Rural neighborhoods defined by the application of analytic induction

William Thomas Boring
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd
Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation
Boring, William Thomas, "Rural neighborhoods defined by the application of analytic induction" (1968). Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 5288. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/5288

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.
RURAL NEIGHBORHOODS DEFINED BY THE APPLICATION OF
ANALYTIC INDUCTION

by

William T. Boring

B. A. University of Montana, 1968

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

1968

Approved by:

[Signatures]

Chairman, Board of Examiners

Dean, Graduate School

AUG 7 1968

Date
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to all the warm, thoughtful people of Ravalli County who gave so freely of their time and energy, and without whom this thesis could never have been written.

Special, and personal, thanks are due to Dr. I. W. Evans who aroused my interest in Sociology. His keen mind, objectivity, and understanding will always be a model of effective teaching to me.

Three others deserve special mention: Dr. Gordon Browder for his wisdom and sustained interest, Dr. Thomas Payne for his encouragement and fresh viewpoint, and my wife, Judi, for her enthusiasm.

W.T.B.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.  INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. THE METHOD OF ANALYTIC INDUCTION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOOD STUDIES</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ANALYTIC INDUCTION APPLIED TO RURAL NEIGHBORHOODS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.  SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The present study is concerned exclusively with rural neighborhoods and its conclusions should not be postulated as being applicable to urban neighborhoods in metropolitan areas. The purpose of the study is exclusively to understand and to provide a rational theoretical account of the functioning of rural neighborhoods. Specifically, this required that rural neighborhoods be defined in terms of the functions they serve to rural people, and also defined in terms of the concepts which rural people held about their neighborhoods.

Rural neighborhoods have been a topic of interest to sociologists for almost sixty years. Therefore, what could one expect to find that has not been found before? Chapter Three will enumerate these previous studies in greater detail. At this point, it is sufficient to state that sociology had reached an impasse in the study of rural neighborhoods in the early nineteen fifties. Neighborhoods still were important to rural people, but sociology discovered that rural people attached no particular importance to the neighborhoods as sociologists had
defined them. In other words, rural people felt that their neighborhoods as they defined them were important, but that the neighborhoods which were defined by sociologists were meaningless entities. The word "neighborhood" signified one thing to rural people, and another thing to urbane rural sociologists.

This thesis is an attempt to derive a definition of rural neighborhoods which has acceptability to the science of sociology by being based on the facts of rural life. What was needed was a method specifically adapted to building a general definition from raw data and one which would allow as much freedom as possible from bias and previous concepts. The method selected was analytic induction because it adequately meets both these criteria. This method is explained in the next chapter, while Chapter Four is a complete account of the details of the application of this method to rural neighborhoods. The latter is the heart and the justification of this thesis.

Before proceeding to an introduction to analytic induction, a brief discussion of the research area is in order. Ravalli County was chosen as a place of research

---


for two reasons. The first reason is that it is still predominantly a rural area. On three sides, the county has definite geographic boundaries which prevent anyone from living within five miles of the county line. On the west is the rugged Bitterroot Range, which still shows the scars of recent glacial activity. On the south is Lost Trail Pass, where even Lewis and Clark had lost their way. To the east lies the massive Sapphire Range. In all three directions the mountains are unfit for cultivation, and suitable only for very limited grazing.

The fourth side is the only point of frequent contact with other areas. Ravalli County is the upper part of the Bitterroot Valley, which merges into Missoula County on the north. Even at the point where the counties join, the valley narrows from 30 miles wide to only eight. Thus, Ravalli County contacts another agricultural area at only one point, and even this one contact is small. It is, in short, an isolated mountain valley which is a geographical and social, as well as a legal, entity.

The second reason which led to the choice of this area is that it had been studied before. This original study is reproduced in its entirety as Appendix B.

---

Detailed comparisons of the changes in Ravalli County which would be of local interest are enumerated in Appendix D.
CHAPTER II

THE METHOD OF ANALYTIC INDUCTION

The method chosen for this study is based upon the logic of analytic induction. This method was first proposed by Florian Znaniecki, in 1934, in *The Method of Sociology*. In this uniquely brilliant book, he attempts to formalize a method of creating a definition from empirical data. It rests upon the less frequently used inductive process, rather than upon the common deductive ones.

Deduction is "inference in which the conclusions follow necessarily from the premise." It is the form of logic in which all children are trained in basic geometry. It is the subject matter of most formal logic, and it is a way of thought that lends itself well to the communication and teaching of knowledge already achieved.

Induction, on the other hand, is "the act, process, or result or instance of reasoning from a part to a whole, from particulars to generals, or from the individual to a universal." It is being able to see

---

commonalities in the items one is investigating. It is the abstracting of common denominators out of data. Thus, induction and deduction are opposite methods of thought. In deduction, the premise is always given. In induction, it is never given. It must be abstracted from the data.

Analytic induction is a process of applying inductive reasoning to physical and social phenomena. The essential intellectual steps are:  

1. Discover which characteristics in a given datum are more, and which are less essential.  

2. Abstract these characteristics, and assume hypothetically that the more essential are more general than the less essential.  

3. Test this hypothesis by investigating to see if the more essential and more general are in fact related.

In actual practice what one must do is to start with a tentative definition. Then data are collected which are relevant to this definition. These data are next compared with the assumptions which are explicit and implicit in the definition. When an instance is found in which what was assumed to be essential is missing, the

7Znaniecki, op. cit., p. 259.
tentative definition must then be discarded. A careful analysis of this exceptional case should reveal what it has in common with all the previous cases. This is now abstracted and incorporated into the definition as an essential characteristic. If all previous and subsequent cases are found to contain this characteristic, then the new characteristic can be assumed to be essential to the definition, and a general characteristic of the class.

Analytic induction thus becomes a method of analyzing particular cases in an effort to derive a definition that is truly inductive, i.e., one which defines the class in such a way that all the essentials of what one is studying are included in the definition, and no anomalies (non-general aspects) are stated as being common unless they are always present in the class one is seeking to define.

The completed definition should include all essential and invariable aspects of what one is defining, and nothing more. If the research is properly done, there will be nothing in the definition that has not been invariably substantiated by being true in all cases that have been studied. In other words, an adequate definition arrived at by analytic induction must contain proven essentials of the phenomenon studied, and state these essentials in a clear manner without any statements of
probability such as "usually has," "generally is," etc. Obviously, once the essentials of a phenomenon are known, it is an easy next step to construct an operational definition, or other device, to measure the quantity of the phenomenon in a particular case. However, this would be a further step not involving the process of analytic induction, so it will not be dealt with further in this paper. Analytic induction allows one to construct a definition that is empirically verified. Once one knows what it is that one is defining, the contribution of analytic induction is complete.

The best known use of this method was in the study of opiate addiction by Alfred Lindesmith. Using it, he defined opiate addiction as the conscious use of drugs to avoid withdrawal symptoms. However, the study has two grave defects.

The first defect was that he implied that he had found the "cause" of addiction as being the use of opiates to avoid withdrawal symptoms. This is not the "cause" but is, instead, a statement of what opiate addiction is.

The second defect of his research is more serious.

---


9 Ibid., p. 8.

10 Ibid., p. 13.
He stated that addiction rested upon consciousness, linguistic processes, and the social aspects of human life,\textsuperscript{11} and that animals could not truly become addicted. Research since the time of his study has proven that animals can become addicted if they are allowed complete control of the frequency and amount of their injections.\textsuperscript{12} Addiction rests upon willful behavior, and upon nothing more. Lindesmith exceeded the proven limits of his data. His flaw was in the assumption that since all the people he studied lived in groups and used linguistic processes, these must be essential to addiction. He reasoned that since animals are incapable of living in groups that use linguistic processes, they could not become addicted. He assumed that what was general was also essential. Analytic induction only works when one assumes that what is proven to be essential is also general, and checks this generality against field data.

This summary of Lindesmith's work is cited to demonstrate the fact that analytic induction is not proposed as a method that is a panacea to a researcher's problems. The method has certain inherent weaknesses. The first of these is that this method allows one to illustrate

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11}Ibid., pp. 165-170.
  \item \textsuperscript{12}John R. Nichols, "How Opiates Change Behavior," \textsl{Scientific American}, CCXII, No. 2 (February, 1965), 83.
\end{itemize}
the conclusions instead of definitely proving them. To prove them would require proof of the essentiality of the characteristics. One can only prove that the characteristics always exist in the phenomenon studied. Essentiality rests upon logic, while commonality may be empirically demonstrated. If the reverse were true, analytic induction would undoubtedly be more widely used.

The second weakness is that the results cannot be stated in terms of a "confidence level." There is no mathematical measure of the probability of the results being completely true in all cases, because the method assumes a confidence level of 1.0, as any exception encountered in the field work must result in the case being analyzed until the definition is completely true of all cases studied.

A third weakness of this method is that it cannot be used in cases where the dependent variable being defined rests upon several factors which can be scaled over an infinite range. One could not use it, for example, to define a "social class," as a social class is an abstraction of many variables such as education, income, family background, etc., each of which can be continuously scaled. If the variables were each a dichotomy, such as homeownership versus non-homeownership, the method would have some applicability. This explains why analytic induction is
not widely used today, as the field of sociology now has generally adequate operational definitions which can be used on these types of phenomena.

If a method has weaknesses, one could well ask, "Why use it?" The answer, of course, is that all methods have weaknesses as well as strengths. It is the balance of strengths and weaknesses for a particular application that determines a method's suitability and appropriateness. The great strength of this method is that the definition must be analyzed when a new item of contrary data is encountered. This new datum becomes a "crucial case" that must be resolved before the research may proceed. In a deductive approach this case is frequently either thrown out, or averaged out, and the wealth of insight which could be secured from it is lost. Thus, this method offers the possibility of forcing the researcher to think in terms of his subject matter instead of in terms of the beauty of his statistical techniques which may or may not give him insight into this subject matter. One has only to examine a considerable number of studies that are able to prove nothing at a significant level of confidence to feel that more time should be spent in asking worthwhile questions rather than in "forcing" a computer to tell the researcher that nothing he suggested may be answered at any significant level of confidence, because he is asking
irrelevant questions.

Using analytic induction, which forces the researcher to concentrate on crucial cases, provides both the incentive, and the means, of analyzing for significant relevance. Any discrepancy between the definition (theory) and fact (datum) may be directly analyzed for the purpose of correcting the theory to coincide with the facts. This is particularly important when attempting to build a definition with demonstrated relevance to the subject matter being defined. No other method offers such a direct confrontation of theory and subject matter. A cursory examination of the next chapter will reveal a real need for sociology to fit its definition to the facts of rural life before proceeding with further research. Analytic induction offered the researcher the opportunity of concentrating directly on the most basic, and most significant, problems in the area of defining a rural neighborhood.

Znaniecki does not give any specific details for the use of his method in the field. Rather, he states the logical premises upon which he rests his case. These have already been covered in this paper. The actual working out of the specific details of a research project will depend upon the subject matter being studied. The essential factors to be considered are, first, to start with a reasonable tentative definition; and second, to state
guidelines for the gathering of data which have relevance to the tentative definition. The third step is to collect data according to the guidelines established; the fourth step is to continually compare the definition to all aspects of all the data gathered; fifth, to modify the definition when necessary so that it conforms to all items of data studied; and sixth, to check the new definition against further data to be sure that the definition does not need to be modified further.

At what point is the research complete? The test is not a numerical one, but instead, one that rests upon judgment. Have enough data been incorporated since the last change in the definition, so that it appears that time and energy are being needlessly wasted by continuing to add new data? If so, the research may be considered adequately completed.

The subject of this investigation required an examination of rural people’s thinking on and conceptualization of their neighborhoods. This required an interview approach that allowed the author latitude to explore their thinking in depth. One hundred nine formal interviews were conducted, using an open ended questionnaire. In addition, the author spent over eight months in getting acquainted with rural people, attending livestock sales, attending a county fair with rural friends, approaching
respondents while they were working in their fields, and occasionally attending church with them. He frequently stayed for supper with respondents after interviewing them, and lived for six weeks in a cabin on the land of one of the families with whom he had become warm friends.

These and other details of the application of analytic induction to rural neighborhoods will be dealt with in Chapter Four.

Before proceeding to that chapter, a brief summary of previous neighborhood studies would be helpful in providing perspective and insight into the problems involved in arriving at a definition of a neighborhood.
CHAPTER III

PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOOD STUDIES

Early day sociologists, at the turn of the century, felt little need to study the rural community. American sociologists were predominantly people of rural, or small town backgrounds, who were primarily interested in urban problems. Urbanization and industrialization were their main concerns, as they were a problem-oriented group who viewed rural life as a positive influence on mankind. They felt no need to study rural neighborhoods because they saw no "problem" there.

