement, but maintained that there should be a dialogue between broadcasters and their audience. Commissioner Abbott Washburn, on the other hand, said: "I've heard broadcasters say they've learned a a great deal . . . that these dialogues (ascertainment) have been healthy . . . to abandon it completely would be a waste" ("FCC Takes a Final Step Toward Setting Radio Free," September 10, 1979, p. 28).

After the Commission voted 7 - 0 to issue an inquiry and rulemaking with regard to radio deregulation, it published a document to that effect on September 27, 1979. The section on "Preferred Options" begins with:

> Our goal in this proceeding is to maximize the benefits of radio services to the public. If that goal can be achieved with a minimum of regulation on our part, we will increase the public benefit, for then we will have reduced the delays and costs of regulation without sacrificing service to the public. From this perspective, the option of eliminating the Commission's ascertainment obligations as well as the guidelines on non-entertainment programming and commercial matters is the most attractive ("The Mixed Bag of Deregulation," October 8, 1979, p. 32).

The notice goes on to say that over the years, radio stations have increased in numbers substantially. In 1927, at the adoption of the Federal Radio Act, there were 681 stations. Today, there are 8,654 AM and FM outlets, including 993 educational FM stations. The

marketplace has forced radio stations to specialize to compete for audiences. In addition, radio stations are providing more news and public affairs programming than are required by the Commission.

Deregulation of Commercial Radio

On Tuesday, February 24, 1981, the FCC issued BC Docket No. 79-219; RM-3099; RM-3273 FCC 81-17, entitled: "Deregulation of Radio." This docket reiterated the philosophy proposed in the above mentioned September 27, 1979, document. The 1981 docket states:

> In less than fifty years, broadcast radio has grown from an infancy of 583 stations in 1934 5o a maturity of nearly 9000 stations today. Moreover, in the early days of radio, it was essential that a few stations provide a broad general service. Today, however, it has become essential in view of the proliferation of radio stations and other broadcast services that radio licensees specialize to attract an audience so that they may remain financially viable. Consequently, policies that may have been necessary in the early days of radio may not be necessary in an environment where thousands of licensees offer diverse sorts of programming and appeal to all manner of segmented audiences (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981, p. 13888).

The philosophy of letting the marketplace determine whether a station is meeting the needs of its listenership is one that has been voiced repeatedly by broadcasters. This new thrust in direction by the FCC offers a more realistic approach for radio stations. The Commission realizes that a station need not cater to the tastes, needs, and problems of those who are not in its listenership, so long as these needs are met by another station in the same area. In other words, minority interests should be dealt with by a radio station whose format is geared for a minority audience. However, according to the FCC, if a station exists in a community with very few stations, this station is obligated to offer a broader spectrum of programming (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981).

The following is the official deregulation statement for commercial radio:

> We are eliminating the guideline and retaining only a generalized obligation for commercial radio stations to offer programming responsive to public issues. Under certain circumstances, the issues may focus upon those of concern to the station listenership as opposed to the community as a whole: Ascertainment - we are eliminating both the 1971 Ascertainment Primer and Renewal Primer. New Applicants must file programming proposals with their application and licensees seeking renewal are only obligated to determine the issues facing their community. They may do so by any means reasonably calculated to apprise them of the issues: . . . Program logs - We are eliminating programming logging requirements. The only record of programming that will be required will be an annual listing of five to ten issues that the licensee covered together with examples of programming offered in response thereto. This record must be placed in the public file (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981, p. 13889).

It is clear from these statements that what has been eliminated is the uniformity of obtaining ascertainment information and program logging. The keynote in the document is the localization of the garnering of this information. However, a station is not exempt from obtaining this information. The method of obtaining this information and reporting it is reduced to an informal report determined by each individual station. The Commission criticized the formal ascertainment requirement by stating that

> . . . ascertainment was never intended to be an end in and of itself. Rather it is merely a tool to be used as an aid in the provision of programming responsive to the needs and problems of the community. . . . Although we have been called upon to decide numerous cases revolving around issues of how an ascertainment was conducted, and whether it was sufficient, or if the correct community leaders were contacted by the requisite type of station employee, etc., one should not let this obscure the underlying purpose of ascertainment - to foster relevant programming relating to community issues (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981, p. 13898).

The Commission repeats the theme in this document that more important than the method by which ascertainment data are obtained is the proposed programming to meet this end.

The new requirements for license renewal by the FCC on the anniversary of the renewal date by the licensees are:

1. Place in the public file a list in narrative form of five to ten issues and examples of programming used to meet these issues.

2. A brief description of how the station determined these issues (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981).

Previously, the petition to deny a license renewal was determined by how a station conducted its formal ascertainment and programming aired to meet these problems. Now, if a station's license is challenged, the FCC will determine if the station acted reasonably in carrying out its obligations to address issues of importance to its listenership.

> Licensees directing their nonentertainment programming to a narrow audience may defend their decision by demonstrating the presence of other stations in the community that reasonably were relied upon to address the issues confronting the other segments of the community. . . . However, as with noncommercial stations, the mere presence of a minority station (for example) is not dispositive. If that minority oriented station had, for instance, consistently not presented such programming, the licensee's judgment may not have been reasonable. . . . In all cases, however, the burden will be upon the licensee to demonstrate, if called to do so, that its determination was reasonable (Fed. Reg. 46, 1981, p. 13877).

The actual deregulation went into effect on April 3, 1981.

Radio Broadcasters' Response to Deregulation

Although the deregulation of radio reduces the paperwork for stations and loosens the requirements for license renewal, it also adds uncertainty to this process.

The National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) requested that the FCC clarify the deregulation in three areas.

1. The generalized obligation of commercial radio stations to offer programming responsive to public issues should be clarified. The NAB said the Commission should, for instance, state specifically what weight it will attach to issue oriented programs carried at 'higher listenership' hours as opposed to other hours of the broadcast day, and make clear when broadcasters can rely on the programming of other stations in making up their own program schedule.

2. The order should be modified to reduce the paperwork required by modifying or eliminating the requirement that a licensee document the manner in which it determined a particular issue in the list of issues with which it said had dealt and was facing the community. The NAB said it agreed wit Commissioner Anne Jones's statement that the requirement was 'residual ascertainment' and could lead to a restoration of formal ascertainment which, she said, 'should be buried forever.'

3. The licensee should not be required to demonstrate the 'reasonableness' of its programming decisions, as the order states it would, in responding to complaints about programming. The NAB said such a requirement 'marks a clear departure from past FCC precedent and the most basic tenets of the First Amendment ("Radio Deregulation Survives Stay Request and Goes Into Effect," April 6, 1981, pp. 126-127).

The government and broadcasters seem to agree that the marketplace should determine standards. The deregulation of commercial radio is a step in that direction, but it is not a complete break from past requirements. At the present time, modern technology offers the consumer various choices for broadcast entertainment. There are AM and FM radio, cable television, satellite receivers, video recorders and video discs. The radio and television broadcast industries offer a variety of formats to satisfy the individual tastes of the marketplace, such as religious formats, music formats tailored to distinct tastes, public and commercial radio and television. Apparently, with all of these choices for the consumer, the public's problems, needs and interests will not be sacrificed by removing formal ascertainment for the broadcast industry.

Summary

The methodology and interpretation of data for ascertainment are quite diversified among broadcasters. The FCC has standardized the format of the report, but because of the diversity in methodology and interpretation of data, the results of an ascertainment survey are questionable. In essence, do they uncover real community problems?

The public interest, convenience and necessity should be met by programming catered to the problems uncovered by an ascertainment. Because of First Amendment rights, the FCC cannot regulate content and therefore cannot really judge if a program is of good quality or attracted an audience. All the FCC can monitor is whether a station provided programming related to problems ascertained.

In view of the rising opinion that ascertainment is a system which produces paper and not information, the FCC has deregulated commercial radio.

The deregulation of commercial radio is a loosening of requirements rather than a complete withdrawal of them. Formal ascertainment as it previously existed is replaced by an informal report listing five to ten problems ascertained by any method. The methodology used should be described briefly in the report. Examples of programming to meet these issues should be included in the report. If a station's license is challenged, the FCC will determine if the station acted reasonably in fulfilling its obligations to the public.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Sample Survey

The sample survey in statistical reseach is a tool with many varied uses. It can be used to determine voter preferences in a political campaign, consumer preferences and consumer acceptability of advertising campaigns. It is also a useful method for audience attitude research and ascertainment studies. Kerlinger (1964) says: "Sample surveys attempt to determine the incidence, distribution, and interrelations among sociological and psychological variables" (p. 411). The sample survey technique, specifically the telephone survey, was employed in this research study as the method for data collection in discovering the top ten problem areas for Stillwater, Oklahoma.

The sample survey uses a sample drawn from a larger population, in this case, all Stillwater household members 16 years old or older. Rather than interview each member of the population, a sample representative of the total population was drawn. To make the sample representative, it must be randomly selected. Runcie (1980) defines a simple random sample as "Each and every person in that large population has an equal chance of being included in our sample and that all combinations of a given size are equally probably" (p. 24).

Method of Sample Selection

The population in this study is operationally defined as individual

households in Stillwater, Oklahoma. One individual from each household participated, the criterion being that one individual was 16 years old or older. The systematic method of sample selection was used to draw the sample. This method was used instead of the simple random method, because it was less costly and time-consuming (Blankenship, 1977).

The sample was selected from the Stillwater telephone directory, using the names that appeared only in the Stillwater section. Glencoe and Perkins names were not included. The total number of pages in this category was 74. This number was multiplied by four, which is the number of columns per page. The resulting number of columns was then divided by the sample size, which was 317. The sample was overdrawn by 117 cases. According to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's An Ascertainment Handbook for Public Broadcasting Facilities (1976), one must overdraw the sample by approximately two-thirds of the total cases needed to obtain the desried completion total. This is because cases which are businesses, government agencies, numbers disconnected, busy, no answer, or refused, are rejected. The skip interval so calculated yielded .93, which was rounded off to 1. This meant that one name from every column would be picked. A table of random numbers was used to determine that every eleventh name in each column would be selected. Whenever a business or government agency turned up, it was rejected and a name was selected from the following column or skip interval. One pass through the telephone directory came up 49 names short. After a table of random numbers was consulted, every 26th name was drawn from every column until the sample selection was completed. (CPB Ascertainment Handbook, 1976; Blankenship, 1977). The same method was used to draw the ten samples for the pre-test.

Selection of the appropriate sample size is a major consideration

in a sample survey. The accuracy of the results which are used to generalize to the population depends on it. This accuracy or sampling error has been tabulated for various sample sizes when the expectation of results if 50-50. For a sample of approximately 196 observations at the 95 percent level of confidence, the estimated error is seven percent (Parten, 1950). Parten says "The permissible error is the largest deviation from the true value which would be acceptable to the sponsor or which would permit the surveyor to solve the essential question or questions of the survey" (p. 306). Sudman (1976) says "A general rule is that the sample should be large enough so that there are 100 or more units in each category of the major breakdowns and a minimum of 20 to 50 in the minor breakdowns."

Parten (1950) believes that a maximum number of ten cases in each category would be sufficient. Fewer observations or smaller samples are needed when the population is homogeneous. In this situation, the cases drawn will be more alike and therefore the means will be less variable (Parten, 1950). For most populations, however, as the sample size increases, the standard error decreases. Parten (1950) defines the standard error as measuring

> . . . the sampling fluctuation or variations in random sampling which determines the chances for not exceeding the tolerance of error . . . This means that about 19/20 or 95 percent of the sample estimates can be expected to fall within the limit of plus or minus two standard errors (p. 307).

Sudman (1977) reviews the current sample sizes used in survey research literature and outlines Table I.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting in its Ascertainment Handbook (1976) suggests Table II.

TABLE I

TYPICAL SAMPLE SIZES FOR STUDIES OF HUMAN AND INSTITUTIONAL POPULATIONS

Number of Subgroup Analysis	People or Households		Institutions	
	National	Regional or Special	National	Regional or Special
None or few	1000-1500	200- 500	200- 500	50-200
Average	1500-2500	500-1000	500-1000	200-500
Many	2500+	1000+	1000+	500+

Source: Sudman (1977) p. 87.

TABLE II

SUGGESTING A SAMPLE SIZE

Number of Demographic Control Variables	City Size	
	Under 100,000 Homes	Over 100,000 Homes
zero	200	350
one	200	450
two	400	525
three or more	500	600

Source: An Ascertainment Handbook for Broadcast Facilities, p. 10.

The criteria for sample size selection are varied according to the project, the cost, time involved, and the individual researcher. Based on the above mentioned literature and cognizant of the limitations (to be discussed later), a sample size of 200 cases was chosen for this ascertainment survey.

Sampling error is one of three errors in survey research.

According to Sudman (1977), the other two are

> . . . Sample biases which are a function of how well the study design is executed; and
>
> . . . Response effects which are the differences between reported and true measures of behavior, characteristics or attitudes (p. 16).

Questionnaire Construction

The questionnaire used was a combination of two, and appears in Appendix A. The bookkeeping portion, introduction, and demographic questions were taken from a sugested questionnaire printed in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's An Ascertainment Handbook for Broadcasting Facilities (1976). The rating scale of 1 to 5 (modified from 1 to 7) and instructions for the use was taken from an ascertainment study entitled "Issues in Ascertaining the Different Needs of Urban and Rural Community Leaders," by Robert K. Avery.

The 29 problem areas rated included problems from the Master Problem list suggested by the Corporation Broadcasting's Handbook mentioned above. It also included problems aimed at the voiceless group mentioned by Walker and Rudelius (1976) and problems getting media attention, such as battered wives and child abuse.

The interview schedule or questionnaire was broken down into three parts: (1) identifying information which included length of time of interview; how many callbacks until completion and refusals; (2) survey questions which included the respondent's overall satisfaction with living in Stillwater; and (3) census-type information, including highest grade completed, age, race, income, sex, and length of time the respondent lived in Stillwater. This complies with Parten's (1953) construction of questionnaires.

The interview schedule was standardized to reduce altered responses due to difference in word and question order (Selling et al., 1962).

The questions asked were of two types - closed or fixed alternatives, and open-ended. The problem areas were rated on a scale from 1 to 5. A response of 1 meant a problem was of little concern; 3, of moderate concern, and 5 meant a problem of great concern. There were four levels of satisfaction with living in Stillwater; from 1, not satisfied at all to 4, very satisfied. The respondents were asked the highest grade completed, and how many years they lived in Stillwater. These were free responses which were coded later. Respondents were asked the question, "What is your age?" and the interviewer coded the response into one of seven categories. There were seven categories for race and six for family income. These were read to the respondent.

An open-ended question concerning the respondent's desire to gain more information on any problem area of his or her interest was asked immediately after the problems rated 1 to 5. These responses were recorded as accurately as possible and coded later for frequency of repeated responses and new problem areas uncovered.

On closed and open-ended questions, Sellitz et al. (1960) says:

> Closed questions are more efficient where the possible alternative replies are known, limited in number and clear cut. Thus they are appropriate for securing factual information (age, education, home ownership, amount of rent, etc.) and for eliciting expressions of opinions about issues on which people hold clear opinions. Open-ended questions are called for when the issue is complex, when the relevant dimensions are not known or when the interest of the research lies in the exploration of a process or of the individual's formulation of an issue (p. 262).

The interview is a unique situation to the respondent and interviewer. This interaction and focused verbal content creates an atmosphere that is subject to complex psychological pressures (Kahn and

Cannell, 1957). The interviewer's intention is to keep a respondent from refusing to cooperate. For this reason, the questionnaire had an introduction worded to motivate the respondent to elect to respond. Kahn and Cannell (1957) refer to this as extrinsic motivation and can be developed if the respondent sees a relation to

> (1) the relevance of the interview content to a change which he desires. The respondent will not spontaneously perceive every research project to be related to his goals and interests; (2) the role of the interviewer in bringing about change, or as the representative of an agency which is able to bring about change (p. 46).

The placement of questions in an interview creates a delicate balance between a respondent's cooperation and refusal. For this reason, the questionnaire began with warmup questions concerning length of time the respondent lived in Stillwater and level of satisfaction with living there. The problem areas began with questions dealing with paved roads, and not until question 5 was one asked concerning alcoholism. Difficult questions were surrounded by less focused ones. For example, question 19 -"abuse of the elderly"- was surrounded by question 18 concerning"high utility rates," and question 20 - "lack of parks and recreation facilities."

Demographic questions were asked after the open-ended question. The sex of the respondent was not asked, but coded by the interviewer. This avoided extraneous comments or awkward moments.

Kahn and Cannell (1957) say:

> Interviewers report that the introduction of a question on income will frequently result in hesitancy or temporary interruption of communication by the respondent. . . . Nor is the income question unique in this respect; rather it is typical of reactions to material which the respondent finds relatively threatening. . . . The interviewer might postpone the offensive question until a later time in the interview on the assumption that the interpersonal bonds are being steadily strengthened and that they will

> sustain such a question best when they have approached their maximum (p. 55).

The Telephone Survey

The telephone survey was selected as the technique for data collection because of its low cost, speed, and ease with which to reach a large sample. Because of the increase of crime in the streets, there is a growing resistance toward face-to-face interviews both on the part of respondents and interviewers. Telephone interviews are easy to supervise and eliminate a bias which might arise because of the way an interviewer looks or dresses; they eliminate a third party bias because the telephone interview is strictly one-to-one. There is also a compulsion to answer the telephone (Blankenship, 1977).

Interviewer Selection and Training

All interviews were conducted by one paid interviewer who was trained by the researcher. The interviewer was a female who had a pleasant telephone voice, perky attitude, and patience. The training session consisted of reading the questionnaire aloud until the phrasing appeared consistent. The interviewer also became more comfortable with the schedule during pretesting.

Conduction of the Interview

The telephone survey lasted from March 28, 1981, until April 6, 1981, with a pretest on March 25. The pretest was used to uncover problems with the format of the questionnaire (Runcie, 1980). No calls were made on Saturday evenings. All calls were made from a list of numbers given to the interviewer and in the presence of the researcher.

The calling began at 5:30 p. m. and ended around 10 p. m. The interviewer let the phone ring ten times before hanging up. This was to allow elderly people time to get to the telephone. Three callbacks were allowed each number before rejection. A completion rate of almost 70 percent can be achieved after three callbacks (Blankenship, 1977).

Blankenship (1977) published this, Table III, to show completion rates based on one, two, and three callbacks:

TABLE III

CUMULATIVE COMPLETION RATE IN THREE ATTEMPTS IN TWO NATIONAL STUDIES BY THE DATA GROUP INCORPORATED

Random Number	Attempt 1	Attempt 2	Attempt 3
Probability (listings 15,718)	35.2%	56.3%	67.6%
Telephone directory (listings 4,812)	43.1%	58.3%	68.9%

Source: Blankenship (1977), p. 83.

The interviews lasted approximately ten minutes with an average of twelve completed in an evening. The researcher edited the completed interviews for errors as they were turned in.

The questionnaire was then coded for ease in tabulation. The length of time in Stillwater was coded as

4 years and under = 1 = shorter-time resident

over 4 years = 2 = longer-time resident

The satisfaction level was coded as

1 = not satisfied at all

2 = not very satisfied

3 = somewhat satisfied

4 = very satisfied

The problem areas ranged from 1 to 5, as mentioned previously. The researcher later divided and labeled the problem areas into two groups. Questions 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, and 29 were labeled "government," and contained 14 in all. Questions 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, and 26 were labeled "environment" and contained 15 in all. Breaking the problems areas into two groups facilitated comparisons, and interpretations were made later.

Highest grade completed was coded as

1 = 8th grade completed

2 = some high school

3 = high school degree

4 = some college

5 = college degree

6 = post-degree work

Age categories were coded as

1 = under 18 years

2 = 18-25 years

3 = 26-35 years

4 = 35-50 years

5 = over 65 years

6 = refused

Age categories were collapsed to

1 = 25 years and under = younger age category

2 = over 25 years = older age category

Race was coded as

1 = White

2 = Black

3 = Asian

4 = Native American

5 = Hispanic

6 = other

7 = refused

Total family income was coded as

1 = under $10,000

2 = $10,000 - $15,000

3 = $15,001 - $20,000

4 = $20,001 - $25,000

5 = over $25,000

6 = refused

These categories were later collapsed to

1 = under $10,000 = lower income

2 = $10,000 and over = higher income

Sex was coded as F for female and M for male

Statistical Tests Used

The statistical tests selected to interpret the data were chosen to answer these specific research questions:

1. What are the ten highest mean scores for the problem questions? Or, which are the ten problems of most concern to Stillwater residents?

