

Pre-Adult Orientations  
to  
Multiple Systems of Government

**Institute for Social Research  
Library**

by  
M. Kent Jennings  
University of Michigan

Prepared for the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists

April, 1966

## Pre-adult Orientations to Multiple Systems of Government\*

In his classic "Rovere" study, Robert Merton applied the terms cosmopolitans and locals to two distinctive clusters of local influentials.<sup>1</sup> While both sets were influential at the community level, the cosmopolitans were oriented toward the affairs of the larger world in addition to or even more so than toward the community. The locals, on the other hand, were almost exclusively oriented to the community and its affairs. Concomitants of these orientations were differences in the structure of social relations, avenues to influence, utilization of status for the exercise of influence, communication behavior, and other life-style variations.

Other community studies, also focusing primarily on elites, likewise uncovered some political actors with rather narrow, parochial perspectives while other participants looked outward as well as inward. One study specifically confronted a set of activists and nonactivists with the task of acknowledging their interest in problems at the national, state, and local levels, and how much attention they paid to problems at these levels.<sup>2</sup> Compared with the nonactivists, the activists showed more interest in and attention to local problems. The saliency of national and local affairs was rather well-divided among nonactivists. Neither grouping evinced much concern about state problems.

Two additional investigations attempted to operationalize Merton's conceptions and to place cross sectional samples along a local-cosmopolitan continuum. In one instance villagers were shown to be considerably more local than were suburbanites in the same community. These differences were not strongly affected by socio-economic and political ideology variations.<sup>3</sup> A second study indicated that even in the context of metropolitan problems the cosmopolitans were likely to take stands reflecting their greater concern about and identification with larger socio-political units than were the locals.<sup>4</sup>

These and other findings suggest that an important strain of the individual's outlook on political life may be encapsulated by the differential salience of public affairs at varied levels. In addition, the notion of differential salience has considerable intuitive appeal. Without knowing exactly why, perhaps, we expect the "locals" to differ from the "cosmopolitans." William Dobriner has suggested that the local-cosmopolitan types spring from the internalization of divergent modes of social relationships.<sup>5</sup> And Thomas Dye has added that such orientations may serve a reality testing function, a social adjustment function, or may serve basic personality characteristics such as ethnocentrism.<sup>6</sup> In short, we expect cosmopolitans and locals to arrange their political worlds differently and to filter incoming stimuli differently. While the polar types may be intuitively well-understood, we are less sure about people occupying positions between the two.

Such considerations lead us to search more systematically for the existence of such orientations and for the wellsprings of these orientations. Recent research on the political socialization of children indicates

that as the child matures he gains the power to discriminate between governmental and nongovernmental objects.<sup>7</sup> It would follow that his cognitive development also leads to a distinction between and among various political systems and governmental levels. As the child moves through the pre-adult years he is confronted with a barrage of stimuli, both direct and indirect, which are specific to given levels of politics. These occur first in the home and other primary group settings. The inputs increase dramatically with the child's entrance into the educational system, at which point there commences a long series of attempts to impart cognitive as well as affective orientations to the political order. From the pledge of allegiance and the early social studies units on helpers in the community, to heavy doses of American (and lesser amounts of state) political history and government, on through examples of world conflicts and accommodations the student is exposed to the idea that there are different domains, scopes, or levels of government and politics.

The developing child, then, not only confronts a situation in which political phenomena vie with other phenomena for a slice of his cognitions and feelings; he also faces a situation in which various components of the political process "compete with" each other for his interests, loyalties, and learning. A portion of this baggage, we are arguing, includes stimuli having to do with multiple levels of government and politics. These levels are most commonly derived from the tripartite divisions of American federalism--local, state, and national levels--plus the fourth level of international politics. It will be observed that this step-like gradation encompasses a dimension of scope or domain. Each level envelops

successively wider domains of geo-political space. This is a property which we shall eventually utilize in constructing a model of multi-level orientations.

Objects in these domains are clearly not recognized as level-specific by the young child, but there is little reason to doubt that in time he begins to distinguish politics and public affairs according to disparate geo-political domains. Obviously, this does not mean that individuals develop to the point where they automatically link given political offices, institutions, or events with their "correct" system levels. However, the cognitive mapping does allow for differentiation according to such common sense terms as community affairs, state politics, national events, world news, and the like. To anticipate our data in this respect, we may note that national samples of high school seniors, parents, and social studies teachers encountered little difficulty in differentiating among these levels in the context of personal interviews and paper-pencil questionnaires.

If pre-adults ~~do~~ do distinguish among multiple systems, we may raise further questions about these orientations. This paper deals with the interest-orderings of multiple levels for the pre-adult; how these interest-orderings are organized in psychological space; their mesh with related behavioral data and other forms of multi-level orientations; and the question of their dynamics. We shall be only marginally concerned with the sources of these orientations.

Pre-adult Interest Orderings Among Multiple Levels of Public Affairs

The data to be utilized are drawn from the Survey Research Center's study of political socialization among high school seniors. During the spring of 1965 interviews were held with a national probability sample of 1669 seniors, distributed among 97 secondary schools (public and nonpublic in due proportions).<sup>8</sup> Schools were selected with a probability proportionate to the estimated size of their senior classes. Within each school, from 15-21 randomly designated seniors were interviewed, with a response rate of 97%. In principle the number of designated seniors at each school should have been constant, i.e., the sample should have been self-weighting. Due to the unavailability of complete prior information on senior class sizes, however, inaccurate estimates of size occurred. The 15-21 range reflects an attempt to compensate for these misestimates. Further compensations were made by the application of weights during the analysis. The weighted N is 2062; all data reported herein stem from this weighted N.

Using high school seniors as our subjects will prove particularly useful for examining pre-adult orientations to multiple systems. Completing high school marks--for most individuals--the conclusion of conscious, concentrated efforts directed toward their civic education. Education, the home, and other pre-adult conditioning effects are virtually completed, and this marks a significant juncture at which to evaluate their consequences. This is probably especially so with respect to cognitive development. While there is persuasive evidence that the child's affective orientation to the political system develops early and positively with only moderate diminution as he matures,<sup>9</sup> it appears that his ability and skills for processing

political stimuli expand remarkably during the adolescent years. As Adelson and O'Neil found, adolescence witnesses an increasing grasp about the nature and needs of a political community, an absorption of knowledge and consensus reflecting the internalization of adult perspectives, and the growth of cognitive capacities--the ability to reason and weigh differential outcomes.<sup>10</sup> At the same time, the high school senior has been little conditioned by adult-like involvement in political concerns and this means we may examine his orientations to different levels of politics without the possible contaminating effects of adult socialization.

Ascertaining the interest orderings of the seniors with respect to multiple levels of politics proceeded in a straightforward fashion. The students were first asked a screening question which attempted to weed out the complete apoliticals on the grounds that their interest orderings would be essentially random and devoid of much cognitive structure.

The screening question read:

Some people seem to think about what's going on in government most of the time, whether there's an election on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?

Students opting for the latter alternative, some 2% of the sample, were then omitted from the following sequence which elicited basic rank order data:

Which one do you follow most closely--international affairs, national affairs, state affairs, or local affairs?

Then:

Which one do you follow least [ interviewer reads the three remaining levels ] ?

