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INTRODUCTION

Peter Rossi (46, p. 415) has said that, "perhaps the most striking feature of contemporary communities is their ceaselessly changing nature".

One type of change is that due to ecological processes. Individuals and firms in the course of seeking to fulfill their objectives make decisions which, when aggregated, profoundly affect the physical and social structure of the communities. Such changes are purposive from the point of view of the individual or firm but are non-purposive from the viewpoint of the community as a whole.

A second type of change in the community is that which results from the self-conscious and purposive efforts on the part of individuals or groups of individuals to transform or maintain the status quo of the community.

It is this second type of change which is the concern of this dissertation. Specifically it is the study of the means by which individuals in a community are able to bring about changes that is the focus of interest. This process has been referred to in the literature of social science as the exercise of social power. This dissertation is a study of social power in a rural community.

One rationale for conducting such a study is generated from the problems surrounding the introduction of social change into communities by change agents. The change agent's objective is to influence people's behavior, namely, to accept new means and/or ends. As such he must determine the most effective and efficient way of doing this. If by
chance the change agent is one of the most influential or powerful people in the community, or if social power has nothing to do with bringing about social change, then the above rationale would be irrelevant.

The consensus is that the capacity to control the behavior of others, i.e., social power, is present in every social system. It is also generally contended that social power is not randomly distributed in the population and that professional change agents in the main are not generally among the persons having social power in the system. It therefore seems reasonable that a study of social power in the community could be an important step in deriving guidelines to be used in training change agents.

Another rationale for the study of social power is to seek out additional findings which may add relevant truth claims to research presently completed and/or to present new findings which will add to the existing body of knowledge and suggest additional areas of research.

The general objective of this dissertation is:
To study, observe and analyze the phenomenon of social power in a small rural community.

The following specific objectives have been engendered from: (1) theoretical writings related to social power, (2) numerous empirical studies related to social power, and (3) the author's involvement in various efforts to instigate social change in rural areas.

These specific objectives are:
1. To identify the individuals who have the capacity to exercise social power in the affairs of the community.
2. To identify individuals capable of exercising social power for several areas of community concern to determine whether the existing power pattern is monomorphic or polymorphic in nature.

3. To determine the bases of social power of the individuals identified.

4. To determine the degree to which the personal and social characteristics of the individuals identified correspond or deviate from the characteristics of the general population.

There are two associated objectives which are also of concern. The first is fundamental to the accomplishment of the above objectives. The second flows from the findings related to the first four objectives.

These objectives are:

1. To explore the validity of the various methodological techniques employed in the field study.

2. To generate implications which will be of assistance in training change agents to fulfill their role.

The general approach to this study is the personal interviewing technique using a prepared field schedule. Following the selection of the community to be studied, three separate stages of data gathering were carried out:

1. Information was gathered from "extra-community knowledgeable" as to the persons presently in the community who would be "inside knowledgeable".

2. The second step of data gathering was to interview the persons identified as "inside knowledgeable" seeking information as to the persons who were influential or powerful in community
affairs.

3. The final stage of interviewing was to interview all those persons identified at least twice by the "inside knowledgeables", seeking information which would allow analyses relevant to the objectives outlined above.

A source of information of value to the study but not gathered through the medium of interviewing was to review the local newspaper for a period of about two years.

All of the data used in this dissertation were collected by the author during a period of three months during late summer 1952. A total of 27 personal interviews were secured.

The community being studied is Center Town*, Iowa, which is the county seat town of South County**. Center Town is located southeast of Des Moines, Iowa. The population in 1960 was approximately 1600.

This community was selected as the focus of study for several reasons, the most important being:

1. General apriori knowledge of the entire social system because of the author's role in a multi-county area social and economic development program which includes South County.

2. The desire to determine the extent of agreement in persons named as having power in a full scale investigation and a "short-cut" method which had been used by the author and a colleague just eight months prior to the time of this study.

*Center Town is a pseudonym used to protect the identity of the real community.

**South County is also a pseudonym.
3. Accessibility to "extra-community knowledgeables".

4. Simplicity of the social system from the standpoint of population size.

5. Uniqueness of the system as a small town which
   a. is a county seat, but
   b. is not a great deal larger than several other towns in the same county.
A review of literature has four major functions which are:

1. To determine the theoretical and empirical work that has gone before.

2. To help delineate the research problem.

3. To aid in the generation of a conceptual framework for interpretation of the findings.

4. To provide suggestions for measures of the concepts.

The optimum fulfillment of these functions would seem to be served best by presentation of literature cited in the appropriate sections of the dissertation. Thus the pattern to be followed here is similar in nature to that followed by Campbell (7).
THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

The general objective of this study, as previously stated, is to study the phenomenon of social power as it exists and is exercised in a small rural community. In order to proceed in a logical manner and in order that the findings may be systematically related to previous research, it is desirable that a theory of social power be constructed or chosen to guide this study.

The diverse background out of which the study of social power has developed suggests that a brief overview of the concept of social power be presented before some of the various conceptions of social power offered in modern sociological theory and research are reviewed.

Background

Specific citation of conceptual frameworks, methodology, and/or empirical findings will be made in the ensuing sections of this chapter. The objective here is to trace briefly the genealogy of social power as a concept in the social sciences.

The concept of social power has been implicit, and often explicit in the writings of all disciplines of social science.

Aristotle's (4, p. 17) writings on social class or stratification implied the existence of differences within society such that some men rule and others are ruled.

Conflict theory is rich in ideas related to social power. In fact, Han Fei Tzu, a teacher of great dictators, taught that the essence of
society is power (31, p. 129). Various Roman and Greek writers, Polybius being the chief one, saw power as the prime mover of society.

Following this period, the concept of power was introduced dramatically into the West by Machiavelli (29).

About 400 years later, Marx divided society into two classes of people—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In line with his economic determinism, Marx attributed the power of the ruling class to their possession of material goods.

Schermerhorn (49, p. xi) credits Marx with providing the impetus to the movement of the social power concept to social science disciplines other than political science.

As concern with social stratification, or social class, grew into a concern for the theoretical aspects of social structure and social change, the concept of social power grew in importance.

Two groups emerged; one suggesting that class was economically determined vis a'vis the influence of Marx. The second group believed that there were more subjective factors which demarcated the classes. This group was represented in the beginning by Cooley (31). The approach of Cooley and other symbolic interactionists gave impetus to identifying factors other than material goods as sources of power for those who came to be in a position of power.

The concept of social power became more explicit as writers began to apply the class phenomenon to specific sub-systems of the society. To quote Schermerhorn (49, p. xi) again:
Weber's typological classification of power into traditional, legal and charismatic forms, ... stimulated sociologists, historians, and political scientists to take a more panoramic view of the subject and to extend Weber's analysis into areas formerly neglected by the political scientist.

The theoretical and empirical works generated by Weber's approach, specifically in the case of his study of bureaucracy, are legion. To review this work would be outside the scope of this dissertation.

The path which led to the study of social power within the context of the community is the concern of primary importance here.

A perusal of research relevant to community power structure reveals Hunter (23) as the sociologist which has had the greatest impact in generating empirical studies of social power at the community level. This is not to ignore writers in other disciplines or the implications in the findings of sociologists such as Robert and Helen Lynd who documented the extension of power in the economic sphere to other spheres of community life such as education, recreation, and local government in Middletown (49, p. 97).

The many studies following Hunter will not be commented on here as they will be heavily drawn upon in the rest of this chapter.

Studies in the area of leadership have also been concerned with the phenomenon which is of central concern here. The validity of this statement is illustrated most succinctly in the definition of leadership which is offered by Tannenbaum, Weschler and Bassarik.

Leadership is interpersonal influence in a situation through the communication process directed toward the attainment of specified goals or objectives (51, p. 21).
Influence then is a core component of leadership. Ignoring semantic difficulties for the moment, it can be seen that research within the framework of leadership may have many implications for the study of power. The one major factor preventing application of much of the leadership research directly to the study of community power is the predominance of controlled laboratory experiments and the relative absence of research in actual on-going social systems.

This brief overview of many disciplines and situations in which power has been studied suggests that the approach to constructing a conceptual framework for the study of social power in a small community can be eclectic. A fact which is both a luxury and a caution.

The next step leading to the presentation of the theory which will guide this research is to define the theoretical setting of the study of social power.

The Theoretical Setting

The study of social power despite the complexities and the many ramifications is the study of only one class of phenomena. As such it is necessary to define the position of social power in a larger theoretical system so as to determine what is and what is not being studied.

This study, as previously stated, is being done in a community. If one chose to study all of the interrelationships existing in the community, a convenient theoretical system would be that of social system analysis as proposed by Loomis (28). Loomis develops his social system analytical framework with three sets of concepts:
1. **Conditions for social actions.** Loomis sets out the conditions for social action as: (1) territoriality, (2) size, and (3) time.

2. **Master processes.** While each of the social system elements can be articulated into specialized or elemental social processes, Loomis sets forth six "comprehensive or master processes" that have special importance in understanding social systems. These include: (1) communication, (2) boundary maintenance, (3) systemic linkage, (4) institutionalization, (5) socialization, and (6) social control.

3. **Specific social system elements.** Within this more general level of conceptualization Loomis delineates nine specific elements of social systems: (1) ends or objectives, (2) facilities or means, (3) norms, (4) status-roles, (5) ranking, (6) sanctions, (7) beliefs, (8) sentiments, and (9) power.

This dissertation is concerned with only one aspect of the total community or social system, namely, the element of power. While the other elements can be assumed constant for the purpose of constructing a theory to guide the research, it is recognized that in reality they will likely be interrelated and in interaction with the concept central to this study.

The interrelationships and interactions of the other elements with power will be taken into account only to the degree that they interact intensively and become a major factor in understanding power.
The theory of social power to be used in this study has been generated from the various conceptions of several writers. As such, a brief examination of these conceptions seems in order.

Conceptions of Social Power

The concept of social power is nebulous. It has been identified with prestige, status, dominance, wealth, authority, influence and many other terms. Certainly this kind of extension of a term greatly reduces the preciseness of meaning and the utility of the term from a theoretical standpoint.

Bierstedt (5, p. 730) concludes that, "in the entire lexicon of sociological concepts none is more troublesome than the concept of power". MacIver (30) and Bierstedt (5, p. 730) suggest that most discussions of power have placed it in the political rather than the sociological context.

This apparent diversity of social power conceptions dictates a review of some of the various conceptualizations offered in search of one, or a combination of several, which can be fruitfully applied to the problem at hand. Whether the selection of a single conception or the synthesis of several will be most useful remains to be seen. In either case it is necessary to examine at least some of the conceptualizations now extant in the literature.

Weber

Modern sociological analysis of power began with Weber (49, p. 114). As such it seems appropriate to begin a discussion of the conceptions of
social power at that point in time.

Weber defines power as:

"... The chance of a man or of a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action (53, p. 180)."

The major component of power for Weber is legitimate authority. Authority is further classified into three types: (1) legal, (2) traditional, and (3) charismatic. Though the basis for each type is different there is a commonality, namely, that the opportunity to realize one's will through authority is conferred on the "office" of the individual by the system. Thus the invocation of that fraction of power called authority is a right granted by the social system and as such is invested in a position within the system rather than a particular individual. The residual fraction of power is not elaborated on or defined by Weber. He does, however, speak of certain conditions of power external to that included in authority. The possession of material goods gives "economically" conditioned power. Power may also be conditioned by social honor or prestige. Further, there is the possibility of deriving power from the existing legal order, i.e., political power.

Though Weber never labels it as such, his discussion of these various conditions of power implies that the components of social power as he defined it, are a result of these "conditions" plus legitimate authority. The implication is also clear that these are likely to be in interaction such that economic power may lead to status and thus to greater total power or vice versa.

One reason that social power as a concept is not overriding in Weber's presentation is that in the ideal type of bureaucracy there would
be no power in excess of that provided by authority. It is only in com-
paring the real world to the ideal type posited by Weber that power
emerges as a general concept including authority and "something else".

It should be noted that Weber's treatment of social power, like many
others, assumes that the capacity of some to rule over others is a uni-
versal phenomenon which exists and is exercised in human societies and
social relationships. The validity of these assumptions will be the
first hypotheses to be tested by the author. The support of these
assumptions will be crucial to the rest of the hypotheses which are
generated. In fact, unless such support is found, the remaining
hypotheses will be irrelevant.

Bierstedt

Bierstedt (5) attempts to sharpen the meaning of social power by
distinguishing it from prestige, influence, dominance, rights, force, and
authority.

In brief, he states that power is often the basis of prestige rather
than vice versa, and that influence is voluntary whereas power is coer-
cive. He also states that dominance is a psychological concept with the
locus in interpersonal relationships whereas power is sociological with
the locus in intergroup relationships. Rights, according to Bierstedt,
are prerequisites to power and not power itself.

In relating power to force and authority he states that:

Power is latent force, force is manifest power and authority
is institutionalized power (5, p. 733).

Continuing, he defines power as:

The ability [potential] to introduce force [limitation of
alternatives of action] into a social situation (5, p. 733).
Power, according to Bierstedt, may be discovered in three areas: (1) formal organizations, (2) informal organizations, and (3) unorganized communities. It is to the latter that attention is here directed.

The major weakness of Bierstedt's conceptualization for the purpose at hand would seem to be in his contention that power is only an inter-group phenomenon. As such he sees power arising only as groups come into conflict over issues of mutual concern. The application of his definition of power to interpersonal relationships, however, would not seem to destroy its utility.

The usefulness of Bierstedt's conception for the problem at hand is in his identification of power sources. The major categories are: (1) numbers of people, (2) social organization, and (3) resources. The differences in power generated by numbers of people and the social organization notwithstanding, the resources play a major role in determination of power. The resources which he identifies are those which he distinguished from power: influence, force, authority, prestige, rights etc.

Lasswell and Kaplan

Lasswell and Kaplan (26) present a very complex but tightly reasoned discussion of social power in their book on Power and Society. Contrary to most writers on the subject, however, they identify influence as the most general concept and power as one form of influence. The implications of this difference will be examined later.

In order to gain the essence of their argument it is necessary to briefly discuss the major components of their presentation.
Values are defined as the goal-events of acts of evaluation. As such, values may play a central role in describing social action of any kind. Lasswell and Kaplan concern themselves with eight values: power, wealth, respect, rectitude, affection, skill, well-being, and enlightenment. The distribution of these values in a social system is referred to as the value pattern. The place occupied by any particular value is the value position and the value position likely to be occupied as the outcome of conflict between values is the value potential. Influence then is value position and potential. The exercise of influence consists in affecting the policies (projected program of goal values) of others than the self. To have maximum influence is to occupy a high position (and potential) with respect to all the values important in the group. Thus in order for power to be effective, it must have a high value position and/or potential.

Lasswell and Kaplan state that the values are interdependent. This gives rise to 64 types of influence and eight forms of power. Power based on power is political power. Power based on affection is personal influence. Power based on skill is expertness, etc.

In any given influence relation, there may be several base values, e.g., power, wealth, and skill. Since power is a type of influence, the definition also applies to the base value for power, or to the power base. A power holder may owe his power to wealth, ability, popularity, or in general, favorable position with regard to any value.

Three propositions developed by Lasswell and Kaplan have significance for the purpose here:
Proposition 1: The forms of power are interdependent. A certain amount of several forms of power is a necessary condition for a great amount of any form.

Proposition 2: The amount of power tends to increase until limited by other power holders.

Proposition 3: Low power position implies low position in the scope values.

Lasswell and Kaplan define authority in much the same way as other writers. Authority is formal power. Authority is ascribed by others. As they state the relationship:

While X may be said to have effective power over Y independently of Y's perspectives—or anyone else's—X may be said to have authority over Y only from the standpoint of some Z, usually, though not necessarily identical with Y, adhering to the political formula from which the authority derives (26, p. 133).

Authority is in this sense "subjective"; its existence depends on someone's think-so, though not, to be sure, simply the think-so of the person having the authority.

The difference between the power conception of Weber and that of Lasswell and Kaplan appears to be partially real and partially semantic. Weber suggests three types of authority as the bases of power in the ideal case and admits a residual only to deal with the untidiness of the real world. Lasswell and Kaplan on the other hand specifically identify eight major bases of influence (Weber's power). The amount of influence (power) one can have, according to Lasswell and Kaplan, is dependent upon the possession of empirical referents of these eight bases and the particular value pattern relative to the eight bases which exist in the social system of central concern.
Thus the over-all effect of power for Weber and influence for Lasswell and Kaplan is the same: to control the actions of others. The major difference in the two conceptions is the postulated bases of power.

The significant contribution of this conception of power (or influence as they term it) is in the explicit recognition of the possible effects of the social system's value pattern on accumulation of power and in the recognition of the kinds of power which can arise out of the interaction of the bases of power.

Parsons

Talcott Parsons defines social power as:

... the realistic capacity of a system unit to actualize its interests (attain goals, prevent undesired interferences, command respect, control possessions, etc.) within the context of system interaction and in this sense to exert influence on the processes in the system (43, p. 95).

Power in this sense, according to Parsons, may be conceived to be a result of the three following factors:

1. The valuation of the unit in the system according to value standards, whether completely common throughout the system or not, and including both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of judgment in relation to these statements.

2. The degree to which (and) the manner in which actors in the system permit deviance from these standards in performance.

3. The control of possessions which is a source of differential advantage in bringing about a desired result.
Parsons stated that these factors are interdependent. Thus the amount of power is seen to be a function of the several sources in interaction.

The concept of power as used by Parsons includes authority as a special case. It is institutionalized power, i.e., power granted by the system itself and not an attribute of particular individuals. The other major component of power in Parsons's system is given by access to scarce resources.