2. Is there a significant difference between the means of each demographic subgroup? Was there a different group of ten problem areas when the sample was broken out into subgroups?

3. Is there a relationship between a demographic characteristic and the way they viewed a problem? If there was a relationship, how strong was it?

The comparison between Stillwater community leaders and Stillwater residents was done statistically.

The central tendency and variance of the dependent variables which were levels of satisfaction with living in Stillwater, and degrees of concern for each problem area labeled government and environment, were measured by the mean and standard deviation for the total sample. In addition, the standard error of the mean for each dependent variable was measured. Kerlinger (1964) says:

> The standard error of the mean . . . is a standard deviation. It is a standard deviation of an infinite number of means only chance error makes the means fluctuate. Thus the standard error of the mean - or the standard deviation of the means . . . is a measure of chance error in its effect on one measure of central tendency (p. 107).

The formula for the standard error of the mean is

$$SE_M = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where SD = the standard deviation of the sample

n = number of cases in the sample n
(Kerlinger, 1964, p. 196).

The tabulations were computed by the Statistical Analysis System or SAS computer package. In this package, along with the above measures, the system computes the coefficient of variation. This is used to describe the variation in the population. The coefficient of

variation is computed by dividing the standard deviation by the mean and multiplying by 100. This measure is unitless. The larger the standard deviation, the larger the coefficient of variation.

The frequency of cases and percentages for each demographic breakdown and similar responses per each question were tabulated. The sample was then divided into three groups, labeled satisfaction levels 2, 3, and 4. The means, standard deviations, standard errors and coefficient of variations were calculated for these groups' responses to each of the 29 questions rating degrees of concern for problems. The sample was then broken down by grade completed, then by age, race, total family income, sex, and years lived in Stillwater, and tabulated in the same fashion as above.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was calculated for each question and groups government and environment by each demographic. This coefficient measures if there is a relationship between measures if the numbers covary. Kerlinger (1964) says:

> Product-moment and related coefficients of correlation . . . are based on the concomitant variation of the numbers of sets or ordered pairs. . . . The most useful indices range from + 1.00 through 0 to - 1.00, + 1.00, indicating a perfect positive relation, - 1.00 a perfect negative relation, and 0, no discernible relation, or zero relation (p. 69).

The t-test procedure was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the means for each dichotomous demographic breakdown per each question and groups government and environment; that is, was there a difference between the means for men and women, income levels 1 and 2, and so on? The t-test is based on the assumption that the variances between the two groups are equal. The SAS program also computes an approximate t assuming the variances are unequal. The degrees of freedom used to compute the approximate t is

derived by using Sattherwait's approximation. The F (folding) statistic is used to determine the equality of the two variances. The formula for the t test is

$$t = \frac{M_A - M_B}{SE_{M_A - M_B}}$$

where $M_A - M_B$ = difference between sample means

$$SE_{M - M_B} = \sqrt{SE_{MA}2 + SE_{MB}2}$$

= standard error of the differences between the means (Kerlinger, p. 209)

To determine if a t is significant, the degrees of freedom must be computed. The df is equal to $(n_1 + n_2) - 2$ (Bruning and Kintz, 1977).

The F (folding) statistic is computed by dividing the larger variance by the smaller variance and determining significance using the F table after computing the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom are one less than the number of cases on which the variance is based (Bruning and Kintz, 1977). A significant F means the variances are unequal.

The Chi-Square (χ^2) statistic was used to test the homogeneity of the sample or if what was observed was different from what was expected based on sample characteristics.

The computational formula for a simple χ^2 is

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N(AD-BC)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(B+D)}$$

where the numbers represented by the letters A, B, C, and D come from the contingency table (Bruning and Kintz, 1977, p. 230).

A	B
C	D

The dfs for the χ^2 equal the number of rows minus 1 times the numbers of columns minus 1 (Bruning and Kintz, 1977).

The Phi coefficient (ϕ) is a measure of correlation designed for use with 2 x 2 tables. The formula for Phi is :

$$\phi = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N}}$$

where χ^2 = Chi-Square value

N = total frequency in the entire contingency table (Bruning and Kintz, 1977, p. 230)

The complex Chi-Square was used to determine if there was any interaction between the variables of each demographic subgroup and responses to the questions. The basic formula for the complex Chi Square is:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(Q-E)^2}{E}$$

where O = the observed frequency for a particular cell of the contingency table

E = the expected frequency for a cell, based on marginal totals (Bruning and Kintz, 1977, p. 233).

The contingency coefficient (C), a correlation measurement for the complex Chi-Square was computed. The formula is:

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{\chi^2+N}}$$

where χ^2 = Chi-Square value

N = total values in the contingency table (Bruning and Kintz, 1977, p. 233)

All of the above tests used the .05 significance level to reject the null hypothesis.

Confidence intervals were computed around the means for the top ten problem areas. The formula for computing confidence intervals for $p<.05$ is:

$$\pm 1.96\ \sigma_{\bar{y}}$$

where $\sigma_{\bar{y}} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$

$\bar{y}$ = sample mean

σ = standard deviation

$\sqrt{N}$ = sample population (Mendenhall, 1977, p. 177)

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The reported findings are based on the methodology described in Chapter II. The sample demographic breakdowns were compared to those of the population for Stillwater, Oklahoma, and Payne County provided by the U. S. 1970 census. The 1980 census data were unavailable at the time of this writing.

The sample was then analyzed to discover the top ten problems for the total sample as well as for each demographic subgroup. Statistical tests were used to describe the relationships between subgroups and their responses. The open-ended questions and Community Leader Survey were not interpreted statistically. The top ten problems discovered in this survey were then compare to the top ten problems ascertained in the previous KOSU-FM survey.

Sample Breakdown Compared With the 1970 Census

Although complete census information for 1980 has not yet been published, the total population of Stillwater and the Oklahoma State University student population is available. The preliminary 1981 census Stillwater population is 38,162 and the student population is 22,420, or more than 50 percent of the total population.

In the sample drawn for the survey, 61.5 percent fell into the category "some college." The "some college" and "post degree" categories made up 75 percent of the sample. However, not all of the

people in these categories may be currently enrolled in classes. Therefore, one could assume that less than 61.5 and not more than 75 percent of the sample was comprised of persons who are currently enrolled or who have completed some college.

The sample demographic breakdown (Table XXVI, Appendix B) and portions of the Stillwater and Payne County 1970 census appear in Appendix B. In the 1970 census for Payne County, women made up 49 percent of the total population, and in the sample they made up 49.5 percent. Blacks made up 2.5 percent in the 1970 census, and 4.5 percent of the sample. Asians made up .4 percent of the population, and 2.5 percent of the sample. Native Americans comprised 1.2 percent of the population, and none were drawn in the sample. The population contained .6 percent Hispanics, and the sample, 1.0 percent. Whites made up 90.5 percent of the sample, and 95.4 percent of the population. Although the sample drawn was consistent with the population for the percentage of women, it was off for Asians, Native Americans, and Hispanics. However, the sample came close to the proportion of Whites and Blacks.

In the 1970 City of Stillwater population projections for age groups in 1980, the category 65 and over came close to that drawn in the sample. The sample drew 5.5 percent, and the population projection percentage was 6 percent. The sample was close to the 1980 population projections for ages 18-50. The sample drawn was 76 percent in the age category and the predicted percentage for 1980 for that age category was 72 percent. For further information, see Tables XXIX-XXXI.

The sample subgroups were collapsed into dichtomous groups because of the sparseness of some categories. These categories were outlined in Chapter II. The grade completed and race categories could not be

collapsed because of the predominance of the "some college" category and "white" category. These subgroups were left as they were but analysis and generalization to the population were limited.

The Chi-Square test for homogeneity of the sample (Table IV) revealed significant Chi-Squares for the category lower and higher income and sex. A Chi-Square of 10.124 was reported with a probability of .0015. This Chi-Square would occur by chance 15 times out of 1,000. This means that there were more females with incomes over $10,000 than were expected. The expected frequency was 51.9, and the observed frequency was 69. A Phi of 0.225 and contingency coefficient of .219 indicate a definite but small relationship between increased income and females. A simple deduction from this information would be that female students might be supported by their families, while males tend to support themselves when in school. Also, women could be reporting their husband's income, since the survey asked only for the total family income.

A significant Chi-Square of 73.006 with a probability of .0001 was reported for younger and older age by shorter-time and longer-time residents. This information appears in Table V. This Chi-Square would occur only by chance one time out of 10,000. The expected frequency for younger age category (25 years and under) and shorter-time residents (living in Stillwater 4 years and under) was 57.7 and the observed frequency was 97. The observed frequency for the older age category (over 25 years) and longer-time residents (living in Stillwater more than 4 years) was 64, and the expected frequency was 34.7. This can be interpreted as the younger the population in Stillwater, the shorter the length of time they have lived here; the reverse being true for the older population. This is logical. In addition, the student population

is young, and students usually remain for only a few years. A Phi of .604 and C of .517 were reported, which indicates a substantial but moderate association between age and length of time in Stillwater. The remaining Chi-Square tests for homogeneity of the sample appear in Appendix F.

TABLE IV

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF SEX BY LOWER AND HIGHER INCOME

NEWYRS / NEWINC	1	3	TOTAL
FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / CELL CHI2 / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT			
1	55	67	122
	50.6	71.4	
	4.4	-4.4	
	0.4	0.3	
	27.50	33.50	61.00
	45.03	54.92	
	66.27	57.26	
2	28	50	78
	32.4	45.6	
	-4.4	4.4	
	0.6	0.4	
	14.00	25.00	39.00
	35.90	64.10	
	33.73	42.74	
TOTAL	83	117	200
	41.50	58.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	1.653	DF= 1	PROB=0.1985
PHI	0.091		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.091		

TABLE V

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF NEW YEARS BY YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE

NEWYRS	NEWAGE		
FREQUENCY EXPECTED DEVIATION CELL CHI2 PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	1	2	TOTAL
1	97 67.7 29.3 12.7 48.50 79.51 87.39	25 54.3 -29.3 15.8 12.50 20.49 28.03	122 61.00
2	14 43.3 -29.3 19.8 7.00 17.95 12.61	64 34.7 29.3 24.7 32.00 82.05 71.91	78 39.00
TOTAL	111 55.50	89 44.50	200 100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	13.006	DF= 1	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.264		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.517		

Completion Rate of Telephone Survey

Blankenship (1977) said that 68.9 percent of the calls in a telephone survey can be completed in three attempts. Table VI reveals that in this survey, 92 percent of the calls were completed in two calls, a better completion rate than would be expected. CPB's Ascertainment Handbook, mentioned earlier, recommended to overdraw the sample by two-thirds because of possible refusals, disconnects, and no answers. This survey's rejection percentage was less than expected, with only 26.5

percent rejected as unusable telephone numbers. Out of this, 9 percent refused to cooperate, no answers 2 percent, and foreign language .5 percent. The majority of unusable telephone numbers came from the disconnects, which made up 15 percent of the total. Parten (1950) says that a refusal rate of only 2 or 3 percent can be expected in a telephone survey. This would make the refusal rate of 9 percent slightly high. One person who was interviewed told the interviewer that this was the third survey this year in which he was asked to participate. Perhaps because this is a university community, Stillwater residents are asked to participate in more surveys than are populations elsewhere. This could account for resistance to cooperate. The completion rate frequency can be found in Table VI.

TABLE VI

COMPLETION RATE FREQUENCY TABLE

Completion	Frequency	Percentage of Total (200)	
Call 1	128	64	
Call 2	56	28	
Call 3	16	8	Total 100%
Refused	18	9	
No answer	3	2	
Disconnected	20	15	
Foreign language	1	15	Total 26.5%

Top Ten Problems by Total Sample

The top ten problems by rank order appear in Table VII. This table also contains the confidence intervals for the top ten problems. "Inflation" was the number one problem for Stillwater residents with a mean score of 3.94, and a relatively low coefficient of variation (c.v) of 29.52. This means that the responses to that problem, although varied, did not vary that much. A mean of 3.94 is considered a problem of concern, but not of great concern. Although when the sub-groups were broken out, the mean score for "inflation" ranged from slightly lower to somewhat elevated. Forty-four percent of the total sample gave "inflation" a rating of 5, or a value of great concern, 21.5 percent rated it a 4, which is word-evaluated as concern, and 24 percent rated it a 3, meaning moderate concern. In all, 89.5 percent of the population rated "inflation" a 3 or higher.

Following close to "inflation" is concern for "high utility rates" with a mean score of 3.53 and a slightly higher c.v. of 36.91; 78 percent of the population rated their concern for this problem 3 or higher.

"Unpaved or poorly paved roads" had a mean score of 3.49 and c.v. of 36.45; 78 percent of the population rated their concern for this problem 3 or higher.

"Lack of public transportation" and "drug abuse" received mean scores above 3. However, the coefficients of variation were larger, showing more variation in the population's response to these problems.

The remaining problems in the top ten, "need for better schools," "crime," "alcoholism," "relations between OSU and the community," "lack of parks and recreational facilities" had mean scres between 2.75 and 2.99 in the word category of somce concern. The coefficients of

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER OF PROBLEM AREAS BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Rank	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.94	1.1633	.0823	1.3532	29.52
2	High utility rates	3.53	1.3029	.0921	1.6976	36.91
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.49	1.2720	.0899	1.6180	36.45
4	Public transportation	3.40	1.4662	.1037	2.1498	43.19
5	Drug abuse	3.04	1.3027	.0921	1.6969	42.85
6	Need for better schools	2.99	1.5204	.1075	2.3115	50.85
7	Crime	2.87	1.2372	.0875	1.5308	43.11
8	Alcoholism	2.86	1.2761	.0902	1.6286	44.62
9	Relations between OSU and the community	2.75	1.4240	.0117	2.0276	51.78
10	Lack of parks and rec. facilities	2.75	1.4141	.1000	1.1000	51.52
11	Poor planning for city growth	2.67	1.1567	.0818	1.3378	43.32
12	Leniency in courts	2.62	1.3880	.0981	1.9252	52.96
13	Availability of low-income housing	2.62	1.4859	.1051	2.2078	56.82
14	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	2.61	1.1600	.0820	1.3457	44.53
15	Equal opportunities for minorities	2.58	1.3351	.0944	1.7825	51.75
16	Corrupt city govt.	2.54	1.3705	.0970	1.8782	54.06
17	Abuse of the elderly	2.50	1.3819	.0977	1.9095	55.39
18	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	2.49	1.2601	.0891	1.5878	50.61
19	Water shortage	2.48	1.4352	.1015	2.0597	57.99
20	Lack of good medical care and facilities	2.45	1.4484	.1024	2.0980	59.12
21	Availability of information about social agencies	2.44	1.2664	.0896	1.6038	52.01
22	Child abuse	2.42	1.4190	.1003	2.0137	58.64
23	Shortage of police	2.40	1.2278	.0868	1.5075	51.16
24	Lack of recreational activities for senior citizens	2.21	1.1759	.0832	1.3828	53.21
25	Police brutality	2.10	1.2705	.0898	1.6141	60.64

TABLE VII (Continued)

Rank	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
26	Chemical wastes in the soil	2.08	1.3184	.0932	1.7381	63.54
27	Battered wives	2.00	1.3319	.0942	1.7738	66.76
28	Teenage pregnancy	1.94	1.3474	.0928	1.8155	69.45
29	Air pollution	1.82	1.6945	.0827	1.3676	64.43
	Government	2.69	.6617	1.0714	.0468	.4379
	Environment	2.60	.7703	.0545	.5934	29.71

Confidence Intervals for Top Ten Problems ($p<.05$)

1	Inflation	$3.94 \pm .161$
2	High utility rates	$3.54 \pm .181$
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	$3.49 \pm .176$
4	Lack of public transportation	$3.40 \pm .203$
5	Drug abuse	$3.04 \pm .181$
6	Need for better schools	$2.99 \pm .211$
7	Crime	$2.87 \pm .172$
8	Alcoholism	$2.86 \pm .177$
9	Relations between OSU and community	$2.75 \pm .197$
10	Lack of parks and recreational facil.	$2.75 \pm .196$

variation were highest, being 51.78 for relations between OSU and the community. These higher variations of response by the population indicate less agreement or degree of concern for these problems.

Computing the confidence intervals for the top ten problems revealed narrow intervals. These intervals did not change the word values for the population's degree of concern for a problem. The Problem Response frequency table used to determine percentages of response reported above can be found in Table XXXVIII in Appendix F.

Top Ten Problems by Satisfaction Level

The sample were asked their level of satisfaction with living in Stillwater. There were no responses to "not satisfied at all," 10 responses to "not very satisfied," 60 responses to "somewhat satisfied," and 130 responses to "very satisfied." Of the total sample, 65 percent were very satisfied with living in Stillwater. This information appears in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION FREQUENCY TABLE BY TOTAL SAMPLE

Satisfied	Frequency	Percent of Total
2	10	5
3	60	30
4	130	65

2 = not very satisfied
3 = somewhat satisfied
3 = very satisfied

All of the responses to "not very satisfied" were in the category shorter-time residents or living in Stillwater four years or less. Of these, two were female and four male whose total family income was under $10,000, and four female whose total family income was $10,000 or over.

In the total sample, 95 percent gave a response of somewhat

satisfied or higher. This response crossed over all demographics, and was fairly evenly dispersed. However, those who lived in Stillwater over four years gave more responses of "very satisfied." The information appears in Table IX.

Level of satisfaction, initially a dependent variable was used as an independent variable after the sample labeled themselves 2, 3, or 4 for this category. The top ten problems in these subgroups were then broken out. The ten persons who responded "not very satisfied" rated "relations between OSU and the community" a mean score of 4.0 or a word value of "concern." Although this is a small sample, presumably of OSU students, it coincides with the comments garnered from the open-ended questions. This will be discussed later. The top ten problems broken out by these subgroups are found in Appendix F.

Top Ten Problems by Subgroups

In all of the subgroups, the problem of "inflation" appears. It usually appears as the number one problem, but drops down to position 5 with a mean score of 3.00 for race = 3 (Asians). This small sample of 5 is the only subgroup where "high utility rates" does not make the top ten. This group rated "need for better schools" number one with a mean score of 4.40. This information appears in Appendix F in Table XXXIV. Tables X, XI, and XII contain the only groups singled out for discussion.

In the age group under 18 years (Table X), "alcoholism" appears as the number one problem with a mean score of 4.13. The coefficient of variation is also small, being only 20.23. However, it is difficult to make general statements about teenagers and concern for alcoholism, because the sample size is only 11. However, when the ages are

TABLE IX

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION FREQUENCY TABLE
WITH DEMOGRAPHICS COMBINED

1. Table of new income by satisfaction controlling for Sex = F, Shorter-time residents = 1

		Satisfaction			Total
		2	3	4	
New	1	2	6	9	17
Income	2	4	15	25	44
Total		6	21	34	61

2. Table of new income by satisfaction controlling for Sex = F, Longer-time residents = 2

		Satisfaction			Total
		2	3	4	
New	1				
Income	2	-	2	11	13
		-	-	25	25
Total		-	2	36	38

3. Table of new income by satisfaction controlling for Sex = M, Shorter-time residents = 1

		Satisfaction			Total
		2	3	4	
New	1				
Income	2	4	16	18	38
		-	11	12	23
Total		4	27	30	61

4. Table of new income by satisfaction controlling for Sex = M, Longer-time residents = 2

		Satisfaction			Total
		2	3	4	
New	1	-	6	9	15
Income		-	4	21	18
Total		-	10	30	40

TABLE X

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 1 (UNDER 18 YEARS)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Alcoholism	4.13	.8345	.2951	.6964	20.23
2	Inflation	3.38	1.5980	.5650	2.5536	47.35
3	High utility rates	3.38	1.4079	.4978	1.9821	91.72
4	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	3.25	1.4881	.5261	2.2143	45.79
5	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for the handicapped	3.25	1.4881	.5261	2.2143	45.79
6	Crime	3.13	1.2464	.4407	1.5536	39.89
7	Drug abuse	3.13	1.5527	.5489	2.4107	49.69
8	Teen age pregnancy	3.13	1.7269	.6106	2.9821	55.26
9	Child abuse	3.13	1.5527	.5489	2.4107	49.69
10	Equal job opportunities for minorities	3.13	1.7269	.6106	2.9821	66.26

*N = 8.

collapsed into two groups, the group 25 years and under rated "alcoholism" mean score of 3.20. "Alcoholism" as a problem did not appear in the top ten problems for those over 25 years.