Finally:

Of the other two--[interviewer reads the two remaining levels] --which one do you follow most closely?

With the first, second, and fourth ranks thus determined, the residual level occupies the third rank.

We may first inspect two types of aggregate profiles resulting from these orderings. The first consists of the proportions assigning given ranks to each of the four levels. A perusal of Table 1 leaves little doubt that international and national affairs loom larger in the attention frames

Table 1

Rank Order Distributions on Saliency of  
Governmental Affairs at Four Levels

Rank of how closely followed	Level of Affairs					
	Inter- national	National	State	Local		N <sup>a</sup>
First	39%	44	6	11	100%	(1942)
Second	26%	38	18	18	100%	(1847)
Third	16%	14	45	25	100%	(1890)
Fourth	19%	3	32	46	100%	(1948)

<sup>a</sup>The N varies somewhat for each ranking because of tied ranks and missing information.

of the students than do state and local matters. The upper-left quadrant--consisting of first and second ranks for international and national affairs--is heavily populated. Similarly, the lower-right quadrant--encompassing third and fourth choices for state and local affairs is also rather dense.



In the aggregate ~~the~~ the students lean much more toward the larger systems and higher levels than toward smaller systems and lower levels, more toward a cosmopolitan rather than a provincial orientation.

Another way of approaching the gross distributions of interest orderings is to lay out the various patterns of rank orders. Ideally, a complete ordering should have been achieved for each student. In practice 7% of the students would not or could not discriminate among two or three of the levels so that tied ranks and incomplete sets of information sometimes appeared. Not surprisingly, the aberrations from complete orderings are generated most often by the inability of the student to handle the interior ranks (2nd and 3rd). These departures, while bothersome, are infrequent enough to warrant their deletion from further analysis.

With four stimuli to rank, the possible number of patterns is  $4! = 24$ . All 24 patterns are represented by the students' orderings, but it is reassuring to observe that some patterns account for much more of the total than do others (Table 2). Indeed, the one-third most frequently utilized account for three-fourths of all orderings. This suggests that there is at least some moderate consensus on the manner in which multiple levels of government are ordered in terms of their saliency.

An additional comment may be made about these orderings. Nearly one-fourth of the students order their interest in direct correspondence to the step-like, geo-political domain dimension. This has its most dramatic form in the international-national-state-local order (I N S L), a pattern which satisfies about one-fifth of the students. A smaller fraction (3%) have the same ordering, except in reverse: local-state-national-international (L S N I). This pair represents what might be termed ideal polar types

Table 2

Distribution of Orderings Generated by  
Student Rankings of How Closely Four  
Levels of Public Affairs Are Followed

<u>Ordering</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Ordering</u>	<u>Percent</u>
I N S L	20.6	L I N S	1.8
N I S L	14.6	S L N I	1.8
I N L S	10.3	S N I L	1.8
N I L S	8.1	L N I S	1.6
N L I S	6.3	S N L I	1.4
N L S I	5.5	L S I N	1.0
N S I L	5.1	I S L N	.8
N S L I	4.2	S I N L	.6
I L N S	3.7	L I S N	.6
L S N I	3.4	I L S N	.5
I S N L	3.0	S L I N	.4
L N S I	2.7	S I L N	.2
Total = 100%			
(N = 1837)			

<sup>a</sup>I=International affairs; N=national affairs; S=state affairs;  
L=local affairs. Orderings are in the direction of most  
followed to least followed.

along the domain or scope dimension, with the I N S L ordering being the most cosmopolitan and outward looking whereas the L S N I ordering is the most provincial and inward looking. That this pair accommodates approximately one-fourth of the complete orders indicates that the anchor points for a cosmopolitan-local continuum are well-populated, a condition not necessary for pursuing our search but one which is nevertheless encouraging.

#### Unidimensionality of Interest Orderings

Although useful for some purposes, the raw rank orderings do not reveal much in terms of the spatial properties of the students' preference of interest orderings. If we assume, as we have, that the orderings I N S L and L S N I bound a useful continuum of level saliency, we are at the genesis of a model which does hint at spatial properties. What we now desire is a method which will enable us to locate the students' orderings in a psychological space running from the I N S L pattern at one extreme to the L S N I pattern at the other. Implicit here is the assumption that the interest preferences may be described by a unidimensional scale. The task, then, is to assay if unidimensionality does exist, and if so, to properly locate the orderings along this scale.

Aptly suited for testing the dimensionality of preference order data is the unfolding technique developed by Clyde Coombs.<sup>11</sup> The unfolding technique is an algorithm for a theory of preference of choice behavior which, in turn, rests on the assumption that preference orderings derive from ideal points in a psychological space. Each individual and each alternative or stimuli may be represented by a point in n-dimensional space. The ideal point for an individual represents the best possible

alternative from his perspective. Coombs explains the algorithm by saying that

Each individual and each stimulus may be represented by a point on a common dimension called a J scale, and each individual's preference ordering of the stimuli from most to least preferred corresponds to the rank order of the absolute distances of the stimulus points from the ideal point, the nearest being the most preferred. The individual's preference ordering is called an I scale and may be thought of as the J scale folded at the ideal point with only the rank order of the stimuli given in order of increasing distance from the ideal point. . . . The data consist of a set of I scales from a number of individuals, and the analytical problem is how to unfold these I scales to recover the J scale.<sup>12</sup>

On any given J scale there will be a midpoint between each pair of stimuli or alternatives, and these midpoints establish segments (I scales) on the J scale. In the case where  $N=4$ , i.e., where 4 alternatives are to be ranked, the resulting J scale(s) will have 6 midpoints  $\binom{4}{2}$  and 7 segments. Individuals holding similar ideals will lie in the same segment and hence have the same preference orderings.

Three other characteristics of a proper J scale may be noted. One is that, since any I scale is a folded J scale, there can be two and only two possible end points. If  $N=6$ , for example, and these are labeled A, B, C, D, E, and F where A and F represent the end points of the J scale, then all I scales must end in either A or F.<sup>13</sup> Another characteristic of a J scale is that the set of I scales comprising it must contain only one set of mirror image orderings, and these are the I scales which indicate the rank ordering of the stimuli on the J scale. Finally, J scales may be recovered at an ordinal level--known as a qualitative J scale--or at an ordered metric level--called a quantitative J scale.

We can now turn to the data at hand, which fit the  $N=4$  case. There are, as we have seen, some 24 possible orderings or, in Coombsian terminology, 24 I scales. Since the number of J scales which can be derived from a complete set of I scales is  $n!/2$ , there are 12 possible J scales. The students' orderings of how closely they follow affairs at different levels may now be examined to see if there is a unidimensional structure underlying these rankings. As implied throughout the previous discussion we have an a priori assumption about which set of I scales will unfold to recover a J scale of theoretical and empirical usefulness. Specifically we have postulated a graduated domain J scale whose mirror images would be I N S L and L S N I. Filling in the interior I scales proceeds directly from the requirement that "the I scales in a set are correctly ordered only if in passing from one to the next a pair of adjacent stimuli is reversed in order."<sup>14</sup> A reversed pair means that a midpoint has been crossed on the J scale. This will be clearer if we show the constituent I scales of our postulated J scale of geo-political domain:

<u>I Scale and Interval No.</u>	<u>Interest Ordering</u>
I <sub>1</sub>	I N S L
I <sub>2</sub>	N I S L
I <sub>3</sub>	N S I L
I <sub>4</sub>	N S L I or S N I L
I <sub>5</sub>	S N L I
I <sub>6</sub>	S L N I
I <sub>7</sub>	L S N I

Notice that this J scale conforms to the requirements of only two end points and only one set of mirror image orderings. That we have retained

two orderings for the fourth I scale (N S L I and S N I L) means that neither of these is strictly implied from the logic of the scale; that is, the order of the midpoints or the reversal of adjacent pairs is legitimate in both cases. Hence we have a qualitative J scale containing ordinal, but not ordered metric information.

