

THE COSMOPOLITAN LOCAL
A REANALYSIS OF THE CONSTRUCT

Jon Patterson
Westminister College, Pennsylvania

Most typologies of professional workers have followed the uni-dimensional polar cosmopolitan-local model proposed by Alvin Gouldner. This model views the latent role identity of the professional worker as constituted of two mutually exclusive foci, the wider generalized profession on the one hand and the local, situationally specific work setting on the other. A review of the original formulation and subsequent applications of this model, in research, leads to a reformulation of the concepts and an empirical test. The new perspective is that the two latent role-identity types, cosmopolitan and local, are two independent foci or dimensions and hence not intrinsically contradictory as proposed in the previous model.

This perspective logically implies a minimum of four typologies, the two pure forms, the situation where neither of the two orientations is extant, and a mix of the two dimensions reviewed as situationally determined in its character.

Measurement of the dimensions was based upon a five item Likert instrument for each dimension. These items were randomly distributed among 44 other Likert items in an 83 item questionnaire distributed to all full time faculty at three major midwestern universities, and one Canadian university. The average return rate was 59.9% with a usable respondent N of 1949 for the four institutions.

The research design involved predicting the outcomes of submitting responses for the ten items in a pooled format to principle components factor analysis. Because the interaction between the two dimensions was expected to be a consequence of external variables unique to each study site, the data were factor analyzed by site population. It was predicted that the ten measurement items would load on two factors clearly delineating the two dimensions, and that where local unique factors were effective, a third factor would emerge displaying the consequential interactive mix among the items.

The findings were correspondent to the predicted outcome. The first factor, representing the total dimension in each case, exhibited an average loading for all five items and at all four sites of .6425 and accounted for 47.65 percent of the explained variance. The second factor in each instance represented the cosmopolitan dimension and exhibited an average loading of .5020 and accounted for 41.91 percent of the variance explained.

For two of the populations a third factor also emerged constituted of a unique mixture of items in each case and exhibiting average loadings of .4800 and .5500 with a percent of explained variance of 19.03 and 21.73 respectively.

The conclusion drawn from this study is that the reformulation of the two concepts of cosmopolitan and local latent role-identity as independent foci of identity is more isomorphic with reality and hence potentially more useful.

A recurrent theme in social research has been the utilization of typologies as indicators of socio-cultural patterns relevant for social behavior. Such typologies have generally been considered useful either as independent, intermediate or dependent variable concepts, in that they enhance explanatory simplicity and improve the potential for the comparability of findings.

Among studies of professionals in organizational settings, the predominant typology has been that of the cosmopolitan and local, or some variation thereof. In these studies the cosmopolitan type is generally viewed as encompassing those persons who have adopted a personal identity, and internalized implicit role patterns stemming from some generalized milieu external to the immediate work setting (e.g., a profession). The local, constituting an opposite identity type, is viewed as one whose self-identity and implicit role system find its source in and are focused upon the local work setting.

The most recent published critical analysis of the cosmopolitan-local construct is that by Grimes and Berger (1970) which, while it is a much more developed critique is comparable to the research reported here. Rather than simply decrying the unfaithfulness of various researchers to the original formulation of the construct, they, as well as those involved in this research, returned to the original formulation and found it wanting in clarity, isomorphism and validity.

The source of the construct was the analysis by Alvin Gouldner (1957), of data gathered from a small liberal arts college faculty (n=125). The ideas and conceptualizations of his analysis were spawned by Merton's (1949) analysis of city managers in which he proposed that managers tended to exhibit either a cosmopolitan or a local perspective in their work. From Gouldner's speculations concerning academic professionals came the dichotomous or polar conceptualization of latent roles-cosmopolitan and local, which he felt were influential in different ways upon individual behavior in complex organizations. So constructed, the model provided a logically complete, mutually exclusive categorical system of latent role patterns which Gouldner felt would lend itself to the prediction of individual, and through additivity, group responses to setting conditions.