In addition to the explicitness and extension of the concept of power which Parsons provides over Weber, he points out a factor which will demand attention at the operational stage. He states that, "the problems of the place of power in social systems shade directly over into those of authority". In other words, the conceptual differentiation is much easier than the analytical differentiation. To determine the bases of power, which is one of the objectives of this study, this problem will have to be resolved.

French

A social psychologist, French (19) offers a formal theory of power in which he presents a five-fold classification of power. The exercise of influence, according to French, is the summation of interpersonal influences which take account of three complex patterns of relations: (1) the power relations among members of the group, (2) the communication networks or patterns of interaction in the groups, and (3) the relations among opinions within the group. The primary interest here is in the power relations among members of the group.
The definition of power used by French is that:

The power of A over B is equal to the maximum force which A can induce on B minus the maximum resisting force which B can mobilize in the opposite direction (19, p. 183).

Continuing, French states that:

The basis of interpersonal power is defined as the more or less enduring relationship between A and B which gives rise to power (19, pp. 183-184).

The five bases of power which have been identified by French are:

1. Attraction power based on B's liking for A.
2. Expert power based on B's perception that A has superior knowledge and information.
3. Reward power based on A's ability to mediate rewards for B.
4. Coercive power based on A's ability to mediate punishment for B.
5. Legitimate power based on B's belief that A has a right to prescribe his behavior or opinions (19, p. 184).

The relative strength of these bases may vary. They may also interact to contribute to the total amount of power. The classification denoted as legitimate power is coterminous with authority as defined by the previous writers. French suggests three postulates, one of which is particularly relevant for this study.

Postulate: For any given discrepancy of opinion between A and B, the strength of influence [power in Weber's and Parsons's discussion] of A over B in the direction of agreeing with A's opinion is proportional to the strength of the bases of power of A over B (19, p. 184).

The potential utility of French's thesis would seem to be in the possibility of using his classification of the bases of power to systematically analyze the sources of power which are attributed to the persons of power in the field investigation.
French's classification schema also provides the initial step toward ascertaining a complete picture of the power patterns existing in a group. To do this however would require a valid operationalization of each of the bases of power in such a way that each individual's force as an inducer could be compared against the resistance of every other member as an inducee. While such a task might conceivably be carried out in small group research under controlled conditions it would seem to be beyond the limits of practical possibility in this study.

Loomis defines power as, "the capacity to control others" (28, p. 20). The components of power are classified as: (1) authoritative and (2) non-authoritative.

The authoritative component is made up of authority which is the right as determined by the members of the system to control others. Authority resides thus in the "office" rather than the person and is nearly always institutionalized. As such the expectancies with regard to the rights and responsibilities of an occupant of an office are standardized.

Non-authoritative power is separated into two types by Loomis: voluntary influence and unlegitimized coercion (28, p. 20). Both may be asserted by single actors as well as by the collectivities of members of social systems (28, p. 20).

Voluntary influence is defined by Loomis as:

...control over others which is not built into the authority component of the status role but results from the willingness of the subordinate to become involved by the superordinate. The capacity to influence may reside in the individual actor
Influence may be based on such factors as skill in manipulating people, social capital resting on past favors, superior knowledge of a social system, wealth or reputation or certain outstanding qualities (28, p. 21).

Loomis suggests unlegitimized coercion as a type of non-authoritative control to account for certain "negative" determinations of behavior. Giving up one's money at gunpoint would be an example.

Unlegitimized coercion according to Loomis

... implies either physical or mental control or both. It is involved when one actor originates action and another actor responds or obeys unwillingly (28, p. 20).

There is a great deal of similarity between the power conceptions of Loomis, Parsons, and Weber. At least part of this would seem to be explained in recognizing that Loomis has been a student of both Parsons and Weber and Parsons was a student of Weber. As such they have all written in the field of social action theory.

The utility of Loomis's conception for this study is in his explicit treatment of power and the component parts of the concept. Furthermore his placement of the power concept in the theoretical scheme of social systems provides a direct means by which the phenomenon of social power can be related to the other phenomena present and operating within any social system.

Summary

In reviewing the conceptions of power which have been presented here one commonality clearly emerges. This commonality is the fact that, irrespective of the terminology used, the phenomenon under study in all cases is the process by which the behavior of others can be controlled.
Loomis's conception of social power will be the main component of the theory guiding the empirical study central to this thesis. The rationale for this is that:

1. His conception embodies all of the essential points of Weber and Parsons which this author accepts as the basic statement of the social power concept relevant to this study.

2. The idea of power being a latent force or a potential which is central to Bierstedt is inherent in Loomis's definition when he states that it is the "capacity" to control others.

3. The idea that there are bases of social power which was expressed in Lasswell and Kaplan, Bierstedt, and French as well as Weber and Parsons is also included in Loomis's concept of social power.

4. Loomis's definition of social power which includes a minimum number of concepts suggests the possibility that operationalization may be less complex.

The Theory

In recent scientific efforts it has become commonplace for writers to refer to the system of concepts guiding their study by such terms as "model", "theoretical model", "construct", and/or "conceptual framework".

This section is specifically denoted as "the theory" in accordance with Brodbeck (6, p. 381) who states that a theory is "a set of hypotheses about an area". This is in distinction to the term "model" which she believes, "in its precise meaning, exists only when the laws of one
theory (say physiology) are isomorphic with the laws of another theory (say sociology)."

The theory to be stated here is a theory of social power. It should not be compared with theoretical systems dealing with the entire phenomenon of social interaction. It is rather a theory of the "middle range", as Merton (32, p. 9) has called it, whose purpose is to state a set of expected relationships between a set of concepts believed to have utility in guiding the study of one class of social phenomena. The context of social power has been previously stated.

The statement of theory must begin with the definition of the phenomenon under study. Thus social power is defined in the manner of Loomis as the capacity to control others (28, p. 20). The simplest procedure would be to assume the existence and the exercise of social power in the social system under study and proceed to the task of defining the concepts and stating the expected relationships. As stated previously in this chapter, however, such an assumption is crucial and of such import that the extra credence to be gained by demonstration of such an assumption seems warranted. Thus what has been stated as an assumption by other writers is presented here as the first two general hypotheses.

G.H. 1. Social power, i.e., the capacity to control others, 
exists in the social system central to this dissertation.

G.H. 2. Social power, i.e., the capacity to control others, is 
exercised in the social system central to this dissertation.
Unless these general hypotheses can be supported the rest of the hypotheses will be irrelevant. Given the "ex ante", the objective now is to present the remaining concepts of the theory and state their expected interrelationships in the form of additional general hypotheses.

In the theory of social power used here there are three major concepts which are: (1) influence, (2) authority, and (3) power structure. The first two are given by Loomis. The third is engendered by the objective to ascertain whether there is a structure or patterning of interaction in the exercise of social power at the community level.

The definitions of these concepts are presented below in summary form.

**Influence**

Influence is the control over others which is not built into the authority component of the status role but results from the willingness of the subordinate to become involved by the superordinate. Thus it is that segment of power which resides in the individual rather than any formal role or roles he plays in the system. Influence here is a summation term which describes the power an actor will have due to the facilities or means valued by others which he has at his disposal. One of the major objectives stated in the introduction is to attempt to determine the facilities or resources which enter into the influence component of social power.

**Authority**

Authority is the right, as determined by the members of the system, to control others. Thus authority resides in a formal status-role or in
what is commonly called an office. In the ideal, the amount of authority in a social system is constant as far as the office holder is concerned and does not vary unless the system deems it so. The variation in the amount of power which may be exerted through an office when the office holder changes may be the result of three factors. First, the amount of influence of the individual may interact with the factor of authority. Secondly, imperfect knowledge on the part of the office holder as to the amount of authority which he can exert. Thirdly, imperfect knowledge on the part of the system units as to the rights which they have invested in a particular status-role.

**Power structure**

A power structure is that network of relations obtained between individuals when individuals possessing power act in concert to affect the decision of a social system on a given issue. In order for a power structure to exist the obtained relationships must be purposely sought. While several actors working in the same direction, each unaware of the other's efforts, might enhance the direction of decision such an occurrence would not be a power structure as here defined.

In summary, the theory of social power directing this study can be formalized as follows:

\[
S.P. = f(I, A, S); \text{ where:}
\]

- **S.P.** = the social power of an individual actor in the system.
- **I** = the amount of influence possessed by the individual.
- **A** = the amount of authority possessed by the individual.
- **S** = the degree to which an individual exerts his power in concert with another individual or individuals in the social system.
The expected relationships between these concepts will be stated in general hypotheses generated from the theoretical and empirical research relevant to social power which has gone before.

Since the decision has been made to test for the existence and the exercise of social power in the social system under study, the following general hypotheses must necessarily be provisional and based on the tentative assumption that social power does exist in the social system and that it is exercised by the individuals who possess it.

The General Hypotheses

C. Wright Mills in his discussion of The Power Elite has stated that:

In every town and small city of America an upper set of families stands above the middle classes and towers over the underlying population of clerks and wage workers. The members of this set possess more than do others of whatever there is locally to possess; they hold the keys to local decision; their names and faces are often printed in the local paper; in fact, they own the newspaper as well as the radio station; they also own three important local plants and most of the commercial properties along the main street; they direct the banks. . . mingling closely with one another they are quite conscious of the fact that they belong to the leading class of the leading families (38, p. 30).

In other words, the stereotype presented by Mills suggests that people of power do exist in every community and what is more, they interact with each other and control the decisions that are made at the community level.

Hunter in his study of Regional City states:

A group of men have been isolated who are among the most powerful in Regional City. It has been shown that they interact among themselves on community projects and select one another as leaders (23, p. 76).
Two generalizations emerge from the observation of Hunter. First, there is a patterning of power relations, i.e., a power structure of some type exists. Secondly, the relations within the power structure are different than the relations between members of the power structure and members of the larger social system which are not a part of the structure. This difference is expressed in the terminology of Goldhammer and Shils who state that:

A power relation is unilateral if only one party to the relationship exercises power over the other and bilateral if both parties exercise power over each other (20, p. 176).

Thus the power relations within the structure of power tend to be of the bilateral type and the power relations outside of the power structure tend to be of the unilateral type.

Mulford (39) in a study of three communities in Iowa found that there was a relatively high degree of cohesive relationships among top influentials. They named each other as "close personal friends", as people they visit frequently, and as people they see every day.

The general hypothesis which emerges from this discussion is:

G.H. 3. Social power will be exercised in the social system by individual power holders acting in concert.

Support of the third general hypothesis stated above will not answer the criticisms vis a'vis Hunter that there may be several power structures rather than one. Dahl (10) and Rossi (46) have been particularly vitriolic on this point. It should be noted in Hunter's defense that he did not unequivocably state the existence of a single power (pyramid) structure. In fact, he states:
... [that he] doubts seriously that power forms a single pyramid with any nicety in a community the size of Regional City. There are pyramids of power in this community ... (23, p. 62).

In the exercise of social power it seems unlikely that every social action project will invoke the same pattern of power relationships. Different projects may require different resources for fruition, in which case the access to these resources may be one of the important bases of power.

Barth and Johnson (1) suggest that community issues be typed in five dimensions, one of which relates to the interests of the power holders. They call this dimension salient-nonsalient to leadership. Thus as they state:

Community issues vary along a continuum from some that are central to the interests of community leaders ... to some that are peripheral to their interests and of little concern to them (1, p. 30).

If the interests and the sources of power of influential people vary, then it would seem reasonable that the exercise of power would be "polymorphic", to use Merton's (32, p. 414) terminology, rather than "monomorphic".

Fanelli, in a study of a small urban community in the South, concluded that community leaders:

... tend to be specialized and that a possible factor in such specialization is the variation in occupational type among community leaders. The fact that the editor of the local newspaper is seen as playing a generalized role may also be related to the function of this particular occupational type in the life of the community (15, p. 335).

Ryan, in a study of leaders in four contiguous townships in Iowa, found that:
Not only have we a tendency for different individuals to be specified as leaders in the respective townships, we have also noted a strong inclination to confine the activities of leaders to a single problem (48, p. 177).

Finally, Dahl discusses the problem of patterns of influence. He believes that the problem of patterns arises for three major reasons which are:

(1) Distributions may vary from one scope to another; in education, say, the dominant group may be relatively small, whereas in elections it may be relatively large. (2) Individual positions may vary from one scope to another; e.g., individuals who are leaders in one kind of activity may not be leaders in another. (3) Social positions may vary. That is, the individuals may not only be different persons, but they may come from different strata of the society--those who influence urban redevelopment might be successful businessmen, while those who influence educational standards in the public schools might be mainly professional educators (8, p. 29).

The derivation of a clear-cut hypothesis is impeded by the suggestion of some researchers who have divided the influentials into two groups, usually denoted by the terms "top influentials" and "key influentials". The top influentials are the persons from whom particular members are drawn into various systems of power relations according to the issue at stake. The key influentials are the sociometric choice leaders among the top influentials. In other words, there may be a situation in which there is a generalized power structure composed of the key influentials and several specialized structures related to various issues in the community.

Miller (34) poses the question as to whether key influentials repeatedly act in concert utilizing subordinate groups. The evidence which he accumulates rejects the presence of clique patterns and infers that there is a significant degree of fluidity among the leaders
relative to different issues which were undertaken.

The preponderance of evidence engenders the following hypothesis:

G.H 4. Power structures will vary depending upon the issue area.

In the course of power studies much discussion has been generated as to whether the people of power make the decisions and/or whether they also become actively involved in the execution phase of a project.

Hunter states that:

It can be seen . . . that a different group was concerned with policy from that [group] concerned with activating the project (23, p. 95).

Beal, in referring to a study by Miller (36), states:

While the number of top influentials who are central in the decision making process may be small in numbers, a large number of lower level leaders, organizations and a large number of community members may be active and important in carrying out the decision (3, p. 12).

Beal also states:

Thus different levels of influence and different social systems become relevant at different stages of social action. The top influentials often move out of the picture at the stage of execution. The men in the understructure of power become the doers and are activated by the top influentials (3, pp. 10-11).

Most of the above conclusions have been drawn from the observation and study of power figures in relatively large social systems. Thus the question logically arises as to whether the same phenomenon would occur in smaller social systems, such as the one under study.

In reference to this question, Freeman and Mayo observed in a study of an open country community that:
Certain characteristics of the community under study lead to the expectation that there will not be sharp breaks in interaction between different levels of the leadership structure, and that there will not be sharp differentiation between makers of major decisions and makers of minor decisions... the number of persons who are qualified and willing to act as "lieutenants" for major community leaders is limited, so that top leaders have to make many contacts directly, which might, in a different type of situation, be made through intermediaries (18, p. 319).

Beal has made the further observation that:

In smaller, more informal, social systems the author of this paper has observed that top influentials are sometimes overtly involved in the more formal group associations and play a more "public" role in the execution of important social programs (3, p. 11).

The paucity of the data relevant to this question may be the result of failure to empirically test the hypothesis based on the unwarranted assumption that two sets of people exist, some making the decisions, and some carrying out the decisions. It is also true that relatively few small communities have been systematically studied for power relationships.

The review of empirical research does not, as seen above, lead to a clear-cut hypothesis about what might be expected to be found in small social systems such as the one under study. It does suggest, however, that the size of the social system may be the intervening variable determining the apparent differences. The implication is that in small social systems the influentials may not only make the decisions but may also be very active in executing the decisions.

The resources it takes to execute a decision may be so scarce in a small social system that the power actors possess these as well as the resources which gives them the decision making role in the community.
Specialization, or the division of labor, as Durkheim (14) indicated, occurs only at certain levels of social density and volume of interaction.

The general level of hypothesis most apropos would be one relating the involvement of policy makers in policy execution to the intervening variable of social system size. Comparative data on communities of varying size were not collected in this study. The community studied was a relatively small social system. The following general hypothesis to be tested in this thesis is stated in line with the findings of Freeman and Mayo:

G.H. 5. The persons of power who control the decisions of the social system will also be the persons who execute the decisions.

A question related to whether one or more power structures exists vis a'vis different issues is whether a power structure is invoked for every decision made in a social system.

The question becomes more complicated or simplified depending upon the conclusion reached in G.H. 4. Assuming for the moment that the pattern of power in the community is polymorphic, the question is whether the power structure in a given issue area is brought into a position of exercising power for every decision that is made in that issue area.

In a comment relative to this problem, Barth and Johnson have stated:

A [second] problem which is central to the understanding of the influencing process relates to observations that not all issues come to the attention of the most influential decision makers. If one distinguishes between the "top level" leadership and the understructure leadership, as did Hunter, it becomes evident that some issues never come before the former group, while other issues achieve major importance to them (1, pp. 29-30).
Utilization of Barth and Johnson's typologies of community issues provides a framework for drawing inferences about the involvement or non-involvement of the power structure in every decision. They state that:

... the problem of dealing with recurrent issues, when they arise in a community, would in all likelihood be handled by constituted community agencies which have access to regularly allocated resources. On the other hand, in the case of a unique issue no such structure or procedure would necessarily be available to members of the community (1, p. 31).

The implication here is that many decisions are made wholly within the limits of an authority structure, e.g., a school board, rather than the power structure which includes influence and may or may not include elements of authority.

Additionally, Barth and Johnson state:

Issues of low salience to community leaders, which are perceived as being of low salience to the general public, are likely to be handled by professional community organizers or lower echelon power figures (1, p. 31).

Thus the general hypothesis is:

G.H. 6. The power structure in a given issue area will exercise power as a power structure only on major issues in that area.

