ABSTRACT. Two studies of contradictory results concerning models of community attachment are briefly reviewed, one of which reported strong support for a 'systemic' model while the other placed greater emphasis on the relationship of size of place with attachment. Using data from 27 communities located in Iowa, measures used in both studies are replicated to the extent possible. Length of residence, age, and local social ties, important elements in the 'systemic' model of community attachment, are more strongly related to attachment than is size of place in this restudy.

Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) described two models of community attachment in mass society – the linear-development model and the systemic model. Both were based on the work of pioneering social scientists. The linear-development model was constructed from the work of Toennies (1887) and Wirth (1938). Kasarda and Janowitz (1974, p. 328) labeled this the linear-development model “because linear increases in the population size and density of human communities are assumed to be the primary exogenous factors influencing patterns of social behavior”. Toennies' predicted societal transformation from gemeinschaft to gesellschaft plus Wirth's suggestion of weakening kinship bonds and stress on secondary rather than primary contacts led to the prediction of decreased emphasis on the social importance of the local community. But Kasarda and Janowitz noted that there have been numerous studies that have refuted these notions. Thus they hypothesized that the two key variables in the linear-development model, population size and population density, would not be significantly related to community attachment.

The systemic model, on the other hand, stressed the importance of length of residence, position in the social structure, and stage in the life cycle in the construction of community attachment. Based on the work of Park and Burgess (1921, 1925) and Thomas (1967), this model allows for the influence of both mass society and of friendship and kinship networks, formal and informal associational ties, and family life on attachment to the local com-
munity. The key variable was thought to be length of residence, although social position (measured by occupation) and stage in the life cycle (measured by age) were suggested to play important roles as well. The implied hypothesis was that these three variables would be significantly related to community attachment.

Using survey data gathered in Great Britain, Kasarda and Janowitz examined the alternative hypotheses and found strong support for the systemic model of community attachment. Length of residence was a significant predictor of each of their three measures of community attachment; occupational class was significantly related only to the degree of interest in local community affairs and age was not associated with any measure to a statistically significant degree. Population density was negatively related to the extent of sorrow expressed about the possibility of leaving the community; that is, those living in more densely settled areas noted less regret about leaving the community if they had to. But population size never was a statistically significant factor; although the relationship was not strong, interest in local affairs increased with population size, which was directly opposite the prediction based on the linear-development model.

Questioning the adequacy of both the theoretical and methodological formulations of the Kasarda and Janowitz study, Buttel et al. (1979) replicated the analysis with data from a statewide survey in Wisconsin. In the work of Buttel et al., population size and age were the most important indicators of community attachment, not length of residence. These results were not surprising to Buttel et al. (1979, p. 477) because they believed that “the social and physical decay occurring in large American cities seemingly should have some effect on the satisfactions with and social attachments to these large urban areas”. In the usual though nonetheless true caveat, Buttel et al. call for further research on community attachment because of the differences between their results and those of Kasarda and Janowitz. This paper replicates the two studies to the extent possible in an attempt to determine the relative importance of the linear-development and systemic models of community attachment.

I. PROCEDURES

Data to examine the two models are available from a study of 27 communities conducted in 1975. These communities were selected from a six-county