This J scale, then, represents a continuum running from a spatial location emphasizing the international or cosmopolitan realm of public affairs and politics on through various locations until the exactly reverse position of localist orientation is reached. But let us say for the moment that we had no a priori conceptions. Instead, we shall ask the question of what set of I scales unfold to recover the J scales which best (in terms of numbers) accommodate the preferential interest orderings of the students. It turns out that three of the qualitative J scales satisfy the orderings of more than half of the students. They are listed here in terms of the mirror image I scales which bound, and therefore describe, the respective J scales. The percentages indicate the proportion of student orderings covered by each scale:

J <sub>1</sub>	I N S L--L S N I	53%
J <sub>2</sub>	S I N L--L N I S	64%
J <sub>3</sub>	S N I L--L I N S	66%

The first, of course, is the scope dimension and represents the a priori preferred scale. Somewhat distressing, therefore, is the fact that the other two scales (J<sub>2</sub> and J<sub>3</sub>) actually cover a greater proportion of the orderings. Another disturbing element is that none of the three scales satisfies as high a fraction of the students' orderings as we would

ideally like. One might question whether the differential saliency of government and politics at multiple levels may be explained by a unidimensional latent structure. We shall return to this problem after first dealing with the fact that our preferred scale handles fewer orderings than the other two.

We examined the distributions for the sets of I scales comprising the three respective J scales. Scales  $J_2$  and  $J_3$  have essentially bell-shaped curves with scant values toward the extremities. The high clustering of cases in the middle of these scales suggests ambiguity and lack of discriminatory power on the part of these two scales. On the other hand, scale  $J_1$ --the a priori preferred scale--takes somewhat the form of a gentle J curve with little clustering in the middle. Ordinarily in working with scales, one would prefer this type of distribution to that of scales  $J_2$  and  $J_3$ .

There is another reason for preferring the scope dimension scale ( $J_1$ ). The two higher-coverage scales are not intuitively appealing. The scope or domain dimension scale describes a continuum of easy recognition with internationalism on one end and localism on the other. But the other two, while both possessing localism as one of the end points, have a state level ranking as the other end point, i.e., the first I scale concludes with a local end point and the last I scale finishes with a state end point. The mirror image I scales which bound these two J scales--which are the polar points describing the scales--do not mean much to us conceptually. One would be hard pressed to apply qualitative or analytical tags to these two dimensions without further inquiry.

These two arguments can be buttressed by a third, one which is not contaminated by our perhaps overzealous protection of the geo-political domain scale. We may test our line of reasoning in a preliminary fashion by involving the three J scales in a number of duplicated bivariate relationships. Using the three scales both as independent and dependent variables, a number of tabulations were performed so that we could observe the relative utility of the three scales. Where the J scales were employed as independent variables we used such dependent variables as tolerance of political diversity, feelings about the United Nations, chauvinism, faith and confidence in three levels of American federalism, and the government's concern about public opinion. Relationships involving the J scales as dependent variables utilized such independent variables as region, metropolitanism, length of residence, father's education, and the student's academic program in high school. In no case did the two high-coverage scales yield results of a strong monotonic nature. Their patterns are distinctly curvilinear and make little sense empirically or logically in terms of scale properties. The preferred but less inclusive J scale proved far superior on this score, with common results of rather smoothly flowing positive and negative relationships.

As with any scaling method, the unfolding technique does not automatically yield an analytical and conceptual interpretation of the phenomena used to generate the scale. In the present instance we have determined that of three J scales incorporating the preference of interest orderings of more than half of the students it is the least enveloping scale which has the greatest conceptual and empirical sharpness. The ability of this scale to satisfy only slightly over one-half of the



students' orderings, although disappointing in some respects, should be placed in perspective. Affairs of the body politic are notorious for their multidimensional nature. A number of variables other than the geopolitical space encompassed (and what this may imply) may reasonably impinge upon the differential saliency of the four governmental levels. That a unidimensional spatial model based only on the domain factor actually accommodates a majority of the students' preferential orderings,<sup>15</sup> and that this configuration appears to resonate well with other meaningful variables are not insignificant results. And, at the very least, the unfolding technique has provided a useful propaedeutic to the study of political cosmopolitanism and localism among pre-adults.

#### Constructing a Scale of Cosmopolitanism

We still face the fact, however, that the preferred scale satisfies only 53% of the students. Coombs says that the unfolding technique will nearly always leave some orderings unaccounted for and that accommodating a good majority of cases is the typical experience when trying to fit an a priori unidimensional J scale. But for many purposes, and certainly for present ones, accommodating only a slight majority will not suffice for a further probing of system-level saliency among high school seniors.

Two avenues are open for resolving the problem. One is to move from a unidimensional to a multidimensional model, again employing the unfolding technique.<sup>16</sup> If our primary interest lay in the psychology of preference behavior, and if the other dimensions were readily apparent, this would be a suitable option. Neither of these contingencies exists.

A second alternative is suggested by our concern with the conception of orientations to politics and public affairs being ordered along the scope dimension. The trial employment of this dimension, as embodied in its J scale form, lent credence to our a priori hunches about its utility. Therefore, a second option lies in modifying or relaxing the requirements of the unfolding technique, while still retaining the valuable information yielded by the procedure. In other words, having permitted the technique to do as much work as possible, can we now layer on the other orderings which do not comprise I scales on this particular J scale? It should be made clear that, having committed ourselves to this departure from the unfolding technique, we will no longer be justified in speaking of a true unidimensional scale in the Coombsian sense. We can strive, however, to retain the ordinal properties of the scale and to capitalize on the basic unidimensional framework of the method.

The most straightforward way of assigning the remaining I scales (16 in number) is to examine their orders and allocate them to previously existing positions. Inasmuch as the selection of a set of I scales satisfying a common J scale proceeds on the basis of adjacent pair reversals (moving across midpoints on the J scale line), we shall take advantage of this criterion as a way of accommodating the remaining I scales. Two positions on the original scale shall be uncontaminated by further layerings. These are the mirror image pairs constituting the polar types--the "pure" international type (ordering I N S L) and the "pure" local type (ordering L S N I). The other five locations on the original J scale will then serve as hosts for the remaining I scales.