Although "lack of public transportation" appears frequently in different subgroups, in the subgroup age level (over 65 years) its mean

score is 4.82 with a very small coefficient of variation of 8.40. This can be found in Table XI. This very small sample of 11 makes it difficult to make general statements about the elderly and their concern for public transportation. However, the concern of the elderly for this problem coincides with responses from the open-ended questions and community leaders' survey.

In Table XII, subgroup race 2 (Black), there were only nine cases. However, these nine Blacks gave "equal job opportunities for minorities" an extremely high mean score of 4.67, approaching the word value of "great concern." The coefficient of variation was also quite small, being only 15.15. This was their number one problem, with "inflation" taking second place, and "high utility rates" way down at tenth place. Although this is too small a sample to make general statements, it might be worthwhile to sample the total population of Blacks residing in Stillwater to discover their attitudes toward these problems. The remaining top ten problems by demographic subgroups can be found in Appendix F.

t-Tests for Equality of Means Between
Younger Age and Older Age

When the categories of age were collapsed to the dichotomous subgroups - younger age and older age, the problems of "alcoholism," "relations betwwen OSU and the community," "lack of parks and recreational facilities," "poor planning for city growth," "water shortage," and "leniency in courts" were not shared by both groups. The top ten problems for younger age and older age appear in Table XIII.

Table XIV supplies the t-tests for younger age (25 years and

TABLE XI

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 6
(OVER 65 YEARS)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Lack of public transportation	4.82	.4045	.1220	.1636	8.40
2	Inflation	4.09	1.300	.3921	1.6909	31.79
3	High utility rates	3.91	.8312	.2506	.6909	21.26
4	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.55	1.4397	.4341	2.0727	40.61
5	Crime	2.91	1.7581	.5301	3.0909	60.44
6	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	2.91	1.3004	.3921	1.6909	44.70
7	Water shortage	2.82	1.6011	.4828	2.5636	56.82
8	Poor planning for city growth	2.73	1.4206	.4283	2.0181	52.09
9	Abuse of the elderly	2.73	1.6181	.4879	2.6182	59.33
10	Lack of recreational activities for senior citizens	2.73	1.3484	.4066	1.8182	49.44

*N = 11.

TABLE XII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: RACE 2 (BLACK)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Equal job opportunities for minorities	4.67	.7071	.2357	.5000	15.15
2	Inflation	4.33	.8660	.2887	.7500	21.65
3	Drug abuse	4.33	.8660	.2887	.7500	19.99
4	Alcoholism	4.00	.8660	.2887	.7500	21.65
5	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.44	1.2360	.4120	1.5278	35.89
6	Lack of good medical care and facilities	3.44	1.3333	.4444	1.7778	38.71
7	Crime	3.33	1.4142	.4714	2.000	42.43
8	Availability of low income housing	3.33	.8660	.2887	.7500	25.98
9	Relations between OSU and the community	3.33	1.5000	.5000	2.2500	45.00
10a	Lack of public transportation	3.33	1.4142	.4714	2.0000	42.43
b	High utility rates	3.33	1.8028	.6009	3.2500	54.08

*N = 9.

TABLE XIII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUPS: YOUNGER AGE AND OLDER AGE

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
	Younger Age (25 years and under)					
1	Inflation	3.96	1.1393	.1041	1.2980	28.81
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.37	1.2055	.1144	1.4532	35.78
3	High utility rates	3.37	1.3942	.1323	1.9441	41.38
4	Alcoholism	3.20	1.3336	.1266	1.7785	41.70
5	Drug abuse	3.20	1.3061	.1240	1.7058	40.84
6	Need for better schools	3.15	1.4783	.1403	2.1854	46.88
7	Relations between OSU and the community	3.11	1.3508	.1282	1.8246	43.46
8	Lack of public transportation	3.03	1.4614	.1387	2.1356	48.28
9	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.98	1.3550	.1286	1.8360	45.44
10	Crime	2.85	1.1770	.1117	1.3854	41.35
	Government	2.67	.7023	0.667	.4932	26.30
	Environment	2.69	.8504	.0807	.7232	31.61
	Older Age (over 25 years)**					
1	Inflation	3.92	1.1987	.12706	1.4370	30.57
2	Lack of public transportation	3.85	1.3446	.1425	1.8080	34.89
3	High utility rates	3.73	1.5566	.1225	1.3356	30.98
4	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.64	1.3420	.1423	1.8011	36.87
5	Crime	2.90	1.3147	.1394	1.7283	45.35
6	Drug abuse	2.84	1.2783	.1355	1.6341	44.97
7	Poor planning for city growth	2.83	1.1204	.1188	1.2554	39.57
8	Water shortage	2.80	1.4316	.1518	2.0495	51.17
9	Leniency in courts	2.79	1.4019	.1486	1.9653	50.31
10	Need for better schools	2.79	1.5556	.1649	2.4198	55.83
	Government	2.71	.6106	.0647	.3728	22.53
	Environment	2.47	.6395	.0678	.4090	25.89

*N = 111
**N = 89.

TABLE XIV

t-TESTS BETWEEN GROUPS: YOUNGER AGE AND OLDER AGE

Younger and Older Age	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Variable: Alcoholism						
1	111	3.20	unequal	4.9799	198.0	0.0001
2	89	2.44				
F=1.57 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .0294	
Variable: Relations between OSU and the community						
1	111	3.11	equal	4.1290	198.0	0.0001
2	89	2.30				
F=1.06 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .7543	
Variable: Lack of parks and recreational facilities						
1	111	2.98	equal	2.876	198.0	0.0078
2	89	2.45				
F=1.13 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .5508	
Variable: Poor planning for city growth						
1	111	2.54	equal	-1.7773	198.0	0.0771
2	89	2.83				
F=1.10 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .6520	
Variable: Water shortage						
1	111	2.22	equal	-2.9004	198.0	0.0041
2	89	2.80				
F=1.06 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .7700	
Variable: Leniency in courts						
1	111	2.40	unequal	4.0071	196.6	.0001
2	89	2.71				
F=1.85 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F = .0029	

under) and older age (over 25 years). For younger age, "alcoholism" (mean = 3.20), "relations between OSU and the community" (mean = 3.11), "lack of parks and recreational facilities" (mean = 2.98), appear in the top ten but do not appear in older age. For older age, these problems have corresponding mean scores of 2.44, 2.30, and 2.45, respectively. When the equality of these means was tested, a significant difference between these mean scores was found. All of the tests surpassed the critical value of t, with t values of 4.799, 4.1290, and 2.876, respectively, and had probabilities well below chance at $p<.05$. Therefore, these problems remained as those chosen by younger age.

For older age, "poor planning for city growth" (mean 2.83), "water shortage" (mean 2.80), "leniency in courts" (mean 2.71) appeared in the top ten problems, but did not appear in younger age with corresponding mean scores of 2.54, 2.22, and 2.40.

"Poor planning for city growth," with a t value of -1.7773 and $p>.05$, could have appeared as a problem in both groups. If one used the $p>.10$ or 10 percent level of confidence, this problem would remain only with older age with its actual probability at $p = 0.771$. "Water shortage" with a t value of -2.99004 was significant at $p<.05$, and "leniency in courts" with a t value of 4.0071 was significant at $p<.05$. Both problems remain as chosen only by the older age group for the ten problems.

t-Tests for Equality of Means Between
Lower and Higher Income

Table XV reports the top ten problems for lower income (under $10,000) and higher income ($10,000 and over). Of these two groups, "lack of park and recreational facilities" and "equal job opportunities

TABLE XV

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUPS: LOWER AND HIGHER INCOME

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
		(Under $10,000)*				
1	Inflation	4.06	1.0859	.1192	1.1793	26.75
2	High utility rates	3.62	1.2477	.1370	1.5569	34.52
3	Unpaved and poorly paved roads	3.55	1.2616	.1385	1.5915	35.50
4	Lack of public transportation	3.47	1.4427	.1589	2.0814	41.58
5	Need for better schools	3.29	1.4941	.1640	2.2324	45.43
6	Crime	3.00	1.2591	.1382	1.5845	41.97
7	Drug abuse	2.95	1.3243	.1459	1.7538	44.86
8	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.94	1.4428	.15837	2.0817	49.08
9	Alcoholism	2.88	1.3104	.1438	1.7170	45.51
10	Equal job opportunities for minorities	2.83	1.3777	.1512	1.8980	48.66
	Government	2.76	.6723	.0738	.4520	24.36
	Environment	2.61	.7633	.0838	.5826	29.25
		($10,000 and over)**				
1	Inflation	3.86	1.2125	.1121	1.4701	31.45
2	High utility rates	3.47	1.3428	.1241	1.8030	38.70
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.44	1.2823	.1186	1.6456	37.24
4	Lack of public transportation	3.34	1.4866	.1374	2.2097	44.48
5	Drug abuse	3.10	1.2891	.1192	1.6618	41.55
6	Alcoholism	2.85	1.2568	.1162	1.5796	44.16
7	Crime	2.78	1.2185	.1127	1.4847	43.87
8	Need for better schools	2.78	1.5092	.1395	2.2778	54.33
9	Leniency in courts	2.75	1.4498	.1340	2.1018	52.68
10	Relations between OSU and the community	2.74	1.4151	.1308	2.0027	51.58
	Government	2.64	.6524	.0603	.4256	24.71
	Environment	2.58	.7784	.0720	.6059	30.17

*N = 83
**N = 117.

for minorities" appear only in lower income. "Leniency in courts" and "relations between OSU and the community" appear only in higher income. The t-tests between lower and higher income appear in Table XVI.

With $p<.05$ and a t value of 1.6474, there is no significant difference between the means for "lack of parks and recreational facilities" for both subgroups. Therefore, this problem can just as easily appear in the top ten problem areas for subgroup higher income. There is a significant difference between the mean of the two groups for "equal job opportunities for minorities" with a t value of 2.2654 and a probability of .0246 or $p>.05$. This problem should remain as appearing only in lower income.

When testing the equality of the means 2.43 and 2.75 for "leniency in the courts" and means 2.76 and 2.74 for "relations between OSU and the community," the t-values of -1.60 and .0754, respectively, did not surpass the critical value for t and the probabilities were $p>.05$. Therefore, these problems could just as easily have appeared in lower income as they did in higher income.

t-Tests of Equality of Means Between Male and Female

Table XVII reports the top ten problems for males and females. Females rated a mean score of 2.85 for "lack of parks and recreational facilities," while males gave it a mean score of 2.64. Males rated "poor planning for city growth" a mean score of 2.59; females gave it a score of 2.75. When conducting the t-tests (Table XVIII), no significant difference was found between the means of both of these problems for both groups. The t values of 1.0247 and -1.0187, respectively, did not surpass the critical values of t with $p>.05$. Therefore, these

TABLE XVI

t-TESTS BETWEEN GROUPS: LOWER AND HIGHER INCOME

Lower and Higher Income	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Variable:	Lack of parks and recreational facilities					
1	83	2.94	equal	1.6474	198.0	.1011
2	117	2.61				
F=1.09 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.6703
Variable:	Equal job opportunities for minorities					
1	83	2.83	equal	2.2654	198.0	.0246
2	117	2.40				
F=1.16 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.4642
Variable:	Leniency in courts					
1	83	2.43	equal	-1.60	198.0	.1100
2	117	2.75				
F=1.28 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.2322
Variable:	Relations between OSU and the community					
1	83	2.76	equal	.0754	198.0	.9400
2	117	2.74				
V=1.04 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.8298

TABLE XVII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUPS: MALE AND FEMALE

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
			Male*			
1	Inflation	3.74	1.2219	.1216	1.4931	32.65
2	High utility rates	3.54	1.3309	.1324	1.7713	37.65
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.48	1.3007	.1294	1.6919	37.43
4	Lack of public transportation	3.19	1.4947	.1487	2.2343	46.89
5	Drug abuse	3.01	1.3153	.1309	1.7300	43.70
6	Need for better schools	3.00	1.5427	.1535	2.3800	51.42
7	Crime	2.92	1.1635	.1158	1.3537	39.83
8	Alcoholism	2.82	1.2280	.1222	1.5079	43.52
9	Poor planning for city growth	2.75	1.2033	.1197	1.4481	43.72
10	Relatios between OSU and the community	2.68	1.4066	.1400	1.9786	52.42
	Government	2.66	.6089	.06059	.3708	22.89
	Environment	2.55	.5992	.0696	.4889	27.42
			Female**			
1	Inflation	4.14	1.0691	.1075	1.1431	25.82
2	Lack of public transportation	3.61	1.4124	.1420	1.9963	39.18
3	High utility rates	3.53	1.2805	.1287	1.6397	36.32
4	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.51	1.2485	.1255	1.5587	35.62
5	Drug abuse	3.07	1.2956	.1302	1.6787	42.19
6	Need for better schools	2.98	1.5050	.1513	2.2649	50.51
7	Alcoholism	2.90	1.3286	.1335	1.7652	45.83
8	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.85	1.5008	.1508	2.2523	52.69
9	Crime	2.82	1.3121	.1319	1.7217	46.56
10	Relations between OSU and the community	2.82	1.4454	.1453	2.0891	51.29
	Government	2.71	.7138	.0717	.5095	26.40
	Environment	2.64	.8376	.0842	.7016	31.73

*N = 101
**N = 99.

TABLE XVIII

t-TESTS BETWEEN SEX GROUPS: MALE AND FEMALE

Male and Female	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob> |T|
Variable: Lack of parks and recreational facilities						
F	99	2.85	equal	1.0247	198.0	.3068
M	101	2.64				
F=1.29 with 98 and 100 df					Prob>F =	.3068
Variable: Poor planning for city growth						
F	99	2.59	equal	-1.0187	198.0	.3096
M	101	2.75				
F=1.18 with .98 and 100 df					Prob>F =	.4064

two problems could have appeared in either group.

t-Tests for Equality Between Means Shorter-time Residents and Longer-time Residents

The categories shorter-time residents (4 years and less) and longer-time residents (over 4 years) showed the most variation in the top ten. Those problems appearing for shorter-time residents and not for longer-time residents were "need for better schools" with a mean score of 3.18, "alcoholism," with a mean of 3.03, "lack of good medical care and facilities" with a mean score of 2.90, and "relations between OSU and the community" with a mean score of 3.16. The corresponding mean scores for these problems by longer-time residents were 2.69, 2.44, 2.36, 1.74, and 2.10. The top ten problems for these groups appear in Table XIX. The t-tests for these groups can be found in Table XX.

TABLE XIX

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUPS: SHORTER-TIME AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
	Lived in Stillwater 4 years or less*					
1	Inflation	3.93	1.1262	.1020	1.2684	28.63
2	High utility rates	3.39	1.3083	.1185	1.712	38.55
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.35	1.2526	.1134	1.5690	37.36
4	Drug abuse	3.18	1.3112	.1187	1.7193	41.23
5	Need for better schools	3.18	1.4939	.1353	2.2317	46.97
6	Relations between OSU and the community	3.16	1.3809	.1250	1.9068	43.64
7	Alcoholism	3.13	1.3171	.1192	1.7347	42.06
8	Lack of public transportation	3.11	1.4927	.1352	2.2282	48.05
9	Lack of park and recreational facilities	3.03	1.3663	.1237	1.8667	45.05
10	Lack of good medical care and facilities	2.90	1.4905	.1350	2.2217	51.37
	Government	2.68	.7094	.0642	.5032	26.47
	Environment	2.66	.8225	.0745	.6765	30.92
	Lived in Stillwater over 4 years**					
1	Inflation	3.95	1.2263	.1389	1.5038	31.06
2	Lack of public transportation	3.85	1.3100	.1483	1.7163	34.06
3	High utility rates	3.74	1.2735	.1442	1.6217	34.02
4	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.71	1.2803	.1450	1.6392	34.56
5	Poor planning for city growth	3.00	1.0691	.1211	1.1429	35.64
6	Water shortage	2.99	1.4549	1.647	2.1167	48.71
7	Leniency in courts	2.95	1.3474	.1526	1.8155	45.70
8	Crime	2.83	1.1668	.1321	1.3615	41.18
9	Drug abuse	2.82	1.2664	.1434	1.6037	44.90
10	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	2.50	1.2458	.1411	1.5520	49.83
	Government	2.70	.5834	.0661	.3404	21.61
	Environment	2.50	.6747	.0764	.4552	26.99

*N = 122
**N = 78.

TABLE XX

t-TESTS BETWEEN GROUPS: SHORTER-TIME AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS

Shorter-time and Longer-time Residents	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Variable: Need for better schools						
S-t	122	3.18	equal	2.2363	198.0	.0264
L-t	78	2.69				
F=1.04 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.8394
Variable: Alcoholism						
S-t	122	3.13	equal	3.8891	198.0	.0001
L-t	78	2.44				
F=1.46 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.0717
Variable: Lack of parks and recreational facilities						
S-t	122	3.03	equal	3.7130	198.0	.0003
L-t	78	2.30				
F=1.02 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.9218
Variable: Lack of good medical care and facilities						
S-t	122	2.90	unequal	5.6353	176.4	.0001
L-t	78	1.74				
F=2.02 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.0011
Variable: Relations between OSU and the community						
S-t	122	3.16	equal	5.5073	198.0	.0001
L-t	78	2.10				
F=1.23 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.3243
Variable: Poor planning for city growth						
S-t	122	2.46	equal	-3.3058	198.0	.0011
L-t	78	3.00				
F=1.19 with 121 and 78 df					Prob>F =	.4162
Variable: Water shortage						
S-t	122	2.15	equal	-4.2010	198.0	.0001
L-t	78	2.99				
F=1.20 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.3654

TABLE XX (Continued)

Shorter-time and Longer-time Residents	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Variable: Leniency in courts						
S-t	122	2.41	equal	12.7217	198.0	.0071
L-t	78	2.95				
F=1.04 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.8444
Variable: Crime						
S-t	122	2.89	equal	.3344	198.0	.7385
L-t	78	2.83				
F=1.21 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.3645
Variable: Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped						
S-t	122	2.53	equal	-1.2275	198.0	.2211
L-t	78	2.73				
F=1.03 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.8894

There was a significant difference between these means with values for t at 2.2363, 3.8891, 3.7130, 5.6353, and 5.5073; all were significant at $p<.05$. Therefore, these two groups did not have the same level of concern for these problems.

"Poor planning for city growth" with a mean score of 3.00, "water shortage" with a mean score of 2.99, "leniency in the courts" with a mean of 2.95, crime with a mean of 2.83, and "sidewalks and buildings not designed for the handicapped" with a mean score of 2.73 were in the top ten for longer-time residents but not for shorter-time residents. The corresponding mean scores for shorter-time residents for these problems are 2.16, 2.15, 2.41, 2.89, and 2.53.

"Crime" and "sidewalks not designed for the handicapped" did not have t values that surpassed the critical value of t. These were .3344 and -1.2275, respectively, with $p>.05$. These two problems could appear in short-time residents' top ten problems as likely as they appeared in longer-time residents' top ten. "Poor planning for city growth" with a t value of -3.3058 and $p<.05$, "water shortage" with a t value of -4.2010 and $p<0.5$, and "leniency in courts" with a t value of -2.7217, $p<.05$, all surpassed the critical value of t. Therefore, these problems were rated differently by these two groups.

t-Tests for Equality Between Government and Environment

When the problems were divided in two groups (labeled "government" and "environment" by the researcher), the means were tested between the two, and tested between each dichotomous subgroup. The breakdown of the problems into these two groups can be found in Table XXI.

The t-test between the means of the two groups, "government" (mean = 2.69) and "environment" (mean = 2.59) was insignificant; that is, the total sample viewed each of these groups of problems similarly. The t value of 1.3262 did not surpass the critical t and the $p>.05$. The t-tests for equality between the means of these two groups and the dichotomous subgroups can be found in Table XXII.