The two major components of power suggested previously are influence and authority. It was also suggested that these components may interact in such a way that the total social power of an individual is greater (or lesser) than the simple summation of the two variables.

Given the alternatives that these variables of influence and authority may interact in such a manner that: (1) total power is greater than the simple sum, (2) total power is less than the simple sum, and (3) total power is the simple sum of the two, the question arises as to
whether actors with the most power are perceived as such on the basis of
the influence they have or the authority which is given to them by the
system, or finally as the result of having both.

Relevant to this Miller has stated:

... it appears from the quantitative and qualitative evi­
dence that the Northeast communities functioned, in decision­
making, more squarely on a basis of social property, or
resources and proficiencies vested in persons of influence;
while the Southeast communities were characterized by a
structural setting in which positional elements led to roles
of authority (37, p. 161).

While Miller's conclusion about regional differences is interesting
it does not lead directly to an hypothesis.

The possibility that a power holder will not necessarily have both
influence and authority or that the relative proportions will change as
power changes is theoretically possible. This is true, because a person
of authority, theoretically need not possess elements of influence.

At juncture to this possibility is the observation and intuitive
conclusion that decisions at the community level are very often made by
people with influence and little, if any, authority.

The general question being raised is whether formal (authoritative)
leaders and informal (influential) leaders are one and the same.

White conducted a study in a rural community of 4000 people in an
effort to determine the relationship if any between formal and informal
leaders. From the data, White reported:

Informal and formal leadership are not clearly related to each
other; they are simply different. Informal leadership occurs
in a social process not significantly conditioned by the
holding of formal leadership positions (54, p. 56).

and concludes:
The first conclusion (when the top forty informal and formal are considered) is that the community worker would by chance be right 50 percent of the time, if he knew the leaders in the [authority] hierarchy, in selecting among them for persons who would be present in the [influence] hierarchy (54, p. 57).

Stewart (50) reported that 38 percent of the top (power) people held no office at all. The implication of Beal's (2) discussion of legitimation as a stage of social action strongly implies that persons of influence and authority are different individuals.

The general hypothesis is:

G.H. 7. The power actors perceived to have more power will have no more authority than the power actors perceived to have less power.

Several authors have stated that the amount of power an individual has depends upon the kinds and number of resources to which he has access.

Miller has suggested some of these resources as contributing to power:

... wealth, time, respect, moral rectitude, reciprocal obligations, and access to intra- or extra community persons and groups of prestige (37, p. 155).

Rossi gives a partial catalogue of bases of power: (1) control over wealth and other resources, (2) control over mass media, (3) control over solidary groups, (4) control over values, and (5) control over prestigious interaction (47, pp. 12-13). Rossi adds that, "in connection with this list it is important to note that it may not be the objective facts which count so much as the reputed facts" (47, p. 13).
Other authors, notably, Lasswell and Kaplan (26), Hunter (23), Miller (35), and D'Antonio (13) have delineated various resources which they believe to be associated with the possession of power.

The specific sources of power stated in terms of authority and influence which are associated with the power actors will be determined in the course of testing the previous hypothesis. Concern with the resources which give power leads to another dimension however. It is whether there is any reason to expect congruence between the sources of power which a person has and the issue areas in which such sources would be relevant.

Hobbs and Powers (21) in a discussion of influence as the major component of leadership have suggested that the direction of influence, i.e., the ability to control the behavior of others, is a function of resources such as specialized knowledge, specialized skills, access to resources and status as related to the situation.

Murphy has stated that:

Leadership calls for a situational approach . . . the concept of "process" is important also in that it calls attention to the fluidity of the leadership situation . . . leadership qualities [bases of influence], so called, vary indefinitely as the needs of groups vary indefinitely (40, p. 674).

In other words, the solution of different problems requires different kinds of resources, and not every individual, even in the power structure, is likely to possess all of the necessary resources for the solution of all community problems.

The general hypothesis is:
G.H. 8. The amount of power attributed to power actors in a given issue area will depend on the degree of congruence between the sources of power possessed by the actors and the resources perceived most relevant to the solution of the issue.

One of the objectives of this dissertation is to determine the sources of a person's power. G.H. 7 and 8 are related to this objective. A corollary objective would be to determine if there is a particular role performance pattern through which persons perceived to have power in the community have had to pass. More formally the relationship to be examined is whether high ranked power actors at time $X_t$, have gone through a common pattern of role performances enroute to their present position of power. If such a role performance pattern exists it should be possible to specify for power actors at time $X_t$, the role performances fulfilled at $X_{t-1}$, $X_{t-2}$ . . . $X_{t-n}$.

In a study of a Minnesota city of 10,000 at two separate points in time, Olmsted reports:

Similarities were found between the participation patterns [roles] and other social characteristics [education, occupational category, sex, or age] of selected leader groups at the two times, with largely different individuals involved; the leader groups were furthermore shown to differ in SP [social participation] score and other characteristics from the general populace (42, p. 281).

and continues:

There appeared to be greater turnover of individuals who were recognized community leaders than there were changes in participation patterns, although the two are not fully comparable (42, p. 281).

and concludes:
These data suggest that the participation patterns of key leaders may constitute a fairly autonomous subsystem within the community's inferred leadership structure (42, p. 280).

Investigation of the SP scores for the selected leaders in 1943 and of those selected again in 1949 shows that the SP score was higher in 1949 than in 1943. Furthermore, of those not selected again in 1949, SP scores had decreased during the six-year interval.

Beal, in summarizing a study of Form and Sauer (17) makes the following statements about the previous participation history of the individuals reputed to have power:

The typical influential [power figure] came to Lansing more than 30 years ago. He belonged to a wide range of local, state, and national business, civic and welfare organizations where he initiated and executed major policy decisions. On the average he belonged to more than 13 organizations—3.9 business organizations, 2.4 professional organizations, 2.9 civic and welfare organizations, 0.8 service organizations and 3.5 social organizations. He had held the top elective or appointive offices in almost all of the organizations in which he had become actively involved. Almost all of the influentials [power holders] had belonged to a common core of organizations—the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Country Club, a leading church, and the Community Chest. However, the highest level of active organizational involvement for the group had occurred in the past (3, p. 9).

The general hypothesis is:

G.H. 9. There will be an expected set of role performances to be fulfilled which are associated with the accumulation of power by actors in the social system.

The testing of the previously stated general hypotheses and the conclusions drawn are inextricably bound to the validity of the methodology employed in gathering the data.

The first two general hypotheses are generated to test whether social power exists and is exercised in the community under study. Under
the tentative assumption that these hypotheses can be supported, the remaining hypotheses (G.H. 3-9) are stated on the implicit assumption that the methodology used to identify the power actors has delineated the persons who actually exercise power. It is furthermore assumed that the persons identified exercise more power than other persons in the social system who were unnamed. The validity of the conclusion in each hypothesis rests upon the validity of the technique used to initially identify the power actors exercising the most power.

The technique used to delineate the persons exercising the most power in this study is referred to in the literature as the reputational technique. The arguments, both pro and con, which have been engendered by the use of this technique have led to several vitriolic exchanges in the professional literature in recent years (10, 12, 16, 34, 44, 45, 46, 56, 57). The question at the nexus of the disagreements is whether reputations of power are an adequate index of the manner in which power is actually exercised in the social system being studied. The importance of the answer to this question relative to the findings of this study suggests that a hypothesis about the validity of the reputational approach be set forth and tested.

The apparent chief critics to the reputational approach are Rossi (46), Polsby (44, 45), and Wolfinger (56, 57). In their critiques and refutation of the reputational approach they, particularly Wolfinger (56, 57), have in the author's opinion, raised two questions of empirical fact and one of validity which are not related to the question of validity of the reputational approach per se.
First, Wolfinger (57) has raised a doubt as to whether the reputational approach can determine whether there is a general power structure as opposed to specialized power structures. The conclusion as to whether power is general or specialized lies not in the validity of the reputational technique, but whether or not power is in fact general or specialized.

Secondly, the question is raised about concluding that there exists a power elite on the basis of data obtained through the reputational approach. The author would also raise a question if such a conclusion were drawn on the basis of these kinds of data. The primary target of this criticism is Hunter. It should be noted that Hunter never used the term power elite, nor did he conclude that a power pyramid existed.* It would appear that the question of a power elite is one of empirical fact and not one of validity vis a'vis the reputational approach. These two questions are being treated in G.H. 3 and G.H. 4.

Finally, Wolfinger questions the validity of the reputational approach by suggesting the possibility of ambiguity in the respondents' interpretation of the question asked by the interviewer. To dispute the cogency of this question would be scientifically naive. What is disputed, however, is the implication that such a question is of greater magnitude in the reputational approach than any other methodology which involves an interviewee response. Thus to raise it as a problem unique to the reputational approach overstates the case.

*See page 29 for a quote from Hunter's study which refutes the assertion that he concluded there was a single pyramid.
The general response to these criticisms by the proponents of the technique has been that opponents have been led to criticize the approach by first building "straw man" expectations about what the technique should do and then proceeding to show the weaknesses. The key issue, according to the proponents (11, 12, 16, 33, 34), is whether the reputational approach will yield the list of persons who exercise the most power in the social system being studied.

D'Antonio and Erickson (12) have stated that there is sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that there is a significant relationship between the reputation and the reality of power exercising capacity. Form and Miller have concluded that the reputational technique along with validating such data against behavioral criteria is the best alternative for the study of community power (16, p. 517).

Since conclusive evidence, in the judgment of the author, is not presented by either the critics or proponents of the reputational technique, the direction of the hypothesis would seem to be the prerogative of the author.

In view of the fact that the reputational technique was employed in the field by the author the following hypothesis will be stated:

G.H. 10. The persons perceived to have the most power in an issue area through the use of the reputational technique are the persons actually exercising the most power in that issue area.
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The major purposes of this chapter are: (1) to describe the social-cultural setting of the study, (2) to briefly outline the field procedure, (3) to derive the epistemic correlations, and (4) state the empirical hypotheses.

The Social and Cultural Setting

The social system which is the unit of study is the town of Center Town, Iowa and the contiguous area considered to be within the limits of the "community".

The community is the county seat town of South County and as such is located approximately at the geographic center. The county is located in southern Iowa.

The population of the town itself was about 1600 in 1960 (24). Peak population was approximately 1900 in 1920. The major population decline occurred from 1950-1960.

The livelihood of the community is derived primarily from agriculture. In 1960, about 45 percent of the employed people were working in agriculture (25). The median family income for 1960 was about $3000.

The town was founded in the early 1800’s. The origin of the early settlers was primarily from the Blue Ridge Mountain area. The present population represents about two and a half generations from the time of the founders. Many of the people presently living there are the sons and daughters of the first settlers.
The population of South County was about 10,000 in 1960, yet there were four towns other than Center Town with populations exceeding 400. Thus the county is composed of several communities, Center Town being the largest in population and dominant to the extent that it is the locus of political and government affairs for South County.

Field Method and Procedure

Introduction

There are according to Form and Miller three major approaches to the study of community power. These are:

1. Study of the potentials for power as based on inventories and influence of persons and organizations.

2. Study of the reputed power or influence of persons or organizations as defined by the opinions of community members.

3. Study of the actual influence or power as shown by the parts played by persons or organizations in determining the outcome of an issue or project (16, p. 517).

The first approach has been criticized. In this respect Form and Miller have concluded that:

These findings indicate that the holders of potential power positions are not necessarily community leaders of influence . . . a method of greater validity is that of identifying persons and groups by power reputations (16, pp. 523-525).

The third approach would be the most ideal and as Form and Miller suggest:

Almost all researchers would prefer this third approach of following through decisions if means could be found to handle the methodological problems (16, p. 530).

One of the severest limitations to the third approach would be the need for a participant observer within the community for a relatively
long period of time. This limitation in itself eliminated this approach in the case of the writer.

Given the inutility of the first approach and the limitations of the third approach, the writer selected the second alternative which is known in the literature as the reputational approach.

A general criticism of the reputational technique has been the incapability of testing hypotheses such as G.H. 3-9 with the limited data yielded by the reputational approach. In recognition of this, the author attempted to expand the research design so that additional data beyond that of the reputational technique would be obtained. The extent to which this was done will become evident in the course of the analyses.

Field procedure

Three separate stages to the field procedure can be identified.

The first stage was to gather information from extra-community knowledgeables about the community selected for study. These were persons who had lived in the community but were no longer residents. The purpose of interviewing these individuals was to gather background information about three areas: (1) possible issues which had recently been of major concern in the community, (2) individuals in the community who would be likely to have knowledge of the community, and (3) individuals who would be likely to have influence in community decisions.

The second stage was to interview several "inside knowledgeables"* in the community. These were people who had been identified as having

*The inside knowledgeables will be referred to hereinafter simply as knowledgeables as a matter of convenience. When referring to them by name, pseudonyms are used.
knowledge of the community by the extra-community knowledgeables. Additional knowledgeables were identified in the course of interviewing the first of the knowledgeables.

In addition, certain persons were interviewed because of their role position in the community and the likelihood that such a role would have afforded them the opportunity to become quite familiar with the community.

The knowledgeables along with their occupational role and years of residence in the community are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Knowledgeables; their occupation and length of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Years residence</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Industrial plant manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Weber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Grant</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Heath</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Professional educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Wholesale business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each knowledgeable was asked a series of questions using a field schedule as a guide*. Appendix A includes the formal questionnaire plus *This questionnaire will be referred to hereafter as the Knowledgeable Questionnaire.
several probe questions which were also used.*

The primary purpose of this interview was to solicit the names of community residents whom the knowledgeable believed to be "power actors"** in the community.

It can be noted in the questionnaire that they were asked to name individuals in several issue areas. Collection of this type of data will provide the means for testing hypotheses such as G.H. 4.

In the third stage the persons named as power actors were interviewed. The selection of persons to be included on this list was made by identifying those persons who had been named by two or more people with respect to any issue area. These data are presented in Table 2.

The power actors were also interviewed through the use of a formal schedule***. In addition, several general probe questions were used. Extensive notes were taken during each interview in addition to the data recorded on the schedule.

The Power Questionnaire is contained in Appendix B.

Additional information was gathered through informal conversations with numerous residents of the community. The author collected all of

---

*These probe questions were developed in the field as a result of initial interviews with knowledgeable in another community. These probe questions were then used in interviewing all the knowledgeable in this particular study.

**Power actors will be the term used throughout this dissertation to refer to those individuals named at least twice by knowledgeable in some issue area and selected for intensive interviewing.

***This schedule will be referred to hereinafter as the Power Questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>General affairs</th>
<th>Courthouse</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Number of areas mentioned in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the data used in this study and spent about one month in the community collecting the data.

Finally, the writer reviewed the weekly newspaper, the Center Town Beacon, for a period beginning January 1961 through January 1963. The activities of community influentials frequently are not reported in local mass media. It was felt however, that a review of the local newspaper would furnish the author with a knowledge of the issues that had been of recent interest. In addition, the review of the newspaper provided a means for a general familiarization of the community, its activities, and the people.

Thus the data to be used in this study are derived from five main sources:

1. Interviews of extra-community knowledgeables.
2. Interviews of knowledgeables.
3. Interviews of reputed power actors.
4. Informal questioning of other community residents.

The Epistemic Correlations

The preceding chapter has set the general framework of this dissertation by selecting and defining the concepts to be studied. In addition, the relationships between these concepts have been stated in the form of general hypotheses.

Once a theory has been stated and defined the ensuing task is to operationalize the theory in such a manner that the relationship between
the conceptual level and the empirical can be determined. That is, the problem of measurement must be solved.

One method of accomplishing the task of stating the relationship of concepts to the empirical is to use a series of propositions which are called epistemic correlations.

According to Northrop an epistemic correlation is:

... a relation joining an unobserved component of anything designated by a concept by postulation to its directly inspected component denoted by a concept by intuition ... Thus an epistemic correlation joins a thing known in the one way to what is in some sense that same thing known in a different way. The usual correlations of scientific knowledge, on the other hand, always relate factors which are known in the same way (41, p. 119).

Northrop also states:

... it is important to note that the epistemic correlations themselves are not directly observed. All that one observes is the immediately apprehended end term in the relation of the epistemic correlation ... Neither the relation itself nor the unobserved, theoretically designated term at the other end of the relation is inspected (41, p. 121).

The derivation of valid epistemic correlations relevant to the measure of the relationships of social power is extremely difficult for several reasons. First, previous research, albeit there are exceptions, has not attempted to develop measures but has chosen to operate within the framework of descriptive analysis. Secondly, past research has contributed little from the standpoint of methodology in power research. As a result the development of measuring devices appears to still be in the initial stages.

A third reason is that the writers who have generated theories of power are not usually the ones who have completed the empirical
research. This situation has likely contributed to the slow development of a set of systematic epistemic correlations.

Thus the epistemic correlations which are developed for this dissertation should be viewed as an exploratory attempt to operationalize the theory postulated in the previous chapter. It is expected that some inadequacies may become apparent in the analysis. These will be noted in the suggestions for future research.

Once the epistemic correlations have been derived, a series of empirical hypotheses are stated as a means of indicating the expected direction of relationships.

Such a procedure as outlined here should permit one to place credence in the general hypotheses or suggest insights which may lead to the reformulation of the general hypotheses.

Existence and exercise of power

It has been previously stated that the existence and exercise of social power must be tested in order to support or refute what has heretofore been a primary assumption in power research.

The question of existence and exercise was divided into two separate hypotheses to facilitate their testing.

The fact that local respondents do provide names of people when questioned as to the persons who are influential in the community can be taken as one measure of the existence of social power.