In his initial research Gouldner utilized the Guttman technique of validating unidimensionality of his construct. The logic of this method holds that if a set of indicators or test questions can be arranged to meet the qualifications of a Guttman scale, then unidimensionality can be logically assumed. As his data minimally met the criteria acceptable at that time (the coefficient of reproducibility found was .906), the unidimensionality of the construct was assumed a valid proposition. In a subsequent analysis (Gouldner, 1957: 299) the data were submitted to factor analysis as a procedure for determining the degree of interaction between the two indicator sets. As the two concepts were theoretically polar to each other it was anticipated that the pooled items would emerge from analysis clustered together into at

least two factors in accord with their original formulation, with no interaction between the two factors. The findings from this analysis, together with his earlier test of unidimensionality, led Gouldner to assert that the concepts were in fact polar points on a single dimension.

Grimes and Berger (1970), in reviewing Gouldner's work, leveled criticisms at both techniques but most specifically at the factor analytic procedures and the conclusions that were drawn. They maintained that the findings as presented did not warrant the conclusion because they fall well within the realm of chance occurrence. In addition to Grimes and Berger's criticisms, it is noted that the respondent-to-item ratio of 1.3:1 (where $N=125$ and $items=93$) does not meet the minimum ratio of 10:1 necessary for validity of findings from factor analysis (Nunnally, 1967). Also the amount of explained variance accounted for by each item was not reported. Consequently the significance of the factors that emerged cannot be determined. The essence then of the criticism is that even though many researchers have and continue to apply the basic model as if it were a tested and validated construct, it is in fact not validated and has received too little critical analysis to assume polarity and unidimensionality.

An alternative to Gouldner's formulation has been suggested by researchers concerned with the organization of work and workers such as Blau and Scott (1962); Bennis (1958); Glaser (1964); Goldberg *et al.* (1965); Lee (1969); and Thornton (1970). The analyses in these reports have centered upon the ex post facto implication that certain characteristics of the organizational setting significantly affect latent identity. Accordingly some variables may be of such a nature as to induce and/or sustain a simultaneous orientational focus on both localism and cosmopolitanism. In other words, an underlying identity exists with both the local setting and the wider occupational or professional field.

Razak (1969) and Warriner (1970, 1971) in a series of studies of universities and their faculties proposed the application of a variant of the above model. This model rejects the unidimensionality that was central to Gouldner's model and views the two identity foci as independent variable dimensions. These are orientations of the professional towards the local work setting and towards a wider professional organization. These two dimensions in their various combinations result in at least four identity types (Figure 1): the itinerant (Hughes, 1958), the local institutional, the local professional, and the alienated or those whose orientational focus is external to the specified objects.

Figure 1. Four identity types.

		Professional Commitment	
		High	Low
Institutional Loyalty	High	Local Professional	Local Institutional
	Low	Itinerant	Alienated

The initial research by Razak utilized a five-item Likert scale for loyalty and a ten-item professional commitment instrument. The loyalty scale, consisting of three original items, one from Gouldner's study, and one from Scott's study (1961) of county agencies proved to be both internally strong and consistent and

to be, as expected, significantly related with length of service in the institution. This scale has enjoyed some improvement and has demonstrated its reliability in subsequent studies.

The professional commitment instrument used by Razak, consisting of three original items and seven items based upon Hall's five theoretical dimensions of professionalism (1968), exhibited neither internal consistency nor strength and proved to be inconsistent in relation to other objective test variables (i.e., publications, membership in profession organizations, and professional meeting attendance). Subsequent studies have led to the development of an improved commitment or orientation to the profession/discipline instrument.

To accomplish this objective, items were sought which would elicit introspective, yet objective, self-reporting of the respondent's locus of identity and latent role system (i.e., his attachment to and identity with, whatever it is he is doing as a professor and as a member of his discipline). The symbolic terms, "profession" and "discipline," were, however, open to some mis-perceptions by the respondents in terms of their departments as professional settings and hence confusing the distinction between the immediate place of work and the pervasive but peripheral occupational organization. Improvements have been made to achieve at least minimal acceptable limits of usefulness. The use of the phrase "this institution" used for the local identity items did not present such difficulties and later analysis confirmed this. For a list of the scale items and their sources see Figure 2.

Conventional statistical analyses were applied to each scale for the six studies to date. Two of these studies were preliminary and are not reported here. The analytic procedures included correlations of each item with the scale, inter-item correlation, and various combinations of items in principle components factor analysis. The purpose of these analyses was to check the consistency among items within the various indicator sets and to determine scaler properties of the instruments.