The first person to study and describe the rural community was a Presbyterian minister, Warren E. Wilson, who wrote in 1912:

The country community is defined by the Team Haul. People in the country think of the community as that territory, with its people, which lies within the team haul of a given center. Very often at this center is a church, a school, and a store, though not always, but always the country community has a character of its own. Social customs do not proceed further than the team haul. Intimate knowledge of personalities is confined

---

to the community and does not pass beyond the team haul radius.\textsuperscript{14}

By "team haul" Wilson meant the distance which a farmer would customarily drive and return with a horse and wagon in a day's time.

This simple concept of the rural community was elaborated upon in a study three years later. C. J. Galpin mapped the areas served by dry goods stores, banks, schools, etc., in Walworth County, Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{15} He concluded that since the social services rendered to the rural and to the urban people differed very little, and since they were in a state of high interdependence, the term "rurban community" was appropriate to describe the rural and urban mixture. This rurban community was an area contiguous to and dominated by some sort of urban center. Between these rurban communities was a neutral zone in which people might go to one community or to the other, depending on preference and the services desired.

In order to explain the existence of rural neighborhoods apart from rurban centers more knowledge of actual community organization was needed.\textsuperscript{16} Under the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}Warren H. Wilson, \textit{The Evolution of the Country Community} (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1912), pp. 91-92.
\item \textsuperscript{15}C. J. Galpin, "The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community," \textit{University of Wisconsin Agricultural Extension Station, Bulletin 34}, May, 1915.
\item \textsuperscript{16}Newell LeRoy Sims, \textit{Elements of Rural Sociology} (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1940), p. 77.
\end{itemize}
United States Department of Agriculture several such studies were initiated throughout the country.

The most famous of these was done by J. H. Kolb in Dane County, Wisconsin. Each family was asked, "By what name is the country neighborhood called in which you live?" The residences of those people who answered with a definite name were plotted on a map. A total of 121 locality groups were found by this method. However, in 26 of these, the factor which was originally present to provide group unity was missing. They were groups in name only. Around each city or village was found a uniform area where the neighborhoods as place names had lost vitality as primary groups, and, thus, as a psychological identification for its residents. Those locality groups which were near a village had lost significance as social entities and were mere place names of geographic but not social importance.

Notice that the research was structured around "locality groups" and that in many cases those groups had no meaning to the resident. Locality groups were defined as neighborhoods by Kolb, but not by the people he studied. Also, it is interesting to note that some people did not answer with a place name. These people Kolb excluded

\[18\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 33.}\]
from the study. Had he been using induction, rather than deduction, he would have had to explain why he discarded their answers. He studied only "those people living in a rural area, who answered with a definite place name," rather than "those people who live in a rural area."
The distinction is crucial and vital. Unfortunately, he ignored it.

Baumgartel's study in Ravalli County was modeled after Kolb's. It quotes Kolb as its theoretical base, and had the same conceptual errors that Kolb's study has. Baumgartel states that, "There are many other ties that make a neighborhood but those of location and identification come first." He describes 53 population groups. However, in his report he does not state how he arrived at these groupings. The basic validity of his premise, that neighborhoods are primarily a matter of identification with a place name, is seriously questioned when he makes this statement: "Where location is apparently the only factor for the group name or where the forces that once cemented it are no longer active, the neighborhood is designated by the term 'topographic.'" Thirty-three of his 53

19 Baumgartel, op. cit., reproduced in its entirety as Appendix B.
20 Ibid., p. 15.
21 Ibid.
"neighborhoods" were so designated. This is over 62% of his "neighborhoods." When a researcher admits that he disregards over half of his data, it raises the issue of the accuracy of his basic definition. Proceeding to build a definition by deduction allows one to ignore the embarrassing half of the data. Had he been using induction, he could have ignored none of the contrary items of data. He would have been forced to examine what he was defining instead of excluding the majority of his data from the study.

An important study done at the same time as these two studies, but which did not assume that geographic proximity automatically created a neighborhood, was done in Wake County, North Carolina, by Taylor and Zimmerman.22 This study stated that to ignore a conflict in defining a community is to ignore a process as important as cooperation. The relation of a landlord to a tenant is not one of friendly goodwill based on brotherly love, nor does it automatically create a "we-feeling." A geographic relationship does not automatically create a community or neighborhood. Neighborhood was defined as a "community group of elders or heads of families who visit each other."

Not surprisingly, this study was summed up as follows:

"It was impossible to find a geographic community in the tangled skein of human relationships."\(^{23}\)

The strong point of the study was that it clearly demonstrated that geography alone does not create a neighborhood, nor tell one much about how neighborhood boundaries are actually drawn by their residents. The weakness of the study was that it never defined precisely and operationally what a neighborhood is. The definition, a "community group of elders or heads of families who visit each other,"\(^{24}\) had been deductively stated at the beginning of the study and was never modified. However, even in the form which the authors left their definition, it is closer in essential content to the definition this author arrived at by analytic induction than any other in the literature.

At about the same time these studies were being carried out, the early nineteen twenties, others were being conducted in such places as Otsego County, New York,\(^{25}\) Boone County, Missouri,\(^{26}\) and Whitman County, Washington.\(^{27}\)

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 30.  
\(^{24}\)Ibid., p. 32.  
\(^{26}\)E. I. Morgan and Owen Howells, "Rural Population Groups," Missouri Agricultural Extension Station, Bulletin 74, 1925.  
The study in Otsego County, New York, never attempted to define neighborhoods in terms of commonalities. It did not look for what each neighborhood had in common with all other neighborhoods, that is, what a neighborhood is, but instead it attempted to build a typology of kinds of rural neighborhoods. Briefly, it found the following types of neighborhoods:

1. The hamlet is described as a group of houses close together and usually associated with some institution or business.
2. The institutional neighborhood is described as a cluster of families tributary to one or more institutions, such as a school, grange, or church.
3. The business neighborhood is described as a group of families tributary to a mill, creamery, store, railway station, or some industrial plant.
4. The ethnic neighborhood is described as a group of families of a common alien race.
5. The kinship neighborhood is described as a group of families closely related in blood.
6. The topographic neighborhood is described as consisting of families whose bond of unity is due to some more or less isolated situation, such as a valley or hill. Often however, such localities are only geographic and not social areas.
7. The village neighborhood is described as a group of farm families so near a village that the village name is used for a locality.

Unfortunately, building a typology gives one the impression that the differences are more important than the commonalities. They are not. The commonalities are what make a definition possible. Thus, although this study

---

28 Sanderson and Thompson, op. cit., pp. 22-25.
is widely quoted, it was not concerned with the same thing as the present thesis. None of these early studies, and there were many, attempted to inductively define a neighborhood.

An example of the research pattern of these early studies was the one done in Boone County, Missouri, in 1925. Since a "we consciousness" was assumed to be important to a neighborhood, the researchers attempted to determine what created "we consciousness." In that study, Morgan and Howells found that institutions were the primary source of "we consciousness," and that the most effective of these was the school. However, the greatest effectiveness of any one institution was when it occurred in combination with others. When, for example, a store and a church were found together they were more effective in building "we consciousness" than a school would be by itself. Kinship bonds and natural phenomena were the least effective in giving a neighborhood a sense of identity.29 This search for what gives a neighborhood "we consciousness" should have been asked after the question, "What is a neighborhood?" had been answered. If neighborhoods had been inductively defined before asking, the question would have been seen as irrelevant and never

29Morgan and Howells, op. cit., pp. 22-25.
asked in the first place. However, as this is the subject matter of Chapter Four, it will not be discussed here.

At this point in the history of rural studies a fundamental change occurred. Researchers quit attempting to define a rural neighborhood and switched to a larger unit of study, the community. They began studying those things which affected rural social life. They were no longer concerned with searching for the smallest geographically significant unit with which rural residents identified, the subject of this thesis, but instead began looking for factors which influenced rural residents. The best known of the new studies was done by Kolb and Wildeon in 1927. They asked, if locality bonds and primary relationships did not make a community, what did? They suggested that it might be special interest groups. They felt that fundamental changes were taking place in rural life which caused people to be less restricted in their social and business contacts, and so the neighborhood groups were no longer the important organizational units.

Another study which illustrates this trend was

\[\text{30J. H. Kolb and A. P. Wildeon, "Special Interest Groups in Rural Society," Wisconsin Agricultural Extension Station, Bulletin 84, December, 1927.}\]
completed by Sanderson in 1934. He asked no questions about neighborhoods but instead concentrated on the larger rurban model. He found that in central New York the communities were not all of one size as visualized under the rurban model, but that they differed even in Wayne County from small villages to urban communities. As they differed in size, they differed in the types of services that they could render. Furthermore, rural people are no longer confined to one community. They may have a primary loyalty to a local community, but this loyalty may attach itself to a larger community for certain purposes. He distinguished primary and secondary communities. The secondary communities were those which had services such as high schools, banks, motion pictures, large hospitals, and other institutions which cannot be maintained in a smaller community. The rurban community had become a hierarchy of communities. It was not a single community as visualized in the original model. As valuable as it was for other purposes, this study yielded little to the knowledge of neighborhoods, because it was intended to re-define the rurban model, a unit which was larger than the neighborhood.

A study in a like vein was of the high school

communities in Michigan, in 1938. The authors of this study conclude that the high school attendance area was the most satisfactory single factor in determining a community boundary, as it did not come and go as erratically as other service areas. This is due to the almost universal attendance at this time, as opposed to less than fifteen per cent (15%) who attended high school at the time of Galpin's study. However, stability is not necessarily the same thing as social reality, and one would be naive, indeed, to assume that the most stable boundary is the most satisfactory because it is the most stable. A high school boundary is the boundary of an institution serving rural neighborhoods, and one must first prove that a neighborhood boundary is identical with a school boundary before stating that the one is an accurate measure of the other. This was not done.

Over the years, the validity of a "name area" as a reality for designating a group which had social cohesion had become more and more questioned by rural sociologists. In 1943, a study in Wright County, Minnesota, found that townships had more validity in indicating group

32J. F. Thaden and Eben Mumford, "High School Communities in Michigan," Michigan State College Agricultural Extension Station, Special Bulletin 283, 1938, p. 34.
consciousness than did local place names. As will be seen in the next chapter, the study dealt with a unit much larger than the neighborhood, and the fact that the township is a better measure of this larger unit than "place names" still tells us nothing about our "smallest identifiable unit," the neighborhood.

Meanwhile, Dane County, Wisconsin, was being studied each ten years on a continuous basis. Although no striking changes were noted from 1921 to 1931, the changes from 1931 to 1941 were significant. Even though the boundaries had not changed significantly, there was a decrease of 20% in the number of active neighborhoods, with a tendency for the larger ones to remain active, and for the smaller ones and those too close to community centers to become inactive.

After the 1951 restudy of Dane County, Kolb reached the conclusion that place names were becoming less dependable as a basis for identifying neighborhoods.

---

33 Vernom Davies, "Neighborhoods, Townships and Communities in Wright County, Minnesota," Rural Sociology, VIII (1943), 51-61.


35 Ibid., p. 3.
than they were 30 years previously.\textsuperscript{36} When he stated that they are less dependable than previously, one must remember that he had never proved, or even demonstrated, that they were dependable in the first place. Had he not discarded those interviews which did not respond in terms of a place name, would he originally have been as convinced that place names were important? One could answer this question only if one knew how much he discarded in proportion to how much he kept. Unfortunately, he never tells us.

This confusion over terms permitted Alexander to advocate dropping the terms "community" and "neighborhood" from the vocabulary of the sociologist, because he felt that they had lost their significance and needed to be abandoned.\textsuperscript{37} His statement refers to the confusion of the sociologist, and not to the confusion of rural people. This author found no one who expressed confusion about his own neighborhood, and very few who did not feel that their neighborhood was important to them.

This problem of rural people thinking in one vein and sociologists thinking in another is well illustrated by a study done in Eastern Washington in 1953. In

\textsuperscript{36}J. H. Kolb, \textit{Emerging Rural Communities} (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959).

six widely separated areas lay experts were reportedly erroneous in their delineation of neighborhoods. In only one of the six areas did they come even close to the same mapping as that done by the residents themselves. Topographic features and length of residence seemed to have no effect on the existence of neighborhoods. This led the authors of the study to ask: "Are we deluding ourselves about the prevalence and meaning of rural neighborhoods? It may be that the time has come for rural sociology to think of the concept of neighborhoods primarily as an ideal type, useful principally for heuristic purposes."\textsuperscript{39}

This feeling of hopelessness is understandable when doing research on a subject matter which has not been analytically defined. However, the author of this paper feels that a more worthwhile approach would be to secure a definition that would allow research to be conducted. The next chapter does this.


\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 59.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYTIC INDUCTION APPLIED TO
RURAL NEIGHBORHOODS

As the previous chapter indicated, no adequate definition of rural neighborhoods has yet been formulated. In order to secure a definition through the method of analytic induction, it is necessary that certain groundwork first be laid. The first requirement is a statement of the class of objects that is to be defined. This is used as a guideline for the data gathering. The second requirement is to formulate a tentative hypothesis which can be modified as the data is collected.