In addition, once a list of names is derived, the willingness of persons to rate others as well as themselves along a continuum representing power would be a measure of the existence of social power.
Thus two epistemic correlations can be stated:

**E.C. 1** The existence of social power will be measured by the degree to which knowledgeables provide names of power actors.

**E.C. 2** The existence of social power will be measured by the degree to which power actors rate themselves and every other power actor.

The exercise of social power could be demonstrated if it could be empirically verified that: (1) one or more persons in the community had been influenced in their decisions by other members of the community, and/or conversely, (2) that one or more persons in the community had been able to influence the decisions of others in the community.

Within the probe questions used in interviewing power actors a question was posed as to whether the respondent had been influenced to "vote"* a particular way on any community issue by other members of the community. This was followed by a question as to the means by which that individual influenced his decision.

The data obtained from these questions will be used as a measure of the degree to which power is exercised in the social system being studied. For the purposes of measurement it will be assumed that power is exercised if at least 50 percent of the power actors indicate that they have been influenced or that they have influenced others.

Thus the following epistemic correlation can be stated:

---

*The term vote as used in this dissertation is not limited to the formal system of balloting but is meant to suggest a wide range of means by which an individual may indicate a decision.*
The exercise of social power will be measured by the instances in which power actors indicate they have been influenced and/or have influenced others in the community. This measure will be referred to as the instances of exercised power.

Operating under the tentative assumption that G.H. 1 and G.H. 2 will be supported, the measures of the remaining conceptual relationships can be meaningfully derived.

**Structure in community power relations**

Implicit in the hypothesis that power relations are structured is the assumption that individuals in the community can be identified by some technique in such a manner that the individuals with more power can be delineated from those with less power.

The reputational technique was chosen to identify these individuals in the community under study. As previously stated, this technique identifies persons of power on the basis of respondents' perceptions of who had, has, or could have exercised power*. The validity of this technique will be treated in the final hypothesis.

Before the hypothesis related to structure can be tested it is necessary to establish support for the assertion that the persons identified through the reputational technique are in fact the "pool"** of the most powerful individuals within the community.

---

*The temporal sequence is purposefully noted here since the community issues studied were past, present, and future in their time referent.

**Pool is used here until such time that the hypothesis of structure is supported or refuted.
One measure of the degree to which the persons named by the knowledgeables constitute the pool of the most powerful individuals within the community would be the extent to which the persons in this pool, i.e., the power actors differentiate between the power of each person in the pool. In addition, the persons in the pool were asked to add the names of any individual they believed should be included as an influential. The extent to which names were not added would be an indication that the persons perceived to be most powerful had been identified.

The capacity to discriminate between those named, combined with the failure to add names should indicate that power is a meaningful dimension and that other system actors are not perceived to exercise as much or more power than those already identified.

Thus the following epistemic correlations can be stated:

**E.C. 4** The extent to which the persons identified by the knowledgeables constitutes the pool of persons with the most power will be measured by the degree to which each person differentiates the amount of power possessed by the other members of the pool. This measure will be referred to as the variability in power values.

**E.C. 5** The extent to which the persons identified by the knowledgeables constitutes the pool of persons with the most power will be measured by the degree to which there are no added names which are mentioned more than once. This will be referred to as the additional power actors measure.

This assertion will be further measured by the extent to which the knowledgeables and the reputed power actors agree as to the persons who
have the most power in the community. This will be done by comparing:
(1) the rank order of community power actors as given by the number of
times a person was mentioned by the knowledgeable with (2) the rank
order of community power actors as derived from the ranking of the
reputed power actors* by the power actors themselves.

The rank order by the knowledgeable will be called the rank order
by knowledgeable. The rank order by the reputed power actors will be
referred to as the rank order by reputed power actors.

Thus the following epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 6 The extent to which the persons identified by the
reputational technique constitutes the pool of persons with the most
power in the community will be measured by the correlation of the rank
order by knowledgeable and the rank order by reputed power actors.
This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the congruence of power
nominations.

The congruence of power nominations will be considered significant
if the correlation is significant at the .10 level of probability.**

Given the "pool" of individuals perceived to possess the most power
in the community a measure can be designed to determine whether there is
structure to the social interaction among the members of the pool.

*The reputed power actors refer here to the list derived from the
Knowledgeable Questionnaire. Thus the comparison is between the
knowledgeable's perception of power actors and the perceptions of the
persons named.

**The selection of .10 for testing the significance of the obtained
correlations is arbitrary and based on the author's judgment that the
.05 and/or .01 levels would be overly restrictive for these kinds of
data.
Such a measure must discriminate between interaction among the persons due to chance and/or due to situations outside the scope of the community and that interaction which is either purposefully instigated to discuss community issues or provides the opportunity for mutual interests to develop or be shared.

One measure of the interaction that occurs between power actors is found in the data given by the power respondents themselves. During the course of interviewing several references were made to persons with whom the power actor interacted, both socially and on business affairs. Thus the following epistemic correlation can be stated:

**E.C. 7** The extent to which the relations of power actors are structured will be measured by the **perceived sociograms** of power actors.

To determine the degree of interaction within the power actor group the following question was asked:

"Which of the above (list of power actors) persons do you and your family visit in their home?"

The pattern of interaction indicated by these data will be referred to as the social interaction sociograms.

The following epistemic correlation can be stated:

**E.C. 8** The extent of structure in power relations will be measured by the extent to which patterns in social interaction are found to exist. This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the **social interaction sociogram**.
Monomorphic or polymorphic power

The fourth general hypothesis has a two-fold objective. First, it is concerned with the question of whether the power actors remain the same over all community issues or whether power actors specialize on certain issues.

Secondly, the hypothesis is concerned with whether or not the structure (assuming support for G.H. 3 is demonstrated) of power actors relations remains the same on all community issues.

With respect to the first concern the extent of overlap between various issues must be determined. Three independent measures will be used to determine the extent of overlap.

In the first the degree of overlap will be determined by the duplication in names between each issue and every other issue on which data were collected. The source of data for this measurement will be questions 4, 26, and 32 of the Knowledgeable Questionnaire. For the purpose of this dissertation the overlap will be considered as demonstrating monomorphic power if the duplication is equal to or exceeds 75 percent. Thus power will be general or monomorphic in the community if the overlap is 75 percent or greater between each issue and every other issue.

The epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 9 The extent to which the community's power is monomorphic or polymorphic will be measured by the extent of duplication in persons perceived to have power in several issue areas. This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the knowledgeables index of polymorphic power.
The second measure to be applied is derived from the perceptions of the power actors themselves. Each power actor rated each of the other 17 as to the amount of power which he believed that person had. The rating was done through the use of a Thurstone-type scale where one end of the scale represented "no power" and the other end of the scale "very much power". The respondent circled a number from 1 to 11 for each person on the list depending upon his perception of the amount of power the person had in the particular issue area being rated. In all, each respondent rated the other 17 persons on five different issue areas. These issue areas were: (1) general community affairs, (2) business and industry, (3) county hospital project, (4) courthouse bond issue, and (5) community fallout shelter.

Once these ratings had been obtained it was possible to compute a "mean power value" for each individual by summing his ratings and dividing by 17.

By computing the correlations between the power actors as rated on each issue and every other issue, an index of the generalized or specialized nature of community power can be obtained.

For the purpose of measurement community power will be considered monomorphic in nature if the correlation is significant at the .10 level or higher.*

Thus the following epistemic correlation can be stated:

*The rationale for using .10 here is the same as in the case of E.C. 6.
The extent to which community power is monomorphic or polymorphic will be measured by the correlation of mean power values between each issue and every other issue. This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the power actors index of polymorphic power.

Corroborative evidence of the degree to which power actors are generalized or specialized can be obtained from the respondents' perception of his own scope of power. In the course of interviewing the power actors the following probe questions were posed:

"Do you exert influence in all kinds of issues in the community?"

"(If no) What determines the issues in which you try to exert influence?"

The term "all kinds" was qualified by indicating areas such as: health, business, political, educational, religious, and recreational to the respondents. For the purposes of measurement power will be considered as polymorphic if at least 50 percent of the power actors indicate that they are not involved in all kinds of issues.

Though less formal and not subject to statistical analysis, the following epistemic correlation is stated:

The degree to which community power is monomorphic or polymorphic will be measured by the perceptions of power actors as to the nature of their own power.

The second aspect of the fourth hypothesis is concerned with the extent to which the structure of power relations between the top power actors are the same in each of the specific issue areas.

The structure of power relations in specific issues will be measured by constructing a sociogram showing the interaction pattern of the
power actors most involved in each issue. These measures will be referred to as **issue sociograms**.

The issue sociograms are primarily derived from the responses of power actors to the following questions which were posed for three issue areas: courthouse, county hospital, and business and industry.

1. "Who were the persons exercising the most influence in the _____ issue?"

2. "Who did they (or you) work with on the _____ issue?"

The issue sociograms of the various issues will be considered to differ significantly if no more than 50 percent of the actors in any one issue sociogram appear in any other issue sociogram. The criterion used to determine whether an actor is in an issue sociogram is as follows. All actors within two interaction units of the power actor perceived to be most powerful in the issue will be included in the sociogram.

This means no actor who is active in the issue would have to go through more than one other actor to communicate directly with the power actor perceived most powerful.

The following epistemic correlation is stated:

**E.C. 12** The difference in power structure over issues will be measured by the degree to which the **issue sociograms** of each issue are different.

**Decision making and execution**

The fifth general hypothesis is that power actors in the community under study will not only make the decisions but will become actively involved in executing those decisions.
In the Knowledgeable Questionnaire the following two questions were asked relative to each issue area:

"If this community were to become involved in a project, who would be the persons that would be very active in this project? That is, who are the people who do the work? (List the ten most active.)"

"If this community were to become involved in a project, who are the persons who would have been influential in trying to get the community to "vote" for the project? That is, who are the people who carry the most weight in this community? (List the ten most influential.)"

The extent to which the names given in answer to the first question overlap with the names given in answer to the second question will be one measure of the degree to which the persons of power are also the persons of execution.

The epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 13 The extent to which the persons of power are also the persons of execution will be measured by the number of duplications in names. This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the knowledgeable index of role diffusion.

For the purposes of measurement the index will be considered significant if it is equal to or greater than 75 percent duplication.

The power actors were asked the following questions:

"Do you think the persons who are influential ever get involved in carrying out projects, or do they stay 'behind the scenes'? What about yourself?"

The level of significance will be the same as in E.C. 13.

The following epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 14 The extent to which persons of power are also the persons of execution will be measured by the power actors' perception of
dual functioning. This measure will be referred to as the power actors index of role diffusion.

**Power structure and level of community issue**

There were four specific issues plus a generalized area in which the writer sought to determine the persons possessing the most power. At least two of the issues in the author's judgment can be considered of major importance. These are the county hospital project and the courthouse bond issue.

The persons believed to have the most power in both of these issues will be determined by the procedure outlined in E.C. 10. The question as to whether they acted as structure will be determined in E.C. 12.

If the information derived by these two measures could be compared to other community issues of lesser import, the results would be a measure of the extent to which the power structure on major community issues is involved as a structure in community issues of lesser import.

Though other community issues were not specifically studied to determine their origin, information was gathered from respondents which indicates the origin and/or execution of several community issues.

Two such issues are Old Settlers Day and the Center Town trading stamp plan. Old Settlers Day is an annual event held each August honoring the early settlers of the area. The Center Town trading stamp plan is a promotion of retail trade.

The criteria by which an issue may be judged as being of minor rather than of major importance are not readily available. For the purposes of measurement the author has used the following criteria as the
means of classifying issues into major and minor importance:

1. The extent to which all people will be specifically asked and/or obligated to participate if an affirmative decision is made.

2. The extent to which an affirmative decision will require capital investment of more than $5000 on the part of the taxpayers.

3. The extent to which nearly all groups and/or organizations will be recognized as relevant in the decision making process.

The relationship between the structure of power actors involved in the major issues and the minor issues will be significant only in the event that the issue sociogram for minor issues is the same as it is for the major issues.

Thus the epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 15 The extent to which the power structure of major community issues becomes involved as a structure in minor community issues will be measured by comparing the power structure on two major community issues with the names of persons influential in two minor community decisions.

An additional measure of the above will be the extent to which power actors in the two major issues indicate that they are, or are not, involved in all community issues.

Negative responses to the question, "Are you involved in all community issues?", will be accepted as evidence that the power structure of the major issues are not involved as a structure in all issues. The term "all" was specified by adding the qualification, "by 'all' we mean projects or issues like the courthouse on the one hand and a project like the annual Red Cross drive on the other". If the number of
negative responses is greater than that due to chance the hypothesis will be supported.

The epistemic correlation is stated:

E.G. 16 The extent to which the power structure of major community issues becomes involved as a structure in minor community issues will be measured by the number of negative responses which they give to the question, "Are you involved in all community issues?". This measure will be referred to as the index of involvement in all community issues.

Influence and authority

On the basis of several research efforts it has been hypothesized in G.H. 7 that the power actors with the greatest perceived power will have no more authority than power actors with less power. Thus the differences in power will not be a function of authority per se.

The rank of power actors in terms of perceived power is given by the mean power value of each person.

Authority is operationalized as filling a formal position, either elected or appointed, in various groups. To determine the authority of a power actor a formal office score was determined for each of the 18 power actors in the manner of Mulford (39, p. 67).

In brief, this method entails the assigning of arbitrarily weighted values to formal positions or offices. Mulford (39, p. 67) used the following: (1) president, 4 points; (2) vice-president, 3 points; (3) secretary, secretary-treasurer, treasurer, 2 points; and (4) other officer or committee chairman, 1 point.
A modification introduced here to account for positions of formal authority above the local level is as follows: county level president, 5 points; district level president, 6 points; state level president, 7 points; regional level president, 8 points; and national level president, 9 points. The change for other offices is increased accordingly as the level moves from the community to the national level.

The relationship between authority and total power will be tested by splitting the power actors into high and low groups on the basis of their total formal office scores and mean power values and computing a phi coefficient. For the relationship to be significant at the .10 level of probability, phi will have to be equal to or greater than 0.39.

The epistemic correlation is:

E.C. 17 The extent to which power actors of high mean power values have the same amount of authority as power actors of low mean power values will be measured by the correlation of mean power values and formal office scores.

A second measure of the relative role of influence and authority in total power can be derived from the following open end question which was posed to power actors.

"What do you think makes a person influential in this community?"

A categorization of these answers into influence and authority would provide a comparison of the perceived relative importance of influence and authority in total social power.

For the purposes of measurement the ratio of influence to authority will be considered significant if there are five or more mentions of
influence for every mention of authority.

The epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 18 The relative role of influence and authority in the total social power of power actors will be measured by the frequency of the mentions of sources of power which are influence as compared to the frequency of mentions which are authority. This measure will be referred to hereinafter as the influence-authority ratio.

Congruence of power sources and issue

This general hypothesis is generated as another dimension of the hypothesis of generalized versus specialized power.

It is logically possible that power actors could be found to be generalized on the basis of peoples' perception but still be specialized to the extent that it is the resources to which they have access that contribute to their being named as a power actor in more than one issue area. Thus control of credit or mass media might contribute to being a person of power in several issue areas. Therefore power would be generalized to the extent that control of credit or mass media is important in all areas.

No data were gathered in the field which would allow delineation of sources of power into categories relevant to each issue area.

An attempt to devise such categories post factum by having judges assign the sources of power posed in the Power Questionnaire to the various issue areas was not successful. The general reason appeared to be the lack of mutual exclusiveness in the sources, e.g., is control of money and credit a position of authority, is it only influence, or
some combination.

To gain some insight into the general hypothesis and to utilize the data which were collected the following measure is suggested.

The sources of power which power actors perceived to be most important in contributing to the power actors' power were obtained for the actor perceived most powerful in the issue areas of business and industry, the courthouse, and the county hospital. Tim Martin was perceived as being the most powerful in business and industry. Wilbur Martin was perceived as being the most powerful in the courthouse issue. Charles Newman was the person perceived as most powerful in the county hospital project.

Each power actor who ranked Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin, and Charles Newman at or near the top in the three respective areas was asked to indicate, in order, the three most important sources of power that that individual possessed. Every first choice was scored 3, every second choice 2, and every third choice 1. The frequency of mention of a source multiplied by the appropriate weighted value gives a total score for that source. The first five sources were then ordered for each of the three individuals.

The following epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 19 The extent to which power actors are perceived most influential in an issue area in which their sources of power are most relevant will be measured by the degree to which the perceived sources of power of the most powerful actors differ by issue area. This measure will be referred to as an index of congruence of power sources and issue.
Role performances

The hypothesis is that persons who are top power actors will have had a similar pattern of role performances within the community over time. That is, there is a set of experiences through which an individual must move in order to eventually gain a position of power.

One measure of the degree to which there is a pattern of expected role performances is provided in data obtained in answer to the following question: "If a relatively young married man came to this community and established himself occupationally and wanted to become active in the community and eventually be a person of influence, what should he do? What shouldn't he do?"

For the purposes of measurement the perceptions of expected role performances will be considered similar if there are at least three role performances mentioned five or more times.

The following epistemic correlation can be stated:

E.C. 20 The extent to which there is an expected pattern of role performances to be fulfilled enroute to power will be measured by the similarity in power actors' perception of expected role performances. This measure will be referred to as an index of expected role performances.

A final measure of the presence or absence of the hypothesized pattern of role performances will be the comparison of the present role performances of persons said to be increasing in power with the past role performances of the power actors said to be remaining the same in their power.
The measure is based on the assumption that persons perceived to be increasing in power by the power actors are likely to be conforming to the expected role performances.