Each of these remaining orderings was assigned a position by comparing its structure with the scalable patterns and with nonscalar patterns previously assigned a position. In most instances relying on the logic of the scale and the rule of adjacent pair reversals made this task straightforward. An unallocated I scale could only reasonably fit two locations on the existing J scale, and the decision lay in determining which it approximated more closely. The assignments made do resemble the original J scale in that a change of one position occurs with the reversal of two alternatives. The alternatives reversed are in the same location in the original and assigned I scales. Listed below are the original constituents of the geo-political domain scale and the orderings assigned:

<u>Original I Scales</u>		<u>Assigned I Scales</u>
I N S L		none
N I S L	←	I N L S; N I L S
N S I L	←	I S N L; I L N S; N L I S
N S I L; S N I L	←	I S L N; I L S N; N L S I; L N I S; L I N S; S I N L
S N L I	←	L N S I; L I S N; S I L N
S L N I	←	L S I N; S L I N
L S N I		none

These assignments, while rather impeccable in a logical sense, may fail to have an equally defensible empirical analogue. The goodness of fit between the original scale position values and those assigned was ascertained through rank order comparisons in two ways. First, comparisons were made between selected values of the five locations on the original scale (the two polar locations being omitted because they received no additional layerings) and the values of the assigned orderings at the five

respective locations, where the values represent rank orders derived from a number of bivariate relationships selected for the comparison. Eleven variables which had produced linear-like relationships with the original J scale positions were utilized. The rank order correlation coefficients (Spearman's rho) between the values obtained from the original locations and from the orderings labeled for assignment to the respective original locations ranged from .40 to 1.0, with the average being .66.

A second mode of comparison lay in taking selected values of the full complement of orderings (I scales) on the original J scale and comparing these with the same values for the full complement of orderings on this same scale after assignments had been made. On the same eleven variables used for the correlations noted above, rank order coefficients were generated with a range of .54 to 1.0 and an average of .87. Coefficients of the sizes produced by these two exercises indicate that there is a reasonably good fit between the original and assigned orderings on the scale. We can say, with some confidence, that the new arrangement of interest orderings harbors much of the ordinal property and at least some of the spatial characteristic of the original J scale.

Despite its departures from the unfolding technique, the new arrangement will be referred to as the cosmopolitanism scale. Like the original J scale this scale locates individuals and their orderings according to the degree to which they are oriented toward successively narrower domains of political phenomena, ranging from international affairs at one extreme on through gradations to local affairs at the other, from the most cosmopolitan to the most parochial. The resulting distribution of scores on

the scale is as follows:

	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
(Most cosmopolitan or least local)	1	21	
	2	33	
	3	18	
	4	17	
	5	5	
	6	3	
(Most local or least cosmopolitan)	7	3	
		<hr/> 100	(N = 1837)

Like the aggregate rankings presented in Table 1 (supra), the scale values reflect a skewness toward the cosmopolitan end of the continuum. A more desirable shape could be forced on the data, but that would vitiate even further the natural properties of the original spatial model.

#### Knowledge, Discourse, and Politicization

Before discussing some behavioral and attitudinal concomitants of system-level orientation, it should be emphasized that the cosmopolitanism scale makes no assumptions about the individual's affective or evaluative orientations to politics. It simply locates the student on a continuum in terms of how his focus on public affairs is ordered according to levels of geo-political domains. Students at the extreme cosmopolitan end, for example, could just as well be internationalists involved in the peace movement or jingoistic Americans ready to drop the bomb. What they have in common is simply a preference ordering placing affairs of the wider world ahead of the more local environment. Similarly, students at the

non-cosmopolitan extreme could be confirmed cynics about local politicians or strong supporters of their local leaders. In this respect, our measure of cosmopolitanism differs markedly from other efforts wherein affective ties (particularly to the community) were tapped in order to classify people.<sup>17</sup>

One of the first tasks we have in plumbing the character of the cosmopolitan-local dimension is to look for behavior which will confirm or deny the proposition that, for example, the more cosmopolitan the student is the more attuned he is to political phenomena of wider domains. Now it is not an absolute contingency that cosmopolitans demonstrate more knowledge about and awareness of world affairs than do locals, but if the reverse were the case we would begin to question the validity of the students' responses or the measuring instrument.

One informational "test" of validity lies in taking the students' responses to two objective questions about historical events and personalities. One of these read: "During World War II, which nation had a great many concentration camps for Jews?" Some 83% of the students correctly identified Germany as the country, 3% named some other country, and 13% indicated they did not know the answer. We may take these answers and assign them ranks of 1, 2, and 3, respectively, with 1 indicating high (or correct) knowledge, and 3 low (or no) knowledge. The gamma coefficient of .38 between these rankings and the cosmopolitan scale ranking indicates that the more cosmopolitan the student is, the more likely he is to give correct information about this particular world affairs event. It might be expected that this relationship would not hold with some other variables controlled, especially general interest in public affairs and the students'

grade average. However, as the first column of the two-column groupings in Table 3 shows, the gammas remain fairly high throughout.<sup>18</sup>

Table 3

Relationship Between Cosmopolitanism and Correct Identification  
of Two World Affairs Events and Personalities<sup>a</sup>

Interest in Public Affairs <sup>b</sup>			Grade Average		
Low	.28	.19	F, D	.37	-.04
Medium	.28	.36	C	.38	.33
High	.47	.28	B	.34	.35
			A	.34	.36

<sup>a</sup> Germany as the scene of concentration camps (first column) and Tito as leader of Yugoslavia (second column).

<sup>b</sup> The original response categories to the question about following government and public affairs (see p. 6 for the wording) were "only now and then," "some of the time," and, "most of the time." "Low," "medium," and "high" have been introduced as more convenient terms.

Another objective question has a more contemporary tone. The students were asked to connect Marshall Tito with his appropriate country. Yugoslavia was correctly mentioned by 27% of students, while 18% named some other country, and 55% confessed ignorance. Again scoring the students 1, 2, and 3 for these respective answers, we may then cross tabulate these rank order data with the cosmopolitan-local rankings. The gamma of .35 reaffirms that the more cosmopolitan the student the more he is likely to know about a particular bit of world affairs. And, as the second column of the two-column pairs in Table 3 demonstrates, this relationship holds when the

general interest levels and student grade averages are examined separately. Only in the case of the D, F students does the substantial positive correlation vanish.

If knowledge scores resonate well with cosmopolitanism, interest in specific activities should also. One inquiry had to do with the United Nations. A screening question ran like this:

Some people say that the United States should get out of the United Nations because it's not doing us or the world any good. Others claim that we should stay in the United Nations because it is helpful to us and the world in general. Have you been interested enough in this to favor one side over the other?

Altogether 13% of the students opted out on the question. What is particularly fascinating, however, is that the denials of interest increase dramatically as one moves from the internationalism end of the continuum across to the localism extreme:

Those Expressing No Interest in U.N. Issue, by  
Cosmopolitanism Scale Position

(High)	1	8%
	2	11
	3	18
	4	17
	5	20
	6	39
(Low)	7	54

And regardless of the student's general interest in politics, his grade average, or the educational level of the mother <sup>19</sup> this pattern holds with only minor variations. The less cosmopolitan the student, the less apt he is to care about an issue popularly known as of "keeping the U.N. out of the U.S. and the U.S. out of the U.N." It is worth noting here that on



queries with similar screens about more strictly domestic politics little difference appeared in the "no interest" responses regardless of the cosmopolitanism scale position.