When the new problem groups were tested against the dichotomous demographic subgroups, only the subgroup younger and older age had significant differences between the means of "government" and "environment." Younger age rated "government" a mean score of 2.67, and older age gave a mean score of 2.71. This was significant at the 95 percent

TABLE XXI

DICHOTOMOUS BREAKDOWN OF PROBLEM QUESTIONS

Government	Environment
Unpaved or poorly paved roads	Crime
Poor planning for city growth	Inflation
Corrupt city government	Alcoholism
Availability of low-cost	Drug abuse
Lack of good medical care and facilities	Relations between OSU and the community
Availability of information about social agencies	Teenage pregnancy
Lack of public transportation	Air pollution
Water shortage	Chemical wastes in the soil
Lack of parks and recreational facilities	Child abuse
Shortage of police	High utility rates
Leniency in courts	Abuse of the elderly
Lack of recreational activities for senior citizens	Police brutality
Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	Equal job opportunities for minorities
Need for better schools	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped
	Battered wives

TABLE XXII

t-TESTS FOR GOVERNMENT AND ENVIRONMENT BY TOTAL SAMPLE AND BY DICHOTOMOUS SUBGROUPS

Shorter and Longer-time Residents	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Government	200	2.69	unequal	1.3262	389.2	0.1855
Environment	200					
F=9.36 with 199 and 199 df					Prob>F =	.0327
Variable: Government						
S-t	99	2.71	equal	.5354	198.0	.5930
L-t	101	2.66				
F=1.37 with 98 and 100 df					Prob>F =	.1150
Variable: Environment						
S-t	99	2.64	equal	.8610	198.0	.3903
L-t	101	2.55				
F=1.44 with 98 and 100 df					Prob>F =	.0735
Variable: Government						
S-t	122	2.68	equal	-.2571	198.0	.7973
L-t	78	2.70				
F=1.48 with 121 and 78 df					Prob>F =	.0650
Variable: Environment						
S-t	122	2.66	equal	1.4189	198.0	.1575
L-t	78	2.50				
F=1.49 with 121 and 77 df					Prob>F =	.0619
Variable: Government						
S-t	111	2.67	equal	2.0943	198.0	.0375
L-t	89	2.71				
F=1.32 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F =	.1720
Variable: Environment						
S-t	111	2.69	unequal	2.1596	197.2	.0320
L-t	89	2.47				
F=1.77 with 110 and 88 df					Prob>F =	.0059

TABLE XXII (Continued)

Shorter and Longer-time Residents	N	Mean	Variances	T	df	Prob>|T|
Variable: Government						
	83	2.76	equal	1.2769	198.0	.2031
	117	2.64				
F=1.06 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.7595
Variable: Environment						
	83	2.61	equal	.2319	198.0	.8169
	117	2.58				
F=1.0 with 82 and 116 df					Prob>F =	.8582

level of confidence with a t value of 2.0943; that is, these numbers would occur by chance only 3.75 times out of 1,000 or $p<.05$, or an actual probability of $p = .0320$.

F (folding) Statistic

In all of the above t-tests the null hypothesis that the variances are equal was rejected if the F-value surpassed the critical value for F and the probability for F was $p<.05$. In those cases, the unequal variance was chosen with its corresponding values for t , df, and probability.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

This matrix appears in Table XXIII. Each problem question (1-29) was correlated to the demographics of "satisfaction level," "grade completed," "age," "race," "family income," new years," "new age," "new

TABLE XXIII

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / N = 200

	SATFN	GR_COM	AGE	RACE	FAMINC	NEWYRS	NEWAGE	NEWINC	SEXN
GN1	0.02163	-0.07331	0.05763	-0.01933	-0.04536	0.13557	0.10618	-0.04263	-0.01174
	0.7612	0.3022	0.4176	0.7859	0.5236	0.0556	0.1346	0.5489	0.8689
GN2	0.11594	-0.03526	0.05664	-0.01990	-0.08730	0.22871	0.12531	-0.02102	0.07220
	0.1021	0.6610	0.1734	0.7798	0.2190	0.0011	0.0771	0.7676	0.3096
GN3	0.01112	-0.06651	-0.01679	0.04193	-0.10281	-0.02376	0.02095	-0.06872	0.04157
	0.8758	0.3567	0.8134	0.5555	0.1474	0.7365	0.7684	0.2116	0.5565
GN4	-0.02065	-0.13749	0.02510	0.08089	-0.15564	0.00601	-0.01439	-0.08728	-0.17165
	0.7712	0.0522	0.7243	0.2548	0.0245	0.9327	0.8397	0.2191	0.0150
GN5	-0.21691	-0.05407	-0.25593	0.06162	0.01353	-0.26640	-0.29671	-0.01291	-0.03032
	0.0020	0.4470	0.0002	0.3860	0.8452	0.0001	0.0001	0.8560	0.6699
GN6	0.03011	-0.05636	-0.04111	-0.07454	-0.05458	-0.01257	0.01019	-0.02669	0.05055
	0.6721	0.4279	0.5633	0.2916	0.4394	0.8853	0.8861	0.7076	0.4737
GN7	-0.05670	0.11213	-0.10425	0.00632	0.02276	-0.19345	-0.05529	0.01400	-0.02102
	0.4252	0.1139	0.1418	0.9292	0.7490	0.0061	0.4043	0.8440	0.7677
GN8	-0.11747	-0.03263	-0.12835	0.08476	0.04065	-0.13506	-0.13597	0.05717	-0.02340
	0.0976	0.6444	0.0701	0.2328	0.5657	0.0565	0.0549	0.4214	0.7423
GN9	-0.17805	0.01733	-0.21468	0.10696	-0.12164	-0.39054	-0.22318	-0.13099	0.03149
	0.0117	0.8075	0.0001	0.1317	0.0857	0.0001	0.0015	0.0645	0.6560
GN10	-0.27167	0.07110	-0.32195	-0.06044	0.00576	-0.36447	-0.28156	-0.00536	-0.04752
	0.0001	0.3171	0.0001	0.3952	0.9355	0.0001	0.0001	0.9400	0.5040
GN11	0.03318	0.07766	-0.21069	-0.09153	0.04517	-0.16261	-0.21454	0.04545	-0.05908
	0.6410	0.2743	0.0027	0.1974	0.5253	0.0214	0.0023	0.5228	0.4060
GN12	0.05573	0.03409	-0.12058	-0.17505	-0.05660	-0.05624	-0.10127	-0.07949	-0.07865
	0.4008	0.6318	0.0890	0.0132	0.1736	0.4290	0.1536	0.2632	0.2683
GN13	0.01575	0.05837	-0.11822	-0.02154	-0.00570	0.01622	-0.04535	-0.00100	-0.03829
	0.8248	0.4116	0.0955	0.7621	0.9362	0.8156	0.5237	0.9887	0.5903
GN14	0.13637	0.09512	0.30107	0.13188	-0.13278	0.24665	0.28098	-0.04312	-0.14268
	0.0507	0.1826	0.0001	0.0627	0.0609	0.0004	0.0001	0.5443	0.0436
GN15	0.19168	-0.04863	0.17091	-0.04387	-0.07251	0.28607	0.20188	-0.01116	-0.00681
	0.0066	0.4941	0.0155	0.5373	0.3049	0.0001	0.0041	0.8753	0.9237
GN16	0.08233	-0.04459	-0.10672	-0.03638	-0.06125	0.03014	-0.07361	0.00561	-0.06271
	0.2465	0.5270	0.1326	0.6090	0.3889	0.6718	0.3002	0.9371	0.3777
GN17	0.10433	-0.06631	-0.05081	-0.09266	-0.03129	0.11030	-0.03577	0.04032	-0.01958
	0.1415	0.3963	0.4749	0.1919	0.6660	0.1200	0.6151	0.5708	0.7831

New Years = shorter and longer-time residents
New Age = younger and older age
New Income = lower and higher income.

TABLE XXIII (Continued)

	SATFN	GR_COM	AGE	RACE	FAMINC	NEWYRS	NEWAGE	NEWINC	SEXN
GN18	-0.04355	-0.14169	0.11206	0.03806	-0.06102	0.13141	0.13803	-0.05473	0.00362
	0.5404	0.0454	0.1141	0.5926	0.2541	0.0636	0.0513	0.4414	0.9555
GN19	0.04728	0.01603	0.07728	-0.05807	-0.03766	0.10702	0.09449	0.00799	-0.03624
	0.5062	0.7999	0.2767	0.4141	0.5963	0.1315	0.1832	0.9106	0.6104
GN20	-0.20303	0.07567	-0.34765	0.01693	-0.06387	-0.25514	-0.18761	-0.11628	-0.07263
	0.0039	0.2621	0.0001	0.8119	0.3665	0.0003	0.0078	0.1011	0.3068
GN21	-0.10502	-0.07564	-0.14637	0.02361	-0.00712	-0.07700	0.00329	-0.03149	0.07022
	0.1389	0.2671	0.0366	0.7400	0.9203	0.2765	0.9632	0.6581	0.3231
GN22	0.12763	-0.09052	0.06195	-0.01593	0.05144	0.18591	0.10773	0.11335	-0.00448
	0.0717	0.2024	0.3835	0.8228	0.1978	0.0071	0.1289	0.1100	0.9458
GN23	-0.20570	-0.09004	-0.26655	0.06140	-0.00830	-0.24599	-0.26560	0.00709	-0.01259
	0.0035	0.2048	0.0001	0.3878	0.9071	0.0004	0.0001	0.9207	0.8556
GN24	-0.08113	0.16040	-0.21544	0.23099	-0.19038	-0.18659	-0.14822	-0.15895	-0.00436
	0.2534	0.0233	0.0022	0.0010	0.0065	0.0062	0.0362	0.0246	0.9512
GN25	0.04230	0.05740	-0.01526	0.00925	0.04093	0.02267	-0.02089	0.02963	-0.07550
	0.5521	0.1700	0.7866	0.8566	0.5650	0.7500	0.7690	0.6771	0.2860
GN26	0.00387	-0.02386	-0.05536	0.05539	-0.02064	0.09560	-0.01178	0.05794	-0.01678
	0.9566	0.7374	0.1792	0.4359	0.7718	0.1761	0.8685	0.4151	0.7518
GN27	0.04971	0.05129	0.11365	-0.08233	-0.05865	0.19768	0.09701	-0.04815	-0.00179
	0.4645	0.4707	0.1091	0.2464	0.1644	0.0050	0.1718	0.4580	0.9795
GN28	0.00256	-0.01357	0.03658	-0.00528	-0.03942	0.08651	0.00135	-0.01565	-0.14783
	0.9668	0.8468	0.6071	0.9408	0.5754	0.2211	0.9849	0.8259	0.0367
GN29	-0.05541	0.03633	-0.13765	0.01363	-0.11522	-0.15656	-0.12015	-0.16615	0.00666
	0.4358	0.6055	0.0515	0.8481	0.1042	0.0264	0.0901	0.0187	0.9254
KGOV	0.01352	0.00556	-0.05493	-0.01389	-0.11955	0.01827	0.02592	-0.05037	-0.03602
	0.8164	0.9532	0.4358	0.8452	0.0918	0.7573	0.6740	0.2031	0.5930
KEAV	-0.07172	-0.01429	-0.16542	0.03215	-0.05588	-0.10033	-0.14722	-0.01648	-0.06108
	0.3129	0.8408	0.0086	0.6513	0.3996	0.1575	0.0375	0.8169	0.3903

income," and "sex." In the matrix, the correlation coefficient is displayed and also its corresponding probability.

Although 53 correlations have significant probabilities at $p<.05$, the strength of these relationships are definite but small, the highest negative correlation being -.39094. This negative correlation is for shorter and longer-time residents, and question 9, which was "lack of good medical care and facilities." This negative correlation meant that as the number of years of living in Stillwater decreased, the

degree of concern for this problem increased, the reverse being true, also. This question had significant correlations for satisfaction, -.17805 (a negligible relationship), "age," .27468, "younger and older age," -.22318. The highest positive correlation was .28607 and was for shorter and longer-time residents," and question 15, which was "water shortage." This means that the longer a person has lived in Stillwater, the more concerned he is about water shortages. This question also had significant positive correlations for "satisfaction," .1968 (negligible), "age," .17091 (negligible), and "younger and older," .20988.

Question 24, "equal job opportunities for minorities," had the most number of significant correlations with "grade completed," .16080, "age," .11544, "race," .23099, "family income," -.19038, "shorter and longer-time residents," -.18659, and "lower and higher income," -.15895, all showing significant correlations with $p<.05$. The highest correlation in that row was "race" at .23099. All the rest were negligible relationships. This means that as the race categories go from 1-6, or "White" to "other," the degree of concern for this problem increases, the reverse being true also. The same holds true for "grade completed." The higher the grade completed, the more concern for this problem. However, the younger the age, the more concern; the lower the income, the more concern; and the fewer years in Stillwater, the more concern. These correlations can be interpreted in the reverse as well.

The category of "shorter and longer-time residents" has 15 significant correlations at $p<.05$. "Unpaved or poorly paved roads" had a positive correlation of .13557. This means that the longer one lives

in Stillwater, the greater the concern for this problem. "Poor planning for city growth" had a correlation of .22871. "Alcoholism" had a negative correlation, -.26640. "Availability of low income housing" had a negative correlation of -.39074; "relations between OSU and the community" had a negative correlation of -.36447. There is a somewhat stronger relationship between these variables. The shorter the time one lives in Stillwater, the higher the degree of concern for these problems. "Teenage pregnancy" had a correlation of -.16261, "lack of public transportation" a correlation of .24665, "water shortage," .28607, "lack of parks and recreational facilities," -25514, "leniency in the courts," .18991, "police brutality," -.24599, "equal job opportunities for minorities," -.18659, "lack of recreational activities for senior citizens," .19768, and "need for better schools," -0.15696. This could indicate that the length of time one lives in Stillwater is a factor in the degree of concern for the problems in the survey. This is borne out by the t-tests mentioned previously, and the Chi-Squares which follow. Because none of these relationships is very strong, only the correlations mentioned above have been singled out for discussion.

Chi-Square Test for Questions

Each question was tested with each dichotomous demographic to determine if there was a relationship between degree of concern and the demographic subgroup.

From this test, 24 significant Chi-Squares were reported. Out of these, two had a c-coefficient above .35 or bordering on moderate but small associations. The SAS program computes the Phi-statistic but

this does not apply to complex Chi-Square, and should be ignored.

Because the contingency coefficients were below .35 for most of these Chi-Square tests, only the two which showed moderate but substantial relationships were singled out for discussion. The remaining Chi-Square tests by questions can be found in Appendix F.

"Lack of good medical care and facilities," question 9 by "shorter and longer-time residents" had the largest Chi-Square reported at 30,831, with $p<.05$ and c-coefficient measured at .365 bordering on moderate but substantial relationship. More persons in "shorter-time residents" expressed concern for this problem than was expected. Therefore, the length of time one lives in Stillwater is a factor in how one rates his concern for this problem. This Chi-Square test appears in Table XXIV.

The Chi-Square test for question 10, "relations between OSU and the community" by "shorter and longer-time residents" reported a significant Chi-Square of 28.602 with $p<.05$. The c-coefficient of .354 indicates a relationship bordering on substantial but moderate. More persons in "shorter-time residents" expressed concern for this problem than was expected. Fewer persons in "longer-time residents" expressed concern for this problem than was expected. Therefore, there is a dependency between response and length of time in Stillwater. This Chi-Square test appears in Table XXV.

Open-ended Questions

The open-ended questions revealed a dissatisfaction with the city government and unavailability of low-income housing. High utility rates and inconsistent billing schedule with high estimates was a

TABLE XXIV

TABLE OF SHORTER--AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 9

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN9

NEWYRS / QN9	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	30	26	17	24	25	122
	45.1	27.4	15.3	17.7	16.5	
	-15.1	-1.4	1.8	6.3	8.5	
	5.1	0.1	0.2	2.3	4.4	
	15.00	13.00	8.50	12.00	12.50	61.00
	24.59	21.31	13.93	19.67	20.49	
	40.54	57.78	68.00	82.76	92.59	
2	44	19	8	5	2	78
	28.9	17.5	9.8	11.3	10.5	
	15.1	1.5	-1.8	-6.3	-8.5	
	7.9	0.1	0.3	3.5	6.9	
	22.00	9.50	4.00	2.50	1.00	39.00
	56.41	24.36	10.26	6.41	2.56	
	59.46	42.22	32.00	17.24	7.41	
TOTAL	74	45	25	29	27	200
	37.00	22.50	12.50	14.50	13.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	30.831	DF= 4	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.393		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.365		

TABLE XXV

TABLE OF SHORTER-AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 10

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN10

NEWYRS / QN10	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	20	20	29	26	27	122
FREQUENCY	32.3	25.0	25.6	18.9	20.1	
EXPECTED	-12.3	-5.0	3.4	7.1	6.9	
DEVIATION	4.7	1.0	0.4	2.7	2.3	
CELL CHI2	10.00	10.00	14.50	13.00	13.50	61.00
PERCENT	16.39	16.39	23.77	21.31	22.13	
ROW PCT	37.74	48.78	69.05	83.87	81.82	
COL PCT						
2	33	21	13	5	6	78
	20.7	16.0	16.4	12.1	12.9	
	12.3	5.0	-3.4	-7.1	-6.9	
	7.4	1.6	0.7	4.2	3.7	
	16.50	10.50	6.50	2.50	3.00	39.00
	42.31	26.92	16.67	6.41	7.69	
	62.26	51.22	30.95	16.13	18.18	
TOTAL	53	41	42	31	33	200
	26.50	20.50	21.00	15.50	16.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	28.602	DF= 4	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.378		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.354		

complaint made on six different occasions. The general feeling revealed to the researcher from the most frequent comments (which appear in Appendix C) is student dissatisfaction with the community's attitudes toward them. They feel the OSU and city police treat them unfairly. Landlords take advantage by charging rents that are too high, and businesses charge higher prices during class session. They also want repeal of the open-bottle law.

These questions also revealed a dissatisfaction with roads, parks, and street sign maintenance.

There was an interest to get more information on the Kaw Reservoir project, which was once a hot news item, but little information has been released lately. An interest was also expressed to get more information on solar and wind energy, and how to get involved in a job exchange program.

"Lack of public transportation" was mentioned five times by those who chose to respond to the open-ended question. The problem also appears in the top ten. This issue seems to demand attention.

"Drug abuse," "problems with the elderly," and "need for more jobs" were also mentioned more than once. Some of these problems appear in the top ten problems by the total sample. However, all of the problems mentioned in the open-ended questions are good subjects for programming for KOSU-FM.

Community Leaders Survey

The community leaders were chosen by KOSU-FM to appear on programs or they themselves asked to be on the air to discuss their organizations. Once these persons were interviewed, they were asked to fill

out a community leaders survey form (found in Appendix D).

The community leaders were from diverse sections of the community. The large number of leaders interviewed (44) gave a wide variety of comments which included all of those which made the top ten. They also raised issues that were not expressed in the 29 problems tested in the survey, such as problems of displaced homemakers, educating the public for medical services of an emergency and non-emergency nature, more support for contemporary art, flood control, and landowner problems in the agrarian community. These are just a few of the problems mentioned by these leaders. The remaining comments can be found in Appendix E. The problems mentioned by this group were relevant, diversified, and compatible with the master problem list.

1980 Top Ten Problems Compared to 1981 Top Ten Problems

In 1980, water shortages were a high priority problem. In the 1981 survey, this problem has 17th place. "Inflation," the number one problem for 1981, also appeared among the top ten problems of last year. Road maintenance, relations between OSU and the community and better recreational facilities are present in both surveys' top ten problems.

"Lack of public transportation," problem number 3 in 1981, was listed in the 1980 survey under problems of the elderly. The remaining problems of community involvement in government, more responsive city government, need for orderly growth and more business and industry opportunities did not appear in the 1981 top ten.

"Drug abuse," "crime," and "alcoholism" were problems not mentioned in the 1980 survey, but appear in the 1981 top ten.

It should be mentioned that the top ten problems of 1980 were not ascertained through random sampling. There were no mean scores, and therefore there was no rating score or rank order of the problems. The 1980 survey appears in Appendix F.