The present role performances of those actors perceived as increasing in power were equated in the time dimension with the actors perceived as being stable in their power by ascertaining the role performances within a five-year period. The period 1957-1962 was used for those increasing in power and the period 1939-1944 was used for those whose power was stabilized. The 18-year interval was obtained by computing the difference in the average age of the two groups. Thus the stabilized group was the same age in the period 1939-1944 as the increasing group was in the period 1957-1962.

The similarity of role performances in the two groups will be tested by examining both groups on three criteria which are: (1) the number of each group belonging to each organization to which at least one of either group belongs, (2) the average percent of attendance of the actors in each group belonging to each organization, and (3) the total formal office score for all members of each group belonging to each organization. The final decision as to whether the role performances are similar will be a judgment of the author since the application of a statistical test, with the expected numbers in several cells being quite small, would be questionable.

The following epistemic correlation is stated:

E.C. 21 The similarity of the present role performances of persons perceived to be increasing in power and the past role performances of power actors perceived to be stable in power will be a measure of the
degree to which there is an expected pattern of role performances enroute to positions of power.

Validity of reputational technique

The validity of the reputational technique as a method of identifying the power actors in the community and furthermore ranking the actors in order of their power is best determined by measuring the degree to which respondents' perceptions are associated with actual participation of power actors in the community decision making process.

The extent to which actual participation can be determined is complicated by: (1) the short time spent in observation of the community, (2) the need to rely on recall of actual participation, and (3) the fact that activities of power actors are infrequently reported in the mass media.

These difficulties notwithstanding, all the power actors were questioned as to: (1) what the persons they identified as most powerful actually did in the issue under study, (2) what they personally did in the issue area, and (3) what other people actually did. These data were secured for the courthouse issue only.

The courthouse issue was current and less subject to the problems of recall than any of the other issues. The bond issue had been voted on only ten days prior to the interviewing period.

The relationship between perceived power and actual power will be considered comparable if the top three power actors as measured by power values are also the top three as measured by actual exercise of power.

Thus the following epistemic correlation is stated:
E.C. 22 The validity of the reputational technique will be measured by the extent to which the *actual exercise* of power of the power actors compares with the *perceived exercise* of social power, i.e., mean power values.

Empirical Hypotheses

The purpose of this section is to restate in full the general hypotheses and to state in the form of empirical hypotheses the expected direction of relationships between the measures set forth in the epistemic correlations.

The empirical hypotheses will not be restated in the null form. The null hypothesis form has the greatest utility where statistical tests of significance are to be applied. This dissertation will contain a minimum of such tests. Thus, while it is recognized that the technique of using null hypotheses is commonly followed, it is the judgment of the author that this procedure would be overly redundant in this study. An excellent rationale for restricting the use of statistical tests to a minimum in the kind of data being analyzed in this study is presented by Lipset, Trow, and Coleman (27).

G.H. 1

Social power, i.e., the capacity to control others, *exists* in the social system central to this dissertation.

E.H. 1 Knowledgeables will provide the names of persons perceived to have power.
E.H. 2 The nominated power actors will rate themselves and the other nominees.

G.H. 2

Social power, i.e., the capacity to control others, is exercised in the social system central to this dissertation.

E.H. 3 There will be instances of exercised power in the community being studied.

G.H. 3

Social power will be exercised in the social system by individual power actors acting in concert.

E.H. 4 There will be variability in the power values assigned by power actors.

E.H. 5 The additional power actors added to the pool by power actors will not be mentioned by more than one person.

E.H. 6 The congruence of power nominations will be significantly positive.

E.H. 7 There will be identifiable perceived sociograms.

E.H. 8 There will be an identifiable power actors social interaction sociogram with clique patterns.

G.H. 4

Power structures will vary depending upon the issue area.

E.H. 9 The knowledgeable is less index of polymorphic power will be
less than 75* between the issue of general affairs and the issue of business and industry.

E.H. 10 The knowledgeables index of polymorphic power will be less than 75 between the issue of general affairs and the courthouse issue.

E.H. 11 The knowledgeables index of polymorphic power will be less than 75 between the business and industry issue and the general affairs issue.

E.H. 12 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the business and industry issue will not be significant.**

E.H. 13 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the courthouse issue will not be significant.

E.H. 14 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

E.H. 15 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

*In E.H. 9-E.H. 11 the index is expressed as the percent duplication of names between issues. Seventy-five is the level defined as being significant.

**The index being used in E.H. 12-E.H. 21 is expressed in terms of a product-moment correlation. The level of significance is the same as that used in E.C. 6.
E.H. 16  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the courthouse issue will not be significant.

E.H. 17  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

E.H. 18  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

E.H. 19  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the courthouse issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

E.H. 20  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the courthouse issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

E.H. 21  The power actors index of polymorphic power between the county hospital issue and the community fallout shelter will not be significant.

E.H. 22  Power actors will indicate that they are not involved in all kinds of issues.

E.H. 23  The issue sociogram of the courthouse and the county hospital will differ significantly.

E.H. 24  The issue sociogram of the courthouse and business and industry will differ significantly.

E.H. 25  The issue sociogram of the county hospital and business and industry will differ significantly.
G.H. 5

The persons of power who control the decisions of the social system will also be the persons who execute the decisions.

E.H. 26 The knowledgeable index of role diffusion in general affairs will be significant.*

E.H. 27 The knowledgeable index of role diffusion in business and industry will be significant.

E.H. 28 The knowledgeable index of role diffusion in the courthouse issue will be significant.

E.H. 29 The power actors index of role diffusion will be significant.

G.H. 6

The power structure in a given issue area will exercise power as a power structure only on major issues in that area.

E.H. 30 The power actors in the courthouse issue sociogram will not act in concert on the Center Town trading stamp plan.

E.H. 31 The power actors in the courthouse issue sociogram will not act in concert in the promotion of Old Settlers Day.

E.H. 32 The power actors in the county hospital issue sociogram will not act in concert on the Center Town trading stamp plan.

E.H. 33 The power actors in the county hospital issue sociograms will not act in concert in the promotion of Old Settlers Day.

*The duplication in persons perceived as active and influential must be equal to or greater than 75 percent to be significant. This applies for E.H. 26-E.H. 29.
E.H. 34  The index of involvement in all community issues will not be significant.

G.H. 7

The power actors perceived to have more power will have no more authority than the power actors perceived to have less power.

E.H. 35  The correlation of mean power values of power actors with their total formal office scores will not be significantly positive.

E.H. 36  The mean power values of power actors will be inversely related to their formal office score for the period 1956-1962.*

E.H. 37  The frequency of sources of power which are influence will be significantly greater than the sources of power which are authority.

G.H. 8

The amount of power attributed to power actors in a given issue area will depend on the degree of congruence between the sources of power possessed by the actors and the resources perceived most relevant to the solution of the issue.

E.H. 38  The perceived sources of power of the top power actors in business and industry, in the courthouse issue, and in the county hospital will be different.

*The level of significance for E.H. 36 is the same as for E.H. 35. A complete explanation is given in E.C. 17.
G.H. 9

There will be an expected set of role performances to be fulfilled which are associated with the accumulation of power by actors in the social system.

E.H. 39 The perception of role expectations will be similar.

E.H. 40 The role performances of power actors presently increasing in power and the past role performances of power actors now stabilized in their power will be similar.

G.H. 10

The persons perceived to have the most power in an issue area through the use of the reputational technique are the persons actually exercising the most power in that issue area.

E.H. 41 The actual exercise of power in the courthouse issue area by power actors will be comparable to their perceived exercise of power in the courthouse issue.
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to: (1) present the data relevant to the testing of the hypotheses, and (2) to state the conclusions as indicated by the data. The general hypotheses will be restated with each of the related empirical hypotheses following.

Table 3 presents a summary of selected personal and social characteristics of the power actors who are the focus of this study. These data are presented here to provide an overview of the power actors and as a convenient way of including some data which will not be specifically used in the succeeding analysis.

The Findings

G.H. 1

Social power exists in the social system central to this dissertation.

E.H. 1 Knowledgeables will provide names of persons perceived to have power.

As can be seen from the data in Table 4, all of the knowledgeables responded with names of persons they believed to have power in the community. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E.H. 2 The nominated power actors will rate themselves and the other nominees.

The data in Table 5 indicate the degree to which each nominee rated himself and all other nominees on a scale designed to measure the
Table 3. Selected personal and social characteristics of power actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power actor</th>
<th>Code no.</th>
<th>Years of educ.</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Years in resid.</th>
<th>Political views</th>
<th>Average gross income</th>
<th>Church affiliation</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Business mgr.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lawyer-judge</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bank cashier</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Conservative Repub.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auto dealer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Production mgr.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Conservative Repub.</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Conservative Repub.</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sewing machine dealer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Farm manager</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Conservative Repub.</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hardware dealer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lumber dealer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Conservative Democ.</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Veterinarian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Liberal Democrat</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jeweler</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conservative Repub.</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Liberal Republican</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retired farmer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Liberal Democrat</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,889</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
amount of power each power actor had. Only two of the power actors refused to rate themselves in addition to those indicated in the footnote of Table 5.

In addition, only two persons (the same as above) refused to rate the other nominees on any of the issues.

These data indicate that out of a possible 90 self-ratings, 85, or 94.4 percent were made. Out of a possible 1530 other-ratings, 1443, or 94.3 percent were made. Thus the empirical hypothesis is supported.

On the basis of the data presented in E.H. 1 and E.H. 2 it is concluded that social power does exist in the community under study. Thus the first general hypothesis is supported.

Table 4. Knowledgeables who nominated power actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Provided names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Weber</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Grant</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Heath</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Frequency of ratings by power actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power actor</th>
<th>Rated themselves&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of other nominees rated by each nominee&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin*&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Each person had an opportunity to rate themselves five times.

<sup>b</sup>There were 17 possible ratings except where a nominee added to the list, thus where the number of ratings exceeds 17 it is due to such additions.

<sup>c</sup>Wilbur Martin, Leonard Frost, and Barry Clark were not in the community at the time of the hospital project, therefore they did not rate themselves or the other nominees.
Social power is exercised in the social system central to this dissertation.

There will be instances of exercised power in the community being studied.

Table 6 presents the data which were obtained in answer to the following questions:

"Have you ever been influenced by others on any community issues?"

"Have you ever influenced others to decide a certain way on any community issue?"

These data indicate that there were 61.1 percent of the power actors who indicated that they had been influenced and 72.2 percent indicated that they had influenced others on community issues.

In addition to the frequency of instances of exercised power, several excerpts of interviews are presented here as examples of the kind of data for which a positive frequency was recorded.

In regard to the building of a local gymnasium, Larry Nichols stated:

"I talked to Oscar Edgewild and Bob Gayle about the need for a new gym. We decided to take it up in the Rotary Club. From there we went to the PTA. By that time the wheels were in motion and two years later we had a new gym . . . I'd say I had some influence over others."

Relative to the county hospital project, Charles Newman stated that he had been chairman of the drive and had personally contacted numerous people soliciting their contributions. He believed that he had influenced a number of people to support the hospital project. In relation
Table 6. Instances of exercised power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power actor</th>
<th>Have been influenced</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Have influenced others</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the power of Charles Newman, Oscar Edgewild stated that:

"Newman was able to influence many people even though Tim Martin was opposed because he is financially independent and his business comes from outside of the community, so he cannot be squeezed by Martin and the others who control the purse strings in the local community."

Tim Martin indicated several cases in which he had influenced the behavior of others. In regard to the courthouse issue he stated:

"... the first election was sort of a trial balloon we sent up to see which way the wind was blowing. After it failed, I told the Board of Supervisors to hold a special election in September rather than with the general election in November."

The special election was held in September, 1962.

On the basis of the data reported in Table 6 and the examples presented above it is concluded that the empirical hypothesis is supported. The support of this hypothesis leads to the conclusion that social power is exercised in the social system under study and thus the general hypothesis is supported.

G.H. 3

Social power will be exercised in the social system by individual power actors acting in concert.

E.H. 4 There will be variability in the power values assigned by power actors.

The variability in power values was computed by determining the standard deviation of ratings assigned by each power actor. These standard deviations are an index of dispersion for the ratings assigned by any individual power actor. These data, along with the mean and range of ratings, are presented in Table 7. Inspection of these data
Table 7. Variability in rated power values by rater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power rater</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean (n=17)</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would indicate that individual raters are discriminating between the actors as to the amount of power they perceived them to have. Thus the empirical hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 5 The additional power actors added to the pool by power actors will not be mentioned by more than one person.

There were 11 names added during the course of interviewing the 18 power actors, none of which were named by more than one power actor. Of these 11, only two had been mentioned by the knowledgeable. Thus the empirical hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 6 The congruence of power nominations will be significantly positive.

The rank order by knowledgeable and by power actors was divided into high and low halves in such a way that a phi coefficient could be computed. Phi in this case was equal to 0.33 which is insignificant at the .10 level of probability. Thus the empirical hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 7 There will be identifiable perceived sociograms.

In the course of interviewing the power actors data were gathered which indicated that several cliques of power actors work together on various issues.

Roger Knight identified a clique in the persons of Wilbur Martin, Tim Martin, and Marion West. He also identified a clique between himself, Wilbur Martin, and Carroll Crane. Crane is the son-in-law of Marion West. Wilbur Martin is the son of Tim Martin, and Tim Martin and Marion West are on the Board of Directors for the Center Town Bank.
Larry Nichols stated that Tim Martin and Marion West worked in concert. Nichols and Oscar Edgewild also work in concert on various community issues. Nichols indicated that the issues on which Martin and West work differ from the issues on which he and Edgewild work.

Charles Newman indicated that Tim Martin and Marion West worked together on many issues in the community.

Bob Gayle identified a group that has worked in concert on several occasions, namely, John Harris, Bill Adams (not on the list of power actors), Marion West and Ralph Stevens.

Edgewild said that he, Gayle, and Charles Newman worked together on the county hospital project.

Edgewild further identified a social clique of young people in the community consisting of Roger Knight, Wilbur Martin, and Carroll Crane of the power actors, and Jack King, Dick Garrett, and Bart Wills. The latter three were not named on any of the lists by knowledgeable more than once.

Stevens, West, Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin, and Carroll Crane were stated as having worked together on the courthouse issue. The author observed these men at coffee on a rather regular basis during the period of interviewing.

Ralph Stevens stated that the hard core of leadership in the community is located in the persons of Marion West, Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin, and Charles Newman. The first three work together on nearly all issues in which they are influential. Newman, however, according to Stevens, is more apt to work with Edgewild and Bob Gayle.

These data support the empirical hypothesis.
There will be an identifiable power actors social interaction sociogram with clique patterns.

The social interaction sociogram is presented in Figure 1. The lines without arrows on either end represent a mutual choice. The scalloped circles represent the power actors perceived to have the most power in the area of general affairs.

Inspection of the sociogram reveals several cliques. One such clique is that of 2, 1, 3, 12, and 14. An overlapping clique is seen in 2, 6, 1, and 3. Still another is 2, 1, 3, and 15.

Another clique is that of 9, 10, and 15. There are also several couplets in interaction, e.g., 7 and 8 (who are father and son), 9 and 10, 1 and 6 (son-in-law and father-in-law), 2 and 4 (father and son), and 7 and 15. Numbers 18 and 16 are near isolates. Number 18 is a retired farmer who was a member of the Board of Supervisors until defeated in the general election of 1962. Number 16 is a jeweler and relative newcomer to the community.

In viewing the relationships between the persons represented by the scalloped circles and the blank circles it is found that all of the persons represented by the blank circles are drawn into direct interaction with at least one of the top power actors.

Further inspection indicates that there are only three persons (16, 18, and 9) who are not drawn into direct interaction with at least one of the top five power actors as measured by their mean power values.

The data in Figure 1 support the hypothesis of clique patterns and a high degree of interaction among power actors. Using this type.
Figure 1. Power actors social interaction sociogram
of interaction as an operational measure of structure in power relations it is concluded that the empirical hypothesis is supported.

G.H. 4

Power structures will vary depending upon the issue area.

E.H. 9 The knowledgeables index of polymorphic power will be less than 75 between the issue of general affairs and the business and industry issue.

The data presented in Table 8 indicate the index to be 86, thus the hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 10 The knowledgeables index of polymorphic power will be less than 75 between the issue of general affairs and the courthouse issue.

The data in Table 8 indicate the index to be 92, thus the hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 11 The knowledgeables index of polymorphic power will be less than 75 between the business and industry issue and the general affairs issue.

The index is 67, thus the hypothesis is supported.

Table 8. Knowledgeables index of polymorphic power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Affairs</th>
<th>Business and Industry</th>
<th>Courthouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 12. The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the business and industry issue will not be significant.

The correlation between general affairs and business and industry is .937 which is significant at the .01 level of probability. Thus the hypothesis is not supported. The correlation used to test this hypothesis and those used to test hypotheses E.H. 13-21 will be found in Table 9.

Hypothesis 13. The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the courthouse issue will not be significant.

The correlation between general affairs and the courthouse issue is .662 which is significant at the .01 level of probability. Thus the hypothesis is not supported.

Table 9. Power actors index of polymorphic power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General affairs $X_1$</th>
<th>Building and industry $X_2$</th>
<th>Courthouse $X_3$</th>
<th>County hospital $X_4$</th>
<th>Fallout shelter $X_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$ -</td>
<td>.937*&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.662&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.458**&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$ -</td>
<td>-.475***&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.614&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$ -</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .01

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .05

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .10
E.H. 14 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

The correlation between these two issues is .458 which is significant at the .10 level of probability. The hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 15 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the general affairs issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

The correlation of general affairs and the community fallout shelter is .345 which is not significant at the .10 level of probability. In this case the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 16 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the courthouse issue will not be significant.