The class of phenomenon studied here is: the smallest unit of social interaction and identification, based on relative geographic proximity, as defined and structured by rural residents, which has psychological significance to these residents. This commitment to data which have psychological significance to the residents required the use of an open ended interview approach, and forced the abandonment of a questionnaire based on Kolb's methodology, which had been used in earlier studies (Appendix E). With this statement of his unit of study
in mind, the author prepared a pre-test (Appendix F), and questioned five rural residents near Florence. At the end of the pre-test, it was still apparent that the questionnaire was much too incomplete, and much too structured to allow a gathering of the data that was needed. In addition, the author had not gained sufficient familiarity with the sub-culture to know how to "draw them out" when encountering undecipherable remarks which seemed full of meaning.

The sub-culture of a rural area contains many differences that must be understood in order to communicate effectively with the people. Differences exist in vocabulary, in thought processes, and even in the "silent" unspoken language people use in their daily living. If these differences are not understood, erroneous conclusions can be reached when interpreting field data, or emotionally significant items may be glossed over.

In order to better understand these aspects of the sub-culture, the author began to get acquainted with as many rural people as possible. He found, for example, that a "scalper" refers to a type of cattle buyer, and not to an Indian. Carnations and irises in a yard usually mean that inside is an "old-timer," eager to talk. The code of politeness differs from that in a city. When a man is working in his fields, he will usually completely
ignore you until you are within speaking distance. He is not being aloof; he is being polite. He does not want you to feel uneasy by staring at you. Whenever you enter someone's home, you must take your leave reluctantly, and slowly, as it is bad manners to make a hasty "visit." The wearing of sunglasses inhibits communication, as people want to "see you" when you talk. These and many other things which a native knows and practices, on a semi-conscious level, must be slowly learned by a non-resident.

When sure of his ability to communicate with rural people, the author constructed another interview schedule, and found that it could be used to secure the needed detail if time was taken to probe any answers which appeared "fuzzy." This schedule (Appendix G) was then used to test a definition which appeared reasonable in the light of the author's reading and experience. This definition was that, "a rural neighborhood is a contiguous geographical area within which social action is patterned on the assumption that a consciousness of kind exists, which will cause the members of this area to treat each other in a different manner than they would treat individuals who did not reside within this area."

After about twenty interviews, this hypothesis became untenable. "Neighborhoods" are not contiguous areas. The neighborhood of Sleeping Child is bisected completely
by Skalkaho and Grantsdale. Sleeping Child is identified as "my neighborhood" by people who live a few miles southwest of Hamilton, as well as those living by Sleeping Child Creek. These two groups interact together socially and financially as one, yet they are separated by two other neighborhoods--Skalkaho and Grantsdale.

The focal point of the social activities of Sleeping Child neighborhood is the "club house," an abandoned school building that is used for community dances, get-togethers, meetings, and picnics. The people of this area also attach considerable importance to the 4-H activities of their children. As these social activities structure their time and energy, they also determine who associates on an intimate basis. The people from Skalkaho and Grantsdale are not excluded, they just have not "been invited" to the "doings" at the club house, nor do their children belong to the same 4-H chapters. Invariably, the families whose children belong to the same 4-H group look upon the other families whose children also belong as "neighbors," even though their farms are not adjacent. The three to five miles, and dozens of farmsteads, between them does not weaken the frequency or intensity of interaction of these two groups that identify themselves as the Sleeping Child Neighborhood. The fact that Grantsdale is geographically between them, and that the village of
Grantsdale contains stores, and even an elementary school, while these people are not identified with Grantsdale, is very significant. Grantsdale, also, is quite a close knit neighborhood, even though it lies between the two parts of Sleeping Child. These data destroyed the tenability of the assumption that neighborhoods are contiguous.

By this time, the data also indicated the need to discard the concept of "consciousness of kind" in the original definition, since it was not always a factor in rural people's thinking in relationship to their neighborhood. Using the canons of analytic induction, any exception must result in the definition being modified to encompass the new exception. "Consciousness of kind" did not always exist in order for people to feel strongly, and act predictably on things related to their neighborhood. In Sleeping Child Valley there is a dentist who has his office in his home. By neither education, training, social status, nor occupation does he have any similarity to his neighbors, yet he is an integral, well regarded, part of the rural neighborhood.

Another example occurred in Florence. The head of the family administers the unemployment office in Hamilton. He had graduate from college in Ohio, had his career firmly integrated into the state civil service hierarchy, yet was very much a part of his neighborhood, without
feeling any "consciousness of kind" with his farm neighbors. In most cases, people can feel that they are good neighbors, without any feeling that they actually have a great deal in common with their neighbors. In some cases, the only thing in common is the fact that their property lines are in contact.

It also became apparent that some people do not belong to a neighborhood. The neighbors on all sides may belong to the same neighborhood, but the man in the center does not. If he is financially more independent, and has his social life elsewhere, he may live in the same place for several years, all the while studiously avoiding any contact with the people on all sides of him. This is illustrated by a gentleman on the west side of the valley, north of Stevensville, who lives in a luxurious colonial style home on a large cattle ranch. He said that he belongs to no local organizations, sends his son to college in Missoula, is a "fan" of the Missoula athletic team instead of local teams, and would not exchange help or tools with his neighbors. When people living near him delineated their neighborhood, he was excluded.

Another case occurred near Roger's Corner. The wife of the family said, "There is no neighborhood name here." She too said that she would not exchange help or tools with her neighbors, and stated that her friends
lived "all over the valley." She did not know the name of a particular family who lived adjacent to her land. The neighbors on both sides of her property said that the neighborhood was called Roger's Corner, and that it was a "close-knit" group. Both neighbors said that she was not a part of the neighborhood. This woman had lived three years in the center of an area that engaged in considerable social contact, but managed to remain aloof. She was an educated, sophisticated woman who appeared to have little interest in those about her. She and her husband were attempting to sell their property for $350,000.

These two examples illustrate a fallacy that previous studies had assumed to be true. That fallacy is the assumption that all rural people who live near each other have some form of identification with each other, and with the land. This assumption is not true. Some individuals do not, in their own thinking, attach any particular importance to knowing those who live near them, nor do they identify with a geographic area.

By the end of the first 30 interviews, two central ideas in the original definition had not been substantiated by field data. These two ideas were, that neighborhoods were contiguous, discrete identities, and that they rested upon a "consciousness of kind." Neighborhoods were also not found to be something with which all rural
residents are identified. They are a common, but not invariable aspect of the life of rural people.

Since relative geographic proximity alone was not sufficient to create psychologically significant interaction among rural people, a search was made for items that might help create significance.

Various items which could be expected to be significant to rural people were re-checked on the interview schedules. The use of telephones appeared to be one of these, until the schedules from the East Fork of the Bitter-root disclosed that the most close knit neighborhood the author had studied, Fourth of July Gulch on Painted Rock Lake, had no telephones, and the residents had refused to get them. Yet, these people all said that they liked their neighbors and interacted very frequently. They also were all adamant in stating that they could turn to their neighbors for aid in any time of need.

Shopping areas were another factor that might be expected to be psychologically significant to rural people. A plotting of shopping areas on a map indicated that where people shopped was more a matter of personality type than it was of proximity. An "ideal type" dichotomy was constructed to illustrate this and is included in Appendix A.

From the previous studies, and from the verbal concern with school athletic teams that rural people
exhibit, one could expect that schools would be very significant in shaping neighborhood definitions. However, Blodgett Creek belongs to the Corvallis School District, but all other measures pointed to Hamilton as the chief focus of significant interaction. These other measures were shopping, frequency of visits with friends, membership in lodges and churches, and their answer to the question, "What is the name of this neighborhood?" The people in this area never named Corvallis.

No relationship with political or postal boundaries was found to have meaning for all residents. Water control districts also were irrelevant to socially significant ties. The crux of the matter is that concern with anything except the smallest significant unit of social interaction is a cul-de-sac. A definition of rural neighborhoods can only be built by studying the neighborhood itself. Studying any larger unit may shed light on the larger unit, but not on the neighborhood. Neighborhoods exist not solely as places on a map, but rather as social ties, feelings and emotions, and expectations of behavior on the part of individual human beings. What was needed was more insight into the way people conceptualize their neighborhoods.

One important insight of this nature occurred at a county fair when the author overheard a man say, "I
guess our neighborhood is going to grow. The family that bought the old Locust Lane ranch looks like they're really going to take hold." Further questioning revealed that the person who had lived there before had been an isolate. The pattern of interaction would now have to change to include a family who wished to interact. What is the nature of the interaction which determines the unspoken, but understood boundary of a neighborhood? At this point, the answer was still somewhat unclear.

One factor contributing to this lack of a clear answer was that rural people attached little meaning to place names as objects of identification. Several representative answers people gave to the question, "What is the name of this neighborhood or locality?" are given below:

"Paradise Heights or Canyon Creek Heights."

"It is just a neighborhood. It doesn't have any name that I know of."

"None. No name."

"No special name."

"Haven't heard it called any one certain thing."

"I suppose, Skalkaho District."

"If it has any name, I guess it would be Kootenai Creek."

"Sula or Ross's Hole."
Even those people who said their neighborhood had no name would not accept the idea that their area was between other neighborhoods. When asked if their area was not a neighborhood, they would reply in positive and certain language that, "There is a neighborhood here, but it just doesn't have a name." Ironically, no one interviewed was at the edge of a neighborhood except those residents who were at the edge of a populated area, such as people who lived beside an unpopulated mountain. Most other people identified their neighborhood as themselves and people living in all directions of their property. In short, a neighborhood is an individual, personal thing to people. "Our" neighborhood is structured by people in such a way that it is, in reality, "my" neighborhood. Geography permitting, each person is in the approximate center of his neighborhood.

This is easier to visualize if one takes a hypothetical example. Arbitrarily assume that there are farmers living on each side of a country road. Label all the farms as one comes to them A through Z. Now take an individual farmer, on farm J, and ask him who his neighbors are. He will reply that they are the people who live on farms H, I, K, and M. Next ask the same question of farmer M. He will reply J, K, N, and O. Although they live near each other, and nominally are of the same
neighborhood, notice that they only share one neighbor in common, neighbor K, in addition to considering themselves as neighbors. Their neighborhoods are more dissimilar than they at first appear. If we now went down the road to farmer S, he would have none of the same neighbors as farmers J or M. He would belong to a completely different neighborhood. Each farm has a slightly different neighborhood, and over a period of space the neighborhood is completely different, yet one could not attempt to draw a map of the neighborhood boundary without appearing slightly ridiculous. Some residents of the area would question any boundary you could draw.

The field data support the same conclusion. Neighborhoods are small and specific to each farmstead. No one interviewed named more than six neighbors. If pushed to exceed this number, people would usually reply about as one respondent did, "Well, to a certain extent, but we don't really neighbor much with them." Most people only named two or three "close neighbors." As another respondent put it, "You're an outsider if you are not born right here. If you live, and were born, five miles down the road you're not a member." The smallest significant unit is indeed very small. It covers only a few homes.

A point which was not known at the time of the
first tentative definition was that, in addition to being a small area that is specific to each farmstead, a neighborhood is a social area rather than purely a geographic one. Some people do not belong to any neighborhood. Some neighborhoods are larger than others, while some have "gaps" in them, or are laid out without any particular regard to geography. They developed the way that they are because of unique historical incidents or personalities.

The only remaining part of the original definition was that which stated that "... will cause the members of this area to treat each other in a different manner than they would treat individuals who did not reside within this area." What is a "different manner?"

A review of the data indicated that, without exception, a neighborhood was defined as those people you know you can turn to for mutual aid. It is not connected with monetary help, nor with a direct return of a favor, like "I'll borrow your horse this week, and loan you mine next," although this situation may exist. Rather it is the expectation that you would "want to help them because they're good neighbors." The way this was expressed by the respondents themselves, when asked if they "exchanged help or tools with their neighbors" is quite interesting. Some of
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their replies were:

"Yes, those close."

"Yes, couldn't make it if we didn't."

"You bet we do!"

"Yeah."

"Oh, always."

"That's the only way you can get along."

"Some help, but not tools."

"It's that type of community where you exchange help."

"Oh, sure--have to! If I didn't you know where I'd be don't you?"

"Oh, heavens yes." (female respondent)

"Yes, we do. One called this morning and offered to help." (resident for two months)

Another revealing question was, "Who could you count on for mutual aid if you get in a bind, or had an emergency?" In all cases where the neighborhood had meaning and psychological importance to the residents, people answered with vigor, such as in these quotations:

"My north neighbors. I helped them feed their cattle last winter when his wife was in the hospital."

"My neighbors would help."

"I wouldn't ever have to worry because the neighbors would be right here to help."
"The neighbors two houses up the road."
"The neighbors."
"My mother, and a neighbor lady." (female respondent)

"Neighbors" are people you turn to with an expectation that if you needed assistance on something such as a crisis caused by a death in the family, an accident, or a routine non-monetary matter that you could not handle alone—they would help.