The final chapter summarizes the findings reported in Chapter III and draws conclusions based on them. These conclusions are made in full awareness of the limitations of this survey; these limitations are also discussed in the final chapter.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Conclusions

The sample drawn in this survey was composed of "some college" and "post-degree" persons at a percentage rate of under 75 percent. If this high percentage of persons in the sample was currently enrolled at OSU, it may have biased the survey toward the concerns of the student population; however, the student population comprises more than 50 percent or more than half of the total population. This makes the problem, needs, and interests of this group vitally important to the community.

Whites make up 95 percent of the total population of Payne County. This would make the percentage in Stillwater slightly less. The sample drew 90.5 percent. For this reason, one can consider this community racially homogeneous. One would need to draw a very large sample to have enough cases in the non-White subgroups to make assumptions as to their problems, needs, and interests. The small number of Blacks drawn in this sample (N=9) expressed nearly great concern for "lack of job opportunities for minorities." If one wishes to be sensitive to the problems of non-Whites in this community, either large samples need to be drawn, or random sampling of just the non-White community would be advised.

The student population in Stillwater generally resides here for

four years or less, and their age group is for the most part 18-25. The townspeople have logically lived here longer and are older. These two groups--younger age, shorter-time residents and older age, longer-time residents, have shown statistically the most differences in levels of concern for problems.

Although these groups shared concern for "inflation," "high utility rates," "unpaved or poorly paved roads," "drug abuse," and "lack of public transportation," they differed sharply on other issues.

The younger group expressed concern toward "alcoholism," "need for better schools": "lack of parks and recreational facilities," "level of good medical care and facilities," and "relations between OSU and the community." The older group expressed concern toward "poor planning for city growth," "water shortage," and "leniency in courts." These concerns did not make the top ten problems list because the sample was smaller for this group. In fact, the problem of "water shortage" appears as problem 19 in the rank order of problems by the total sample. This problem was considered a top ten problem in the KOSU-FM survey of 1980, being the first mentioned in their list. The concern of this older group should not be ignored in programming for KOSU-FM. They seem to represent the townspeople's attitudes toward the city where they live permanently.

A major problem in Stillwater is the population split: older and longer-time residents vs. younger and shorter-time residents (this could also imply townspeople vs. students). However, only the younger group expressed concern for this problem in the survey or "relations between OSU and the community." The open-ended questions revealed the younger population's dissatisfaction with high rents and business tactics toward them. Both of these groups are dependent economically

upon each other, and need open communication to understand each other's concerns. This researcher would strongly recommend programming to meet this need.

When the researcher divided the problems into two categories, "environment" and "government," there was no difference between the means of the total sample. This lack of difference could have been because the division was inferior, or that the total sample simply did not see a difference between these groups.

When the sample was broken out into dichotomous subgroups, the younger age group showed more concern for problems of environment, and the older age group, more concern for problems of government. This difference is consistent with the split attitudes these groups have shown in other tests and reinforces those comments previously mentioned.

The community leader survey, although not ascertained scientifically, nevertheless uncovered all of the major problems of concern to Stillwater residents. The survey also raised valid concerns for problems not mentioned in the general public survey. Community leaders should have a pulse on what the problems of their community are. The random sampling general survey supported this notion.

The study answered these research questions:

1. What are the top ten problems for Stillwater?
2. Is there a significant difference between the means of each demographic subgroup? Was there a different group of top ten problem areas when the sample was broken out into subgroups?
3. Is there a relationship between a demographic characteristic and the way they viewed a problem? If there is a relationship, how strong was it?

In summary, the top ten problems for Stillwater are:

1. Inflation
2. High utility rates
3. Unpaved or poorly paved roads
4. Lack of public transportation
5. Drug abuse
6. Need for better schools
7. Crime
8. Alcoholism
9. Relations between OSU and the community
10. Lack of parks and recreational facilities

The main groups which showed a significant difference between these concerns for problems were younger age (25 years and under) and older age (over 25 years), shorter-time residents (lived in Stillwater 4 years or less) and longer-time residents (lived in Stillwater over 4 years). There was a small to moderate relationship between these groups and the way they responded to questions.

Limitations

The limitations of this survey are due largely to its small sample size of 200. In random sampling, there is always a chance to draw a sample that is not truly representative. The larger the sample, the more representative it will be.

The total sample was of sufficient size for analysis, but when it was broken out into subgroups, it became sparse in the categories of race, income levels, age, and grade completed. For these reasons, the sample was collapsed into dichotomous groups. Had the categories not been so sparse, much more detailed information could have been gleaned.

To generalize the results of this survey to the total population of Stillwater should be done with caution and awareness of these limitations.

The telephone survey has limitations by its very design. The interview must be quite short so that in-depth questions are not asked nor can many items be investigated. The interviewer cannot use a visual cue to determine the honesty of the respondent in answering questions (Parton, 1950). Probe questions might turn off the respondent and cause him/her to hang up (Blankenship, 1977). The telephone survey is limited to those who have telephones, and would therefore be biased against lower income households. The percentage of these households is usually small, but in rural communities can be as high as 50-60 percent (Sudman, 1976).

Kerlinger (1969) says telephone surveys "are limited by possible non-response, uncooperativeness, and by the reluctance to answer more than simple superficial questions. Its principal defect obviously is the inability to obtain detailed information" (p. 714).

Future Research

The findings in this research indicate areas for future exploration. The split in attitudes of the older age, longer-time residents vs. the younger age, shorter-time residents can be further researched to determine whether this is actually a division between townspeople and students.

The minority population drawn in this study was too small to ascertain their attitudes. This small sample, however, indicated different problem areas of concern for minorities than for those of the

white community. A sample of just the minority population would further clarify whether there is really a difference in the way minorities view problems as opposed to whites in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"All This Rewrite Talk." Broadcasting, May 28, 1979, p. 57.

An Ascertainment Handbook for Broadcasting Facilities. Washington, D. C.: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 1976.

Avery, Robert K., "Issues in Ascertaining the Different Needs of Urban and Rural Community Leaders" in CPB Experiments, Ed., Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Washington, D. C.: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 1979.

Bell, K. and Miller, T. "A Criticism of the FCC's Ascertainment Requirement." (Unpublished Paper, Department of Mass Communication, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1980.)

Blakely, R. To Serve the Public Interest. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1979.

Blankenship, A. B. Professional Telephone Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977).

Bruning, J. and Kintz, B. L. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1977.

"Deregulation Filings Swamp FCC With Wide Range of Ideas." Broadcasting, March 31, 1980, p. 25.

"FCC Takes a Final Step Toward Setting Radio Free." Broadcasting, September 10, 1979, p. 27-28.

Federal Register 25, "Network Programming Inquiry: Report and Statement of Policy (FCC 60-970)," July 29, 1960.

Federal Register 33, "Broadcast Applicants: Ascertainment of Community Needs (FCC-68-847)," August 22, 1968.

Federal Register 34, "Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants: Notice of Inquiry (FCC 69-1402)," December 25, 1929.

Federal Register 36, "Primer Ascertainment of Community Problems by Broadcast Applicants (FCC-71-176)," March 3, 1971.

Federal Register 41, "Ascertainment of Community by Broadcast Applicants: Primer (FCC 75-1361)," January 7, 1976.

Federal Register 41, "Ascertainment of Community Problems by noncommercial Educational Broadcast Applicants, Permittees, and Licensees (FCC 76-234)," March 25, 1976.

Federal Register 46, "Deregulation of Radio (FCC 81-171)," February 24, 1981.

Foley, J., "Ascertaining Ascertainment: Impact of the FCC Primer on TV Renewal Applications." Journal of Broadcasting, 1972, 16, pp. 387-405.

Kahn, R. and Cannell, C. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Krasnow, E. and Quale, J. "Ascertainment: The Quest for the Holy Grail." Public Telecommunications Review, 1974, pp. 6-13.

McGuire, B. "Assessing Community Problems, Needs and Interests: Evaluation of a Panel Survey to Fulfill Public Television Ascertainment Requirements." (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1979.)

Mendenhall, W. Introduction to Probability and Statistics. North Scottvale, Massachusetts: Doxbury Press, 1974.

Parten, M. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Pember, D. Mass Media Law. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1977.

"Radio Deregulation Survives Stay Request and Goes Inot Effect." Broadcasting, April 6, 1981, pp. 126-127.

Rivers, W. and Schramm, W. Responsibilities in Mass Communication. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Runcie, J. Experiencing Social Research. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1980.

Sellitz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M. and Cook, S. W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Sudman, S. Applied Sampling. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Surlin, S. and Bradley, L. "Ascertainment Through Community Leaders." Journal of Broadcasting, 1973-74, 18:1, pp. 97-107.

"The Mixed Bag of Deregulation." Broadcasting, October 8, 1979, p. 32.

Walker, Jr. O. and Rudelius, W. "Ascertaining Programming Needs of "Voiceless" Community Groups." Journal of Broadcasting, May 28, 1979, p. 67.

Wood, D., and Wylie, D. Educational Telecommunications. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1977.

APPENDIX A

KOSU-FM ASCERTAINMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

KOSU-FM ASCERTAINMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Phone #_____ Interviewer _____

	Call 1	Call 2	Call 3
Time called	_____	_____	_____
Completed (time)			
Busy			
No answer			
Disconnected			
Foreign Language			
(State language)			
Refused			

, my name is_____. I'm calling for KOSU Public Radio here in Stillwater, KOSU is trying to find out what problems are most important to the people of Stillwater. Are you the head of the household? (If yes, continue the interview. If no, ask to speak to the head of household. If head is not available, interview the person answering the phone if he or she is over 16 and a member of the family.) No babysitters!

(1) First of all, how long have you lived here?_____

(2) Overall, how satisfied are you with living in this community? Would you say --

Not satisfied at all_____

Not very satisfied_____

Somewhat satisfied_____

Very satisfied_____

Now I'd like to ask you to rate on a scale from 1 to 5 the degree of concern some problems are to you in your community. A score of 1 indicates a problem of little or no concern, and a score of 5 indicates a problem of great concern. A score of 3 would indicate a problem of moderate concern to you in your community. Please feel free to use the entire range of numbers from 1 to 5.

1.	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Poor planning for city growth	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Crime	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Inflation	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Alcoholism	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Corrupt city government	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Availability of low-income housing	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Drug abuse	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Lack of good medical care and facilities	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Relations between OSU and the community	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Teen-age pregnancy	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Availability of information about social agencies (legal aid, consumer protection, welfare, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Child abuse	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Lack of public transportation	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Water shortage	1 2 3 4 5
16.	Air pollution	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Chemical wastes in the soil	1 2 3 4 5
18.	High utility rates	1 2 3 4 5
19.	Abuse of the elderly	1 2 3 4 5

20. Lack of parks and recreational facilities 1 2 3 4 5

21. Shortage of police 1 2 3 4 5

22. Leniency in courts 1 2 3 4 5

23. Police brutality 1 2 3 4 5

24. Equal job opportunities for minorities 1 2 3 4 5

25. Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped 1 2 3 4 5

26. Battered wives 1 2 3 4 5

27. Lack of recreational activities for senior citizens. 1 2 3 4 5

28. Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped. 1 2 3 4 5

29. Need for better schools 1 2 3 4 5

30. If you could have information on any problem, which one problem would you most want information on ? Please feel free to mention a problem we might have overlooked.

Now, just a few final questions.

31. What is the highest school grade you completed? ____ ____refused

32. How old are you? _____under 18 years

_____18-25 years

_____26-35 years

_____36-50 years

_____51-65 years

_____over 65 years

_____refused

32. What is your race?

_____white

_____black

_____Asian

_____Native American

_____Hispanic

_____Other

_____refused

33. Would you please tell me which of these categories represents the total family income?

_____under $10,000

_____$10,001 - 15,000

_____ 15,001 - 20,000

_____ 20,001 - 25,000

_____ over 25,000

_____ refused

Record sex - (do not ask!)

_____Male

_____Female

Thank you very much for helping us!

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN OF SAMPLE AND 1970 CENSUS DATA FOR PAYNE COUNTY AND STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA

TABLE XXVI

DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN OF SAMPLE*

	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency
Grade completed				
Eighth grade	1	1	.5	.5
Some highschool	3	4	1.5	2.0
Highschool diploma	34	38	17.0	19.0
Some college	123	161	61.5	80.5
College degree	12	173	6.0	86.5
Post degree	27	200	13.5	100.0
Age				
Under 18	6	8	4.0	4.0
18-25 years	107	115	53.5	57.5
26-35 years	45	160	22.5	80.0
36-50 years	17	177	8.5	88.5
31-65 years	11	188	5.5	94.0
Over 65 years	11	199	5.5	99.5
Refused	1	200	.5	100.0
Race				
White	181	181	90.5	90.5
Black	9	190	4.5	95.0
Asian	5	195	2.5	97.5
Hispanic	2	197	1.0	98.5
Other	2	191	1.0	99.5
Refused	1	200	15	100.0
Family Income				
Under $10,000	83	83	41.5	41.5
$10,001-15,000	14	97	7.0	48.5
$15,001-20,000	12	109	6.0	54.5
$20,001-25,000	17	126	8.5	63.0
Over $25,000	71	197	36.5	98.0
Refused	3	200	1.5	100.0
Sex				
F	99	99	49.5	49.5
M	101	200	50.5	100.0

*Stillwater population (1980 preliminary census data), 38,152
OSU student enrollment (Spring, 1981), 22,420

TABLE XXVII

NEW DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency
Shorter and longer-time residents				
4 years and under	122	122	61.0	61.0
Over 4 years	78	200	39.0	100.0
Younger and older age				
25 years and under	111	111	55.5	55.5
Over 25 years	89	200	44.5	100.0
Lower and Higher Income				
Under $10,000	83	83	41.5	41.5
#10,000 and over	117	200	58.5	100.0

TABLE XXVIII

MINORITY BREAKDOWN FOR PAYNE COUNTY - POPULATION BY SEX AND MINORITY STATUS

1970

Minority Status	Number		Percent Distribution		Labor Force Participation Rate	
	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1. Total	50,654	24,905	100.0	100.0	52.2	41.4
2. White	48,320	23,782	95.4	95.5	52.0	40.7
3. Black	1,255	649	2.5	2.6	65.4	70.8
4. American Indian	626	305	1.2	1.2	NA	NA
5. Oriental	220	96	0.4	0.4	NA	NA
6. Other Races	233	73	0.5	0.3	44.6	39.4
7. Spanish-American	328	190	0.6	0.8	53.9	48.9
8. Minority Groups*	2,662	1,313	5.3	5.3	56.5	57.9

Notes: *NA = Not Available*

* *Sum of Spanish American and all races except white. Some duplication possible since Spanish-American may include nonwhite races as well as white. Sum of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.*

Source: Census of Population 1970.

TABLE XXIX

1970 U.S. CENSUS POPULATION BREAKDOWN FOR STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA*

[For minimum base for derived figures (percent, median, etc.) and meaning of symbols, see text]

	STILLWATER								THE VILLAGE							
	1970 population							1960 population	1970 population							1960 population
	All races			White		Negro			All races			White		Negro		
	Total	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		Total	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
All ages	31 126	16 292	14 834	13 444	14 106	411	433	23 965	13 693	6 612	7 033	6 537	7 004	1	2	13 118
Under 1 year	507	281	226	264	210	8	9	602	282	120	162	119	162	...	...	292
1 year	430	231	199	218	188	1	6	443	266	150	116	149	115	...	...	363
2 years	394	213	181	204	167	6	6	485	242	132	110	130	109	...	...	351
3 years	336	158	178	151	166	4	7	418	220	103	117	103	114	...	...	399
4 years	329	181	148	161	142	12	5	399	253	127	126	127	125	...	...	438
5 years	344	184	160	173	149	5	7	362	286	146	140	145	138	...	...	401
6 years	409	225	184	205	171	16	8	352	303	142	161	141	160	...	...	423
7 years	361	165	196	153	178	8	14	331	309	153	156	149	154	...	...	401
8 years	398	215	183	199	168	10	12	290	284	147	137	145	135	...	...	341
9 years	337	167	170	149	156	10	8	266	299	153	146	152	145	...	...	286
10 years	340	180	160	169	145	10	14	256	324	180	144	170	141	...	...	260
11 years	315	156	159	145	153	5	4	276	275	139	136	137	136	...	...	246
12 years	314	164	150	156	142	6	5	290	282	154	128	154	127	...	...	308
13 years	327	183	144	171	139	10	2	242	283	137	146	136	141	...	...	273
14 years	328	157	171	146	157	7	11	189	299	132	167	130	167	...	...	137
15 years	317	151	166	136	152	11	10	233	298	135	163	134	162	...	...	141
16 years	318	164	154	153	145	11	7	215	272	144	128	142	128	...	...	137
17 years	347	173	174	159	171	9	3	261	271	130	141	127	141	...	...	128
18 years	1 952	1 001	986	965	937	20	36	1 475	201	117	84	115	84	...	...	64
19 years	2 946	1 506	1 440	1 414	1 376	27	39	1 839	166	69	97	66	96	...	...	48
20 years	2 810	1 541	1 269	1 496	1 229	20	26	1 660	138	49	89	49	89	...	...	73
21 years and over	16 932	8 696	8 036	8 417	7 663	195	192	13 041	8 142	3 853	4 289	3 809	4 235	...	...	6 565
Under 5 years	1 996	1 064	932	998	873	31	33	2 367	1 263	632	631	628	625	...	...	1 843
5 to 9 years	1 849	956	893	879	842	49	51	1 601	1 481	741	740	732	732	...	...	1 852
10 to 14 years	1 624	840	784	787	736	38	36	1 253	1 453	742	721	735	712	...	...	1 244
15 to 19 years	5 915	2 995	2 920	2 867	2 783	78	95	4 043	1 208	595	613	564	611	...	...	518
20 to 24 years	8 479	5 108	3 371	4 903	3 423	74	65	5 215	960	408	552	404	547	...	...	451
25 to 29 years	2 355	1 355	1 010	1 247	933	31	31	1 927	1 205	583	622	576	615	...	...	957
30 to 34 years	1 309	702	607	635	556	24	21	1 105	949	485	464	480	460	...	...	1 387
35 to 39 years	999	513	486	477	470	19	9	993	803	374	429	370	421	...	...	1 343
40 to 44 years	957	472	485	453	462	9	17	871	974	449	525	448	521	...	...	872
45 to 49 years	933	431	502	421	485	5	11	794	1 030	488	542	484	538	...	...	569
50 to 54 years	877	406	471	385	441	12	20	832	743	383	360	380	353	...	...	474
55 to 59 years	792	363	429	347	410	13	13	748	545	253	282	236	277	...	...	273
60 to 64 years	808	346	462	331	447	12	12	644	408	188	220	183	215	...	...	149
65 to 69 years	635	260	375	253	369	5	4	519	298	138	160	135	158	...	...	95
70 to 74 years	553	202	351	195	345	4	5	468	184	73	111	72	110	...	...	69
75 to 79 years	372	138	234	136	223	1	9	327	94	35	59	35	59	...	...	34
80 to 84 years	247	68	181	63	179	3	-	160	55	24	31	24	30	...	...	19
85 years and over	214	73	141	67	139	3	1	98	37	11	21	11	20	...	...	14
Under 18 years	6 451	3 348	3 103	3 112	2 899	149	140	5 950	5 048	2 524	2 524	2 498	2 500	...	...	5 345
62 years and over	2 505	962	1 543	922	1 508	27	26	1 958	877	387	490	379	487	...	...	320
65 years and over	2 023	741	1 282	714	1 255	16	19	1 572	663	261	382	277	377	...	...	231
Median age	22.4	22.2	22.6	22.2	22.7	20.6	20.1	22.6	27.0	25.6	27.3	26.6	27.2	...	...	25.8

*Age by race and sex, for places of 10,000 to 50,000

TABLE XXX

OSU POPULATION TRENDS

Population Sector	Number of Persons[1] 1960-61	1970-71	1976-77
I. Students			
A. Undergraduate[2]	8,940[7]	14,821	17,614
B. Undergraduate[3]	-	-	-
C. Graduate Full Time and Vet. Med.	1,358[7]	1,572	1,774
D. Graduate Part Time	-	1,352	1,731
E. Other [4]	-	992	NA
Sub-Total	10,298[7]	18,737	21,119
II. Faculty			
A. Senior Faculty [5]	NA	679	546
B. Junior Faculty [6]	NA	392	394
C. Affiliated Faculty (part-time)	NA	-	114
Sub-Total	NA	1,011[8]	1,054
III. Administration			
A. Professional Adm.	NA	NA	667
B. Other Staff	NA	NA	2,147
Sub-Total	2,392	3,893[8]	2,814
IV. Part-Time Non-Student Employees	969	-	530
V. Total University Pop.	13,659	23,641	25,517

TABLE XXXI

PROJECTED AGE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR 1980
FOR STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA

Population Distribution By Age Group

A breakdown of 1976-2000 population change by age group is shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF STILLWATER, 1970-2000

		Persons			
Age Group	Group	1970	1980	1990	2000
0-19	Young	11,384	13,279	15,383	18,643
20-24	New Family	8,679	13,784	13,722	16,888
25-34	Young Family	3,674	6,010	10,131	9,831
35-44	Older Family	1,956	2,521	5,360	7,781
45-64	Empty Nesters	3,410	3,909	5,789	9,029
65 and Over	Retired	2,023	2,521	3,216	3,966
Total Population		31,126	42,023	53,601	66,138
		Percentage Distribution			
Age Group	Group	1970	1980	1990	2000
0-19	Young	36.6%	31.6%	28.7%	28.2%
20-24	New Family	27.9%	32.8%	25.6%	25.5%
25-34	Young Family	11.8%	14.3%	18.9%	14.9%
35-44	Older Family	6.3%	6.0%	10.0%	11.8%
45-64	Empty Nester	10.9%	9.3%	10.8%	13.6%
65 and Over	Retired	6.5%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%
Total Percent		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: U. S. Census 1970, Stillwater Department of Community Development, Frank Osgood Associates, Inc.