Thus far we have presented evidence indicating that in terms of knowledge and interest, there is a moderately good fit between the students' location on the cosmopolitanism dimension and some independent measures of cognitions. We may use one final example, perhaps the most stringent test. After ascertaining whether the students engaged in political conversations with either adults, friends, or family members,<sup>20</sup> they were asked to give some examples of topics recently discussed. One way of viewing the answers was to determine the level of politics to which the student was referring. (Many responses could not be handled this way.) Answers were coded in terms of whether the topic lay in international, national, state, or local domains. For present purposes we may treat these references as ordinal data (in the order given), and compare them with the cosmopolitanism scale.

In view of the greater amount of attention given world and national events in the mass media, the resulting gamma coefficient of .26 may be interpreted as a moderately good indication of articulation between the two measures. The relationships hold when prime control variables are introduced. For example, according to grade average the coefficients are:

"A" students	.43
"B" students	.30
"C" students	.20
"D, F" students	.35

It appears ~~that~~ that our measure of system-level orientation to public affairs has moderate to strong support in the behavior of the students. The

more the student is oriented to larger domains of public affairs, the more likely he is to have some knowledge about people and events in those domains, to be interested in specific things transpiring there, and to tailor his political discourse to topics at those levels. The reverse applies too, of course.

We may now proceed to ask a number of other questions about the characteristics of the students occupying positions along the cosmopolitan-local continuum. One question of immediate interest is whether there is a relationship between system-level saliency and the student's general interest in politics. That is, do students with a greater interest in public affairs generate more of a cosmopolitan or local orientation. Or, conversely, are students with cosmopolitan orientations more likely to be greater or lesser consumers of political fare. What we are intent on doing here is describing a relationship or association rather than positing either one of the two variables as antecedent to the other.

The data contained in Table 4 indicate that there is a generally positive relationship between the two. The contrasts are most vivid between those with high and low interest in public affairs and between those toward the extremes of the cosmopolitanism scale. In general, the more cosmopolitan the student, the more closely he pays attention to public affairs writ large; and the closer attention he pays to public affairs the more likely he is to be a cosmopolitan rather than a local : Politicization and cosmopolitanism occur in tandem.

Why this should be is not immediately apparent. However, it may be that the student with a high interest in public affairs is inherently more

Table 4

Relationship Between Cosmopolitanism  
and Interest in Public Affairs  
(Percentaged in Both Directions)

<u>Cosmopolitanism</u> <u>Scale Position</u>		<u>Interest in Public Affairs</u>				<u>N</u>
		<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>		
(High)	1	49%	43	8	100%	(382)
	2	46%	42	12	100%	(608)
	3	44%	41	15	100%	(328)
	4	35%	48	16	99%	(305)
	5	19%	52	28	99%	(92)
	6	16%	48	36	100%	(60)
(Low)	7	12%	45	43	100%	(63)

<u>Cosmopolitanism</u> <u>Scale Position</u>		<u>Interest in Public Affairs</u>				
		<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>		
(High)	1	25%	20%	11%		
	2	37	32	26		
	3	19	17	18		
	4	14	18	18		
	5	2	6	9		
	6	1	4	8		
(Low)	7	1	4	10		
		99%	101%	100%		
N =		(754)	(805)	(278)		

gamma = .26

concerned about the scope and magnitude of public actions--scope and magnitude in terms of the numbers of people affected and the degree to which they are affected. He invests his time resources in those spheres which, most people would agree, are the most consequential. For the student not so concerned with public affairs, attention may be directed to less encompassing domains for other reasons. Politics may be more of a spectator sport for the episodic consumer and, this being the case, residing in the same physical orbit as the game and the players may induce the higher saliency of provincial politics. The more abstract and distant conduct of politics are filtered out because of their non-immediacy and their non-tangential relationship to the student's everyday experiences.

Viewing the mutual association from the other direction, it might be argued that the student's interest in the more cosmopolitan side of public affairs increases or abets his general interest in politics. The stakes, glamour, and complexities of larger-domain politics probably generate more interest and concern than do the less consequential and less glamorous happenings of provincial politics. We suspect that a reciprocal relationship exists here. Greater general interest encourages the student to look beyond his local domain because the local domain is one of limited richness. The richness of larger domains, in turn, serves to hold or elevate the student's general interest in public affairs.

That both degree of cosmopolitanism and the general saliency of governmental affairs may be affected by common factors acting on both is quite likely. That is, the association may be spurious, even though descriptively useful. Although we are not particularly concerned with sorting out causative forces at this moment, it will be instructive to examine the relationship

between the two dimensions with at least one other crucial variable controlled. Let us take mother's educational level once more as a summary variable. The positive relationships remain at each of four educational levels. While this does little to explicate the association, it does suggest that the relationship has a vitality independent of differential home environments. Significantly, however, the relationship declines as parental education increases, the gammas being .38 (elementary), .26 (some high school), .21 (high school graduate), and .18 (some college or more). Thus it seems likely that parental education--or, rather, what the concomitants of this are--does affect, in undefined ways, the linkage between general political interest and system-level saliency.

#### Evaluations of Multiple Systems

Other orientations to different domains of public affairs can also be explored using, as a reference point, the student's degree of cosmopolitanism. Let us begin with the question of whether cosmopolitanism has its counterpart in affective orientations. Does a tendency to look outward to successively broader dimensions of politics bring with it the tendency to evaluate the more encompassing political systems in a more favorable light? Is the pre-adult who is more sensitized to the more localized arena of politics

imbued with high affect toward the capabilities of these systems rather than of larger ones? Alternatively, even though the child's socialization has resulted in, say, a more cosmopolitan than local orientation, does this necessarily mean that corresponding system-level loyalties are involved? Degree of cosmopolitanism, defined only as the pre-adult's ordering of multi-level saliency, may carry with it no differential attachment or estrangement to multi-level systems.

To gain some insight into this relationship, we ascertained the rank ordering of faith and confidence in the three levels of American federalism. Unfortunately for our purposes, there is no international level of government, per se. The line of questioning went like this:

We find that people differ in how much faith and confidence they have in various levels of government in this country. In your case, do you have more faith and confidence in the national government, the government of this state, or in the local government around here?

Overall, the students evinced remarkably more trust in the national government than in the state and local, as these figures reveal:

<u>Most Faith and Confidence in</u>	
National government	79%
State government	11
Local government	6
Combination of two	
or three	2
Other, miscellaneous	2
	<hr/>
	100% (N = 2062) <sup>21</sup>

For the present, we shall discard that minority of students not selecting one of the three as their preferred level. Taking those who selected one of the three levels, we may now examine the faith and confidence rankings in relationship to the cosmopolitanism scale. The percentages displayed

in Table 5 and the summary statistic of a .45 gamma demonstrate a profound tendency for saliency structure to be associated with affective orientations.

Table 5

Relationship Between Cosmopolitanism and Faith  
and Confidence in Three Levels of Government

Cosmopolitanism Scale Position		<u>Most Faith In</u>			N	<u>Least Faith In</u>			N
		National	State	Local		National	State	Local	
(High)	1	93%	7%	0% <sup>a</sup>	(373)	3%	15%	82%	(344) <sup>b</sup>
	2	87	9	4	(596)	6	20	73	(554)
	3	85	8	7	(318)	6	23	71	(287)
	4	77	16	7	(297)	8	22	70	(270)
	5	76	16	8	(86)	11	20	69	(74)
	6	41	46	13	(57)	50	7	42	(51)
(Low)	7	34	34	31	(63)	40	17	43	(56)
gamma = .45					gamma = -.26				

<sup>a</sup>Less than 1/2%.