An illustration of this occurred in the West Fork of the Bitterroot. A gentleman who owns an airport has a "cat" which he uses to plow the snow off his airfield in the winter. A man bought a ranch near his, from a neighbor whom the airport owner had known for years. He went to clean his neighbor's driveway of snow one morning after he cleaned his airfield, as he had been doing for years. This particular morning his new neighbor stopped him with the remark, "I didn't ask you to do that." Now the neighbors in the area make sure that the boundaries of their neighborhood stop at Piquett Creek. These "neighbors" rendered the newcomer no aid when the county bridge leading to his home was washed away in a spring flood.

With this new understanding of the nature of a neighborhood, a new tentative definition could be prepared for further testing. The new definition should include
these concepts which have been discussed:

1. Neighborhoods are social areas rather than purely geographic areas.

2. Neighborhoods are specific to each home, as each home has a slightly different neighborhood.

3. The social obligations that go with a neighborhood are quite clear in the minds of the individuals involved.

4. These obligations are accompanied by sanctions, both positive and negative, that help assure the enforcement of the "obligations of neighborliness."

5. The crucial aspect of being a good neighbor is the willingness to render help or assistance to another neighbor in time of crisis.

6. This help does not usually include direct financial commitments, but consists of personal assistance, labor, or time spent, rather than money loaned.

When the new definition was revised to include these new items of data, it read: A rural neighborhood is that social area surrounding a residence in which the rights and obligations for mutual non-monetary aid are clearly understood and socially binding upon those occupying the land.

This definition was tested against over eighty additional interviews and was not once found to be in need
of revision to fit new interview data. The author now believes that this definition meets the requirements of analytic induction. A further clarification of the implications of this definition are in the next, and final, chapter.
In the initial planning stage of this thesis, the feasibility of re-studying the neighborhoods of Ravalli County after a time lapse of forty-five years was considered. The original base which would have been used for purposes of comparison was a study published in 1922 by Baumgartel.\textsuperscript{41} The methods of defining a neighborhood which were used in that study, however, were too vague to allow the research to be duplicated with any meaningful results. As a consequence, this vagueness was examined. It proved to be caused by a hazy conceptualization, rather than by a lack of care in the wording of the report.\textsuperscript{42} A review of the literature disclosed that all previous studies had proceeded deductively, that is, they had initially defined a neighborhood and had never refined their definition to correspond with the data gathered during the field contact stage of the research. In other words, the definition was formulated in the researcher's office, and never modified

\textsuperscript{41}Baumgartel, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{42}See Chapter Three, pages 18-19, of this thesis for a critical review of Baumgartel's premises.
by the contacts which he had with rural people while he
was interviewing them. The researcher "knew" what a
neighborhood was, and if this did not completely agree
with the concept that the man on the land held about his
neighborhood, the discrepancy could be attributed to the
latter's ignorance. The result of this habit of thinking
was the growth of a body of literature about rural neigh­
borhoods which allowed each observer of the rural scene to
define neighborhoods in a different manner.

This thesis was conceived in the hope of develop­
ing a definition which would be legitimized by its rele­
vance to the concrete realities of rural behavior and pat­
terns of thinking, instead of by "being the opinion" of
another "authority." Therefore, the definition would have
to be developed from an intensive study of the beliefs and
behavior of rural people, rather than from a discussion
of the opinions of experts. The method which would serve
this function would be analytic induction.\textsuperscript{43}

This method requires one to start with a tentative
definition and check this definition against information
gathered in the field. When a situation, or instance, is
encountered that does not fit the original definition, it
must be studied and the definition must be modified so
that it includes the facts of the new situation, as well

\textsuperscript{43}Znaniecki, loc. cit.
as all the facts of all previous situations. This process is continued until one arrives at a definition which is general enough so that there can be no exception to it existing in any field data. It is thus inductive in the true sense of the word, as it proceeds from concrete cases to a general statement which may be made about these cases. It is analytic because it does not average the cases studied to state "this is usually true," but instead, cases are analyzed so that one can state with certainty that "this is true of all cases." The crucial cases which do not fit the original definition provide both the incentive and the means for the empirical modifications which are the heart of this method.\textsuperscript{44}

Using this research method, the author derived the following definition:\textsuperscript{45} A rural neighborhood is the social area surrounding a residence in which the rights and obligations for mutual non-monetary aid are clearly understood and socially binding upon those occupying the land. This implies that each farmstead would have a slightly different set of obligations, hence a slightly different neighborhood. This is indeed the case. A

\textsuperscript{44} For a more complete treatment of this method, refer to Chapter Two of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{45} Chapter Four contains the complete details of the process of developing this definition, as well as a fuller explanatory discussion of the definition.
neighborhood is specific to each farmstead. Where geography permits, each farm operator perceives his own farm as being near the center of his neighborhood. Most respondents had close neighboring relationships with only two to four other farmsteads, and these were not necessarily with those farms which were adjacent. As was demonstrated in the previous chapter, some farms do not belong to a neighborhood, so that the actual mapping of neighborhoods would require a farm-by-farm survey. In addition, any conglomeration or averaging of these specific binding ties would be an abstraction. This is the reason that boundaries of neighborhoods are so diffuse and elusive. The "area between neighborhoods" is the center of the neighborhood of the man who lives there.

Since most rural people belong to neighborhoods, and neighbors are friends, could one just refer to these groupings as primary groups? The answer is definitely no. A primary group and a neighborhood are different entities. Neighborhoods are usually primary groups, but not all rural primary groups are neighborhoods. The difference is one of structure. In a neighborhood the rights and obligations are attached to a farm. When one buys a farm one acquires a complete set of behavioral expectations from people who live on the adjacent land. One may choose to honor, or not honor them, but they are there.
They go with the land.

If one buys land from a man who did not belong to a neighborhood, he will feel that he resides in an unfriendly area. It may not be unfriendly; it is just that the people have the pattern of their lives organized to exclude the person who lives on that particular piece of land. To reorganize their patterns requires time and initiative from someone. On the other hand, if one buys land from someone who had maintained a great deal of interaction, he will inherit the expectation of this interaction continuing.

Up to this point we have begged the most important question. That question, of course, is why these ties of rights and obligations are binding upon the parties involved. One could say that each person lives up to his obligations in order that he will be granted his rights when they are due. Or, one could say that it is the nature of norms to be self perpetuating, because people are creatures of habit, who prefer to live in a predictable world. Both of these statements are true, but they still beg the question. The central question is not that people live up to the norms of neighborliness and neighboring which have been defined over a period of time, but why obligations of neighboring are felt more strongly in some areas than in others. Further, no two people coming into
the area will initially feel equally bound by its established norms. However, after a period of time they will begin to act and think much more alike than formerly. In short, the problem is this: what gives some neighborhoods greater social control than that possessed by other neighborhoods? Can we predict the extent of social control exercised by a neighborhood? Is it possible to predict how much control a neighborhood will have on a particular individual who buys a farmstead? The answer to the last two questions is a definite yes. They will be automatically answered by answering the first question, which asked, basically, what factors control the power of a neighborhood group over its members?

In 1954, Richard La Piere\(^4\) formulated four axioms of social control in an attempt to explain how some groups have more control over their members than do other groups over theirs. These broad, general rules have stood the test of time, and can be applied to neighborhood groups to make these groups more meaningful to a reader.

Sociologists generally regard these axioms as applying to all groups, in every culture, at all times and places. If these axioms hold true for rural neighborhoods, we can consider our research complete. If they

---
apply we would need no new theory to explain when rural neighborhoods exercise control over their members. This would take the concept of "neighborhood" out of the present mysterious category it now occupies, and allow it to be treated in the same rational manner as other concepts in sociology. It is the author's belief that these axioms are well illustrated in his field data.

The first of these axioms states that "all other factors remaining equal, the control that is exercised by a group over an individual member is inverse to the size of the group." A small group, such as a family, a graduate seminar, a boy's gang, or a closed professional society, can and does influence a person more than such groups as "our community," or "the people of the United States," or other aggregations of people. A group of ten has more control over an individual than has a group of a thousand.

One could expect that a neighborhood of ten would have more control than a neighborhood of fifty. Does the field data support this conclusion?

The answer is inconclusive because all neighborhoods that the author could identify were small. Even in the relatively thickly settled area west of Hamilton, most

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 101.}
people neighbored closely with only two to four other families. As was demonstrated in the previous chapter, the maximum size of an individual's neighborhood does not exceed six other families. Even the geographically smallest possible neighborhood in Ravalli County, which was Alta, a former mining camp at the extreme end of the west fork of the Bitterroot River, had four families and two widowers. The four families did not interact with the single men.

Since all identifiable neighborhoods were approximately of the same effective size, the field data could not decisively demonstrate the applicability or inapplicability of this axiom to rural neighborhoods. However, the fact that the ones which were identifiable were all of the same approximate size may be the result of the operation of this axiom. Since neighborhoods as defined in this study presupposes an effective mechanism of social control, the larger ones may not be as easily discerned because the controls are weaker as a result of the size being larger. If one accepts the validity of this axiom, it would naturally follow that the control of the larger neighborhoods would be less "visible" as a consequence of the larger size. One could say that due to their small size, neighborhoods could be expected to be powerful agents of social control when compared to larger social units.
The second axiom states that "all other factors remaining equal, the control that is exercised by a group over an individual is directly related to the length of time that the members may be expected to maintain relations. Past experience indicates, for example, that the members of a family remain members for as long as they live, and the friendship coteries that form in college cease to be meaningful in a very short time after graduation. The sailor on shore leave is much less concerned with people's evaluation of him than that same sailor would be of people's opinion while he was on leave to his home. The integrity of so-called fly-by-night enterprises is everywhere suspect; for a merchant who does not intend to stay in business in a community has little concern for what his customers will think of him after they have spent their money.

This axiom is demonstrated in Ravalli County by the sugar beet farmer who would extend himself to help an adjacent farmer, but would hardly have the time of day to give to his seasonal, non-permanent workers. Urban commuters who rent a home in the valley, in an area which was once exclusively rural, will seldom adjust their values to agree with the older members of the community; but a
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farmer who buys a ranch in the same area will usually ex-
pend considerable effort in getting acquainted and estab-
lishing his good name. When asked what he least liked
about his neighborhood, one respondent replied, "New-
comers!" As he expanded his thoughts on the matter, he
said, "Oh, you know how these city people are that want
to live in the country. They'd move tomorrow if they got
a better job. . . . Not much point in even trying to
neighbor, as you never know when they'll pull out."
Viewed from the perspective of a transient individual in
a community (he is a surveyor, who has had a difficult
time adapting to local patterns of neighboring), the same
question was answered, "People resent outsiders; they just
love to feud around here. Some of these people are sort
of crazy and two-faced." Needless to say, he was not
being accepted.

Another person who was discussing his neighbor-
hood added parenthetically, "There is /sic/ summer people
here sometimes on weekends, but they are separate, but
real good people." Even if the personalities and values
do not conflict, people will not easily be integrated into
a neighborhood unless they appear to be permanent residents.

The third axiom states that "all other factors
remaining equal, the ability of a group to control the
behavior of the individual is directly related to the
frequency with which members of the group enter into actual association." This should not imply that there is a constant relationship between the duration of a group and the frequency with which they meet. A lifelong friendship can be maintained at a considerable distance with only occasional meetings, and cell-mates in prison are prone to "forget" one another after one is released. It does mean, however, that the more a group communicates, the more subtle and pervasive control it can exercise.

Two areas in which rather constant interaction was found to occur were in the summer home sections of the east and west fork of the Bitterroot River. These people were usually in contact only during the summer months, but during this time they were free from the demands of making a living and interacted quite intensely and constantly. Their remarks were an interesting documentation of this subtle control:

"We just couldn't imagine spending the summer any place else."

"My husband is a mechanic, so he repaired the Sula fire truck free." When the author asked, "Why?" she replied, "Well, we want to live here you know."

Another respondent who lives eight miles up a
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winding, unpaved road helped repair the Sula firehall, even though he is too far from it to receive aid in time to suppress a fire. When asked, "Why?" he replied, "Well, our neighbors thought it would be the right thing to do to help them out down there."

An interesting fact that the field research uncovered was that rural women interact much more frequently on the telephone than one would suspect from casual contact with them. When asked if they visit frequently on the telephone, they usually always answer "No!" However, after one is fairly well acquainted, the answer that they visit "once in a while" is understood to mean about 45 minutes a day. Thus the frequency of interaction should be directly measured to be valid, because verbal replies are purposefully misleading. However, the field data mentioned earlier do substantiate the conclusion that where neighbors interact frequently, the social control is considerable.