APPENDIX C

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

TABLE XXXII

PROBLEMS MENTIONED MORE THAN ONCE - AND NEW PROBLEMS

Problem	Frequency Mentioned
1 - Disenchantment with city government	8
2 - Not enough low-income housing - landlords charge high rents	7
3 - Utility rates are too high and billing schedule inconsistent	6
4 - Drug abuse	6
5 - Poor campus and community relations	6
6 - Need for public transportation	5
7 - Problems with elderly	5
8 - Lack of job opportunities	4
9 - Need for better schools	4
10 - Child abuse	2
11 - Poor park maintenance	2
12 - Poorly paved roads	2
13 - Inflation	2

NEW PROBLEMS (not mentioned in questionnaire)

1 - OSU police and city police hassle students	___
2 - Merchants take advantage of students by charging high prices	___
3 - Lack of street signs and poor maintenance of signs	___
4 - More Kaw Reservoir information	___
5 - More solar and wind energy information	___
6 - More information on job exchange program	___
7 - Repeal wanted for open bottle law	___

APPENDIX D

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY AND PROBLEMS ASCERTAINED

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

STATION KQSU FM

DATE/TIME _____

PLACE OF MEETING _____

Community Leader Contacted:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

ORGANIZATIONS/OCCUPATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, NEEDS, AND INTERESTS AS STATED BY COMMUNITY LEADER:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

CHECK BOXES WHICH BEST DESCRIBE LEADER'S ORGANIZATIONS

- ☐ Agriculture
- ☐ Business
- ☐ Charities
- ☐ Civic, Neighboorhood, and Fraternal Organizations
- ☐ Consumer Services
- ☐ Culture
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Environment
- ☐ Government
- ☐ Labor
- ☐ Military
- ☐ Minority or Ethnic Group
- ☐ Organization for/of the Elderly
- ☐ Organization for/of Youth or Students
- ☐ Organization for/of Women
- ☐ Professions
- ☐ Public Safety, Health, and Welfare
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Religion
- ☐ Other _____

IS THE LEADER ANY OF THE FOLLOWING:

- ☐ Black
- ☐ Hispanic, Spanish, or Spanish surnamed American
- ☐ American Indian
- ☐ Oriental
- ☐ Woman

Name of Person Conducting Interview _____

Reviewed by _____

Title _____

Date _____

_____
Leader Signature

TABLE XXXIII

COMMUNITY LEADERS ASCERTAINMENT

M	F/Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
M		Big Brothers APGA	Charity, Education, Org. for Youth	1 Community involvement 2 Drug abuse
	F	Sheltered Workshop	Education, Minority, Handicap	1 Residential center for handicapped, accessible housing near campus, community for handicapped; streets designed for handicapped 2 More community understanding of mentally retarded
	F	Sheltered Workshop	Educ., Minority, Public safety Recreation	1 Transportation, housing for elderly handicapped 2 Adult basic edu/ Spec Educ 3 Orientation of general public to special needs
M		Star Trek - Therapeutic Recreation for Energetic kids	Org for youth, Recreation for Disabled, Handicapped	1 Need for more rec. for handicapped 2 Better awareness and acceptance of disabled
M		Lawyer, OSU, SGA	Profession, Consumer Service	1 Money for community org. 2 Communication between "town and gown"
M	Nat. Amer.	Veterans' Coordinator	Bus. Educ. Military Org. for Students	1 More jobs for vet. 2 Financial assist. for vet; housing assistance

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

M	F/Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
M		Wildlife Society	Educ., Environment, Rec.	1 International program in city schools 2 landowner prob. in agrarian community 3 Rent and utility costs in Stillwater 4 Good family entertainment
M		Economic Assoc.	Edu., Business	1 Need more price competition in professions 2 Breaker enforcement of state and Fed. anti-trust laws
	F	Architecture City transp. Chamber of Commerce beautification	Culture, Bus. Cons. Services, Government Minority	1 Utilities, supply and maintenance 2 Programs for elderly 3 Beautification 4 Public transp.
M		City Commis. United Way	Bus., Charity, Government, Civic	1 Water 2 Inflation 3 Economy 4 High interest 5 Better streets and traffic control
M		Realtor	Bus., Civic	1 Lack of cooperation within Board of Commissioners
	F	High school	Educ., Prof.	1 City Manager has poor support
	F	Stillwater Personal Contact Service	Civic	1 Educ. 2 Coordination of Community Serv.
	F	Parenting	Edu.	1 Need for help in competence in parenting role

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

M	F-Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
	F	Criminal Justice	Edu.	1 Crime 2 Community involvement with local government 3 Drug abuse
M		Criminal Justice	Edu.	1 Energy prep. 2 Crime prevention 3 OSU/community prob. 4 Growth of city and university 5 Water resource and dis.
	F	Home management	Bus., Consumer Educ.	1 Barking dogs 2 Zoning laws 3 Public transp.
	F	Dietitian	Prof.	1 Education 2 Health - Phy. Fit. 3 Water, Energy 4 Housing
M		Horticulture	Agriculture	1 Community appearance 2 Unleashed dogs 3 Housing
	F	Public health	Org. for elderly Public welfare	1 Low cost housing for elderly 2 Reasonable cost Char. errand service for elderly
	F	United Way	Civic Charity	1 Drug abuse 2 Elderly and Youth
	F	Home Ec	Educ.	1 More and better day care
M		Physical Plant	Bus.	1 Drug abuse 2 Battered children and women 3 Crime in general 4 Parks and recreation

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

M	F-Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
	F	Domestic violence service	Civic	1 A shelter for battered persons and their children 2 Financial support
	F	Humane Society	Civic	1 Need animal adoption agency 2 Emergency care for injured dogs
	F	Univ. Extension - Home Econ.	Org. for Women	1 Awareness of prob. for displaced homemakers 2 Good paying jobs 3 Drug awareness program
M		City Manager	Government	1 Inflation 2 Water supply and treatment 3 Supply of electricity 4 Streets
	F	Displaced homemakers	Org. for Women	1 Community awareness of displaced homemakers 2 Better paying jobs for women 3 Transportation
M		OSU Counseling	Org. for Youth	1 City govt. divided 2 School for drug difficulty 3 Economics - large plant tax office
	F	Career counselor	Edu	1 Communication between generations 2 Community responsibility for solving problems

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

M	F-Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
M		Water research	Educ. Environment	1 Resource dev. 2 Community dev. and planning 3 Community interact. with Commission through communication services (radio)
	F	Home Econ.	Edu. Prof.	1 Too many dirt roads which cause air pollution 2 Substandard houses 3 Discrimination for business in OSU area because of parking fees 4 Public transp. 5 Only one mail delivery to Tulsa and Okla. City 6 Better relations between community and OSU
M		Art Gallery	Culture, Educ.	1 More support for contemporary arts, visual and perf. atten. and fin. aid
	F	Dean Home Ed.	Edu. Prof.	1 Improving support wervices 2 Consumer educ. for inflation 3 Conservation mgmt. 4 Adequate nutrition 5 Adequate family housing and housing alternatives 6 Family impact analysis of public policies
	F	Nutrition	Consumer serv., Org for elderly, Public health	1 Nutrition educ. 2 Parent education 3 Funding nutrition educ.

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

M	F-Minority	Community Leader	Categories	Problems
M		Realtor, Chamber of Commerce		1 Water 2 Econ. Div. 3 Industrial growth 4 Community improvements 5 City-wide cleanup 6 Streets & utilies
M		Coordinator Emergency Dept. at Medical Center	Public Health	1 Edu. of public for med. services of emergency and non-emergency nature 2 Dev. of effective emergency transport system
	F	League of Women Voters	Civic, Org. for women	1 Housing 2 Zoning 3 Flood "control" 4 Adequate school finan.
	F	League of Women Voters	Civic, Org. for women	1 Revise tax system 2 Plan for orderly growth of city
M		Wholistic medium	Prof. Publ. Safety	1 Prevention of disease
	F	Fashion	Consumer Serv. Bus. Educ.	1 Understand econ. and marketing struc which provides varied merchandise
	F	Tri-County Employment and training	Labor	1 Lack of industry
M		Chamber of Commerce	Civic, Bus.	1 Water 2 City awareness of common problems 3 Quality growth 4 Jobs 5 Information on drug abuse

APPENDIX E

CONTACT WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS AND OTHER CITIZENS

TOP TEN PROBLEMS ASCERTAINED BY KOSU-FM

IN 1980

Oklahoma State University

KOSU-FM 91.7

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
JOURNALISM AND BROADCASTING BUILDING
(405) 624-6352

January 25, 1980

Ten Community Problems Indentified Through
Contact With Community Leaders and Other Citizens

1. More water needed.
2. Closer cooperation between Oklahoma State University and the city is needed.
3. Roads need repair and continued maintenance.
4. High standards at schools need to be implemented and maintained. Also under school heading was-keeping up with what the school board is doing.
5. Economy and inflation, including the need for more funding for the city, are a continuing interest. Citizen flak over increased costs of paving districts was listed as a current inflation problem.
6. General problems of the elderly need to be explored and corrected. Listed were: better transportation, more jobs, better facilities and better management in nursing homes.
7. There needs to be more community awareness of issues and involvement in city government. This concern included: more visibility of social services and schools--and a need for community projects to bring citizens together.
8. Stillwater needs a generally more responsive city government.
9. We need a progressive and orderly program for the growth of Stillwater.
10. The city needs more business and industries. Also listed was the need for a better downtown area.

*Also high in concern was "Quality of Life"--more adult recreation (physical and otherwise, needed), better shopping centers, better youth recreation centers, etc., are needed.

Janis McMullen
Acting News Director

APPENDIX F

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL TESTS ON THE RANDOM SAMPLE OF STILLWATER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

TABLE XXXIV

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF SEX BY OLDER AND YOUNG AGE

SEX	NEWAGE		
FREQUENCY EXPECTED DEVIATION CELL CHI2 PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	1	2	TOTAL
F	53 54.9 -1.9 0.1 26.50 53.54 47.75	46 44.1 1.9 0.1 23.00 46.46 51.69	99 49.50
M	58 56.1 1.9 0.1 29.00 57.43 52.25	43 44.9 -1.9 0.1 21.50 42.57 48.31	101 50.50
TOTAL	111 55.50	89 44.50	200 100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	0.306	DF= 1	PROB=0.5799
PHI	0.039		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.039		

TABLE XXXV

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF NEW YEARS BY LOWER AND HIGHER INCOME

NEWYRS / NEWINC	1	3	TOTAL
1	55	67	122
	50.6	71.4	
	4.4	-4.4	
	0.4	0.3	
	27.50	33.50	61.00
	45.08	54.92	
	66.27	57.26	
2	28	50	78
	32.4	45.6	
	-4.4	4.4	
	0.6	0.4	
	14.00	22.00	39.00
	35.90	64.10	
	33.73	42.74	
TOTAL	83	117	200
	41.50	58.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	1.653	DF= 1	PROB=0.1985
PHI	0.091		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.091		

TABLE XXXVI

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF NEW AGE BY LOWER AND HIGHER INCOME

NEWAGE / NEWINC	1	3	TOTAL
1	49	62	111
FREQUENCY			
EXPECTED	46.1	64.9	
DEVIATION	2.9	-2.9	
CELL CHI2	0.2	0.1	
PERCENT	24.50	31.00	55.50
ROW PCT	44.14	55.86	
COL PCT	59.04	52.99	
2	34	55	89
FREQUENCY			
EXPECTED	36.9	52.1	
DEVIATION	-2.9	2.9	
CELL CHI2	0.2	0.2	
PERCENT	17.00	27.50	44.50
ROW PCT	38.20	61.80	
COL PCT	40.96	47.01	
TOTAL	83	117	200
	41.50	58.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	0.718	DF= 1	PROB=0.3967
PHI	0.060		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.060		

TABLE XXXVII

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF SEX BY SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS

SEX NEWYRS

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / CELL CHI2 / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	1	2	TOTAL
F	61	38	99
	60.4	38.6	
	0.6	-0.6	
	0.0	0.0	
	30.50	19.00	49.50
	61.62	38.38	
	50.00	48.72	
M	61	40	101
	61.6	39.4	
	-0.6	0.6	
	0.0	0.0	
	30.50	20.00	50.50
	60.40	39.60	
	50.00	51.28	
TOTAL	122	78	200
	61.00	39.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	0.031	DF= 1	PROB=0.8596
PHI	0.013		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.013		

TABLE XXXVIII

PROBLEM RESPONSE FREQUENCY TABLE

		Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unpaved or poorly paved roads	1	18	18	9.0	9.0
	2	26	44	13.0	22.0
	3	52	96	26.0	48.0
	4	48	144	25.0	72.0
	5	56	200	28.0	100.0
Poor planning for city growth	1	34	34	17.0	17.0
	2	63	97	31.5	48.5
	3	50	147	25.0	73.5
	4	41	188	20.0	94.0
	5	12	200	6.0	100.0
Crime	1	26	26	13.0	13.0
	2	60	86	30.0	43.0
	3	57	143	28.5	71.5
	4	28	171	14.0	85.5
	5	29	200	14.5	100.0
Inflation	1	10	10	5.0	5.0
	2	11	21	5.5	10.5
	3	48	69	24.0	34.5
	4	43	112	21.5	56.0
	5	88	200	44.0	100.0
Alcoholism	1	33	33	16.5	16.5
	2	53	86	26.5	43.0
	3	49	135	24.5	67.5
	4	39	174	19.5	87.0
	5	26	200	13.0	100.0
Corrupt City Government	1	64	64	38.0	32.0
	2	39	103	19.5	51.5
	3	47	150	23.5	75.0
	4	26	176	13.0	88.0
	5	24	200	12.0	100.0
Availability of low-income housing	1	66	66	33.0	33.0
	2	40	106	20.0	53.0
	3	34	140	17.0	70.0
	4	25	165	12.5	82.5
	5	35	200	17.5	100.0

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

		Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Drug abuse	1	33	33	16.5	16.5
	2	31	64	15.5	32.0
	3	66	130	33.0	65.0
	4	35	165	17.5	82.5
	5	35	200	17.5	100.0
Lack of good medical care and facilities	1	74	74	37.0	37.0
	2	45	119	22.5	59.5
	3	25	144	12.5	72.0
	4	29	173	14.5	86.0
	5	27	200	13.5	100.0
Relations between OSU and the Community	1	53	53	26.5	26.5
	2	41	94	20.5	47.0
	3	42	136	21.0	68.0
	4	31	167	15.5	83.5
	5	33	200	16.5	100.0
Teenage Pregnancy	1	115	115	57.5	57.5
	2	32	147	16.0	73.5
	3	25	172	12.5	86.0
	4	6	178	3.0	89.0
	5	22	200	11.0	100.0
Availability of information about social agencies	1	62	62	31.0	31.0
	2	43	105	21.5	52.5
	3	60	165	30.0	82.5
	4	16	181	8.0	90.5
	5	19	200	9.5	100.0
Child Abuse	1	72	72	36.0	36.0
	2	47	119	23.5	59.5
	3	35	154	17.5	77.0
	4	17	171	8.5	85.5
	5	29	200	14.5	100.0
Lack of public transportation	1	34	34	17.0	17.0
	2	24	58	12.0	29.0
	3	35	93	17.5	46.5
	4	43	136	21.5	68.0
	5	64	200	32.0	100.0
Water shortage	1	70	70	35.0	35.0
	2	49	119	24.5	59.5
	3	23	142	11.5	71.0
	4	32	174	16.0	87.0
	5	26	200	13.0	100.0

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

		Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Air pollution	1	114	114	57.0	57.0
	2	42	156	21.0	78.0
	3	22	178	11.0	89.0
	4	11	189	5.5	94.5
	5	11	200	5.5	100.0
Chemical wastes in the soil	1	96	96	48.0	48.0
	2	43	139	21.5	69.5
	3	31	170	15.5	85.0
	4	10	180	5.0	90.0
	5	20	200	10.0	100.0
High utility rates	1	19	19	9.5	9.5
	2	25	44	12.5	22.0
	3	49	93	24.5	46.5
	4	45	138	22.5	69.0
	5	62	200	31.0	100.0
Abuse of the elderly	1	67	67	33.5	33.5
	2	43	110	21.5	55.0
	3	36	146	18.0	73.0
	4	32	178	16.0	89.0
	5	22	200	11.0	100.0
Lack of parks and recreational activities	1	54	54	27.0	27.0
	2	36	90	18.0	45.0
	3	50	140	25.0	70.0
	4	27	167	13.5	83.5
	5	33	200	16.5	100.0
Shortage of police	1	55	55	27.5	27.5
	2	65	120	32.5	60.0
	3	41	161	20.5	80.5
	4	23	184	11.5	92.0
	5	16	200	8.0	100.0
Leniency in courts	1	58	58	29.0	29.0
	2	45	103	22.5	51.5
	3	37	140	18.5	70.0
	4	35	175	17.5	87.0
	5	25	200	12.5	100.0
Police brutality	1	88	88	44.0	44.0
	2	52	140	26.0	70.0
	3	20	170	15.0	85.0
	4	13	183	6.5	91.5
	5	17	200	8.5	100.0

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

		Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Equal job opportunities for minorities	1	52	52	26.0	26.0
	2	52	104	26.0	52.0
	3	53	157	26.5	78.5
	4	14	171	7.0	85.5
	5	29	200	14.5	100.0
Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	1	57	57	28.5	28.5
	2	48	105	24.0	52.5
	3	51	156	25.5	78.0
	4	28	189	14.0	92.0
	5	16	200	8.0	100.0
Battered wives	1	110	110	55.0	55.0
	2	29	139	14.5	69.5
	3	32	171	16.0	85.5
	4	10	181	5.0	90.5
	5	19	200	9.5	100.0
Lack of recreational activities for senior citizens	1	73	73	36.5	36.5
	2	51	124	25.5	62.0
	3	46	170	23.0	85.0
	4	21	191	10.5	95.5
	5	9	200	4.5	100.0
Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	1	27	37	18.5	18.5
	2	61	58	30.5	49.0
	3	63	161	31.5	80.5
	4	22	183	11.0	91.6
	5	17	200	8.5	100.0
Need for better schools	1	51	51	25.5	25.5
	2	29	80	14.5	40.0
	3	40	120	20.0	60.0
	4	31	151	15.5	75.5
	5	49	200	24.5	100.0

TABLE XXXIX

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 2
(18-25 YEARS)

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.98	1.0987	.1062	1.2072	27.60
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.41	1.2128	.1172	1.4708	35.35
3	High utility rates	3.37	1.3772	.1331	1.8967	40.82
4	Drug abuse	3.18	1.2872	.1244	1.6569	40.51
5	Need for better schools	3.16	1.4867	.1437	2.2104	47.07
6	Relations between OSU and the community	3.11	1.3270	.1283	1.7609	42.64
7	Alcoholism	3.09	1.3285	.1284	1.7648	42.94
8	Lack of public transportation	3.08	1.4610	.1412	2.1344	47.37
9	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	3.02	1.3597	.1314	1.8487	45.04
10	Crime	2.82	1.1640	.1125	1.3550	41.24

TABLE XL

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 3 (26-35 YEARS)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Lack of public transportation	3.87	1.3585	.2025	1.8455	35.15
2	Inflation	3.82	1.2843	.1915	1.6795	33.60
3	High utility rates	3.80	1.0574	.1576	1.1181	27.83
4	Need for better schools	3.18	1.6554	.2468	2.7404	52.09
5	Crime	3.02	1.3227	.1972	1.7495	43.77
6	Drug abuse	2.96	1.2784	.1905	1.6343	43.26
7	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.92	1.4832	.2211	2.2000	50.57
8	Poor planning for city growth	2.84	1.2052	.1797	1.4525	42.37
9	Availability of low-income housing	2.80	1.6040	.2391	2.5727	53.29
10	Leniency in courts	2.78	1.5358	.2289	2.3586	55.29

*N = 45.