As was expected, analysis of loyalty repeatedly proved to be quite strong and internally consistent. Factor analysis for each of the studies produced more than one factor and in those instances when two factors were produced the second was of minimal difference and contributed little to further understanding.

Factor analysis of the professional orientation items resulted in a number of factors. Analysis of the substantive content, however, did not record any extreme inconsistencies across these factors and in fact mimicked the various components viewed as making up the content of this concept. That is, the factors were consistent with the various subjects dealt with among the items, e.g., disciplinary identification, professional skills, and collegial interaction patterns. In consequence, the analysis of these items collectively supported the prediction that scaler properties were not to be anticipated for the professional orientation indicators as a closed set.

Under conditions of pooled factor analysis, however, the statistical characteristics of these two sets of indicators was expected to change in conformity with the theoretical model of bi-dimensionality. That is, the dimensions of loyalty and commitment were hypothesized to be independent of each other but of the same genotype, i.e., primary identity factors. The most rigorous test of this conceptualization is the submission of the pool items to factor analysis with the results predicted (Nunnally, 1957).

Figure 2. Items used in professional-loyalty construct.

Professional Commitment*

1. At the present time I cannot think of anything that would prompt me to leave my professional discipline for another activity.
2. I would continue my activities within my discipline even if that discipline ceased to be important in universities.
3. I would not be as satisfied working in another discipline as I am in my present discipline.
4. My basic capabilities and intellectual skills are most appropriate for my discipline.
5. I am more pleased with the recognition paid me by my disciplinary colleagues than by those outside my discipline.

* These items were original with the studies conducted by Warriner and Patterson and have little parallel with those items used in the original Razak/Warriner studies.

Institutional Loyalty

6. By and large, I think that this university is a good place for a professional to work. (Original with Razak and used in all studies.)
7. This university offers me the facilities I need to do what I like to do.
8. I will probably leave this university within two or three years. (Adapted from Scott's study, 1961, by Razak and used in all studies.)
9. I could do the work that I want to do anywhere else as easily and as well as I can do it here at this university. (Original with Razak and used in all studies.)
10. I don't really care what happens to this university as long as I can find some place to do my work. (Original with Razak and used in all studies.) A reversed item.

That is, to the extent that factor analysis is analogous to the theoretical model of meaning, perception and communicative action (i.e., responses to test questions), the consequences of a theoretically generated set of symbolic statements can be anticipated to produce a specifiable outcome from a factor analysis.

In the case at hand the theoretical model proposes that local and professional orientations are independent dimensions within a single framework. Secondly, it proposes that some situational conditions of the action setting operate so as to promote or deny the significant simultaneity of the two dimensions with the respondents latent identity field. Submission of response data to a deductively generated set of questions using this framework was expected to have the following outcomes: 1) At least two primary factors corresponding to the two independent dimensions; 2) A third factor indicating intra-dimension inter-action of items where conditions of the setting affect the entire respondent population;² and 3) In line with the relative symbolic concreteness of the two dimensions, the first dimension should reflect the local orientation and the second should correspond to the professional orientation.

Procedures

The data collection for this study involved an 83 item questionnaire distributed and returned through campus mails at each institution. The sample population included the full time faculties at each of four universities. Return rates averaged 59.9% with a high of 76.5% and a low of 45.0% and total usable N of 1949. Each institution was sampled independently at different times from spring to winter 1970. The institutions included three from among the major midwestern state universities and one high prestige Canadian university.

The ten items of concern in this paper were of the Likert variety having five alternative answers ranging from "agree" to "disagree." These items were randomly distributed among the first 46 items of the questionnaire which were all of similar Likert form.

Analysis of the commitment-loyalty construct involved the submission of the ten items to factor analysis and Kaiser's normal Varimax rotation for the purpose of testing the above hypotheses. Table 1 presents the results of these analyses with loadings less than .25 suppressed.

Results

With the exception of a few unsystematic anomalies, the factor analyses confirm the hypotheses proposed. Loyalty items, with their stronger symbolic mechanisms, load strongly and with little variation upon the first factor. Commitment items, being somewhat weaker in their referents, load significantly upon the second factor. In addition the patterns of loading strengths easily meet the discerning eye of sociological common sense (i.e., item 2's weakness relative to its cohort of items is understandable given the decreasing stability in the present occupational placement picture of academia).