The fourth axiom states that "all other things being equal, the more fully structured the relationship of the members of a group, the more control that group will have over the individual member." People who work together will frequently state that they belong to the same neighborhood, even if they do not know the name of

---
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a person who lives somewhere between their homes. Relatives will also frequently belong to the same neighborhood without knowing all the people who live in the houses that separate their homes. In general, any influence which structures the relationship of a neighborhood will give that neighborhood more control over the members than it would have without the structure. The Sleeping Child club house is an example. During the winter, residents have get-togethers there about twice a month. To be excluded from these get-togethers is tantamount to being excluded from the neighborhood.

Other strong sources of structure in Ravalli County are the churches. Two churches in particular demonstrated this capability. The first is the community denominational church in Conner. This organization exerts a cohesive control on the associations of its members. The neighborhood of the members is defined as those church people who live near them. Unless they belong to the same church, social interaction is minimal. One respondent who was a member of this church, when asked who he would turn to if he got in a bind or had an emergency, replied with proud dignity, "My Pastor." Further probing revealed that he would not turn to the people who owned land on either side of him, because they were not "church people." A neighborhood boundary can be established by any organization
that has this strong control over its members. The Hutterite group near Corvallis also did not "neighbor" with non-members.

On all issues each of these two groups presented a united front, and all respondents interviewed from each group felt that the only other people they could "really trust to come through" were members of their group. The author never completely gained the confidence of these people, but he was able to establish enough contact to know that the potential social control that could be exerted by each group over its members was very large indeed. Structure does give a neighborhood control over its members.

If, then, these four broad rules allow one to predict when a neighborhood group will be able to influence a member, the obvious question is why does anyone value his specific status in any particular group in the first place? "Man is not born with a need for, or drive to, social status."\(^{51}\) It is, rather, that (1) the human animal is born wholly incapable of surviving without human aid and (2) the period during which the human animal must be provided with food, protection, and guidance is far longer than that required by any other animal.\(^{52}\)

\(^{51}\)Ibid., p. 46.

\(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 45.
the years of infancy, childhood, and youth, animal dependency upon people diminishes; but through those years the individual acquires a growing psychological dependency upon others.\(^53\) This regard for the good opinion of others is an infracultural phenomenon rather than an innate biological drive. Its effect, however, is to make an individual feel a great deal of psychological pain when he senses that those people who are significant to him are not in a mood to respond to his needs. This feeling of anxiety is not in proportion to the loss of benefits which might result from their lack of response. Rather, it is a separate worry which is additional to the worry over people not granting him his "rights" (benefits due like individuals in a similar situation). Concern with one's personal status in a group is a non-rational, but essentially human characteristic, that gives human society its distinctive form.

Philosophers may speculate endlessly about this phenomenon, but social scientists usually content themselves with the knowledge that human beings will generally derive a lower anxiety level, which is interpreted by most rural Americans as a "feeling of contentment," when they live their lives in such a way that they are assured of the spontaneous and genuine response of the people in the

\[^{53}\text{Ibid.}\]
groups to which they belong.

Rural Americans today have a great many more alternative groups to choose from than the group which they call "neighbors" than they did formerly. The existence of these alternative groups, and people's need to invest their emotional energy in the ones that they feel to be important, means that they can invest less of themselves in the one particular group which is geographically closest to them.

In 1920, a family would be on the same party line, send their children to the same small school, very likely attend the same church, and have almost all of their social contacts with the same people. To state that this is not as frequently true today is to risk sounding trite in the making of such an "obvious" statement. In the course of the author's research, he recalls an incident that happened in the west fork of the Bitterroot. At the end of his interview, the respondent asked, "Would you like to interview Charlie here? He just happened to drop by, and is a good one to talk." Charlie lived in the Corvallis area, over fifty miles away, when he "just dropped by to say Hi."

Geographically, people today have a much larger area in which they may associate than they did formerly. This, however, should not mislead one into thinking that neighborhoods are becoming unimportant to rural people.
They still exist and are still important, but they are not the only groups to which rural people may now belong. Today there are alternatives to the neighborhood. It is now possible for an urban person to commute to work in an urban area, have the important social relationships of his life in the city, and merely use his home as a place to domicile himself and his family. Examining this situation, it is apparent that this urban man would not belong to a neighborhood. If he sold his home, there would be no rights and obligations, to other people, that would go with the land. No one would "drop by" expecting to use his horse or cultivator. He would, in short, have usually built a system of friendships with other urban people that would meet his needs. When he moves to another place several miles away, these ties would go with him, since in this case, they were not dependent on his residence. In a neighborhood the ties would remain with the land and become the property of the new owner. This is the crucial difference between a neighborhood group and the "friendship groups" of people who live in the country. These friendship groups are becoming a frequent alternative to neighborhood groups in Ravalli County.

This trend toward friendship groups and away from neighborhood groups can be expected to continue as rural people associate less frequently with their neighbors due
to the improvement of automobiles and roads; as rural people adopt less of an expectation of spending the rest of their lives on the same farm; and as the structures of the grange, the community club house, and the local church structure their social relationships to a lesser degree.\textsuperscript{54}

However, this trend could not be projected to the point that one would say that rural neighborhoods are eventually going to disappear. The author and a respondent were sitting on the back steps of the respondent's home one evening after having eaten supper together. Suddenly, the respondent sat up and said: "Hey, that's my horse."

In the distance there was a horse and rider traveling quite rapidly away from them. The respondent looked intently a moment, sat back down, relaxed, and added, "Oh, that's just my neighbor. His cows must have gotten out." (And he was using the horse to round them up.)

There will always be times when the understood rights that go with being a neighbor are of inestimable value to rural people. As long as these patterns of

\textsuperscript{54}There is another grouping which exerted a considerable influence on a portion of the residents in Ravalli County. This is the "radical right wing" which is treated in greater length in Appendix C.
neighboring serve a vital function for rural people, one would not expect them to disappear.
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APPENDIX A
The "law of retail gravitation" states that a trade center will draw business from an area in direct proportion to its size, and in inverse proportion to the square of the distance along an improved highway.\(^5\)

When the homes of the respondents were plotted on a map, and then color keyed in accordance with where they said that they shopped, it was apparent that although this law might be valid for a large statistical survey, it would not be particularly useful as a rule to depend upon in specific cases.

Examination of the interview schedules of those people who generally shopped in towns furthest from their homes showed that certain background factors were remarkably uniform. All those people who tended to do all their buying at the nearest retail outlet, on the other hand, were also remarkably uniform, but in the opposite direction from long distance shoppers.

One could take these characteristics of shoppers, and exaggerate them into polar extremes, creating an "ideal type" which would be very useful in conceptualizing our thinking about where people shop.

Four characteristics are related to shopping distance. The first is education. The more educated shoppers tended to travel farther. This is particularly true if they have attended college.

The second variable is income. Higher income families tend to travel farther to make comparable purchases than do lower income families.

The third characteristic of long-range shoppers is their political liberalism. Local shoppers tend to be more conservative in their political viewpoints.

The fourth noticeable characteristic of long-range shoppers is that their whole philosophy represents a more cosmopolitan view. They have usually been born elsewhere, or at the minimum, have attended college away from home for several years. Invariably, those people who did all their shopping at the closest retail outlet were "born and raised near here." Even on vacations local shoppers were reluctant to travel over a few hundred miles.

If we took the characteristics of long-range shoppers, we could summarize them as usually being families of above average education (whose heads normally have graduated from college), as being above average in income, as being on the liberal side of the political spectrum, and as being cosmopolitan in outlook, in distance traveled on vacations, and in a high frequency of
residential movement.

The characteristics of people who always shop locally are usually at the opposite extreme on each of these factors. This group would be composed of people who had attended grade school, but never finished the primary grades. They would have been born and raised locally, and have a lower level of income, or practice subsistence farming. Their total history of travel would be minimal. Vacations would be normally spent at home, and their politics would be very conservative, possibly of the type described in Appendix C.

An abstract "ideal type" of this nature would be very useful in conceptualizing the propensity of an individual to shop in an area other than that in which he lives. The construction of one, however, would take us too far afield from the legitimate concerns of this research.
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When the American farmer relegated the ox-yoke, hoe, and flail to the attic, he took on the ways of a machine farmer and became a farm engineer. Straightway American agriculture captured a place in the sun alongside other great industries, and the farmer himself became a power among producers. Although this era of the farm machine has by no means come to its height as yet, another era, that of rural organization, is fast following on the heels of the machine era.

The American farm community is beginning to pension off the little country school district, as familiar and sacred to the last generation as the flail was familiar and useful to our great-grandfathers. The country crossroads store, too, which served the farmer well in his days of pioneering, is gently being pushed into the cubby-hole with the other relics of a by-gone age. For the high standard of living required by the American farmer demands, in order to satisfy his wants, the variety of trade establishments and service agencies usually supplied by a smart town or small city. The farmer, cheered on by his other successes, is also looking about for a new type of municipality suited to his local political and community needs. He is getting ready to throw into the discard his little make-shift local units of government of whatever kind. He wants as real and as effective a municipal local government as a city has. He wants the appliances for his home life which local government gives the city family. He sees no reason why his household should not have, for example, fire-control facilities, municipal electric light and power, police administration. The analysis of Ravalli County into its population groups is an attempt to assist the farmer and his friends in the process of thinking out the problems of community reconstruction in the new era of rural organization.

—C. J. Galpin
A Social Study of Ravalli County

INTRODUCTION

The increased demand for food created by the Great War, together with the marked readjustment necessitated by its termination, has caused a crisis in American agriculture which threatens the enviable position our farmers have held in the past. The solution of many of their newer problems calls for community thinking and community action. The rapid growth of associations, bureaus, "pools," and societies is indicative of the farmer's appreciation of the collective ideal as an instrument for the promotion of his welfare.

Rural community organization being a new field, exact information concerning it is limited. Knowledge of it can be gained only by investigation, experiment, and experience. The data thus accumulated must be classified, analyzed, and properly presented to the farmers and rural workers, that they may recognize their problems and effectively direct their energy in a constructive rural program. With this goal in view, the Montana State College, cooperating with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, has undertaken a series of studies in rural community organization.

The first of these is the subject of this bulletin. It is an attempt to picture the natural and the artificial divisions of the county which are imposed upon it by the more familiar political, social, and economic institutions already extant and to point out how such institutional limits affect rural community organizations.

Ravalli County presents an excellent opportunity for such a study. Its natural boundaries eliminate many problems arising from the determination of county lines by politicians. The absence of large industrial towns assures its primary interest in agriculture and its early settlement lends stability to its social life. The county's excellent schools and roads prove the interest of its citizens in constructive rural progress.

The fundamental institutions through which the communities of the county express themselves may be divided into two types. The first may be designated as the Enclosing Institution. It usually covers
Identification map of Ravalli County, showing the distribution of farmsteads, the principal roads and streams.
n a well-defined area and includes the entire population in its activities. It is likely to be impersonal in its contacts, consequently many individuals are unaware of their responsibilities as members of it. The school district and voting precinct are examples of this type. The second may be described as the Ramifying Institution. It penetrates the communities of the county in much the same manner as the nervous system extends through the body. Its relationships are personal. Individuals belong to it by choice. It creates the social atmosphere in which a community moves. Lodges, churches, societies, and clubs are of such a nature.

The material in this bulletin is confined to the Enclosing Institution and includes only those that are county-wide in scope.

The publication is presented in three parts. Part I describes the physical features and gives a brief history of the county. Part II enumerates and describes the Enclosing Institutions. Part III contains some deductions and suggestions which may assist in promoting the efficiency of the various institutions and in correlating them with effective community organization.

PHYSICAL ASPECTS AND GENERAL HISTORY

THE BITTER ROOT VALLEY FORMATIONS.—Ravalli County is almost identical with the Bitter Root Valley—especially so, if one considers the mountain slopes on the west, east, and south as parts of the Valley. The lofty Bitter Root range, snow-capped, heavily timbered on its abrupt slopes, forms the western boundary; and the lower, gently rising foothills of the Rockies mark the bounding sky-line on the east and south.

The tiller portion of the valley begins, with the exception of the Sula district in the extreme southeastern part, at the junction of the East Fork and West Fork of the Bitter Root River. It extends north to Missoula County, a distance of fifty-two miles. The width varies from two to three miles south of Weeping Child Creek (locally known as Sleeping Child); and from five to fourteen miles north of this creek all the way to the north county line. Its greatest width occurs through the Burnt Fork and Big Creek districts.

The Bitter Root River, which with its tributaries forms the drainage system of the valley, flows northward to join the Clarke Fork River at Missoula. Its water grade is a little more than ten feet to a mile. The river divides the agricultural lands of the basin into the East side
A scene near Hamilton, showing the valley floor and the Bitter Root Mountains.
and the West side. These areas differ widely in their structural formation and in soil types. The East side, which possesses the larger acreage of arable land, has been worn down to a series of gently rising terraces or benches, which afford excellent agricultural and grazing land. The West side rises from the river rather abruptly and at a remarkably uniform angle to the peaks of the Bitter Root range. The soil is generally stony and rough and, though not so well adapted to general farming as the East side, boasts the better orchards. This side of the valley is broken by deep and rugged canyons cut by the perennial streams that flow from the glacial lakes high up on the Bitter Root range.