The correlation between business and industry and the courthouse issue is .475 which is significant at the .05 level of probability. The hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 17 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

The correlation between business and industry and the county hospital issue is .614 which is significant at the .01 level of probability. Thus the hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 18 The power actors index of polymorphic power between the business and industry issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.
The correlation in this case is .267 which is not significant at the .10 level of probability. In this case the hypothesis is supported.

**E.H. 19** The power actors index of polymorphic power between the courthouse issue and the county hospital issue will not be significant.

The correlation between the courthouse and the county hospital is -.032 which is not significant at the .10 level of probability. The hypothesis is supported.

**E.H. 20** The power actors index of polymorphic power between the courthouse issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

The correlation between the courthouse issue and the community fallout shelter issue is .377 which is not significant at the .10 level of probability. The hypothesis is therefore supported.

**E.H. 21** The power actors index of polymorphic power between the county hospital issue and the community fallout shelter issue will not be significant.

The correlation between these two issues is .049 which is not significant. The hypothesis is supported.

**E.H. 22** Power actors will indicate that they are not involved in all kinds of issues.

In general the power actors' statements with respect to the scope of their own power refutes the above hypothesis. Some of the statements of power actors are as follows:

"The thing which determines the issues I get involved in are my interests and being in a position to do something about it . . . therefore while I'm not in on every issue, I do get involved in many kinds of issues."
"I get involved in all the major issues and projects, in fact they are all checked with me, except school issues. School issues can split the community and create long bitter memories . . . a person who wants to keep a position of influence can't get involved in many of these and stay on top."

"I don't see any specialization by men in certain issues to the exclusion of others . . . all of us [on the list] get brought into many different issues although the same people may not head up every project . . . (gosh) in a community this size there isn't enough good leadership so that people can specialize by different issue areas."

"I'm mainly interested in community improvement, promotion of business and things like that . . . when it comes to political issues such as the courthouse I stay out as much as I can because you always make some enemies if you choose up sides in controversial affairs . . . but this doesn't mean that I'm specialized by only one kind of issue . . . for example, I was the initiator on Crazy Daze, the South County Chamber of Commerce, a part of the county hospital committee etc."

"I feel that the persons who get involved down the line change depending on the issue, for example the people who do the leg work on school reorganization are different than the ones who do the leg work on an issue like the county hospital . . . but when you talk about influentials being involved, I'd say the same hard core [Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin, Marion West, and Charles Newman] gets involved in nearly every issue."

On the basis of these data and similar data from other respondents it is concluded that the empirical hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 23 The issue sociogram of the courthouse and the county hospital will differ significantly.

Figures 2 and 3 respectively present the major cliques involved in the county hospital and courthouse issues. It can be noted that only number 12 (Ralph Stevens) is involved in both issues. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 24 The issue sociogram of the courthouse and business and industry will differ significantly.
Figure 4 presents the major clique pattern identified in the area of business and industry. It can be observed that only number 2 and number 12 (Wilbur Martin and Ralph Stevens) are in both issue sociograms. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 25 The issue sociogram of the county hospital and business and industry will differ significantly.

A comparison of Figure 4 and Figure 2 shows that five of the persons in the two issue sociograms are the same. The major difference that exists is that number 8 is the locus of the county hospital issue whereas number 10 tends to be the locus in the business and industry issue. On the basis of these data it is concluded that the hypothesis is not supported.

In summary, E.H. 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 25 are not supported, whereas 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are supported. An inspection of the specific hypotheses which are not supported and the ones which are supported suggests that the power actors that are involved in the various issue areas in the community tend to be monomorphic in nature. That is, the same power actors become involved to some degree in nearly all of the community issues. At the same time, however, the data suggest that the power structure, i.e., the network of relations that are brought to bear on an issue, changes over issues. Thus the power structure tends to be polymorphic in nature.

As a result of the above findings it is likely that a clear-cut rejection or support of the general hypothesis is untenable at this time. The possibility of restating the hypothesis will be presented in the succeeding chapter.
Figure 2. Major clique pattern in the county hospital issue

Figure 3. Major clique pattern in the courthouse issue

Figure 4. Major clique pattern in the business and industry issue
The persons of power who control the decisions of the social system will also be the persons who execute the decisions.

E.H. 26 The knowledgeables index of role diffusion in general affairs will be significant.*

The extent of overlap between perceived influentials and perceived actives or executors in general affairs is 62. Thus the hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 27 The knowledgeables index of role diffusion in business and industry will be significant.

The extent of overlap between the persons perceived to be powerful and the persons perceived to execute the decisions in the area of business and industry is 45. The hypothesis is not supported.

E.H. 28 The knowledgeables index of role diffusion in the courthouse issue will be significant.

There is an index of 75 in the case of the persons perceived to be powerful in the courthouse issue and the persons perceived to execute the decision. The hypothesis is supported in this case.

E.H. 29 The power actors index of role diffusion will be significant.

The data relevant to this hypothesis are in the form of open end statements. Several of these will be presented in excerpt form. Table 10 presents a summary of the responses as well as a categorization of the data by the author. Below are four excerpts:

*The index must be 75 or more to be significant. The same level applies for E.H. 26-E.H. 29.
"I wouldn't see very many of the influentials in this community just playing the role of legitimizer as you call it... take Tim Martin for instance... he took two weeks off from court and beat the drums for the courthouse. He went out to all parts of the county and talked to local people... he actually went day and night. That doesn't mean he works on every project that much however... there are several he just says go ahead."

"Yes, the people who carry the weight in Center Town get into the action stage... around here if you had an idea and waited for someone else to carry it out nothing would ever happen. You asked what the difference was between the first time the courthouse issue was voted on and the second time... I'll tell you what it was... I took two weeks off from court duties and worked night and day for it. I don't get involved in all projects, mostly the ones I'm for or against."

"you asked who I would talk to if I had an idea... I've learned long ago in this community that if you want something done you do it yourself."

"I was probably the most influential in getting the county hospital project over the top and I can tell you that meant plenty of hard work, contacting hundreds of people... there wasn't anyone around who just gave the go ahead."

In summary it is seen that the knowledgeables index of role diffusion is supported in only one of the three hypotheses.

The power actors index of role diffusion however strongly supports the hypothesis that power actors in Center Town not only exercise power but also become active in the execution and carry-out phases of action projects.

It is the author's judgment that the power actors index is a better measure than the knowledgeables index. On this basis and the data presented above it is concluded that the general hypothesis is supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open end</th>
<th>Coded response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are influential also active?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Carroll Crane | "I wouldn't see very many of the influentials . . . just playing the role of legitimizer as you call it."
| Wilbur Martin | "I worked a great deal on the courthouse issue and I imagine people see me as influential."
| Roger Knight | "I know that the two most influential people on the courthouse were the most active."
| Tim Martin | "I worked night and day for two weeks on the courthouse--I work on any project I'm for or against."
| Larry Nichols | "I believe the people who are influential here are also active . . . of course some active people are not influential."
| Marion West | "If you want to get an idea sold here you work for it no matter who you are."
| Clarence Newman | "My dad has been influential in Center Town for many years and he always gets actively involved in the projects he is a part of . . . it's the same for most others here too."
| Charles Newman | "I've never been able to influence much action without helping carry out the project."
| Lloyd Frevert | "I wouldn't see anyone in the community who just gives the word and someone else carries out the project." |
| Bob Gayle | "I've initiated the South County Chamber of Commerce and Crazy Day in Center Town and the only way they came to reality was by a lot of work on my part and others . . . when the 'power boys' want something to happen they have to work too." |
| Oscar Edgewild | "When a group of us wants something to happen here we have to work at it . . . sure, other people who are not influential do a lot of work, but so do we [Charles Newman, Harris, Stevens, etc.]." |
| Ralph Stevens | "Yes, the influentials are active . . . Tim [Martin] and I sat down and identified about a dozen people we believed could help pass the courthouse issue and he drove out and saw them . . . he did this night and day for two weeks." |
| John Harris | "I imagine we are less active than before but there aren't any kingpins in this town who just say what to do . . . Tim Martin is active and he probably carries the most weight of anyone." |
| Leonard Frost | "The top men are also active, but not in every project. Sometimes they don't get involved in any action." |
Table 10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open end</th>
<th>Coded response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are influentials also active?</td>
<td>Are influentials also active?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>&quot;The influentials are often active in issues, particularly if they are strongly in favor or opposed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>&quot;I believe the same people are active and influential, no matter what the issue. The top men are less active than the younger men... but they work on projects, e.g., Charles Newman and Tim Martin.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>&quot;Well I know Wilbur [Martin] and Ted [Martin] worked damn hard on the courthouse issue and they are two of the most influential in town. Tim doesn't work on every issue in town though, but most are checked out with him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>&quot;I don't see any difference between the people who are influential and the ones who work except that everybody who works is not influential.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The power structure in a given issue area will exercise power as a power structure only on major issues in that area.

E.H. 30 The power actors in the courthouse issue sociogram will not act in concert on the Center Town trading stamp plan.

Figure 3 has presented the major clique or structure involved in the courthouse issue.

In the Center Town trading stamp plan, Barry Clark was the initiator and major executor of the plan. Assistance was provided by three other persons, none of whom were identified as power actors. Clark stated that:

"I got the idea after I was elected president of the Chamber of Commerce ... the executive board went along with it but I had to sell it personally to everyone around the square ... it seems to be working out so far but there isn't much comment by the 'wheels'."

On the basis of these data it is concluded that the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 31 The power actors in the courthouse issue sociogram will not act in concert in the promotion of Old Settlers Day.

Old Settlers Day is an annual event held every year since the early 1870's. The 1962 event was held during the time the author was interviewing knowledgeable in the community. The chairman of this year's event was Ted Porter. Master of ceremonies was Bob Gayle. None of the six power actors of Figure 3 were instrumental in the affair however.

These data support the hypothesis.
E.H. 32  The power actors in the county hospital issue socio-
gram will not act in concert in the Center Town trading stamp plan.

The power actors acting in concert on the county hospital are
presented in Figure 2. Of these, none were involved in the initiation
and carrying out of the stamp plan. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 33  The power actors in the county hospital issue socio-
gram will not act in concert in the promotion of Old Settlers Day.

Two of the power actors in Figure 2 (Bob Gayle and John Harris)
were involved in the organization and carrying out of Old Settlers
Day. The other five contributed some time and money but were not key
persons in the event. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 34  The index of involvement in all community issues will
not be significant.

Table 11 indicates that no power actor perceives himself to be
influentially involved in all issues. In addition to the data pre-
ented in Table 11, the responses presented in E.H. 22 lend additional
support to the above hypothesis.

Finally the partial negation of a monomorphic power structure in
G.H. 4 supports the hypothesis that power structures in one issue area
do not necessarily act in concert on other issues. These data are
inferential since the importance of the issue was not a criterion for
testing G.H. 4. It is concluded on the basis of the above data that
top power actors who act in concert on major issues do not act in con-
cert on issues of less importance.
Table 11. Index of involvement in all community issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power actor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Power actor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Prevert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G.H. 7

The power actors perceived to have more power will have no more authority than the power actors perceived to have less power.

E.H. 35 The correlation of mean power values of power actors with their total formal office scores will not be significantly positive.

Table 12 presents the total formal office score for each power actor. The phi coefficient between the high and low mean power values and the high and low formal office scores is -.11 which is not significant. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

Categorization of formal office scores into time intervals as shown in Table 12 suggests another hypothesis which is as follows:
Table 12. Formal office scores by five-year intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe formal office score is assigned during the interval in which the office was assumed.
E.H. 36 The mean power values of power actors will be inversely related to their formal office score for the period 1956-62. Computation of phi gives a value of -.56 which is significant at the .05 level of probability. The hypothesis is supported.

E.H. 37 The frequency of sources of power which are influence will be significantly greater than the sources of power which are authority.

A total of 50 responses were given by the power actors as sources of power. These were categorized by the author into 15 sources of power as seen in Table 13. Of the 50 responses, 46 were assigned to the influence component and 4 were assigned to the authority component. This gives a ratio of influence to authority of 11.1:1. On the basis of these data it is concluded that the hypothesis is supported.

Support of E.H. 35-37 leads to the conclusion that the amount of power and authority is unrelated, thus the general hypothesis is supported.

G.H. 8

The amount of power attributed to power actors in a given issue area will depend on the degree of congruence between the sources of power possessed by the actors and the resources perceived most relevant to the solution of the issue.

E.H. 38 The perceived sources of power of the top power actors in business and industry, in the courthouse issue, and in the county hospital project will be different.

Table 14 presents the sources of power believed to contribute to
Table 13. Perceived sources of power by power actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Coded as Influence</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to money</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening ability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership ability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church affiliation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the power of Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin, and Charles Newman respectively. It is evident that the rank order as well as the sources are different between the three men. To this extent the hypothesis is supported. Additional support for differences in the sources of power and their relevance to a particular issue can be provided for
Table 14. Congruence of power sources to issue area; a comparison of power sources for the top power actor in three issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of power</th>
<th>Tim Martin (Business)</th>
<th>Wilbur Martin (Courthouse)</th>
<th>Charles Newman (Hospital)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of money and credit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>Past participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of authority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contacts with people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kind of occupation</td>
<td>Human relations skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past participation in community groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Position of authority</td>
<td>Source of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tim Martin and Charles Newman. Tim Martin is perceived as most powerful in the area of business and industry and general affairs as well as second in the courthouse issue. He does control money and credit to the extent that he is President of the Board for the Center Town Bank. It seems reasonable that such a source of power would be relevant to promoting business and industry. Martin himself said, "they (a local committee) were trying to get a doctor to locate here ... when they found one he said that the community would have to loan him $10,000 to get started ... well the committee was all worried about how to do it and I told them just to go ahead, that I would sign for it over to the bank."

Charles Newman, whose past participation in community groups and past achievements are perceived most important, has been active in many
health related activities, thus a major share of his participation and achievements are directly related to issues such as the county hospital.

Additional suggestions relative to this general hypothesis will be presented in the discussion chapter.

G.H. 9

There will be an expected set of role performances to be fulfilled which are associated with the accumulation of power by actors in the social system.

E.H. 39 The perception of expected role performances will be similar.

Table 15 is a summary of the perceptions of present power actors as to the expectations they see as operative for a newcomer who desires to move up the scale of power. There is a fairly high degree of consensus on at least the first four expected role performances.

Another source of data which provides additional support of this hypothesis is provided in the rank order of sources of power as determined by the frequency with which the power actors selected them as contributing to social power in the community.

These data are presented in Table 16. As can be seen from these data, the expected role performances presented in Table 15 may result in the individual accumulating past achievements, having contacts with others, being influential in community groups, having past participation, etc.

On the basis of these data it is concluded that the hypothesis is supported.
Table 15. Perception of expected role performances of persons desiring
to gain power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected role performances</th>
<th>Frequency of mention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be active in community affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be successful in their own business</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check out any ideas for community change with us (power actors) before moving ahead</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be honest in your business dealings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join the right groups</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber and/or Junior Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate with a church</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get elected to office in groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get acquainted with us (power actors)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.H. 40 The role performances of power actors presently increasing in power and the past role performances of power actors now stabilized in their power will be similar.

Table 17 presents the data comparing the role performances of those power actors perceived to be increasing in their power with the role performances of those persons perceived to be remaining the same at this point in time. The role performances of the latter group are for the time period 1939-44, at which time they would have been the same age as the first group during the period 1957-62.
Table 16. Sources of power perceived to be necessary for exercising power in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency (Maximum n=18)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency (Maximum n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of ideas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Access to outside people</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kind of occupation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of money and credit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Position of authority</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential in groups</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control of jobs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Middle age or older</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past participation in groups</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Take the time</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, both groups belonged to the same organizations. It is evident that several of the organizations are listed due to the membership of one person.

Average attendance appears to be higher for the first group. In gathering the data on organizational attendance a single value was obtained irrespective of the time period the person belonged. Thus it is possible that the apparent difference is a function of the older power actors averaging their attendance over the entire period. This possibility is supported by the common remark of many of the members who indicated that they did not attend as much any more.

The 1957-62 group also averaged higher formal office scores in the organizations where at least two members of either group belonged. The
Table 17. Comparison of actual role performances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Group 1b (n=9)</th>
<th>Group 2c (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attendance</td>
<td>attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office score</td>
<td>Office score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Church</td>
<td>8  64</td>
<td>4  97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>5  78</td>
<td>5  71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>4  68</td>
<td>6  23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Lodge</td>
<td>3  36</td>
<td>3  27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td>5  32</td>
<td>3  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>7  39</td>
<td>3  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts</td>
<td>3  83</td>
<td>1  90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Committee</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>3  65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Director</td>
<td>1  100</td>
<td>2  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City government</td>
<td>1  100</td>
<td>2  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County government</td>
<td>2  100</td>
<td>1  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Board</td>
<td>2  100</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* See text p. 69 for explanation of means by which time dimension was equated between the two groups.

*b* Group 1 is the increasing group and Group 2 is the stabilized group. Group 1's performance was measured in 1957-1962; Group 2's in 1939-1944.

*c* One of the actors rated as stable in power was only 18 years of age at the time (1939-1944) role performances were computed, therefore was not included.