Additionally, where the third factor did occur it added to the total variance explained in the analysis but without adding systematically to further understanding of the phenomena except for its high loading across the first two factors indicating dimension interaction. To further clarify for the reader some of the more significant anomalies a few ex post facto accountings have been proposed.

Table 1. Results of rotated factor analysis of pooled professional commitment and local loyalty scale items for four studies.

Factors:	Studies									
	A N = 420		C N = 509		B N = 336			D N = 683		
	I	II	I	II	I	II	III	I	II	III
Professional Commitment										
1. (Refer to Figure 2 for the statements.)	.33	.67	.34	.66		.60	.33	.32	.63	
2.		.55		.47		.68			.59	
3.		.70		.74		.73	.25		.73	
4.		.68		.68		.73			.68	
5.		.48		.49	.27	.25	.66		.30	.65
Local Loyalty										
6. (Refer to Figure 2 for the statements.)	.72		.70		.65		.41	.76		
7.	.61		.65		.32		.75	.74		
8.	.61		.60		.76			.59		.30
9.	.62		.69		.69			.67		
10.	.66		.55		.70			.26	-.25	.70
% of original variance explained by each factor:	23.00	20.14	21.98	20.52	25.22	19.65	10.54	21.62	19.60	11.45
% of total variance explained:	43.13		42.50		55.41			52.67		

(1) The secondary loading of commitment item number 1 upon factor 1 (loadings: .33, .34, .32), the loyalty factor, seems to be the primary systematic variation. This relates to the expressed fear of respondent confusion in using the terms "profession" and "discipline." In this case it is most likely that these loadings represent the extent to which the respondents see their disciplinary profession as synonymous with their present occupational status. Leaving one's discipline for another activity is then the same for these respondents as leaving the university in which they are presently members and vice versa.

(2) The presence of third factors for study B and D and their absence in study A and C is in part understandable by virtue of special institutional characteristics. Subjective impressions gleaned both from personal contacts and interviews as well as from general review of the data by the researchers shed some light upon these differences and the unsystematic nature of the third factor loadings. The institutions represented by study A and C tend to be pure types of their respective institutional forms. University A is best described as a major midwestern university characterized by a certain provincialism. School C, on the other hand, is a top rank Canadian university representing to its faculty a zenith of academic status. Both of these institutions then may be seen as promotional of unambiguous identity factors.

The institutions represented by study B and D tend more towards a confused atmosphere conducive to ambivalent identification. Both are large midwestern state universities but they exhibit a greater internal conflict between the traditional high quality professorial model and the newer research/publication model of higher educational institutions, this situation being notably prevalent in the institution of study B.

An additional, if not alternative, explanation of these patterns found in B and D is the fact that both institutions were sampled at a time when they both were experiencing the effects of the anti-university forces that emerged during 1970. This may in part not only account for the emergence of a third factor as a consequence of felt threats to present faculty statuses resulting from budget cuts, it may also account for the different loading patterns themselves, due to the fact that the objects of conflict were somewhat different at each institution.

(3) Item 5 suggests, by the character of its loading pattern across the studies, that it is a very weak dimension of professional commitment if not in fact a detracting variable. It is a relatively weak variable where bi-dimensionality is clear as in A and C and the prime variable for the emergence of factor III when conditions become threatening as proposed for B and D. Hence, item 5 seems best fitted in a pragmatism dimension in which one's significant others are located where one sees his future needs. In other words, when local conditions encourage confidence in one's present status, recognition by particular colleagues is loose and ambiguous and equated in part with recognition at the local level. However, where such local conditions are in a contrary vein, tending in fact to provoke a sense of insecurity, disciplinary colleague recognition becomes quite important. Commonsensically, if one feels insecure in his present status, he will become concerned that he be known and appreciated by those who may most directly affect an improvement in his status security either in the present location or elsewhere.

Conclusion

The assumption of bi-dimensionality and independence of these two constructs bears more consistent results than have previous models. Not only does this analysis

demonstrate in four different instances the consistent independence of the two identity foci, but also is supportive of the proposed interaction between the two different situational conditions.