The altitude of the valley (averaging about 3,500 feet) added to its extremely sheltered position among the mountains, gives it an exceedingly pleasant climate. It is characterized by cool, delightful summers with a mean temperature of 63 degrees Fahr. and moderate, open winters (28.4 degrees Fahr.). While electrical storms are not infrequent during the summer months, the valley is remarkably free from severe wind storms and blizzards.

The average annual rainfall recorded at Hamilton is 10.71 inches. This small rainfall, varying widely with the altitude, necessitates irrigation or careful dry farming practice. Both methods of farming are followed in the valley.

General History.—The first white men who entered the Bitter Root Valley were the members of the famous Lewis and Clark exploring expedition. On September 4, 1805, they pushed across the continental divide and descended into the mountain pocket in southeastern Ravalli County now known as Sula or Ross Hole. Here they pitched their camp and made advances to the Indians whom they encountered. The Indians received them in a friendly spirit and guided them in their farther march down the Bitter Root Valley and to the west over Lo Lo Pass. The explorers named this tribe the Ootlashoots, but for some unknown reason they came to be called the Flathead tribe.

This tribe was courageous and peace-loving. Their steadfast friendship with the white man was noteworthy. Perhaps the calm and beautiful valley in which the Flathead Indians lived had some bearing on developing these characteristics. So strong was their religious fervor that, having learned something of the Roman Catholic faith from a wandering Iroquois, they would not rest until they had persuaded Jesuit missionaries at St. Louis, Missouri, to send them a "Blackrobe."
In 1840 Father De Smet was sent as a missionary to them. He was received with solemn ceremony. Under his guidance the Flatheads erected a mission near the present town of Stevensville and in the spring of 1842 broke the first land in the present state and planted it to wheat and potatoes. So impressed was Father De Smet with the enthusiasm of the tribe that he enlisted the assistance of several young priests among whom was Father Ravalli. He came to the mission in 1845 and later took charge of it. His influence on the early history of the valley was large and by no means limited to the Indians. He cemented the friendly feeling between the white man and the Flatheads and did much to bring the tribe to accepting the ways of the white man's civilization. The mission also became a shelter for the early traders and trappers.

St. Mary's Mission, Stevensville, the site of the first agricultural operations in Montana.

The Blackfoot tribe east of the Rockies was constantly at war with the Flatheads and so often did they invade the latter's territory that the mission was often exposed to their raids. It was, therefore, abandoned for a period.

In 1850 Major John Owen bought the property and opened a trading post. Being harassed by the unfriendly Blackfeet he built a fort, the remains of which are still to be seen, and around it was
laid the foundation for the first permanent white settlement in Montana.

During the winter of 1853-54 the surveying party under Lieutenant Mullan, which was sent by Governor Stevens of Washington Territory to determine the route of a transcontinental railroad, made its headquarters near Fort Owen, then known as St. Mary's village. In his report to the governor he makes these significant comments:

"The soil of this portion of the valley is principally of a rich dark colored loam mingled at times with much sand and gravel, the whole being covered with a growth of rich and luxuriant grass. It is well adapted to the purposes of agriculture.

"I have seen oats grown in this valley by Mr. John Owen that are as heavy and as excellent as any that I have ever seen in the States; and the same gentleman has informed me that he has grown most excellent wheat and that from his experience, while in the mountains, he hesitates not in saying that here might agriculture be carried on in its numerous branches and to the exceeding great interest and gain of those engaged in it. The valley and the mountain slopes are well timbered with an excellent growth of pine and are not only capable of grazing immense bands of stock of every kind but also capable of supporting a dense population."

In 1855 Governor Stevens concluded a treaty with the Flathead, Blackfeet, and Crow Indians, opening the Bitter Root Valley to white settlers. At this time St. Mary's village was incorporated as Stevensville. It boasted one store, one saloon, and one blacksmith shop. There were three families and about twenty-five single men (more or less transient and engaged in trading and trapping) in the community.

With the discovery of gold in Idaho and Montana, agriculture in the Bitter Root received its first commercial impetus. Vegetables, dairy products, potatoes, and grain were in demand at the mines and brought almost unheard of prices. Trading in horses and cattle was lively, the prospectors disposing of their trail-worn animals to the farmers for fresh ones. Much live stock was brought into the valley in this way. By 1865 there were approximately one hundred white inhabitants in the valley. They were almost entirely of American origin and largely from south of the Mason and Dixon line. With the exception of a half dozen people, they were engaged in agricultural pursuits.

After the gold stampede had subsided, agriculture progressed more slowly but steadily until the lumbering industry brought the railroad into the valley in 1884. The railroad, which is a branch of the Northern Pacific system, was completed to Victor in 1885. Unfortunately for the
agricultural development of the valley it was built on the less favored side of the river. From Victor the railroad was pushed on to Grantsdale and here it terminated until the lumber industry necessitated its extension to a point two miles above Darby, which is its present terminal. The lumber industry had a significant influence in creating industrial towns like Hamilton—and in a sense Victor and Darby—in a region primarily adapted to agriculture. With the withdrawal of this industry the towns found themselves unprepared for and rather unsympathetic with their agricultural environment.

**The Orchard Boom and Land Settlement.**—The Bitter Root Valley passed through the experience of a promoted orchard land boom a decade ago. Land values were temporarily disturbed but readjustments have been made and a wholesome prosperity now prevails. Most of the orchard tracts in the Bitter Root Valley were put on the market by companies employing elaborate selling methods. Advertising campaigns, clever real estate agents, homesekers’ excursions, brought many an interested person from the regions about Chicago, Madison, and Minneapolis into the valley. The natural charm of the country and the royal hospitality of the promoters colored the orcharding proposition a rosy tint in the eyes of the visitor; and it took a very sagacious mind indeed to be able to withstand the convincing demonstrations on sample orchard plots kept in fine condition regardless of expense. One or two
companies maintained fine hotels, cottages, automobiles, constantly at the service of their clients.

The easy plan of ownership and operation whereby the purchaser was given five years for payment, during which time the company's trained orchardists were to take care of the growing orchard, appealed to many people not ready to go to Montana to live. So the orchard plots and ranches were sold; so many settlers moved into the valley; and so disappointment came to many of the settlers when their orchards turned out to be on soil unsuited for fruit-growing. And so, moreover, many purchasers of orchard plots—purchasers who never came to the county—let their orchards run down after the five-year period. Settlers faced hard conditions. Some had no alternative but to stay; and of those who won out some did so either by a resort to other work than farming, or to other farm work than orcharding. Some of these are now among the progressive farmers of the county.

The run-down and abandoned orchards have proved a menace to the real fruit industry of the county. Pests have thrived in these uncared-for tracts. Legislation has sought to meet the situation. Before many years, however, little trace will be left of these romantic orchards of hope unfulfilled.

The pioneers who made good and have come into possession of substantial homes and acres feel that they are ready to retire, and their sons and daughters for the most part take an easy attitude toward life. It is difficult to arouse them to community action, but once aroused they push a project to completion. The people who came to the valley during the land boom and who, when once disillusioned by sad experience, became anxious to quit their farms and get out are known as the "bitter-enders." A third class of farmers has come in since the land boom subsided—progressive, forward-looking men ready to push any project that will bring prosperity to the valley, ready to work to rebuild what was torn down in the boom. These are social-minded men for the most part, generally leading off on the new program which the farm bureau and commercial clubs inaugurate.

Types of Farming.—The census for 1920 shows 1,321 farms in Ravalli County. Of these 924 are operated by owners or managers and 397 by tenants. Live stock assumed first place among farm products and was reported in its several classes as follows: horses, 7,814; mules, 155; cattle, 21,390; sheep, 33,790; swine, 10,386. The principal crops, acreage, and yield for 1919 were: wheat, 15,732 acres, 202,526
Orchard tracts in Ravalli County in 1910 and 1920.
bushels; oats, 5,692 acres, 210,264 bushels; barley, 2,403 acres, 52,924 bushels; and hay, 35,250 acres, 53,430 tons.

Types of farming in the Bitter Root Valley are closely related to topography and rainfall. Irrigation is largely practiced on the valley floor and lower benches while dry farming methods are followed on the higher benches.

![Image of the cooperative creamery near Stevensville.](image)

Dairying and diversified farming are carried on with success on the valley floor. Excellent herds of pure-bred Holstein, Guernsey, and Jersey stock are kept on many farms in this area. Dairying is the most promising of the agricultural pursuits and centers largely around Stevensville, which has one of the most successful cooperative creameries in the west. Hay (principally alfalfa), potatoes and many of the cereals grow very well. Of recent years Canada field peas, as well as other varieties, have taken an important place in the crop rotations. Root crops and vegetables do very well throughout the floor of the valley. This portion was the first to be settled and has the greater part of the population. In some spots the land is suffering because of inadequate drainage. (Heavy irrigation on the benches brings the water-table close to the surface and tends to drown out the crops.) The lower benches, those first above the valley floor, are well adapted in soil and topography for orcharding. Most of the successful commercial
A farm scene near Hamilton.
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Apples are the most important fruit crop, bringing approximately a million dollars annually to the valley. Some cherries, pears, and plums are also grown. The McIntosh is the most successful commercial variety of apple and the most largely grown. Wheat, oats, and alfalfa do very well on these terraces.

On the higher benches where the snowfall in the winter is greater and the growing season shorter, wheat, oats, and barley are grown. Dry farming (a system whereby half of the farm is fallowed and mulched one year and cropped the next) and grazing have proved profitable. The national forests which border the entire valley and county offer excellent range for cattle, horses, and sheep. This area, however, is sparsely peopled.

THE POPULATION GROUPS

THE FARM NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS.—The records in the county court-house tell us that John Doe resides on the east one-half of the southeast quarter of section seven; Township 9 north; Range 21 west. If John Doe were asked where he lived, his likely reply would be that he farmed the old Dole place about a half mile east of the schoolhouse down on Clear Creek. In other words, John Doe, the farmer, identifies himself as a member of a neighborhood and with landmarks which have significance because human beings have been connected with them. There is a social atmosphere in John Doe’s description which is entirely lacking in the legal records. There are many other ties that make a neighborhood but those of location and identification come first. An analysis of the farm population of the county, family by family, discloses the following fifty-three groups, each with its local neighborhood name. Where location is apparently the only factor for the group name or where the forces that once cemented it are no longer active, the neighborhood is designated by the term “topographic.” Some of the groups come to find that they have important interests as groups with one another, and so inter-neighborhood group relations arise and a sort of informal federated or consolidated group comes about, formed out of two or more neighborhood groups. This larger group in some instances approaches the character of a community and indicates, perhaps, the direction of community growth and evolution.

East Fork. Five homes connected by neighborly feeling. The group is due to location together in the East Fork Valley.

Cirque Creek. Seven homes. The spot Lewis and Clarke arrived
at first in the Bitter Root Valley. Annual picnic in commemoration of the Lewis and Clarke arrival. This group is the result of location together on Camp Creek.

Ross Hole. About a dozen households. Three strong families, interrelated, produce a kinship bond which explains much of the grouping.

French Basin. Eight homes informally social at the schoolhouse.

East Fork, Camp Creek, Ross Hole and French Basin groups form the larger group called Sula. Sula has an organized club-house and a neighborhood church. The church services are held in the club-house. This larger neighborhood is part of the Darby trade area. Cattle, hay and sheep rank in importance. All these groups are in one mountain pocket with lateral creek bottoms. Kinship ties are common in Sula.

East Fork Bitter Root. This is a valley or topographic group of households loosely connected. They are scattered along the road to Sula.

Rye Creek. Topographic group with social organization at the schoolhouse. Frequent interchange with Baldwin of neighborhood hospitality on the occasion of social programs.

Alta. A mining camp.

West Fork. Topographic group.

Baldwin or Connor. Has a community club. Is a church group. The schoolhouse is a social center. Lately has consolidated its school w' th Darby.

Chaffin Creek. Topographic.

West Fork, Baldwin, and Chaffin Creek are more or less interrelated as a larger group.

Tin Cup. Is purely topographic in character. Has social life as well as trade life in Darby. Has no community consciousness of its own.

University Heights. This was an agricultural camp for absentee orchard holders and has a group of buildings that were meant as summer cottages for absentee holders. The company is still operating, though the apple orchards have been temporarily damaged by the fruit-tree leaf-roller. Community leans toward Hamilton. School and trade are at Darby. It was influential in bringing about recent school consolidation and high school for Darby.

Como Bench. Topographic group.
University Heights and Como Bench are closely allied in interest. 

Como. Is a postoffice center. Has a community club, a farm bureau, a church. Is a strong, well-organized social unit. It owes its organization to the influence of one social-minded pioneer.