<sup>b</sup>The N's run slightly less in this column because fewer students declared they had least faith and confidence in any given level.

Thus the more one is oriented to the public affairs of given system-levels the more likely he is to imbue levels in that range as more deserving of his trust.

Given the high correlation between expression of cosmopolitanism and more trust in higher-level governmental systems, it would be surprising if the reverse were not also true. That is, attributions of least faith and confidence by level should be negatively associated with cosmopolitanism.

The more cosmopolitan the student, the less confidence he will have in lower levels of government and, by the same token, the less cosmopolitan the student the less confidence he will have in higher levels of government.

Evidence along this line may be adduced from the responses to a succeeding question which asked the student to indicate in which level of government he had the least faith and confidence. The overall results are something of a reverse image of the answers having to do with most faith and confidence. Local government emerges as the clear winner for least trust votes:

Least Faith and Confidence in

National government	8%
State government	17
Local government	63
None, neither	5
Other, miscellaneous	7
	<hr/>
	100% (N = 2062)

Again, removing the fraction of students not selecting one of the three levels, we may examine the relationship between level saliency (cosmopolitanism) and level faith and confidence. The cross-tabulation bears out the supposition (Table 5). Although the overall gamma of  $-.26$  is not as strong as that obtained for the "most confidence" replies, there is little doubt that cosmopolitanism is inversely related to lack of confidence in higher levels of government. Or, to state it the other way, cosmopolitanism is positively related to lack of trust in lower levels of government.

These relationships hold when the students are allocated according to three variables having summary properties, as the gamma coefficients in Table 6 reveal. While all the gammas show substantial associations, it is



apparent that students for whom politics in general has low salience, those with mothers of low educational levels, and those with lower grade averages tend to be most affected by their cosmopolitan-local orientation. In the absence of other factors ordering their affective orientations, students in these subgroupings seem particularly likely to place their trust in the levels to which they pay most attention. Another way of viewing this is to say that these students take a more standardized view of political systems.

Table 6

Relationship Between Cosmopolitanism and Most and Least Faith and Confidence in Three Levels of Government, by Three Groupings<sup>a</sup>

<u>Interest in Public Affairs</u>			<u>Mother's Education</u>			<u>Grade Average</u>		
	<u>Most Faith</u>	<u>Least Faith</u>		<u>Most Faith</u>	<u>Least Faith</u>		<u>Most Faith</u>	<u>Least Faith</u>
Low	.60	-.34	Elementary	.62	-.43	F, D	.61	-.51
Medium	.47	-.29	Some H.S.	.42	-.30	C	.49	-.29
High	.34	-.25	H.S. grad.	.43	-.24	B	.40	-.23
			College	.40	-.23	A	.24	-.20

<sup>a</sup>The three levels are national, state, and local. For ordinal purposes they were scored "1," "2," "3," respectively. Thus, the minus signs in the "least faith" column mean there is a negative association between cosmopolitanism and little faith in higher levels of government.

Their saliency and trust orderings are even more bound up with each other than is true for the other students. The likely reason is that differentiation of political phenomena is somewhat more difficult for them. In this sense they

are more consistent than the other students. But the other students are likely to perceive more of the complexities and nuances of the political world. Even though they also exhibit high articulation between saliency and trust orderings, there is less of the simple interchangeability between the two.

The articulation between the pre-adult's interest orientation to a multi-system political world and his differential investment of trust in multi-systems is not without theoretical implications. Having arrived at some symmetry between the two dimensions, the pre-adult is not as likely to be caught up in situations creating dissonance. One can imagine cosmopolitans who are intensely loyal to the local system and have greatest faith and confidence in it. Indeed the data suggest the occasional occurrence of such individuals. Yet this would most likely be a stressful situation for the individual. He would be investing his very limited resources in political domains for which his positive affect was relatively low. Gratification would be meager, except for the perverse individual who relished obtaining more information to confirm his preexisting reservations. With moderately high correspondence between the two sets of orientations, a source of potential conflict between the individual's cognitive and affective structures has been avoided. In ways we cannot yet describe, the child acquires a more or less consistent set of such orientations.

Our discussion has perhaps implied that the spatial structuring of system saliency precedes the development of differential trust orderings. This is primarily an artifact of foremost attention being paid to the concomitants of cosmopolitan-local orientations. It might as easily be inferred that the more faith and confidence one generates in systems encompassing given geo-political domains the more likely he is to devote more attention

to those domains. Indeed, if the faith and confidence rankings are taken as the independent variable and percentaged against the cosmopolitan scale positions the results support that proposition also. The two variables undoubtedly affect each other. Moreover, they almost certainly covary with common elements in the political socialization of the child. Agents acting to produce varying positions on the cosmopolitanism scale also generate roughly comparable positions with respect to structures of faith and confidence.

We may direct the relationship between cosmopolitanism and evaluations of governmental systems to a quite different tack. Inherent in most of the fragmentary work which has been carried out on the question of multi-level orientations is the assumption (sometimes verified by data) that the cosmopolitan is more tolerant of diversity of political forms and, conversely, that the local is less generous. Looking outward to wider domains of geopolitical space as he does, the cosmopolitan would seem more likely to develop greater tolerance simply on the basis of the principle of greater exposure, if for no other reason.<sup>23</sup> True, the jingoist may also order his interests in the direction of wider domains, and such persons are an important fraction of any set of cosmopolitans, adult or pre-adult. But such persons probably constitute a rather small fraction, and will ordinarily be obscured by the more internationalist types in the cosmopolitan end of the continuum.

Unfortunately, we do not possess a wealth of data to test this assumption, but at least one thread of evidence can be presented. The students were confronted with this bald assertion, and asked to agree or disagree with it: "The American system of government is one that all nations should have." The greater the degree of cosmopolitanism the greater the tendency to disagree with the proposition ( $\gamma = .27$ , where disagree is scored "1" and

agreement "2" for computation of the statistic). The more cosmopolitan students, then, are more inclined to tolerate political diversity, while the less cosmopolitan are less open-minded. Chauvinism runs highest among the non-cosmopolitans.

Tolerance of political diversity is likely to be related to other factors, particularly the educational attainment of the student's parents. When this variable and those of general interest in public affairs and grade average are introduced, (Table 7) the relationship continues to hold although there is some fluctuation according to grade average. Since these results

Table 7

Relationship Between Cosmopolitanism and Tolerance of  
System of Government Diversity, by Three Groupings<sup>a</sup>

<u>Interest in Public Affairs</u>		<u>Mother's Education</u>		<u>Grade Average</u>	
Low	.19	Elementary	.28	D, F	.04
Medium	.22	Some H.S.	.27	C	.32
High	.30	H.S. grad.	.20	B	.17
		College	.23	A	.30

<sup>a</sup>The gamma coefficients show the relationship between cosmopolitanism and tolerance within each grouping.

were obtained with but a single item, it would be unwise to generalize prematurely. It appears, however, that there is a connection between what the pre-adult pays attention to and how he cognizes polities other than his own. The more cosmopolitan he is in terms of consumption the more ecumenical his

stance on other forms in the political order.