The validation of the proposed minimum four types from the two dimensions, commitment and loyalty: itinerant, local, local professional, and alienated and thereby the validity of construct interaction and consequential organizational behavior is the primary objective of the Razak and Warriner research. The test hypothesis was that consistently different behavior and behavioral preferences would be related to the four types. This hypothesis has not been rejected and analysis continues to contribute to the consistency of the findings.³

Consequently this research contributes in justifying much of the speculation mentioned above and provides some direct answers to the needs enumerated by Grimes and Berger. The findings demonstrate the independence of the two orientations and point to a conceptualization that is not in essence a content classification scheme. Rather the dimensions are orientational foci existent under conditions where the legitimization of one's status finds its source in more than one location. They are identity locus points in this case corresponding to the respondent's meaning and ideology bestowers on the one hand (i.e., his professional discipline) and the bestower of spatial status on the other (i.e., his place of work - the institution). In this case the difficulty is not the enumeration of specific series of items as the definers of the concepts themselves. It is the operationalization of the concepts in reference to particular situations which is problematic.

A second major consideration is in the application of the model. Not only is it necessary that the effectiveness of the model be demonstrated in a relatively homogenous population (as opposed to "discovering" the relative cosmopolitanism of scientists vis-a-vis engineers in the same setting). But the sociological significance of the model can only accrue by demonstrating that it is effective as a dependent, independent, and/or intermediating variable in a larger scheme. Both of these objectives have been minimally met in this research and as the sample sizes per discipline increase the purity in meeting these criteria should be enhanced.

In conclusion, the model which relates the two concepts of loyalty and commitment, as independent dimensions of primary status identity has been shown to be valid, relatively reliable, usefully influential upon behavior and behavior preferences and applicable in a homogenous population. On the other hand the model has not been applied in other situations and hence is as of yet limited in scope to academia. But for the problematic nature of operationalizing the concepts, such a broadening of its scope should prove fruitful in terms of improving the conditions of work settings so as to promote the smooth coexistence of two, often conflicting, dimensions of identity.

Footnotes

¹The statistical outcomes of these various analyses are not reported here as they are extensive and have been reported in Warriner (1970). In addition further analysis and study is in process in order to improve the validity and reliability of the instrumentation used.

²The larger theoretical model of which this is a part, proposes the key situational conditions of the setting to be the department organization. Hence where the variation in departmental conditions across the institution is wide and extreme these various conditions should have a cancelling effect upon each other across the in-

stitution resulting in two primary factors only. However, where conditions are unitarily conducive to simultaneity of the two dimensions across an institution, or at least across those subordinate units included in the sample, then three factors should appear, indicating analogously, interaction between the two dimensions and this conditional property of the institution.

References

- Bennis, W.G., N. Berkowirz, M. Affinito, and M. Malone
 1958 "Reference groups and loyalties in the out-patient department." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 481-500.
- Glaser, Barney G.
 1963 "The local-cosmopolitan scientist." *American Journal of Sociology* 69: 249-259.
- Goldberg, Louis C., Frank Baker, and Albert H. Rubenstein
 1965 "Local-cosmopolitan:unidimensional or multidimensional?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70: 704-710.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.
 1957 "Cosmopolitan and locals: Towards an analysis of latent social roles - I." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 281-306.
 1958 "Cosmopolitan and locals: Towards an analysis of latent social roles - II." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2: 444-480.
- Grimes, Andrew J., and Phillip K. Berger
 1970 "Cosmopolitan-local: Evaluation of the construct." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 15: 407-413.
- Hall, Richard H.
 1968 "Professionalization and bureaucratization," *American Sociological Review* 33: 92-104.
- Hughes, Everett C.
 1958 *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Lee, Sang M.
 1969 "Organizational identification of scientists." *Journal of the Academy of Management* 12: 327-337.
- Merton, Robert K.
 1949 "Patterns of influence: A study of interpersonal influence and of communications behavior in a local community," *Communications Research 1948-1949*, ed. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton, 189-202.
- Nunnally, Jum C.
 1967 *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Razak, W. Nevell
 1969 "Department structure and faculty loyalty in a major university," Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas (Unpublished dissertation).
- Thornton, Russell
 1970 "Organizational involvement and commitment to organization and profession." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 15: 417-426.
- Warriner, Charles K.
 1970 "Professional commitment and institutional loyalty as factors in faculty orientations." Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.