*d* NA indicates that the organization was not organized during the period 1939-1944.
Table 17 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Group 1 (n=9)</th>
<th>Group 2 (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attend-</td>
<td>attend-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office score</td>
<td>Office score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
<td>2 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Star</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 30 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Bar Association</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1 100 4</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Church</td>
<td>1 100 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Club</td>
<td>1 50 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterback Club</td>
<td>1 75 2</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio Board</td>
<td>1 50 2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Republicans</td>
<td>1 50 0</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>1 90 2</td>
<td>1 100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>1 50 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Board</td>
<td>1 95 2</td>
<td>1 100 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Committee</td>
<td>1 100 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Chamber</td>
<td>1 100 0</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 75 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Council</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 95 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significance of this difference is subject to question when the problem of recall for the 1939-1944 group is taken into account.

On the basis of the data available it is the judgment of the author that the hypothesis is supported.

The support of E.H. 39-40 leads to the conclusion that the general hypothesis is supported and that there is an expected pattern or role performances associated with the eventual attainment of power in the community under study.

G.H. 10

The persons perceived to have the most power in an issue area through the use of the reputational technique are the persons actually exercising the most power in that issue area.

E.H. 41 The actual exercise of power in the courthouse issue area by power actors will be comparable to their perceived exercise of power in the courthouse issue.

Numerous instances of exercised power are included in the analyses presented thus far. Of particular note is Table 10 which relates the power actors' answers to the question of whether persons having power are or are not involved in the execution of the decisions they have influenced.

At this point it would seem desirable to draw together the statements made by the power actors as to the actual acts which occurred in regard to the courthouse issue. The following data were taken from the interview notes recorded during the interviewing of the power actors.
"Tim Martin took two weeks off from court duties and beat the drums for the courthouse. He actually traveled to all parts of the county talking to particular individuals."

"Wilbur Martin did as much work if not more than Tim. He talked to groups in nearly every community—in some two or three times."

"My dad was particularly influential, probably because of his role in the Republican Party. He was able to reach out all over the county and make contacts."

"Both Tim and Wilbur Martin made a lot of personal contacts. Tim was able to put some pressure on because of his position in the Republican Party. Tim was able to get all the banks in the county to issue a statement supporting the courthouse."

"After the first attempt failed . . . I told the Board of Supervisors to hold a special election in September rather than waiting for the general election . . . I took two weeks off from court and worked night and day on the courthouse, contacting and talking to people all over the county . . . I just spotted the 'bull elks'* and set out to convert them . . . I knew when I did that there would be several more [converts] before I got back to town. The Board of Supervisors, the Assessor, the Treasurer, and the Auditor did what I told them to do. I had seven women fold and mail 1960 personal letters to county residents about the courthouse."

"The Judge was able to put the finger on several people because of past political activity in the county. He got the banks to support the courthouse, even the one in Cornerville**. He got the Center Town bank to pay $200 postage—told them to charge it off to advertising."

"Tim [Martin] wrote several letters in the paper. Both he and Wilbur [Martin] made presentations all over the county. Bill Head also made some presentations. The major role he played was doing what Tim told him to . . . Bill was on the Board of Supervisors, you know. Nichols does what Martin and West tell him to do."

---

*"Bull elks" were defined by Tim Martin as the fathers and grandfathers of voters whom he had grown up with and knew all his life.

**Cornerville voted against the courthouse issue as a community.
"Wilbur Martin and Bill Head were the two who tried to influence people the most besides Tim. West also exercised some influence... he called me the night before the election and told me to get 10 votes for the courthouse the next day."

"Martin [Tim] told one of my clients who wanted a loan that if he voted the right way he would see to it that he got the loan."

"Tim put the finger on people in every township during the courthouse issue."

"Nichols is strictly a 'yes' man for Martin [Tim] and West."

In addition to these direct quotes from interviewees, several other statements were made which indicated that:

1. Tim Martin organized and directed the absentee voting for all shut-ins in the county.

2. Tim Martin was able to pressure the banks because of county funds which he could control as to location because of his control over the Board of Supervisors. In line with this, Bill Head, who was chairman of the Board and a Democrat, stated that:

   "I'm a Democrat but I owe everything that I have to the Republicans, in fact some people in the county say that I'm more Republican than Democrat... I suppose that's because I agree with Martin a lot, but after all he's a pretty intelligent person."

3. Tim Martin and Marion West influenced the votes of many creditors and customers of the Center Town Bank because they are on the Board of Directors.

These data indicate a predominant role in the courthouse issue for Tim Martin, Wilbur Martin and Bill Head.

In the mean power values which are based on the perceptions, i.e., the reputational technique, these three power actors were rated as
having the most power.

Thus the hypothesis is supported and it is concluded that the power actors identified through the use of the reputational technique is a valid measure of the actual power which is exercised by the power actors.
DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

It can be seen from examination of the two previous chapters that an analytical framework has been used in this dissertation. One of the advantages of such an approach is that fairly finite limits to the investigation can be established. In addition, the analytical framework demands a rather rigorous set of definitions of concepts at all levels. Finally, it requires the data to be dealt with objectively, at least to the extent that operational definitions or criteria for measurement be spelled out for all to see.

These advantages of an analytical framework are also disadvantages to some extent. For the analytical framework used herein excludes from the analyses many of the intuitions and innuendos of the data which may be paramount to the eventual ordering of cause and effect in the area of social power. Another way of expressing this disadvantage is to say that the thread of continuity in the social reality which is observed does not seem amenable to the hypotheses testing technique which was used in this study. Thus the alternative of descriptive analyses might be considered.

There are however several serious disadvantages to the use of descriptive analysis alone. One of the obvious and most serious is that the generalizations drawn are usually based on author judgment without the benefit of operational definitions which state what will be considered significant for the purposes of measurement.
In addition, one can easily allow irrelevant data to enter into the conclusions of descriptive analyses.

The study by Vidich and Bensman (52) is an example of descriptive analysis. One of the disadvantages to this type of analysis might be illustrated by the editorial in a social science journal which states the following reaction of the community which was studied:

The people of the village waited quite a while to get even with the authors, who wrote a Peyton Place type book about their town recently.

The featured float of the annual Fourth of July parade followed an authentic copy of the jacket of the book, Small Town in Mass Society . . . Following the book cover came residents of Springdale riding masked in cars labeled with the fictitious names given them in the book.

But the pay-off was the final scene, a manure spreader filled with very rich barnyard fertilizer, over which was bending an effigy of the author (55, p. 1).

Thus the advantage of descriptive analysis, namely, presenting the data in detail and chronological order with liberal interpretation of the researcher, would seem to be outweighed by the disadvantages.

It is hoped that the analyses in the previous chapter can now be strengthened by presenting some data in the descriptive framework.

The major purposes of this chapter are to: (1) discuss the findings of the previous chapter and reformulate those general hypotheses which were rejected in total or in part, (2) to make suggestions for future areas of research relative to social power in the community, and (3) to derive several implications from the findings for change agents.

In addition it is the function of this chapter to provide an opportunity for presenting observations and insights which could not be presented in the analytical framework of the previous chapter.
The general procedure will be to present and discuss some general observations vis à vis the total research effort, then to treat each general hypothesis separately including the suggestions for future research. The final section of the chapter will be devoted to the implications for change agents.

General Observations

It will be recalled that three major steps of data collection were used in this study. These were the interviewing of: (1) extra-community knowledgeable, (2) knowledgeable, and (3) reputed power actors.

A questionnaire was prepared for field use for the latter two groups. These are in Appendices A and B respectively.

One of the methodological problems encountered was the need for adjusting the field schedule as the interviewing proceeded. That is, additional issues involving power exercise were discovered which, in the author's judgment, would have been more useful from the research standpoint than some of those used.

In the main, it was decided to follow the field questionnaire previously prepared.

An additional problem somewhat unique to research of interrelationships between people like those involved in social power is that of learning data about individual A after you have already interviewed A. The decision must be made as to whether to return to A to probe or take individual B's perception as the data with which the analysis will be made.
An admitted weakness of this research was the lack of resources by the author, mainly time, to return to an individual several times.

Three suggestions from the standpoint of general methodology are made here for future research efforts.

First, more time needs to be spent gathering general information about the community from knowledgeable before using a formal data gathering instrument such as a field schedule.

Secondly, it would seem feasible to use a prepared field schedule along with a set of probe questions developed in the process of interviewing.

Thirdly, provisions should be made for returning to the respondents, particularly the power actors, several times to cross check their perceptions.

As a final over-all comment on methodology vis-à-vis future research it is suggested that all researchers provide the opportunity for others to review their methodology as a means of strengthening the methods used in power research. At present it is virtually impossible to extract the specific methodology used in any power research reported in the literature.

There were no women identified as being a part of the power structure in this research study. It is expected that women would have been identified had data been sought on issues involving "expressive" groups as well as those issues used which are most likely to involve "instrumental" groups.

The geographic frame of reference for the study was the Center Town community, meaning the incorporated limits of the town and the
contiguous rural area generally included in the primary retail trade area.

Despite this frame of reference, all the persons identified as power actors resided within the city limits. One possible reason that this might have occurred is because no specific "farm" or rural issue was used as a focus of data gathering.

It is also possible of course that none of the rural population in question are influential to the extent that they would rate higher than those persons named.

In future research of small rural communities it would seem desirable to include an issue of particular orientation to the rural population to determine whether a different set of power actors would be identified. That such would be the case is suggested by the finding that different persons played major roles of influence in the issues studied.

Another observation of the general nature was the complete absence of mass media personnel, in this case the newspaper, in the list of power actors. This occurred despite the fact that the publisher had been a U. S. Representative for over 20 years. Not only were the mass media and the publisher excluded from a role of influence, they were in fact the target of many disparaging comments.

A final observation of general nature regards the attitude of respondents relative to the interview situation and content. Of the nine knowledgeable and 18 power actors, only one exhibited anything less than complete cooperation. Respondents are willing to respond to both indirect and direct questions about power as it is exercised in
the community.

It is the opinion of the author that additional data relevant to testing the hypotheses could have been obtained if he had been as "brave" at the beginning as at the end. To counteract this as a serious obstacle, the author interviewed power actors in another community first and began the interviews in the community central to this thesis with persons perceived to have the least power.

An example of a direct probe to which the interviewee responded might exemplify the degree to which they will provide answers (data).

In interviewing the major power figure about his role in the courthouse issue, the author asked, "It has been said by others that you brought pressure to bear on bank directors throughout the county to support the courthouse issue. How did you do that?" The power actor responded by describing the "facts of life" which he had pointed out to the various bank boards, among them the fact that county funds did not have to be deposited in every bank.

Observations on General Hypotheses

Existence of social power

The fact that persons freely named people when asked to identify power actors was accepted as evidence that social power exists. In addition, the fact that power actors were willing and able to rate themselves and others as to amount of power possessed is evidence that social power is a meaningful and familiar phenomenon to community residents.

It is the judgment of the author, therefore, that the existence of power can be assumed in most social systems, particularly social
systems such as the community.

**Exercise of social power**

The support for exercise of social power was demonstrated by the occurrence of instances of exercised power.

As with the first general hypothesis it would seem that this hypothesis has been supported in enough cases that it could be assumed as a starting point for power research. The likelihood that a researcher would find a social system without power being exercised would seem to be nil.

The major problems in social power research are related to the exercise of power to be sure, but not in supporting the hypothesis that it is exercised.

Thus in future research it is suggested that more attention be devoted to developing more complete data gathering techniques. Additional comments relative to this suggestion will be stated for specific cases throughout this discussion.

**Structure in power relations, monomorphic or polymorphic power, and power structure and level of community issue**

Due to the high interrelationship of these three general hypotheses they will be jointly discussed.

The data support the hypothesis of structure in power relations on the three major issue areas, the structure varying from issue to issue.

The data also support the hypothesis that the structure on major issues is not involved as a structure on minor or less important issues.
It was also concluded on the basis of the data that the power actors identified are monomorphic to the extent that nearly all major issues draw the top power actors from these people and polymorphic to the extent that the core group of power actors in interaction for any given issue is likely to differ from the core group on other issues.

A problem of measurement is to determine when you have in fact identified the structure, i.e., what criteria are imposed to say this individual is or is not a part of the structure.

For the purpose of analysis in this dissertation it will be recalled that the persons assigned to the core group, or power structure, were those no more than two interaction units removed from the person perceived to exercise the most power.

While this operational definition seems adequate for discriminating among top power actors over issues, it leaves void the answer as to the total network by which power is disseminated throughout the total social system including the other power actors. For if the objective of the top power actors is to deter the actions of all "voters", then some mechanism must be used to do this.

This research has not focused on this diffusion process. A legitimate question might be raised as to whether underlevel power actors, e.g., Tim Martin's "bull elks", are monomorphic or polymorphic in function.

Thus it is suggested that a future research effort focus on one issue entirely, providing enough resources to trace the issue from its initiation to its completion. While it is true that such a study will be limited in the generalizations that can be made, it should provide useful
insights for additional research.

Therefore it is the suggestion of the author that Rossi (46) be ignored in his plea for studying all kinds of issues in all kinds of communities until more complete understanding is gained with respect to single issues. This plea is based upon the usual restriction of resources which is nearly always a legitimate assumption.

The courthouse issue would have been adapted to the kind of study suggested.

Turning again to the finding which suggests that the pool from which power actors are drawn into a specific issue is monomorphic and the particular core group in any issue is polymorphic, the following comments seem applicable. These data are not unlike those of Hunter (23) who suggested that there was an over-all structure of power from which particular individuals were brought into sub-groups as any specific issue became important.

It is also possible that the measuring instrument is incapable of eliminating "halo" effect so that even though a power actor is primarily influential in one area he is perceived to be influential in another, thus giving rise to an image of monomorphic power. The possibility of such an occurrence is one legitimate rationale for extending the research design beyond the reputational technique alone.

The possibility of the "halo" effect seemed to be demonstrated in the present research. Nearly all power actors stated that Tim Martin was opposed to the county hospital. Several accounts of how he did not contribute money until after the drive was successful were given by various power actors. Martin acknowledged these to be correct. Despite
these accounts of actual behavior he was rated as the second most influ-
ential person in getting the hospital project to succeed.

Related to the above argument which casts doubt on the finding of a
monomorphic power pool is the variable of community size. The size of
the community supports the likelihood that a rather small number of per-
sons (15-20) may in fact be the pool from which power actors are drawn
into varying structural relationships, depending on the issue.

The degree to which the exercise of social power is judged to be
generalized or specialized would also seem to be affected by the economic
base of the community. Form and Miller state that:

There is good evidence that the less diversified the economic
base of the community, the more clustered is the potential
for power (16, p. 538).

They also state:

The political homogeneity of a community also seems to be a
contributing factor (16, p. 538).

All of the tentative explanations of the data eventually end by
begging the question as to what criteria are to be imposed which will
lead to conclusions as to whether the observed behavior is a case of
generalized or of specific power exercise.

It is therefore concluded that future research efforts follow the
above suggestion of thoroughly studying selected issues as a means of
sharpening the concepts, particularly the concept of structure.

In regard to the involvement of the power structure as a structure
in issues of major and minor importance two observations seem relevant.

First the question of structure must be solved as suggested above
before conclusive data can be gathered.
Secondly, there needs to be a technique whereby issues can be ranked along a single continuum if possible. As noted in the second chapter, Barth and Johnson (1) have suggested five typologies of community issues. While they seem to be conceptually useful they are incapable of empirical test because of the number of issues that would be needed to test every possible combination and permutation of the five typologies.

Thus there is a need for a single continuum which can be defined and used in future research. The division of major and minor used in this dissertation might be one way if the criteria were sharpened and a technique developed whereby the respondents in the community determine where an issue falls on the continuum.

It may be noted that the findings relative to this hypothesis were in the expected direction.

Decision making and execution

The knowledgeable index of role diffusion was significant only in the case of the courthouse issue. There are several possible reasons for this.

The courthouse issue was current and specific. General affairs and business and industry were both diffuse areas as well as undefined in terms of time.

In the course of gathering data from the knowledgeables they were inclined to provide many more names for the latter issues (with respect to active persons) than on the courthouse issue.
The form of questioning was also different in the case of the knowledgeables than the power actors. In the case of the knowledgeables the question as to who was active was posed first with the question about influentials following. The power actors were asked whether influentials got involved in carrying out the projects.

The degree to which the form of questioning affected the response is not known. It does seem reasonable in retrospect however, that the question asked of power actors is more specific.

Finally, an arbitrary criterion of 75 percent overlap was set as the level of significance. If the level had been set at 45, all three of the empirical hypotheses would have been supported.

The general hypothesis stated that the decision makers would also be the executors of the decisions. The size of the system was the intervening variable giving rise to this particular hypothesis. This hypothesis was supported in the community being studied.

A suggestion for future research would be to test the same hypothesis in other communities of larger size. It should also be tested in more communities of the same size in an attempt to determine whether size of the social system is the relevant variable.

This hypothesis could be studied in more detail by focusing on a single issue from the initiation of an idea until completion as was previously indicated.

Influence and authority

The major intent of this hypothesis was to determine whether the total power of a power actor was associated with the amount of authority
which the person had. The findings indicate that present power is unrelated to total authority ever accumulated and inversely related to authority possessed within the last five years.

The conclusion of these findings, recalling the components of power which were postulated in the second chapter, is that influence plays the major role in determining the amount of power an individual has.

Previous research has postulated several bases of power (or influence as defined previously) but has not attempted to isolate these bases beyond the stage of correlating factors such as wealth, occupation, age and the like.

Investigation of Tables 13 and 14 provides insight into some of the bases of influence. In Table 13 it will be noted that access to money, leadership ability, community responsibility, willingness to work, and respect of people are among the most important sources of influence.