It is but a small though significant step to the proposition that cosmopolitanism is associated with a general tolerance of diversity in political and social behavior. Again let us rely on rather crude measures to assess this proposition. The data come from two other items offered in the agree-disagree format: 1) "If a person wanted to make a speech in this community against churches and religion, he should be allowed to speak"; and 2) "If a Communist were legally elected to some public office around here, the people should allow him to take office." The responses indicated a mild relationship between cosmopolitanism and a more tolerant reply to each statement. The resulting gammas--.19 and .17, respectively--are not as high as on the prior item about forms of government. Even though they fail to achieve a level strongly supportive of the hypothesis, there is clearly some linkage again between cosmopolitanism and tolerance of social and political diversity.

#### System-Level Orientations, the Life Cycle, and Generational Variations

As stated at the outset, one of the advantages of using high school seniors as the subjects for inquiring into system-level orientations is that they are at a significant juncture in the life cycle. We have seen their proclivity for cosmopolitan rather than localistic orientations, the degree to which the domain or scope continuum--as developed through the unfolding technique--accommodates their differential interest orderings, and some behavioral and attitudinal concomitants of their location on the cosmopolitan-local continuum. No case is being made that these orientations are forever

fixed at this stage. Indeed, one might well expect permutations as the individual encounters a quite different set of stimuli and undergoes further socialization (or resocialization and desocialization) in his progress through the life cycle. Confrontation with the world of realpolitik, new orbits of educational, social, and occupational endeavors, attachments to specific locales, tangible and intangible investments associated with and contingent upon the conditions in certain geo-political domains, and simply the business of everyday living may all work to modify or reinforce the saliency structures held at the immediate pre-adult stage. Chances are these forces result in a net movement toward less, rather than more cosmopolitanism.

An alternative though not necessarily conflicting model of dynamics in system-level orientations springs from the premise of generational variations. Although it is exceedingly difficult to sort out the effects of political aging from true generational differences, there is little doubt that individuals are different because of the varying states of the political system during formative periods of socialization. Turning to the case at hand, for example, the high school seniors--representing a cohort with post-World War II birth dates--have undergone a quite different set of socialization experiences with respect to orientations to political domains than was true of earlier generations. It is commonly assumed that the post-World War II generation is being molded toward a greater awareness of and involvement in larger geo-political domains, not the least reasons being a figuratively shrinking world and the threat of world conflict. In short, one would expect generational changes currently to favor a more cosmopolitan outlook among the young. Both the life cycle and the generational models augur for greater cosmopolitanism among pre-adults than adults.

Some glimpse of the gap between the pre-adult and the adult political citizen may be obtained by taking comparable data from the student sample and a sample drawn from the parents of the students. Parents were randomly designated in such a fashion that two-thirds of the mothers and two-thirds of the fathers should have been interviewed or, to state it another way, one-third of the students were assigned father-only interviews, one-third mother-only, and one-third both mother and father.<sup>24</sup> With appropriate weighting we may treat the parents as a probability cross-sectional sample of parents with high school seniors.<sup>25</sup> That this sample departs in some important ways from a true adult cross-sectional need not overly concern us; but it should be noted that the parent cross-sectional, when compared with a typical adult sample, is more highly educated and has an age distribution which peaks mightily in the 35-55 years of age range.

As with the students, we first sifted out those parents who evinced no interest in government and public affairs. Whereas this segment constituted 2% of the students, it comprised some 7% of the parents. Discarding these apoliticals, we may first note the aggregate rankings of the parents and set these alongside the students'. When this is done (Table 8), it is apparent that the two are by no means a replica of each other. For one thing the parents spread their choices out somewhat more evenly than do the students. For another, and this is represented by the "difference" figures in the table, the parents gravitate much less toward the international and national domains than do the students, but much more toward the state and local domains.

By inspection ~~one would~~ one would estimate that the spatial locations of the parents' choice patterns will reflect an ideal point less oriented to

Rank Order Distributions on Saliency of  
Governmental Affairs at Four Levels,  
for Parents and Students

Rank of how closely followed	Level of Affairs				N <sup>a</sup>	
	Inter- national	National	State	Local		
First						
Parents	23%	44	12	22	100%	(1655)
Students	39%	44	6	11	100%	(1942)
Difference	+16	--	- 6	-11		
Second						
Parents	19%	29	25	27	100%	(1563)
Students	26%	38	18	18	100%	(1847)
Difference	+ 7	+ 9	- 7	- 9		
Third						
Parents	21%	22	37	21	101%	(1575)
Students	16%	14	45	25	100%	(1890)
Difference	- 5	- 8	+ 8	+ 4		
Fourth						
Parents	37%	5	27	31	100%	(1636)
Students	19%	3	32	46	100%	(1948)
Difference	-18	- 2	+ 5	+15		

<sup>a</sup>The N varies somewhat for each ranking because of tied ranks and missing information.



cosmopolitanism than is true of the students. In order to make a precise comparison the parent interest orderings were transformed into cosmopolitan scale position scores in exactly the same fashion as were the students. Interestingly, the preferred qualitative J scale used as the basis for the scale (mirror images of I N S L - L S N I) accommodated 49% of the parents' with complete orderings, compared with a nearly equal figure of 53% for the students. The assignment of the remaining orderings (I scales) duplicated the procedure used for students.

The resulting array on the cosmopolitan scale confirms our speculations about the less cosmopolitan orientation of the parents:

Distributions on the Cosmopolitanism Scale

		Parents	Students
(High)	1	9%	21%
	2	22	33
	3	19	18
	4	24	17
	5	10	5
	6	8	3
(Low)	7	8	3
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		100%	100%
		(N = 1539)	(N = 1837)

The parent scores are not skewed in the severe fashion of the students and there is considerably more flow toward the non-cosmopolitan end of the continuum.

The gross differences between parents and students may result either from discrepancies in the pre-adult socialization of the two or alterations in the adult cohort due to post-adolescent socialization. If the former

holds, then the divergencies are primarily a consequence of generational differences; if the latter applies, the life-cycle explanation would be more suitable. Obviously, both factors could be at work.

It is impossible, short of extensive analysis, to demonstrate which model best explains the parent-student differences. Our initial impression, however, favors the life cycle model. One bit of evidence bolstering the life-cycle interpretation comes from looking at the scale scores of parents according to their educational attainment. Specifically, we shall consider those parents who attained the educational level of our student sample, i.e., high school graduates. Strictly speaking, of course, the high school graduates of a previous time are not the counterparts of contemporary high school graduates because of some very complicated historical and analytical reasons. Nevertheless, they provide the most appropriate adult cohort for purposes of comparison with contemporary high school seniors.

As it turns out, there is but a trace of variation between the distribution for the high school graduate parents and that for the parent sample as a whole. No difference greater than  $\pm 2\%$  separates the scale values of the entire parent sample from that of the high school graduate segment. That is, the striking differences portrayed between the parent cross-section and the student cross-section also hold between parents with high school diplomas and the current crop of diploma recipients. We suspect, therefore, that the experiences of adult citizenship do modify the system-level orientations held at the immediate pre-adult stage.