Ward’s Cove. Together with Charles Heights is a social unit. Has a farm bureau, parent-teacher association, strawberry growers’ association. Community has been made to feel its oneness by a unanimous insistence on good roads. Cooperative projects fostered by outside organizations that hope to dispose of the absentee landlords’ property by building a better community have had a large influence on the present activity of this neighborhood.

Charles Heights and Ward’s Cove are interrelated.

Sleeping Child. Topographic. Some social life at school. Most of the people go to Hamilton for their social life.


Grantsdale. Store, postoffice, school, church.

Skalkaho and Grantsdale are interconnected, forming a neighborhood.


Sawtooth. Topographic. Has a school.

Butte Orchards and Sawtooth are connected.

Gilchrist Bench. Topographic. Socially a part of Hamilton.


Dunbar. Topographic.

Woodtick Ridge. As long as it had a school it was a real social unit. Now topographic.

Rocky Flat. Topographic.

Dutch Hill. Topographic.

Dunbar, Woodtick Ridge, Rocky Flat, and Dutch Hill center at Woodside, where there is a club-house. This combination of neighborhoods is sometimes called “Little Missouri.” Farm bureau center and railroad station.

Riverside. Topographic.

Bitter Root Stock Farm. Is a portion of the estate of Marcus Daly. It is not independent topographically but is convenient for
The neighborhood of primary groups in the Bitter Root Valley.
location purposes. It is largely in the hands of tenants who, together with Riverside, make Hamilton their institutional center.

**Hamilton Heights.** Has good natural group. Water-users’ association. Large part of the area held by Boston capitalists and cared for by local manager. As a speculative proposition it has been a failure. These eastern holders have been influential in bringing good schools and modern community institutions, not only in Hamilton Heights but in other communities that have been promoted by them. Their failure lies in not getting the members of the community to cooperate in supporting their institutions.

- Willow Creek. Topographic.
- Summerdale. Topographic.

Willow Creek and Summerdale are really parts of Corvallis community in all respects. Orcharding is the principal industry.

- Poverty Flat. Topographic.
- Fairview. Topographic.
- Pleasant View. Topographic.
- Sweathouse. Topographic.

Poverty Flat, Fairview, Pleasant View, and Sweathouse are socially related to Victor; school, church, entertainments.

- Curlew Mines. Once a large mining camp—gold, silver, lead. Deserted at the present time except for three families. Industrial.
- Big Creek. Topographic. Isolated. Large number of Finn farmers in the neighborhood.

- Aetna. Topographic.
- Home Acres. Topographic.
- Pine Hollow. Topographic.

Aetna, Home Acres, and Pine Hollow have become in the last year a very enthusiastic farm bureau unit, made up of all settlers, old and recent. It was not in the boom district. Took action on weed eradication and on better roads movement with success. Is a real neighborhood and has a good district school, contemplates a community house.

- Rosedown. Topographic.
- Upper Burnt Fork. Has influential leadership. A real social group—church, country club, parent-teacher association.
- Lower Burnt Fork. Has school, seems to have no other local institutions.

- Fort Owen. Topographic.
West Side. Topographic.

Lower Three Mile. Topographic.

This group, as well as the three preceding groups, depends largely on Stevensville for its social life.

Upper Three Mile or Lone Rock. A real social unit. Has a farmers' club, farm bureau, an up-to-date school, one of the best in the state; provides recreation, social-minded leadership, also has a live Sunday school.

Gray Horse Bench. Topographic. Shares Lone Rock institution.

Bass Creek. Topographic.

Sweeney Creek. Topographic.

Eight Mile. Topographic. Together with Sweeney Creek this group shares the social institutions of Florence.

The neighborhood is the first social group outside of the family with which the individual becomes acquainted. In it he makes his early social adjustments and through it he is brought into contact with the larger social agencies of the community. The number and type of his social contacts and his choice of companions are often directly related to the physical distance between him and his neighbors. Few
individuals are fully aware of the great social importance of distance.

The automobile, telephone, and good roads are obliterating old neighborhood boundaries and are establishing new limits. This expansion and recasting of the neighborhood must have its effects upon other rural institutions. It is reflected in the consolidated school district. Until this transition period has passed the neighborhood group as a social unit must be considered plastic but can never be neglected in the promotion of a constructive social program.

Trade Area Groups.—The agencies of trade and of personal service in Ravalli County are concentrated for the most part in the village and city centers of the county. These trade and service centers are Hamilton, Stevensville, Darby, Corvallis, Victor, and Florence. A country store is also at each of the following—Woodside, Connor, Sula, Grantsdale, and Ward's Cove. Farm households, on the whole, identify themselves with one of these trade centers more than any other, if not to the exclusion of the others. The fact that they have the same center of trade agencies and service agencies unites farm families in a trade bond more or less, somewhat as it does the families that trade and work and reside in the same town or city. Any group of farm families or any number of farm neighborhoods that trade in the same village or
Trade-area map of Ravalli County, indicating trade areas about trading centers.
city obviously make up a population group which must be reckoned with in many respects and connections, as, for example, particular roads and road improvements, railway transportation facilities and accommodations, warehousing and marketing opportunities, credit and banking, besides many subtle social relations and activities.

That farm population group that possesses at its trading center a full complement of trading agencies, such as stores, shops, coal yards, printing establishments, and of service agencies, such as dental offices, medical offices, and the like, is fortunate indeed. How to give a farm group a complete trading center in place of several inadequate little centers is a problem worthy the prolonged attention and effort of boards of commerce, merchants' associations, and service agencies of all kinds. Tradesmen, bankers, professional men, managing and operating in villages, towns, and cities the agencies of trade and service, may well give much thought to the satisfaction of the wants of their farmer clientele. Indeed, these agents are largely responsible for the character of the material and mental goods and service that farmers purchase. The farmer's standard of buying, whether of high quality or low, and consequently his standard of living, high or low, lie in the hands of these agents of commerce and personal service perhaps as fully as much as in the farmer's economic ability to buy.

Postal groups.—The United States Post Office Department has a large measure of influence in determining the group character of farm populations through its rural delivery service. The Department arbitrarily decides what any particular farmer's post office address shall be. This fact is important in the eyes of the farmer. He is a very interested party, just as much so as the city dweller or the villager.

A plain piece of inconvenience and damage to the farmer is to have dictated to him a post office address at some center with which he is not connected and to which he never goes. It will at once occur to any one who has thought upon the question of farm populations and their facilities that the farmer's post office and business address should be at his trading center. Note the close resemblance of the trade area and the post office area maps.

Educational groups.—The law provides that people shall be grouped into areas or school districts, so-called, for the maintenance of public schools. The school district is an important social group, just because the education of children together is a very influential social process for them; and, furthermore, the education of children
Map of Ravalli County, showing post-office and rural route areas.
together affects more or less the education and socialization of every household as a whole. The ease of maintaining a school of value depends upon the natural social grouping of the households involved.

The Florence-Carlton consolidated high school, located in the open country.

When small groups of households determine to consolidate their schools and school districts, it is often a vexing question to decide how much territory to take in and what households to incorporate. The most evident principle is that all people in a consolidated school district should be, so far as possible, in a natural social group. This principle has been largely practiced in the organization of consolidated districts in Ravalli County, with the result that an excellent school system is maintained at the lowest expense for each student of any county in the state (1920). The Florence-Carlton consolidated high school, located in the open country, would make a creditable institution for any progressive town. Several of the districts, noticeably Lone Rock, boast modern buildings and equipment which serve both the educational and social needs of their group in an adequate and satisfactory manner.

At present there are twenty-nine school districts in the county. Six maintain high schools which, with one exception, are located in incorporated areas. These are identified on the map by squares. The
School district map of Ravalli County. Squares indicate consolidated high schools, and circles show grade schools.
The remainder, indicated on the map by circles, are grade schools. The following list enumerates the districts by name and number:

15—Florence-Carlton
8—Holden
13—Upper Three Mile or Lone Rock
17—Lower Three Mile
26—Bass Creek
37—Ambrose
22—Lower Burnt Fork
2—Stevensville
25—Curlew
6—Upper Burnt Fork
4—Aetna
1—Corvallis
34—Hamilton Heights
18—Canyon Creek

3—Hamilton
27—Sawtooth
5—Grantsdale
14—Ward’s Cove
32—Sleeping Child
20—Como
9—Darby
40—French Basin
39—Rosemount
7—Victor
38—Birch Creek
30—Dominic
35—Baldwin
31—Sula
21—Rombo and Alta

**Political groups.**—The law sets the bounds of election districts and of local political areas. The farm population, in its usual scattered condition, offers a real problem in political science. How to get enough farm households together to make a municipality and how to give it such privileges as it requires, are far from easy from the point of view of the local community. It is quite evident that America has not fully grappled with this problem, for the farm population of any county has few of the political privileges and appliances for maintaining institutions possessed by city and village populations.

Perhaps the day will come with the advent of good roads, when the farmers who have relations of trade with the merchants in a trading center will be ready to cast their political lot with the people of the trade center and share with them some measure of common political privilege. The problem is one of engineering. It is also one of taxation. Political scientists and civil engineers should join hands in the solution of this fundamental rural problem.

**Farm Bureau groups.**—The farm bureau is the latest expression of social and economic hope for the farm population. It will be strongest, therefore, where it brings together those households having natural social connections. It would be as grave a blunder to attempt to combine in a local farm bureau farm households not accessible to one
Governmental precincts, showing the population of each precinct by the 1920 census.
another as to attempt to unite such households for social purposes. The hope of farming in Ravalli County is in the organization and socialization of its farms, farm households, and natural farming groups.

Instead of scattering his energies among individual farmers, the county agricultural agent may utilize the social point of view of the
group and develop the economic group sense, feeling, and power of these farmers.

**Church Groups.**—In a sense church groupings are within the control of church people. In another sense the decisions of a previous generation fasten upon the succeeding generations a particular church grouping very difficult to change. And yet it is evident that the necessities of pioneer days may not be the convenience, even, of later times.

Religion and church-going and pastoral care are intensely social aspects of life as well as ethical, creedal, and ritualistic. Religion binds groups together and separates group from group. Farmers have suffered much from ill-advised church groupings, which have divided their natural social groupings. Though in a very delicate region of life indeed, it can not prove offensive to anyone, surely, to be reminded that farm people owe it to themselves and to their children to maintain churches and Sunday schools in association with such groups of farmers as will strengthen their whole endeavor to live well in this world.

**Recreative Groups.**—Recreation is fast taking its place as a legitimate activity and phase of organized life alongside education, employment, religion, politics. Recreation at its best is social. Taking a day off from work and simply lying about the house or farm may prove far from recreative. Loafing is not even resting. Recreation, physical and spiritual upbuilding, is usually active, stirring, and emotional.

What group of farmers can best take their recreation together? This is the group question. Some forms of recreation involve only a small group. Other forms involve larger groups. At this point we face the same questions we faced in the local political, educational, and religious groups. It seems natural that the bonds of work and economics and politics should be strengthened by the bonds of play, ethics, religion, and recreation.

While the last-named groups are not of the inclusive type of institution, they are touched upon because they may sometime be so classified.

**Suggestions**

**Reorganization Suggestions.**—The analysis of Ravalli County into its population groups of various kinds and levels opens the way to a modification of the present institutions of the farm people in the interest of progress. Group power conserved in institutional development is the part of wisdom. Growth implies new groups and reorgani-
zation: (a) New Consolidated School Districts. Certain farm neighborhood groups lying accessible to one another could well be consolidated into new school districts. It is not difficult by a look at the farm neighborhood map to pick out these logical groups. (b) Church Centers. If Darby, Florence, and Lone Rock be picked as natural centers for strong churches, in the present development of the county, then Como, Sula, Ward's Cove, Baldwin, Actna, Woodside, Burnt Fork, would be selected as places for Sunday schools, related to churches in the larger centers. (c) Farm Bureaus. A division of the county into local farm bureaus on a basis of natural grouping would provide fifteen such local bureaus, arranged as follows: Sula (East Fork, Camp Creek, Ross Hole, French Basin); Baldwin (East Fork Bitter Root, West Fork, Baldwin or Connor, Chaffin Creek); Darby (Tim Cup, University Heights, Como Bench); Como; Ward's Cove (Charles Heights, Ward's Cove); Grantsdale (Sleeping Child, Skalkaho, Grantsdale, Sawtooth); Hamilton (Gilchrist Bench, Canyon Creek, Riverside, Stock Farm, Hamilton Heights); Woodside (Dunbar, Woodtick Ridge, Rocky Flat, Dutch Hill); Corvallis (Willow Creek, Summerdale, Dominic); Victor (Pov­erty Flat, Fairview, Pleasant View, Swathouse, Curlew Mines); Burnt Fork (Upper Burnt Fork, Lower Burnt Fork); Aetna (Big Creek, Aet­na, Home Acres, Rossmount); Stevensville (Fort Owen, West Side, Lower Three Mile, Bass Creek); Lone Rock (Lone Rock, Gray Horse Bench); Florence (Sweeney Creek, Eight Mile). (d) Community Houses. The following groups support a community house: Baldwin, Ward's Cove, Corvallis, and Aetna. This place of meeting for social, economic, political, and educational purposes would strengthen the bonds of community and citizenship. (e) Recreative Activities. Certain standard community and neighborhood activities of a recreative character would furnish a medium of acquaintance and group strength. Such activities are the annual community fair, the annual community picnic, annual community pageant (the history of the county and its various communities furnishes material for a pageant of an unsurpassed character), country plays, school field days, and annual county play-day and school meet.