TABLE XLI

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 4
(36-50 YEARS)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.29	.9852	.2389	.9706	22.94
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.77	1.3933	.3379	1.9412	37.01
3	High utility rates	3.65	1.4976	.3632	2.2427	41.06
4	Water shortage	3.59	1.3257	.3215	1.7574	36.94
5	Abuse of the elderly	3.00	1.1180	.2712	1.2500	37.27
6	Corrupt city government	2.77	1.4803	.3590	2.1912	53.54
7	Chemical wastes in the soil	2.77	1.6782	.4070	2.8162	60.70
8	Crime	2.71	1.2632	.3064	1.5956	46.68
9	Poor planning for city growth	2.71	.9852	.2389	.9706	36.41
10	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	2.71	.9852	.2389	.9706	36.41

*N = 17.

TABLE XLII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: AGE LEVEL 5
(51-65 YEARS)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.91	.9439	.2846	.8909	24.15
2	Lack of public transportation	3.91	1.2210	.3682	1.4910	31.24
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.46	1.5076	.4546	2.2727	43.64
4	High utility rates	3.36	1.4334	.4322	2.0546	42.61
5	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	3.09	1.0445	.3149	1.0909	33.79
6	Need for better schools	3.00	1.3416	.4045	1.8000	44.72
7	Leniency in courts	2.91	.8312	.2506	.6909	28.57
8	Poor planning for city growth	2.82	.7508	.2264	.5636	26.64
9	Crime	2.82	1.1678	.3521	1.3636	41.44
10a	Alcoholism	2.73	.7863	.2371	.6182	28.83
b	Lack of recreational facilities for senior citizens	2.73	1.0091	.3042	1.0182	37.00

*N = 11.

TABLE XLIII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: RACE 1 (WHITE)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.92	1.1521	.0856	1.3273	29.37
2	High utility rates	3.54	1.2889	.0958	1.6612	36.45
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.51	1.2807	.0952	1.6402	36.51
4	Lack of public transportation	3.36	1.4751	.1096	2.1759	43.91
5	Drug abuse	2.97	1.3014	.0967	1.6937	43.78
6	Need for better schools	2.96	1.5106	.1123	2.2818	51.01
7	Crime	2.84	1.2210	.0908	1.4909	43.00
8	Alcoholism	2.80	1.2898	.0959	1.6635	46.14
9	Relations between OSU and the community	2.74	1.3960	.1038	1.9489	50.94
10	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.72	1.4076	.1046	1.9813	51.78

*N = 181.

TABLE XLIV

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: RACE 3 (ASIAN)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Need for better schools	4.40	1.3416	.6000	1.8000	30.49
2	Lack of public transportation	3.60	1.6733	.7483	2.8000	46.48
3	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	3.60	.8944	.4000	.8000	24.85
4	Equal job opportunities for minorities	3.60	1.9494	.8718	3.8000	54.15
5	Inflation	3.00	1.8708	.8367	3.5000	62.36
6	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	2.80	1.0955	.4899	1.2000	39.12
7	Poor planning for city growth	2.80	1.3038	.5831	1.7000	46.57
8	Drug abuse	2.80	1.3038	.5831	1.7000	46.57
9	Lack of good medical care and facilities	2.80	1.6432	.7349	2.7000	58.69
10a	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	2.60	1.3416	.6000	1.8000	51.60
b	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	2.60	1.5166	.6782	2.3000	58.33

*N = 5.

TABLE XLV

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: RACE 5 (HISPANIC)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.50	.7072	.5000	.5000	15.71
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	4.00	1.4142	1.0000	2.0000	35.36
3	Lack of public transportation	4.00	-	-	-	-
4	Leniency in courts	4.00	-	-	-	-
5	Police brutality	4.00	1.4142	1.0000	2.0000	35.36
6	Sidewalks and buildigns not designed for handicapped	4.00	1.4142	1.0000	2.0000	35.36
7	High utility rates	3.50	.7071	.5000	.5000	20.20
8	Poor planning for city growth	3.00	-	-	-	-
9	Availability of low income housing	3.00	-	-	-	-
10a	Drug abuse	3.00	-	-	-	-
b	Child abuse	3.00	-	-	-	-

*N = 2.

TABLE XLVI

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: RACE 6 (OTHER)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	5.00	-	-	-	-
2	Equal job opportunities for minorities	5.00	-	-	-	-
3	Lack of good medical care and facilities	5.00	-	-	-	-
4	Drug abuse	4.00	1.4142	1.0000	2.0000	35.36
5	High utility rates	4.00	.4142	1.0000	2.0000	35.36
6	Crime	3.00	2.8284	2.0000	8.0000	94.28
7	Alcoholism	3.00	1.4142	1.0000	2.0000	47.14
8	Availability of low income housing	3.00	2.8284	2.0000	8.0000	94.28
9	Relations between OSU and the community	3.00	2.8284	2.0000	8.0000	94.28
10	Need for better schools	3.00	2.8284	2.0000	8.0000	94.28

*N = 2

TABLE XLVII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: FAMILY INCOME LEVEL 1 (UNDER $10,000)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.06	1.0859	.1192	1.1793	26.75
2	High utility rates	3.62	1.2477	.1370	1.5569	34.52
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.55	1.2616	.1385	1.5915	35.50
4	Lack of public transportation	3.47	1.4427	.1584	2.0814	41.58
5	Need for better shcools	3.23	1.4941	.1640	2.2324	45.43
6	Crime	3.00	1.2591	.1382	1.5854	41.97
7	Drug abuse	2.95	1.3243	.14536	1.7538	48.86
8	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.94	1.4428	.1584	2.0817	49.08
9	Alcoholism	2.88	1.3104	.1438	1.7170	45.50
10	Equal job opportunities for minorities	2.88	1.3104	.1438	1.7170	45.50

*N = 83.

TABLE XLVIII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: FAMILY INCOME LEVEL 2 ($10,001-15,000)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.36	1.0818	.2891	1.1703	24.83
2	Lack of public transportation	4.21	1.1883	.3176	1.4121	28.20
3	High utility rates	3.57	1.5046	.4021	2.2637	42.13
4	Drug abuse	3.43	1.4526	.3882	2.1099	43.37
5	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.14	1.4601	.3902	2.1319	46.46
6	Poor planning for city growth	2.93	1.4917	.3987	2.2253	50.97
7	Corrupt city government	2.71	1.5407	.4118	2.3736	56.76
8	Relations between OSU and the community	2.71	1.5898	.4249	2.5275	58.57
9	Alcoholism	2.57	1.2839	.3431	1.6484	49.93
10	Abuse of the elderly	2.57	1.7852	.4771	3.1868	69.42

*N = 14.

TABLE XLIX

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: FAMILY INCOME LEVEL 3 ($15,001-20,000)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.33	1.2309	.3553	1.5152	28.41
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	4.17	1.1146	.3218	1.2424	26.75
3	High utility rates	4.00	1.3484	.3893	1.8182	33.71
4	Crime	3.83	1.467	.4234	2.1515	28.41
5	Lack of public transportation	3.67	1.3707	.3957	1.8788	37.38
6	Water shortage	3.33	1.3707	.3957	1.8788	41.12
7	Abuse of the elderly	3.33	1.6143	.4660	2.6061	48.43
8	Sidewalks and buildings not designed for handicapped	3.33	1.2309	.3553	1.5152	36.93
9	Need for better schools	3.33	1.2309	.3553	1.5151	36.93
10a	Alcoholism	3.08	1.2401	.3580	1.5379	40.22
b	Lack of job opportunities for the handicapped	3.08	1.3790	.3981	1.9015	44.72
c	Battered wives	3.08	1.5050	.4345	2.2652	48.81

*N = 12.

TABLE L

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: FAMILY INCOME LEVEL 4 ($20,001-25,000)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Lack of public transportation	3.88	1.1115	.2696	1.2353	28.63
2	Inflation	3.71	1.3117	.3181	1.7206	35.40
3	Water shortage	3.53	1.4628	.3548	2.1397	41.45
4	High utility rates	3.53	1.3284	.3222	1.7647	37.64
5	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.47	1.3284	.3222	1.7647	38.28
6	Leniency in courts	3.30	1.6494	.4000	2.7206	50.07
7	Poor planning for city growth	3.12	.9926	.2408	.9853	31.84
8	Corrupt city government	2.94	1.5195	.3685	2.3088	51.87
9	Child abuse	2.94	1.5195	.3685	2.3088	51.66
10	Chemical wastes in the soil	2.94	1.6760	.4065	2.8088	56.98

*N = 17.

TABLE LI

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: FAMILY INCOME LEVEL 5 (OVER $25,000)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.78	1.1110	.1318	1.2342	29.43
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.35	.2317	.1462	1.5171	36.74
3	High utility rates	3.31	1.3158	.1562	1.7312	39.75
4	Drug abuse	3.06	1.2176	.1445	1.4825	39.84
5	Lack of public transportation	2.94	1.5296	.1815	2.3396	51.96
6	Need for better schools	2.94	1.4332	.1700	2.0539	48.69
7	Alcoholism	2.93	1.2343	.1465	1.5235	42.13
8	Relations between OSU and the community	2.89	1.3580	.1612	1.8443	47.03
9	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.76	1.3884	.1648	1.9276	50.29
10	Crime	2.73	1.0550	.1252	1.1131	38.61

*N = 71.

TABLE LII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: GRADE COMPLETED 2 (SOME HIGH SCHOOL)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	4.33	1.1547	.6667	1.3333	26.65
2	Inflation	4.33	.5774	.3333	.3333	13.32
3	Lack of public transportation	4.33	1.1547	.6667	1.333	26.65
4	Availability of information about social agencies	4.00	1.000	.5714	1,000	25.00
5	Alcoholism	3.33	.5773	.3333	.3333	17.32
6	Availability of low-income housing	3.33	1.5275	.8819	2.3333	45.83
7	High utility rates	3.33	2.0817	1.2019	4.3333	62.45
8	Lack of job opportunities for handicapped	3.33	.5774	.3333	.3333	17.32
9	Drug abuse	3.00	1.0000	.5774	1.0000	33.33
10	Abuse of the elderly	3.00	1.0000	.5774	1.0000	33.33

*N = 3.

TABLE LIII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: GRADE COMPLETED 3 (HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.14	1.1046	.1894	1.2201	26.63
2	High utility rates	4.12	1.1485	.1970	1.3191	27.89
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.77	1.4783	.2535	2.1854	39.27
4	Lack of public transportation	3.71	1.3823	.2371	1.9109	37.30
5	Leniency in courts	3.18	1.3811	.2368	1.9073	43.48
6	Poor planning for city growth	3.09	1.2153	.2074	1.4626	42.39
7	Water shortage	3.06	1.5752	.2702	2.4813	51.50
8	Crime	2.83	1.2094	.2074	1.4626	42.39
9	Corrupt city government	2.65	1.3230	.2270	1.7505	49.98
10	Need for better schools	2.65	1.4951	.2564	2.2353	56.48

*N = 34.

TABLE LIV

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: GRADE COMPLETED 4 (SOME COLLEGE)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.96	1.1551	.1045	1.3344	29.18
2	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.43	1.2219	.1102	1.4931	35.62
3	High utility rates	3.42	1.2804	.1155	1.6395	37.41
4	Drug abuse	3.23	1.2467	.1124	1.5543	38.63
5	Alcoholism	3.18	1.3184	.1189	1.7382	41.48
6	Need for better schools	3.14	1.4895	.1343	2.2185	47.46
7	Relations between OSU and the community	3.11	1.3920	.1255	1.9378	44.71
8	Lack of public transportation	3.10	1.5009	.1353	2.22527	48.45
9	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	3.07	1.4069	.1269	1.9793	45.90
10	Crime	2.92	1.2187	.1099	1.4851	41.95

*N = 123.

TABLE LV

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: GRADE LEVEL 5
(COLLEGE DEGREE)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.58	1.1650	.3361	1.3561	32.50
2	Inflation	3.42	1.2401	.3580	1.5379	36.30
3	Lack of public transportation	3.42	1.3790	.3981	1.9015	40.36
4	Poor planning for city growth	3.33	1.5470	.3333	1.3333	34.64
5	High utility rates	3.17	1.3371	.3860	1.7879	42.23
6	Crime	2.92	1.2401	.3580	1.5379	42.52
7	Leniency in courts	2.92	1.5643	.4516	2.4470	53.63
8	Corrupt city government	2.75	1.4848	.4286	2.2046	53.99
9	Drug abuse	2.75	1.4848	.4286	2.2046	53.99
10	Teen age pregnancy	2.67	1.4975	.4323	2.2424	56.16

*N = 12.

TABLE LVI

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: GRADE LEVEL 6
(POST-DEGREE WORK)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Lack of public transportation	4.22	1.0860	.2090	1.1795	25.72
2	Inflation	3.74	1.2586	.2422	1.5840	33.65
3	High utility rates	3.41	1.3661	.2629	1.8661	40.09
4	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.33	1.2710	.2446	1.6154	38.13
5	Equal job opportunities for minorities	3.07	1.3567	.2611	1.8405	44.14
6	Availability of low-income housing	3.00	1.5933	.3066	2.5385	53.11
7	Need for better shools	3.00	1.6172	.3112	2.6154	53.91
8	Drug abuse	2.74	1.2277	.2363	1.5071	44.80
9	Relations between OSU and the community	2.74	1.4302	.2753	2.0456	52.18
10	Abuse of the elderly	2.74	1.3183	.2537	1.7379	48.10

*N = 27.

TABLE LVII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: SATISFACTION LEVEL 2
(NOT VERY SATISFIED)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.00	.8165	.2582	.6667	20.41
2	Alcholism	4.00	1.0541	.3333	1.1111	26.35
3	Relations between OSU and the community	4.00	1.0541	.3333	1.1111	26.35
4	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	3.70	1.0593	.3350	1.1222	28.63
5	Drug abuse	3.50	1.2649	.4000	1.6000	35.14
6	Lack of good medical care and facilities	3.50	.9718	.3073	.9444	27.77
7	High utility rates	3.50	1.5092	.4773	2.2778	43.12
8	Police brutality	3.30	1.4181	.4485	2.0111	42.97
9	Need for better schools	3.20	1.3165	.4163	1.7333	41.14
10a	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.10	.5676	.1795	.3222	18.31
10b	Equal job opportunities for minorities	3.10	1.1972	.3786	1.4333	38.62

*N = 10.

TABLE LVIII

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: SATISFACTION LEVEL 3 (SOMEWHAT SATISFIED)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	4.00	1.0730	.1385	1.1514	27.05
2	High utility rates	3.65	1.1173	.1442	1.2483	30.61
3	Drug abuse	3.15	1.1764	.1519	1.3839	37.35
4	Need for better schools	3.08	1.4990	.1935	2.2472	48.62
5	Alcoholism	3.02	1.1860	.1531	1.4065	39.31
6	Lack of parks and recreational facilities	2.98	1.3082	.1689	1.7116	43.85
7	Availability of low-income housing	2.98	1.3082	.1689	1.7116	43.85
8	Equal job opportunities for minorities	2.62	1.2768	.1645	1.6302	48.80
9	Sidewalks and buildings designed for handicapped	2.60	1.2101	.1562	1.4644	46.54
10	Child abuse	2.58	1.3936	.1799	1.942	53.95

*N = 60.

TABLE LIX

TOP TEN PROBLEMS BY SUBGROUP: SATISFACTION LEVEL 4 (VERY SATISFIED)*

	Problem	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance	Coeff. of Variation
1	Inflation	3.92	1.2302	.1079	1.5134	31.36
2	Lack of public transportation	3.50	1.4640	.1284	2.2230	55.86
3	Unpaved or poorly paved roads	3.48	1.3924	.1178	1.8020	38.52
4	High utility rates	3.48	1.3709	.1202	1.8793	39.43
5	Drug abuse	2.95	1.3544	.1188	1.8343	45.97
6	Need for better schools	2.93	1.5511	.1360	2.4060	52.93
7	Crime	2.87	1.2413	.1089	1.5409	43.26
8	Poor planning for city growth	2.78	1.1679	.1024	1.3641	41.94
9	Leniency in courts	2.78	1.4157	.1242	2.0041	50.98
10	Alcoholism	2.70	1.2859	.1128	1.6535	47.63

*N = 130.