This is not to say that the pre-adults of today are no more cosmopolitan than were their parents when they were high school seniors. They may well be, especially in view of a shrinking world and--presumably--greater

attention to larger domains of politics in formal and informal socialization processes. In the measure that these conditions do apply, we have some support for the generational hypothesis also. However, even if today's pre-adults begin their adult political lives with a greater degree of cosmopolitan orientations to public affairs than did their parents it seems likely that later processes will set in to erode these orientations.<sup>26</sup>

### Conclusion

In this paper we have been concerned with how the pre-adult cognizes different system-levels of public affairs. On the eve of entry into the adult world of politics, the pre-adult has sorted out some rather basic orientations to a rather complicated set of political systems. We have argued that in terms of psychological space the unidimensional model of geopolitical domain--transformed into the cosmopolitanism scale--is a prime way the pre-adult organizes his orientations to multiple levels. That we were forced to modify this unidimensional interpretation for analytical purposes does not, we feel, seriously lessen the utility of the concept. At the same time, a multi-dimensional interpretation would undoubtedly throw more light on the question of how the pre-adult orients himself to these domains.

We have purposely avoided an inquiry into the shaping of these orientations. But the introduction of three control variables with summary properties--general concern with public affairs, mother's educational level, and student grade average--has in general suggested that these orientations are not simply the surrogate for some other variable. This is particularly

so since each of these three variables was in turn moderately related to cosmopolitanism. Further analysis (not reported in the preceding) indicated that cosmopolitanism differed hardly at all among boys and girls or according to the urbanness of locales. Students in the South proved less cosmopolitan than those in other regions; and the longer the student had resided in his community and in the state the less cosmopolitan were his orientations.<sup>27</sup> These and other associations, while well within the range of statistical and analytical significance, are not of the magnitude to warrant the deduction that the cosmopolitan-local dimension has no life of its own.

Contrary to some other orientations, such as basic commitment to the regime and party identification, the individual's posture toward multiple levels of government is probably subject to considerable fluctuation over the life span.<sup>28</sup> By this we do not mean to gainsay the function of what we think is a relatively firm set of orderings in late adolescence. These orientations help serve as steering and filtering mechanisms as the pre-adult enters adulthood. Out of all the possible political stimuli available he can and will devote his scarce resources to only a meager few, and his preference orderings developed after 18 years of political socialization will presumably help determine these allocations. And, as we have seen, certain other cognitive, affective, and evaluative orientations to politics and multiple systems are likely to accompany these allocations. Nevertheless, as the individual moves through his life space other factors seem likely to intrude upon these postures, as our brief look at the parental data suggests. Determining the relative fixity of these orientations and the permutations they subsequently undergo will contribute to our further comprehension of the citizen's relationship to diverse domains of the political universe.

## FOOTNOTES

\*I wish to acknowledge the advice and assistance of Philip Converse, Richard Niemi, and Michael Traugott.

<sup>1</sup>Robert K. Merton, "Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials," in Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (rev. and enlarged ed.: New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), 387-420.

<sup>2</sup>George Belknap and Ralph Smuckler, "Political Power Relations in a Mid-West City," Public Opinion Quarterly, 20 (Spring, 1956), 73-81. In the same issue see related articles by Robert E. Agger and Vincent Ostrom, "The Political Structure of a Small Community"; Kenneth P. Adler and Davis Bobrow, "Interest and Influence in Foreign Affairs"; and David Riesman, "Orbits of Tolerance, Interviewers and Elites."

<sup>3</sup>William M. Dobriner, "Local and Cosmopolitan as Contemporary Suburban Character Types," in Dobriner (ed.), The Suburban Community (New York: Putnam, 1958), 132-143.

<sup>4</sup>Thomas R. Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics," Social Forces, 41 (March, 1963), 239-246.

<sup>5</sup>Dobriner, op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>6</sup>Dye, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>7</sup>See David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The Child's Image of Government," The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science and Social Science, 361 (September, 1965), 40-57; and Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), Chapt. 4.

<sup>8</sup>Due to 13 initial refusals from the original selection of schools (N=98), 13 additional schools--matched as nearly as possible with refusing schools--were selected as replacements. One of these also declined to cooperate so that the total N of schools is 97.

<sup>9</sup>Greenstein, op. cit., Chapt. 3; David Easton and Robert Hess, "The Child's Political World," The Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6 (August, 1962), 229-246.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Adelson and Robert P. O'Neil, "The Growth of Political Ideas in Adolescence: The Sense of Community," (unpublished paper, 1965).

<sup>11</sup>Clyde Coombs, A Theory of Data (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964).

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>13</sup> Coombs gives an illustration which helps visualize this quality: "If we think of the J scale as a length of string with a series of knots on it corresponding to where the stimuli are, and then if we pick up the J scale and fold it at any point, the knot furthest from the folding point is inevitably one of the end knots on the unfolded J scale. Hence the two end stimuli are known from the fact that all I scales end with one of them." Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> The likelihood of a common qualitative or quantitative J scale occurring by chance is remote, especially for the latter. This is because the probability is a function of the ratio of the number of admissible to the number of possible sets of I scales, which, even in the case of N=4, assumes extremely low values. Ibid., pp. 91-92.

<sup>16</sup> For an example using political data see Philip E. Converse, "The Problem of Party Distances in Models of Voting Change," in M. Kent Jennings and L. Harmon Zeigler (eds.), The Electoral Process (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), 175-207.

<sup>17</sup> Dobriner, op. cit.; and Dye, op. cit.

<sup>18</sup> The gamma association between interest in public affairs and cosmopolitanism is .26; between grade average and cosmopolitanism it is .21.

<sup>19</sup> Mother's educational level will be employed as a major control variable rather than father's because fathers were absent in approximately one-ninth of students' homes. Mother-father educational levels correlate quite highly with each other in any event. The relationship between mother's education and the student's cosmopolitanism is .17.

<sup>20</sup> All but 6% of the students reported having at least some minimal political conversations.

<sup>21</sup> This is the total sample N (weighted), prior to removal of apoliticals and those with incomplete orderings.

<sup>22</sup> See note 20.

<sup>23</sup> At the extreme this would not be true. The sincere advocate of liberal democracy is unlikely to become more tolerant of fascism merely because he is exposed to it.

<sup>24</sup> Due to the fact that there are more single-parent domiciles headed by mothers and due to the incidence of slightly higher response rates among women than men the raw number of mother interviews exceeds father interviews, 1106-886. The overall response among parents was 93%.



<sup>25</sup>Parents were initially assigned the same weights held by their interviewed offspring. For cross-sectional purposes those parents who constitute a mother-father pair, (i.e., where both were designated and both were interviewed) must be given half-weights since only one-half of them would have been selected under the rules employed in the single-parent (family representative) selections. The alternative to half-weighting is sub-sampling among the parent pairs. The virtue of half-weighting lies in a reduced sampling variability. The grand total N for the parents as a cross-section is 1927 (weighted); the number of actual interviews is 1992.

<sup>27</sup>If this is the case for pre-adults, it helps explain why adults are less cosmopolitan than the students. Despite high mobility rates among adults, the majority of these moves still find the individual in the same general area.

<sup>26</sup>One important constant between adult and student orientations is that among both there is a positive relationship to general interest in public affairs, .31 for parents, .26 for students.

<sup>28</sup>Preliminary work with the parent data suggests that the cosmopolitanism scale is also more powerfully related to other political phenomena among adults than among pre-adults.