The foregoing analysis of Ravalli County into its population groups is confessedly only an initial effort to bring out into the clear the most obscure, but important, group forces of the county. It is hoped that this first step toward a more efficient organization of the people of Ravalli County will be followed by many other steps until the social texture of the county is woven into the pattern of strength and beauty. Every county in Montana may weave its fabric of life in the light of all its social forces and human interest groups if it so wills.
THE RIGHT-WING SUBCULTURE

There is a definite subculture among certain segments of the population of Ravalli County. The basic orientation of these people could be classified by Sorokin as "ideational" rather than as "sensate." The logical processes of this subculture rest upon religious and sacred ways of thinking, rather than upon the secular and profane logic so much in use in colleges and universities.

The publications which espouse the dominant values of this way of thinking are found in many homes. Such publications as The Eagles Eye, The Dan Smoot Report, and newsletters and magazines of The Christian Crusade, all reject the realities of the twentieth century. In their view of the world there are two types of people: Christian Americans and communists. The communists category includes all criminals, college teachers, agents of communist governments, liberals, sexual perverts, and intellectuals. That all these diverse categories of people can be summed up as "communist" is not surprising, if one uses their canons of logic. Being a communist does not consist of having a proven relationship with the
communist party. Far from it, this is the least of the criteria used to judge whether to classify a person as a communist or as a Christian American.

The criterion used to "type" an individual is his actions. As one tells who is a Christian by his good behavior, one also tells who is not a Christian by his evil behavior. One does not need to prove a relationship with the devil to equate someone with sin—a sinful act is sufficient to tell who is a "sinner." To listen to the arguments of an agent of the devil is to foolishly place one's own soul in jeopardy. Listening to the other side is in itself a minor sin which a good Christian American should know better than to do. Their concern, then, becomes one of protecting themselves from contamination. They would be quite content to be left alone, but as the integrating forces of mass media and central government involve them, they feel that they must fight back—and they do!

They bitterly resent those things which they feel the forces of evil are trying to thrust upon them, such as the Job Corps Training Center near Trapper Creek. Opposition to this center has taken on the nature of a religious crusade which is led by the pastor of the Baptist Church in Connor.

Two other organizations which have been organized
by the people who feel directly threatened by current developments are the John Birch Society and the Minute-
men. The John Birch Society members feel that there is a direct threat to the American way of life. They be-
lieve, quite strongly, that the danger consists of people who have foresaken the moral and religious teaching of our forefathers in favor of the communist way of life. Their solution is to ferret out those individuals respon-
sible, and to conduct an intensive education program to alert the general public.

The Minutemen, apparently, feel that the process of internal moral decay has already proceeded to the point that external enemies will be able to capitalize on this situation. They are preparing to resist the foreign invasion, which they feel is imminent. Their preparation consists of rigorous training for guerrilla warfare, the stockpiling of arms, and other para-military pursuits. In the course of his research the author learned that two caches of weapons and ammunition were discovered on Forest Service land. It subsequently developed that these were definitely identified as belonging to a local Minuteman organization.

One could not understand the social life of Ravalli County without being aware of this subculture, and its effect on the other residents. While a member of
the John Birch Society is musing, "I wonder if he is a communist?" the person whom he is wondering about may be musing, "I suspect that character might be a Bircher. I'll have to be careful what I say around him." Thus, the very existence of this subculture has an influence on both members and non-members of Ravalli County.
APPENDIX D
This study and the previous one by Baumgartel are not comparable, because of the differences in their methods. Nevertheless, can we find many changes in Ravalli County in the forty-five intervening years? Surprisingly, one can reconstruct the major changes from the available data.

The most striking change is in the foothills of the nearby mountains. These areas are much less populated now than they were forty-five years ago. In general, the children have tended to sell these farms as their older parents passed away. Urban life, even as a railroad, mine, or factory worker, has more attractions than a marginal existence upon a farm that offers only subsistence living with little cash return. Two communities, Rosemount and Dominic, which were thriving in 1921, are now completely unpopulated. French Basin and Eight Mile each has only one homestead, and many others have been reduced to a fraction of their former population.

A result of this change is the disappearance of many neighborhoods as meaningful place names. University Heights and Tin Cup residents identify their neighborhood
now as Darby. Camp Creek, East Fork, Ross's Hole, and French Basin now are combined into a neighborhood known variously as Sula or East Fork. Como Beach is now combined with Como. Chaffin Creek, East Fork of the Bitterroot, and Rye Creek residents will usually reply "Conner" when asked the name of their neighborhood. Other words which have dropped from the vocabulary of all but the "old timers" are Greyhorse Bench, Fairview, Aetena, Dunbar, Gilchrist Bench, and Curlew Mines. The residents of these neighborhoods now identify with the closest town. In general, any populated area has an "identifying fringe" which covers a much wider area than formerly.

A phenomenon one encounters when asking people about their neighborhood is one which can be thought of as The Rule of Increasing Specificity. It operates this way. As one gets into an area, directions become more specifically related to certain places and landmarks. A person will say, for example, "I have a summer home up the West Fork." Further questioning will reveal that it is at Painted Rock Lake, and if he feels that one is familiar with the area, he will say that "it is on the Fourth of July Gulch." Or he may say, "I live above Charlos Heights," but he will refer to the area as "Lost Horse" when he talks with his immediate neighbors. The principle is simply this: people residing in an area think in terms of
these specific landmarks, instead of the names outsiders use in a generic sense when referring to a larger area.

This principle is one that a person would need to be aware of when attempting to map neighborhoods. It helps explain why Baumgartel had so many neighborhoods (33 of 53) which he classified as "topographic." People need specific place names in order to give directions, and in order to discuss an area.

Another change observed in the valley since the Baumgartel study is in the school system. In 1920, there were twenty-four grade schools and six high schools. There are now only eight elementary schools but still six high schools. By 1921, the high school consolidation process was completed, and since that time the elementary schools have joined the trend. The process is almost complete except for Grantsdale elementary school, which most people expect to be merged with Hamilton on the next special election.

Minor changes seem to have been made in the valley's social structure as a result of the telephone systems. An effect has been noted in four cases. Two of these cases concern privately owned telephone systems. One system is used in Alta by three families, and gives these three families much closer contact, especially in winter, than they would have without this system. The
other system is used by some families "related by blood," southwest of Hamilton. It has a unifying effect, but causes adjacent people to refer to the users as "the clan."

Just south of Florence is a new dividing line that forces people to phone "long distance" to talk to their closest neighbor. This invisible barrier to social interaction is deeply resented by the people involved, and has apparently altered the frequency of their interaction.

The fourth instance occurs everywhere in the Bitter-root Valley where the older multiple party lines have been replaced by the newer four-party lines. The users are unaware that they may still, by a simple technique, phone the other people on their line. Many people expressed bitterness over their erroneous belief that they could no longer phone their "old friends."

Since telephones were not mentioned in the previous study one can only state that telephones have affected neighborhood relationships, but any effect which they have on the changes between studies will always remain a matter of conjecture.

Another most important change in the valley is the growing dependence upon the automobile. The greater number, speed, and dependability of automobiles, coupled with more miles of surfaced roads, have allowed people to make frequent social contact with others at geographically
greater distance. The expression, "I had a flat tire" was at one time a valid excuse for being late. Now the same expression will sometimes elicit a knowing smile, or a chuckle.

Another factor which has changed the whole of Ravalli County is the increased mechanization of the farms and ranches. Sugar beets are now planted, thinned, cultivated, and even topped and harvested completely by machine. Sprinkler systems have drastically reduced the labor while increasing the efficiency of irrigation. Poultry farms resemble a factory more than they do a farm of even a quarter of a century ago. The author encountered not a single farm wife who raised chickens for her own "egg money." Agri-business is an accomplished fact in Ravalli County. A few large and amazingly efficient farms have absorbed many of the small landholders of the past.

Concurrent with this trend is an increasing number of people who live in the country to commute to a job in a nearby city. One individual, an electrical engineer, commutes eighty-seven miles each way daily and stated that "I wouldn't have it any other way."

In all, the major changes in Ravalli County are those permitted by better automobile transportation and more mechanized farming. These factors, added to the declining birthrate, have allowed school officials to
consolidate grade schools into fewer and more efficient units. This in turn has allowed people to identify with towns more distant from their homes. When the people who live on a farmstead gain their main subsistence elsewhere as an employee, rather than as an independent farmer, identification with a particular area is less meaningful than formerly. This gives the superficial impression that neighborhoods are declining in number and importance.

This is an erroneous impression. Neighborhoods are still important to rural people. One must simply be more careful to avoid mapping them as concrete spatial realities, instead of the social relationships which they actually are.
APPENDIX E
I am a graduate student at Montana State University working toward a master's degree in sociology. My thesis is a repeat of Mr. Walter H. Baumgartel's neighborhood mapping of Ravalli County, which he did for the Agricultural Extension Service in 1921.

With your cooperation, I hope to secure a preliminary mapping of neighborhood locations. If you will please answer and return this questionnaire, it will be of great help to me in completing my study.

Thank you.

William T. Boring

What is the name of the neighborhood in which you live?

I do not mean the name of the nearby village or city, nor even necessarily, though it may be, the name of your district school, but the name of the country locality or neighborhood in which your home is located. Some such names are: Woodside, Eight Mile, Upper Three Mile or Lone Rock, Pleasant View, Hamilton Heights, Gilchrist Bench, Rye Creek, etc.

Your Neighborhood

Your Name

Student's Name

If you know the quarter and section of land in which your home is located, would you please write it in the space below?
APPENDIX F
PRE-TEST

Questions to be asked of neighborhood respondents:

1. What is your name?
2. What is your post office address?
3. How long have you lived in this neighborhood?
4. How long have you lived in Ravalli County?
5. What are the names of four of your closest neighbors?
6. How often do you see them?
7. Are any of these related to you?
8. What would you say the boundaries of your neighborhood are?
9. Where (at what town) do you usually trade?
10. Where do you usually purchase your children's school clothes?
11. Where do you usually purchase your farm supplies and equipment?
12. Do you belong to the farm bureau? If so, where?
13. Do you belong to the Grange? If so, where?
14. Where do you go for commercial recreation, such as bowling, the movies, etc.?
15. When you attend church, where is it located?
16. Do any of the friends you visit with most often live in this neighborhood?
APPENDIX G
QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire was the principal means used to collect data. An effort was made to ask the questionnaire in a spontaneous, conversational manner. During the interview, as much information was written on each form as time allowed. After each interview, the researcher filled out each blank completely.

Interviews varied in length from fifteen minutes to three hours, averaging about one-half hour. Follow-up questions, and additional probing were used on each question as required.

(The spacing used on these forms allowed approximately twice as much room to write as in the one reproduced here.)
1. What is the name of this neighborhood (or locality)?

2. Do you know where the name originated?

3. By what name is this ranch (farm) known locally?

4. (If appropriate) Where did it get that name? When?

5. What do you like most about this neighborhood?

6. What do you like least?

7. Have you ever noticed any evidence of cliques or clannishness?

8. How long have you lived here?

9. Where did you live before moving here? How long have you lived in the Valley?

10. Where did you go to school? (level)

11. Did your (husband-wife) attend school there too? If not where, and to what level?

12. Do you have any children? Ages? Where do (did-will) they attend school?

13. What school athletic team do you boost for?
14. What town (or place) do you do most of your shopping?

15. Do you belong to any civic or fraternal organizations? What? Where?

16. Does your (husband-wife) belong to any auxiliaries? What? Where?

17. Where do you attend church? How often?

18. (If applicable) Of these organizations, which ones do your closest friends belong to?

19. What neighborhood do they live in? (Each one)

20. With whom do you visit most frequently? Where do they live?

21. Do you have any relatives living near here? What is their relationship to you?

22. How many people are on your telephone party line? How often do you visit on the phone? (Specifically)

23. Do you exchange help or tools with any of your neighbors?

24. Would you feel an obligation to attend any of your neighbors' funerals if something happened to them? Whom else's would you attend?

25. Who could you count on for mutual aid?

26. Would you classify yourself as a full-time farmer? If not, what are the other occupations?
27. Do you own or rent your home?

28. What is your name?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Location</th>
<th>B. Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In this space was drawn a small map that was used to locate the residence on a larger master map of Ravalli County.)</td>
<td>(This space was used to write in any other data about the interviewees. Opinions, significant remarks about life, neighbors, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>