TABLE LX

TABLE OF SEX BY QUESTION 2

TABLE OF SEX BY QN2

SEX / QN2	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
F	18	29	34	12	6	99
	16.E	31.2	24.E	20.3	5.9	
	1.2	-2.2	9.3	-E.3	C.1	
	C.1	C.2	3.5	3.4	0.0	
	9.00	14.50	17.00	E.CO	3.00	49.50
	18.18	29.29	34.34	12.12	E.06	
	52.94	4E.03	EE.00	29.27	50.00	
M	16	34	1E	29	6	101
	17.2	31.E	25.3	20.7	E.1	
	-1.2	2.2	-9.3	E.3	-C.1	
	0.1	0.2	3.4	3.3	0.0	
	E.00	17.00	E.00	14.50	3.00	50.50
	15.84	33.66	15.84	2E.71	5.94	
	47.0E	53.97	32.00	70.73	50.00	
TOTAL	34	63	50	41	12	200
	17.00	31.50	25.00	20.50	E.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	14.025	DF= 4	PROB=0.0072
PHI	0.265		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.25E		

TABLE LXI

TABLE OF SEX BY QUESTION 20

TABLE OF SEX BY QN20

SEX	QN20					
FREQUENCY EXPECTED DEVIATION CELL CHI2 PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
F	25	22	17	13	22	99
	26.7	17.8	24.8	13.4	16.3	
	-1.7	4.2	-7.8	-0.4	5.7	
	0.1	1.0	2.4	0.0	2.0	
	12.50	11.00	8.50	6.50	11.00	49.50
	25.25	22.22	17.17	13.13	22.22	
	46.30	61.11	34.00	48.15	66.67	
M	29	14	33	14	11	101
	27.3	18.2	25.3	13.6	16.7	
	1.7	-4.2	7.8	0.4	-5.7	
	0.1	1.0	2.4	0.0	1.9	
	14.50	7.00	16.50	7.00	5.50	50.50
	28.71	13.86	32.67	13.86	10.89	
	53.70	38.89	66.00	51.85	33.33	
TOTAL	54	36	50	27	33	200
	27.00	18.00	25.00	13.50	16.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	10.875	DF= 4	PROB=0.028
PHI	0.233		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.227		

TABLE LXII

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 1

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN1

NEWAGE / QN1	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	11	12	35	31	22	111
	10.0	14.4	28.9	26.6	31.1	
	1.0	-2.4	6.1	4.4	-9.1	
	0.1	0.4	1.3	0.7	2.7	
	5.50	6.00	17.50	15.50	11.00	55.50
	9.91	10.81	31.53	27.93	19.82	
	61.11	46.15	67.31	64.58	39.29	
2	7	14	17	17	34	89
	8.0	11.6	23.1	21.4	24.9	
	-1.0	2.4	-6.1	-4.4	9.1	
	0.1	0.5	1.6	0.9	3.3	
	3.50	7.00	8.50	8.50	17.00	44.50
	7.87	15.73	19.10	19.10	38.20	
	38.89	53.85	32.69	35.42	60.71	
TOTAL	18	26	52	48	56	200
	9.00	13.00	26.00	24.00	28.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	11.649	DF= 4	PROB=0.0202
PHI	0.241		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.235		

TABLE LXIII

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 5

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QNS

NEWAGE / QNS	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	15	22	22	30	22	111
FREQUENCY	18.3	29.4	27.2	21.6	14.4	
EXPECTED	-3.3	-7.4	-5.2	8.4	7.6	
DEVIATION	0.6	1.9	1.0	3.2	4.0	
CELL CHI2	7.50	11.00	11.00	15.00	11.00	55.50
PERCENT	13.51	19.82	19.82	27.03	19.82	
ROW PCT	45.45	41.51	44.90	76.92	84.62	
COL PCT						
2	18	31	27	9	4	89
	14.7	23.6	21.8	17.4	11.6	
	3.3	7.4	5.2	-8.4	-7.6	
	0.7	2.3	1.2	4.0	5.0	
	9.00	15.50	13.50	4.50	2.00	44.50
	20.22	34.83	30.34	10.11	4.49	
	54.55	58.49	59.10	23.08	15.38	
TOTAL	33	53	49	39	26	200
	16.50	26.50	24.50	19.50	13.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	23.950	DF= 4	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.346		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.327		

TABLE LXIV

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 4

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN9

NEWAGE QN9

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / CELL CHI2 / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	30	26	16	21	18	111
	41.1	25.0	13.9	16.1	15.0	
	-11.1	1.0	2.1	4.9	3.0	
	3.0	0.0	0.3	1.8	0.6	
	15.00	13.00	8.00	10.50	9.00	55.50
	27.03	23.42	14.41	18.92	16.22	
	40.54	57.78	64.00	72.41	66.67	
2	44	19	9	8	9	89
	32.9	20.0	11.1	12.9	12.0	
	11.1	-1.0	-2.1	-4.9	-3.0	
	3.7	0.1	0.4	1.9	0.8	
	22.00	9.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	44.50
	49.44	21.35	10.11	8.99	10.11	
	59.46	42.22	36.00	27.59	33.33	
TOTAL	74	45	25	29	27	200
	37.00	22.50	12.50	14.50	13.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	12.253	DF= 4	PROB=0.0156
PHI	0.248		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.240		

TABLE LXV

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 10

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN10

NEWAGE / QN10	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	19	17	29	25	21	111
FREQUENCY	29.4	22.8	23.3	17.2	16.3	
EXPECTED	-10.4	-5.8	5.7	7.8	2.7	
DEVIATION	3.7	1.5	1.4	3.5	0.4	
CELL CHI2	9.50	8.50	14.50	12.50	10.50	55.50
PERCENT	17.12	15.32	26.13	22.52	18.92	
ROW PCT	35.85	41.46	69.05	80.65	63.64	
COL PCT						
2	34	24	13	6	12	89
	23.6	18.2	18.7	13.8	14.7	
	10.4	5.8	-5.7	-7.8	-2.7	
	4.6	1.8	1.7	4.4	0.5	
	17.00	12.00	6.50	3.00	6.00	44.50
	38.20	26.97	14.61	6.74	13.48	
	64.15	58.54	30.95	19.35	36.36	
TOTAL	53	41	42	31	33	200
	26.50	20.50	21.00	15.50	16.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	23.500	DF= 4	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.343		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.324		

TABLE LXVI

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 14

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN14

NEWAGE / QN14	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	27	13	23	26	22	111
	18.9	13.3	19.4	23.9	35.5	
	8.1	-0.3	3.6	2.1	-13.5	
	3.5	0.0	0.7	0.2	5.1	
	13.50	6.50	11.50	13.00	11.00	55.50
	24.32	11.71	20.72	23.42	19.82	
	75.41	54.17	65.71	60.47	34.38	
2	7	11	12	17	42	89
	15.1	10.7	15.6	19.1	28.5	
	-8.1	0.3	-3.6	-2.1	13.5	
	4.4	0.0	0.8	0.2	6.4	
	3.50	5.50	8.00	8.50	21.00	44.50
	7.87	12.36	13.48	19.10	47.19	
	20.59	45.83	34.29	39.53	65.63	
TOTAL	34	24	35	43	64	200
	17.00	12.00	17.50	21.50	32.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	21.361	DF= 4	PROB=0.0003
PHI	0.327		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.311		

TABLE LXVII

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 15

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY Q15

NEWAGE Q15

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / CELL CHI2 / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	50	23	13	14	11	111
	38.6	27.2	12.8	17.6	14.4	
	11.2	-4.2	0.2	-3.8	-3.4	
	3.2	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.8	
	25.00	11.50	6.50	7.00	5.50	55.50
	45.05	20.72	11.71	12.61	9.91	
	71.43	46.94	56.52	43.75	42.31	
2	20	26	10	18	15	89
	31.1	21.8	10.2	14.2	11.6	
	-11.1	4.2	-0.2	3.8	3.4	
	4.0	0.8	0.0	1.0	1.0	
	10.00	13.00	5.00	9.00	7.50	44.50
	22.47	29.21	11.24	20.22	16.85	
	28.57	53.06	43.48	56.25	57.69	
TOTAL	70	49	23	32	26	200
	35.00	24.50	11.50	16.00	13.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	12.276	DF= 4	PROB=0.0154
PHI	0.248		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.240		

TABLE LXVIII

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 19

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN19

NEWAGE / QN19	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	43	26	13	15	14	111
	37.2	23.9	20.0	17.8	12.2	
	5.8	2.1	-7.0	-2.8	1.8	
	0.9	0.2	2.4	0.4	0.3	
	21.50	13.00	6.50	7.50	7.00	55.50
	38.74	23.42	11.71	13.51	12.61	
	64.18	60.47	36.11	46.88	63.64	
2	24	17	23	17	8	89
	29.8	19.1	16.0	14.2	9.8	
	-5.8	-2.1	7.0	2.8	-1.8	
	1.1	0.2	3.0	0.5	0.3	
	12.00	8.50	11.50	8.50	4.00	44.50
	26.97	19.10	25.84	19.10	8.99	
	35.82	39.53	63.89	53.13	36.36	
TOTAL	67	43	36	32	22	200
	33.50	21.50	18.00	16.00	11.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	9.506	DF= 4	PROB=0.0496
PHI	0.218		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.213		

TABLE LXIX

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 20

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN20

NEWAGE / QN20	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	20	21	32	17	21	111
	30.0	20.0	27.8	15.0	18.3	
	-10.0	1.0	4.3	2.0	2.7	
	3.3	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.4	
	10.00	10.50	16.00	8.50	10.50	55.50
	18.02	18.92	28.83	15.32	18.92	
	37.04	58.33	64.00	62.96	63.64	
2	34	15	18	10	12	89
	24.0	16.0	22.3	12.0	14.7	
	10.0	-1.0	-4.3	-2.0	-2.7	
	4.1	0.1	0.8	0.3	0.5	
	17.00	7.50	9.00	5.00	6.00	44.50
	38.20	16.85	20.22	11.24	13.48	
	62.96	41.67	36.00	37.04	36.36	
TOTAL	54	36	50	27	33	200
	27.00	18.00	25.00	13.50	16.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	10.526	DF= 4	PROB=0.0324
PHI	0.229		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.224		

TABLE LXX

TABLE OF YOUNGER AND OLDER AGE BY QUESTION 23

TABLE OF NEWAGE BY QN23

NEWAGE / QN23	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	38	30	18	11	14	111
	48.8	28.9	16.6	7.2	9.4	
	-10.8	1.1	1.4	3.8	4.6	
	2.4	0.0	0.1	2.0	2.2	
	19.00	15.00	9.00	5.50	7.00	55.50
	34.23	27.03	16.22	9.91	12.61	
	43.18	57.69	60.00	84.62	82.35	
2	50	22	12	2	3	89
	39.2	23.1	13.3	5.8	7.6	
	10.8	-1.1	-1.3	-3.8	-4.6	
	3.0	0.1	0.1	2.5	2.8	
	25.00	11.00	6.00	1.00	1.50	44.50
	56.18	24.72	13.48	2.25	3.37	
	56.82	42.31	40.00	15.38	17.65	
TOTAL	88	52	30	13	17	200
	44.00	26.00	15.00	6.50	8.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	15.175	DF= 4	PROB=0.0043
PHI	0.275		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.266		

TABLE LXXI

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 5

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN5

NEWYRS QN5

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / CELL CHI2 / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	17	25	27	31	22	122
	20.1	32.3	29.9	23.8	15.9	
	-3.1	-7.3	-2.9	7.2	6.1	
	0.5	1.7	0.3	2.2	2.4	
	8.50	12.50	13.50	15.50	11.00	61.00
	13.93	20.49	22.13	25.41	18.03	
	51.52	47.17	55.10	79.49	84.62	
2	16	28	22	8	4	78
	12.9	20.7	19.1	15.2	10.1	
	3.1	7.3	2.9	-7.2	-6.1	
	0.8	2.6	0.4	3.4	3.7	
	8.00	14.00	11.00	4.00	2.00	39.00
	20.51	35.90	28.21	10.26	5.13	
	48.48	52.83	44.90	20.51	15.38	
TOTAL	33	53	49	39	26	200
	16.50	26.50	24.50	19.50	13.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	17.923	DF= 4	PROB=0.0013
PHI	0.299		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.287		

TABLE LXXII

TABLE OF SHORTHER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 6

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN6

NEWYRS / QN6	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	44	15	32	14	17	122
FREQUENCY	39.0	23.8	28.7	15.9	14.6	
EXPECTED	5.0	-8.8	3.3	-1.9	2.4	
DEVIATION	0.6	3.2	0.4	0.2	0.4	
CELL CHI2	22.00	7.50	16.00	7.00	8.50	61.00
PERCENT	36.07	12.30	26.23	11.48	13.93	
ROW PCT	68.75	38.46	68.09	53.85	70.83	
COL PCT						
2	20	24	15	12	7	78
	25.0	15.2	18.8	10.1	9.4	
	-5.0	8.8	-3.3	1.9	-2.4	
	1.0	5.1	0.6	0.3	0.6	
	10.00	12.00	7.50	6.00	3.50	39.00
	25.64	30.77	19.23	15.38	8.97	
	31.25	61.54	31.91	46.15	29.17	
TOTAL	64	39	47	26	24	200
	32.00	19.50	23.50	13.00	12.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	12.470	DF= 4	PROB=0.0142
PHI	0.250		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.242		

TABLE LXXIII

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 13

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN13

NEWYRS / QN13	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	48	29	15	8	22	122
	43.9	28.7	21.3	10.4	17.7	
	4.1	0.3	-6.3	-2.4	4.3	
	0.4	0.0	1.9	0.5	1.1	
	24.00	14.50	7.50	4.00	11.00	61.00
	39.34	23.77	12.30	6.56	18.03	
	66.67	61.70	42.86	47.06	75.86	
2	24	18	20	9	7	78
	28.1	18.3	13.6	6.6	11.3	
	-4.1	-0.3	6.4	2.4	-4.3	
	0.6	0.0	3.0	0.8	1.6	
	12.00	9.00	10.00	4.50	3.50	39.00
	30.77	23.08	25.64	11.54	8.97	
	33.33	38.30	57.14	52.94	24.14	
TOTAL	72	47	35	17	29	200
	36.00	23.50	17.50	8.50	14.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	9.906	DF= 4	PROB=0.0420
PHI	0.223		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.217		

TABLE LXXIV

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 14

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN14

NEWYRS / QN14	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	29	14	22	29	28	122
FREQUENCY	20.7	14.6	21.3	26.2	39.0	
EXPECTED	8.3	-0.6	0.7	2.8	-11.0	
DEVIATION	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.1	
CELL CHI2	14.50	7.00	11.00	14.50	14.00	61.00
PERCENT	23.77	11.48	18.03	23.77	22.95	
ROW PCT	85.29	58.33	62.86	67.44	43.75	
COL PCT						
2	5	10	13	14	36	78
	13.3	9.4	13.6	16.8	25.0	
	-8.3	0.6	-0.6	-2.8	11.0	
	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.9	
	2.50	5.00	6.50	7.00	18.00	39.00
	6.41	12.82	16.67	17.95	46.15	
	14.71	41.67	37.14	32.56	56.25	
TOTAL	34	24	35	43	64	200
	17.00	12.00	17.50	21.50	32.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	17.213	DF= 4	PROB=0.0017
PHI	0.294		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.282		

TABLE LXXV

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 15

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN15

NEWYRS / QN15	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	54	31	12	15	10	122
	42.7	29.9	14.0	19.5	15.9	
	11.3	1.1	-2.0	-4.5	-5.9	
	3.0	0.0	0.3	1.0	2.2	
	27.00	15.50	6.00	7.50	5.00	61.00
	44.26	25.41	9.84	12.30	8.20	
	77.14	63.27	52.17	46.88	38.46	
2	16	18	11	17	16	78
	27.3	19.1	9.0	12.5	10.1	
	-11.3	-1.1	2.0	4.5	5.9	
	4.7	0.1	0.5	1.6	3.4	
	8.00	9.00	5.50	8.50	8.00	39.00
	20.51	23.08	14.10	21.79	20.51	
	22.86	36.73	47.83	53.13	61.54	
TOTAL	70	49	23	32	26	200
	35.00	24.50	11.50	16.00	13.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	16.762	DF= 4	PROB=0.0022
PHI	0.289		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.278		

TABLE LXXVI

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 18

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN18

NEWYRS / QN18	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	12	18	37	20	35	122
	11.6	15.3	29.9	27.4	37.8	
	0.4	2.8	7.1	-7.4	-2.8	
	0.0	0.5	1.7	2.0	0.2	
	6.00	9.00	18.50	10.00	17.50	61.00
	9.84	14.75	30.33	16.39	28.69	
	63.16	72.00	75.51	44.44	56.45	
2	7	7	12	25	27	78
	7.4	9.8	19.1	17.5	24.2	
	-0.4	-2.8	-7.1	7.5	2.8	
	0.0	0.8	2.6	3.2	0.3	
	3.50	3.50	6.00	12.50	13.50	39.00
	8.97	8.97	15.38	32.05	34.62	
	36.84	28.00	24.49	55.56	43.55	
TOTAL	19	25	49	45	62	200
	9.50	12.50	24.50	22.50	31.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	11.369	DF= 4	PROB=0.0227
PHI	0.238		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.232		

TABLE LXXVII

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 19

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN19

NEWYRS / QN19	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	49	26	12	22	13	122
	40.9	26.2	22.0	19.5	13.4	
	6.1	-0.2	-10.0	2.5	-0.4	
	1.6	0.0	4.5	0.3	0.0	
	24.50	13.00	6.00	11.00	6.50	61.00
	40.16	21.31	9.84	18.03	10.66	
	73.13	60.47	33.33	68.75	59.09	
2	18	17	24	10	9	78
	24.1	16.8	14.0	12.5	8.6	
	-6.1	0.2	10.0	-2.5	0.4	
	2.5	0.0	7.1	0.5	0.0	
	9.00	8.50	12.00	5.00	4.50	39.00
	23.08	21.79	30.77	12.82	11.54	
	26.87	39.53	66.67	31.25	40.91	
TOTAL	67	43	36	32	22	200
	33.50	21.50	18.00	16.00	11.00	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	16.877	DF= 4	PROB=0.0023
PHI	0.288		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.277		

TABLE LXXVIII

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 20

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN20

NEWYRS / QN20	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	22	22	31	24	23	122
	32.9	22.0	30.5	16.5	20.1	
	-10.9	0.0	0.5	7.5	2.9	
	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.4	
	11.00	11.00	15.50	12.00	11.50	61.00
	18.03	18.03	25.41	19.67	18.85	
	40.74	61.11	62.00	88.89	69.70	
2	32	14	19	3	10	78
	21.1	14.0	19.5	10.5	12.9	
	10.9	-0.0	-0.5	-7.5	-2.9	
	5.7	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.6	
	16.00	7.00	9.50	1.50	5.00	39.00
	41.03	17.95	24.36	3.85	12.82	
	59.26	38.89	38.00	11.11	30.30	
TOTAL	54	36	50	27	33	200
	27.00	18.00	25.00	13.50	16.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	19.214	DF= 4	PROB=0.0007
PHI	0.310		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.296		

TABLE LXXIX

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 22

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN22

NEWYRS / QN22	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	43	30	18	18	13	122
FREQUENCY						
EXPECTED	35.4	27.4	22.6	21.3	15.3	
DEVIATION	7.6	2.6	-4.6	-3.3	-2.3	
CELL CHI2	1.6	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.3	
PERCENT	21.50	15.00	9.00	9.00	6.50	61.00
ROW PCT	35.25	24.59	14.75	14.75	10.66	
COL PCT	74.14	66.67	48.65	51.43	52.00	
2	15	15	19	17	12	78
FREQUENCY	22.6	17.5	14.4	13.6	9.8	
EXPECTED	-7.6	-2.5	4.6	3.4	2.3	
DEVIATION	2.6	0.4	1.4	0.8	0.5	
CELL CHI2	7.50	7.50	9.50	8.50	6.00	39.00
PERCENT	19.23	19.23	24.36	21.79	15.38	
ROW PCT	25.86	33.33	51.35	48.57	48.00	
COL PCT						
TOTAL	58	45	37	35	25	200
	29.00	22.50	18.50	17.50	12.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	9.387	DF= 4	PROB=0.0521
PHI	0.217		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.212		

TABLE LXXX

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS BY QUESTION 23

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN23

NEWYRS / QN23	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	40	38	19	12	13	122
	53.7	31.7	18.3	7.9	10.4	
	-13.7	6.3	0.7	4.1	2.6	
	3.5	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.7	
	20.00	19.00	9.50	6.00	6.50	61.00
	32.79	31.15	15.57	9.84	10.66	
	45.45	73.08	63.33	92.31	76.47	
2	48	14	11	1	4	78
	34.3	20.3	11.7	5.1	6.6	
	13.7	-6.3	-0.7	-4.1	-2.6	
	5.5	1.9	0.0	3.3	1.0	
	24.00	7.00	5.50	0.50	2.00	39.00
	61.54	17.95	14.10	1.28	5.13	
	54.55	26.92	36.67	7.69	23.53	
TOTAL	88	52	30	13	17	200
	44.00	26.00	15.00	6.50	8.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	19.262	DF= 4	PROB=0.0007
PHI	0.310		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.296		

TABLE LXXXI

TABLE OF SHORTER AND LONGER-TIME RESIDENTS
BY QUESTION 24

TABLE OF NEWYRS BY QN24

NEWYRS / QN24	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1	26	32	32	7	25	122
FREQUENCY						
EXPECTED	31.7	31.7	32.3	8.5	17.7	
DEVIATION	-5.7	0.3	-0.3	-1.5	7.3	
CELL CHI2	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.0	
PERCENT	13.00	16.00	16.00	3.50	12.50	61.00
ROW PCT	21.31	26.23	26.23	5.74	20.49	
COL PCT	50.00	61.54	60.38	50.00	86.21	
2	26	20	21	7	4	78
	20.3	20.3	20.7	5.5	11.3	
	5.7	-0.3	0.3	1.5	-7.3	
	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.7	
	13.00	10.00	10.50	3.50	2.00	39.00
	33.33	25.64	26.92	8.97	5.13	
	50.00	38.46	39.62	50.00	13.79	
TOTAL	52	52	53	14	29	200
	26.00	26.00	26.50	7.00	14.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	11.117	DF= 4	PROB=0.0253
PHI	0.236		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.228		

VITA 2

Karen S. Bell

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: ASCERTAINING THE NEEDS, PROBLEMS, AND INTERESTS OF STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA (1981)

Major Field: Mass Communication

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Brooklyn, New York, March 18, 1947, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. I. Isaacs.

Education: Graduated from Abraham Lincoln High School, Brooklyn, New York, in January, 1964; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Speech and Theatre from Brooklyn College in 1968. Enrolled in the Master's program at New York University, 1968-1969; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in December, 1981.

Professional Experience: Teacher of High School Speech, Brooklyn, New York, 1968-1969; teacher of Middle and High School Speech, Wilton and Weston, Connecticut, 1970-1971; theatre critic, Jacksonville Chronicle, Jacksonville, Florida, 1973-1974.