Table 14 provides an insight into the possibility of respondents identifying the sources of power specific to selected power actors as well as indicating the sources of power for the actors in question.

Two possibilities for future research emerge from the above findings.

First, the possibility of developing a more refined and mutually exclusive set of source categories than was used in this research. (See Question 16 in Power Questionnaire.)

Secondly, there is the possibility of getting additional data of the type in Table 14 along with sufficient face sheet data on each individual to attempt validation of the perceived sources of power for individuals. For example, in Table 14, Tim Martin is perceived to have
control of money and credit, the face sheet data indicate he is President of the Bank Directors, thus validation is possible.

The specific question as to whether authority and influence do or do not interact to increase total power was not dealt with in the formal analysis. Some insight is gained, however, by examining the following specific data.

Tim Martin has the position of bank director which is authority. He is also independently wealthy which is influence. He is the acknowledged strength of the Republican Party. He is a lawyer by profession and a judge by occupation.

These facts in themselves suggest strongly the possibility that this combination is what contributes to his total power. In addition, his son is a lawyer and county attorney and his son's law partner (and formerly his partner) is the chairman of the Republican Party.

Therefore it seems feasible that the power of Tim Martin is not only a function of his own bases of power interacting, but also a function of his bases and the bases of others in interaction. Support for this possibility is seen in the data which indicate that Larry Nichols, head bank cashier, is a "yes" man for Martin. Thus another basis of his power might be the control over the jobs of others (Larry Nichols and Carroll Crane) through his position as President of the Board of Directors.

Thus while Tim Martin has a minimum of authority positions it becomes apparent that the one he has is a key position and does not lend itself to equation with other positions of presidency at the local level, e.g., president of PTA. The tentative conclusion at this point is that
not only may authority be interacting with sources of influence, but that certain positions of authority may be grossly underrated. The case for authority being overrated can also be derived from the data.

In attempting to determine who would be most powerful in the area of community fallout shelters, Everett Jackson was rated at the top, the apparent reason being that he was "Civil Defense Director". No one, however, including himself, claimed that anything had been done in the area of civil defense. The respondents in general seemed to be saying that this is a unique issue area, one which is new, and of low interest, thus the network of power relations has not been established. With these "facts" as background the usual response was, "well I suppose Jackson would be the most powerful, after all he is the Civil Defense Director". His relative role in other community issues, as well as his own attitude towards civil defense, would not support this conclusion.

The implication of this discussion for future research is the need to develop a more feasible system of scoring authority positions. The possibility that authority and influence are not the best conceptual breakdown should not be ruled out. This point is raised as a follow-up to the earlier comment that authority and influence could be conceptually distinguished much easier than they could be operationally divided.

**Congruence of power source and issue**

It is the author's opinion that pursuit of this hypothesis could be one of the most fruitful in future power research. This is particularly true if one is concerned with deriving practical implications for the change agent. The preoccupation of focusing on the persons involved as
opposed to the desired end result seems akin to the situation of not being able to "see the forest for the trees". Admittedly the findings relative to this hypothesis are inconclusive and simply provide the basis for developing future research. Several of the suggestions of the previous hypothesis would also seem to be applicable here. One of the additional needs for extending research in this area would be the development of adequate criteria for determining what resources are needed to solve particular issues, particularly those resources relevant at the decision making stage. The implications of this hypothesis for change agents will be examined in the succeeding section.

Role performances

In addition to the factors specifically revealed in the findings it should also be noted that there are other characteristics of the power actors which distinguish them from the total population of the community.

In Table 3 it can be noted that the average annual family income is nearly $16,000. The median is nearly $15,000. For the population as a whole the median family income was about $3,000.

The average years of education among the power actors was 14.6 whereas the average for the total population was about 10.

The church affiliation was predominantly Methodist. Though this is the largest denomination in the community it is not nearly as disproportionate as the membership of power actors would indicate.

Twelve out of the 18 are politically aligned with the Republican Party. Though the actual ratio of Republicans to Democrats is not known, the affiliation of power actors does not seem to be significantly
different.

When the top five power actors on general affairs are viewed it is found that they average 14.6 years of education, $23,400 annual gross income, 55.6 years of age, belong to the Methodist Church and own their own business.

There are extremes within the top power actors however. Tim Martin has not belonged to a community organization of any kind for over 30 years. Charles Newman on the other hand has participated in a wide range of community organizations.

A comparison of the role performances of Tim Martin with the role performances of other power actors, both the stabilized and the increasing, as well as the perceptions of what a person would need to do to gain power reveals that Tim Martin has not conformed to many of the perceived norms.

Thus Martin does not conform to the hypothesis of Romans that:

The higher the rank of a person within a group, the more nearly his activities conform to the norms of the group (22, p. 141).

Many of the respondents felt compelled to note that "Tim does a lot of things that no one else could get away with, but everyone knows that when the chips are down and you're in trouble, that Tim can get you out of it if anyone can".

Thus until other communities have been studied and particular attention given to the role performance of the top power actor, it would be premature to suggest Tim Martin as the prototype of Hunter's "biggest man in town".
Validity of reputational technique

The major shortcoming of the findings relative to this hypothesis was the limited data with which to test the hypothesis. The suggestion for future research is to develop more means of gathering data on what people actually did in a given issue area. This suggestion coincides with those made earlier vis-à-vis the need for studying specific issues in detail. The present research effort could have been strengthened by concentrating the questions as to the actual role of power actors on a single issue. A review of the analysis will indicate that the data used were from only one issue.

The controversy which generated the need for the hypothesis would appear to be ready for "burial", as Wolfinger (56) suggests, but for different reasons.

The author agrees with D'Antonio and Erickson (12) that the reputational technique is an adequate index of the actual exercise of power. Granted to Wolfinger, however, is the need to validate such findings. Thus the need for future research, and the means of burying the issue of the reputational approach, would seem to be in expanding the research designs to allow for validation on a systematic basis.

In sum, the critics of the reputational approach are worried about the validity of perceptions, or what in jurisprudence would be called hearsay. The solution to this concern would seem to be in tighter conceptualization and attention to the rules of analyses, just as hearsay is eliminated from testimony by certain rules.

A final suggestion for future research concerns the methodology used in obtaining mean power values. Though outside the scope of this
dissertation it would be important to determine some measure of consistency and/or concordance before extending the scaling technique to other research.

Implications for Change Agents

As was noted in the introduction to this study, one of the major rationale for studying the phenomenon of social power was to derive if possible some implications for change agents.

This section is an attempt to state in brief some implications which can be generalized at this stage of research. As an over-all restriction, it would appear that the following implications have the greatest relevance for rural social systems as opposed to large urban centers.

An obvious implication is that change agents should recognize that social power does exist and is exercised in every social system, particularly the community. An associated implication is that it is usually easier to work toward change from within the power system than outside or at cross currents to it. Recognition of these points should suggest to the change agent the need for becoming a part of the system or at least to establish open communication with it.

Given the need for working with or through the power system another implication of this research for the change agent can be identified. Basically it is the fact that a change agent can identify the power system by a lay application of the reputational technique used in this research. By selecting several issue areas and then asking several key knowledgeable about the persons of influence in each issue the change
agent will have most likely identified the relevant power system. Such a statement is based on the assumption that the reputational technique is valid and that the change agent has some skills in interviewing. The change agent, particularly one who remains over time, can continue to add data as time goes on thus refining his knowledge of the structural relations between the persons previously identified.

As support for the above it should be noted that of the 18 power actors interviewed in this study, 15 were named (several twice) by the first two knowledgeables interviewed.

A very practical implication of knowing the power system is to enable the change agent to sort out the legitimizers appropriate for various issues. In the community under study at least, the major power holder believed that he could stop any project to which he was opposed. If this is true of top power actors, and it seems to be more likely in small social systems, it would behoove the change agent to take this into account.

The findings of this study support that of others and suggest that the change agent be cautious in equating holders of formal office as being holders of power. At best, the persons who held authority positions 10-15 years previous would be current power holders of consequence. Even this guideline would not be as useful as the procedure of questioning outlined above.

The analysis indicated that the persons at the core of an issue would likely vary by issue. This suggests the need for the change agent to be prepared to work with various power actors and not limit himself to a specific power actor.
If there is a set of role performances as it appeared in this study it would suggest a route for the change agent to become a part of the community power system. Again this would be particularly relevant for the change agent who lives in the community.

An implicit caution for the change agent is to determine whether the power system is unitary or clearly divided into factions. If the latter prevails, the change agent would do well to develop lines of communication with both rather than "choosing up" sides.

Though the hypothesis relating sources of power to sources perceived most relevant for solving a problem was only tentatively supported, the logic of the hypothesis suggests an implication for change agents. This implication is to analyze the resources most relevant to solving the problem and then review the power actors in an attempt to isolate those having the required resources. The caution here is to do the best job possible in specifying the resources needed as well as the resources which power actors actually have.

It also appears from this research as well as others (13, 16, 33) that the change agent can begin looking for potential power actors from among the top economic figures in the community.

The logic seems fairly clear if one accepts the assumption that few major changes are made that do not require economic contributions of one kind or another. Added to this is Talcott Parsons's charge that economics is the major adaptive factor in social change.

Finally, if the finding that the top power actors may not be involved in all issues, particularly of a minor nature, is valid, the change agent should guard against legitimizing all projects with the
top power actors.

For if the top power actors do play a significant and specialized role in the decision making of the community it does not seem to follow that they will need to, or want to, legitimize all projects.

This implication should be related by the change agent to the one regarding congruence of power sources and sources needed to solve certain problems.
The major purposes of this study were:

1. To identify the individuals who have the capacity to exercise social power in the affairs of the community.

2. To identify individuals capable of exercising social power for several areas of social concern to determine whether the existing power pattern is monomorphic or polymorphic in nature.

3. To determine the bases of social power of the individuals identified.

4. To determine the degree to which the personal characteristics of the individuals identified correspond or deviate from the characteristics of the general population.

5. To explore the validity of the various methodological techniques employed in the field study.

6. To generate implications which will be of assistance in training change agents to fulfill their role.

To guide the research effort designed to fulfill these objectives ten general hypotheses, 22 epistemic correlations, and 41 empirical hypotheses were generated.

The theory used to engender the general hypotheses was taken primarily from Loomis's (28) statement, although highly related to Parsons's (43) and Weber's (53) conceptualizations of social power.

The measures were developed in a series of statements which Northrop (41) calls epistemic correlations. This is basically a process of operationalizing the theoretical concept in such a manner that the
theoretical concept can be linked to an empirical referent.

The data necessary for measurement were obtained from five principal sources:

1. Extra-community knowledgeables.
2. Knowledgeables.
3. Reputed power actors.
5. Informal conversations with several community residents.

In summary the findings related to the general hypotheses were as follows*:

**G.H. 1** That social power does exist in the social system central to this study.

**G.H. 2** That social power is exercised in the social system central to this study.

**G.H. 3** That social power is exercised in some issues (those specifically studied) by individuals acting in concert.

**G.H. 4** That the pool of power actors from which individuals are drawn into relationships for a specific issue is monomorphic whereas the core or primary structure (clique) is polymorphic, i.e., changes from one issue to another.

**G.H. 5** That the persons perceived as making the decisions in various issue areas are also the persons primarily responsible for executing those decisions.

______________________________

*It should be noted that the summary statements which follow are not in the form in which the general hypotheses were originally stated.*
G.H. 6 That the power structure involved in a major issue will not act as a structure on minor issues but individuals from the structure may be highly involved in minor issues.

G.H. 7 That the total power of power actors is unrelated to the authority which they have or have had. This was qualified to the extent that interaction of influence sources and certain authority positions may be a key to total power.

G.H. 8 That there is a possibility that the question of mono­morphic versus polymorphic may actually be a question of the relevance of a power actor's resources to the solution of various problems.

G.H. 9 That there is a set of expected role performances and that the power actors currently increasing in power are now performing the roles which the power actors now stabilized previously played.

G.H. 10 That the reputational approach is capable of generating an index of the actual power of power actors.

In terms of future research the following major suggestions were made:

1. The data gathering at the initial stage should be expected to allow the researcher to develop a more complete questionnaire for use with the power actors.

2. More time for field interviewing of the power actors should be provided so that there is opportunity to return to each respondent several times if necessary to cross check data.

3. An issue particularly relevant to rural residents should be included so that the rural nonfarm area specifically is drawn into the research frame of reference.
4. A research effort focused on one major issue from beginning to end might furnish the means for developing more adequate measures of structure, the sources of influence, congruence of power sources and issues, and the relative role of authority and influence components.

5. Power research should be carried out in communities of varying sizes, and replicated, to determine the impact of population size on the phenomenon of social power.

6. Future research should utilize the reputational approach plus extending the design to gather more data on actual behavior.

On the basis of the findings several implications were derived for change agents. In summary these were to:

1. Recognize that social power exists and is exercised in the community.

2. Be aware of the fact that change is usually easier to accomplish with the aid and assistance of the power actors than at cross currents with them.

3. Utilize the reputational technique as a method of identifying the power actors.

4. Be cautious in selecting formal office holders as important power actors.

5. Be conscious of the means by which a person, including a change agent, can work into the power system of a community.

6. Examine the top economic figures for power actors.

7. Exercise caution in legitimizing all projects with the top power actors.
Thus it can be seen that the major objectives of the dissertation were accomplished. In addition, the support of the hypotheses, though in varying degrees, should add to the body of knowledge about social power in general and in small rural social systems in particular.
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APPENDIX A

Knowledgeable Questionnaire

Introduction

I am on the research staff of the Economics and Sociology Department at Iowa State University. I am also an Extension Rural Sociologist on the Cooperative Extension Staff. In these jobs, one of my major interests is in the way in which things get done in communities, i.e., how do swimming pools get built, industry brought to town etc. This is one of the questions I am frequently asked by people throughout the state as I work with organizations like the Iowa Council for Community Improvement. My objective is to determine how community decisions are made and the action carried out. I am interested in finding out which people in the community are able to influence the decisions of others, and who are the people that actually do the most work in community projects. To get this information I am asking several people such as yourself to discuss the working of your community with me. Anything which you tell me will be confidential and not identified with you in any way. Furthermore, names of other persons which are mentioned during the course of our discussion will not be revealed in such a way as to identify them. I'm not sure how much time we will talk, but in any event it is likely that I will be back one or more times in the next few weeks.

Do you have any questions about what I am trying to do, who I am, or what I will do with the information once I have it?

1. As we start to discuss your community and the ways in which things get done I would like to have you draw a line on this map which outlines the area you consider to be in your community. (Give respondent map of South County.)

A. On what basis have you included the area you outlined? Check (x) those that apply.

___ Trade territory for your business
___ Trade territory for the town as a whole
___ The area in the school district
___ The area in which people visit back and forth more than they do outside of the area
___ The area in which the membership of the local churches is located
___ Dividing line where people inside the line come to this town most of the time and those on the outside go to other towns most of the time.
To help set the scene for the rest of our discussion I have brought a reproduction of an editorial which appeared in a newspaper of a small town in the United States. I would like you to read the editorial before I ask any more questions. Don't worry about remembering anything specific, I'm not going to ask you what is in the story, as a matter of fact you can continue to look at it if you wish while we talk.

2. Supposing a new industry opened its doors in the community, who would be the people that would be very active in bringing the industry to the community? (Probe: Would they be active if it were a county wide project?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>South County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which of the above people you named would be likely to work with you? (Place an X beside the names.)

4. Are there any people in this community who might operate "behind the scenes" as those in Springbrook did? By "behind the scenes" I mean those people who have a great deal of influence in the community and/or are the people who give approval to the ideas of others etc. Who would these people be? (Probe: Which of them would be the most influential within the community? Who would be likely to have contacts outside of the community?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence OUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Which of the above people that you have named would have influence if the project was to bring industry into all of South County, not just this community? (Place an X beside the names mentioned.)

6. In Springbrook, several organizations apparently became involved in the process of bringing in industry, which organizations in this community would be most likely to be involved in such a project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SER</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


7. Would you be active in an effort to bring industry to this community?  ____ Yes  ____ No  
(If Yes) In what way would you be active?  

8. If you had an idea for a new industry, or something similar, who would you be most likely to talk to about this idea? (Probe: Of those mentioned under question 4, which ones would you feel free to talk to about this idea?)  
Names  

9. The article about Springbrook also mentioned that there might be future needs in the area of educational facilities because of the increase in the number of students. Supposing your community were faced with a need in changing school facilities or school districts, who would be the people who would be very active in supporting such a change? (Probe: Would they be active if the change was to be county-wide?)  
South County  
Names  

10. If there were active opposition to such a change, who might be the persons most active?  
South County  
Names  
11. Are there any people in this community who would be "behind the scenes" in a change involving the schools? Who would these people be? (Probe: Who would have the most influence within the community? Who would have contacts outside the community?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence OUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How about people "behind the scenes" who might be in opposition to such a change? Who might these be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence OUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which of the above people that you have named would be influential if the project on school changes involved all of South County? (Place an X beside the names he mentions.)

14. Which of the organizations in the community would be active in a project involving the schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SER</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Would you be active in an effort concerning schools?

  ____ Yes  ____ No

  (If Yes) In what way would you be active?

16. Supposing you had an idea involving changes in the schools, who would you be most likely to talk to about this idea? (Probe: Of those mentioned under question 11, which ones would you feel free to talk to about this idea? Please place an X by the names mentioned in question 11.)
17. One item that was mentioned in the news article was recreational facilities. If your community were to undertake a project in recreation, e.g., picnic facilities, swimming pool etc., who would be the people who would be very active in the project? (Probe: Would they be active if the project were county-wide, e.g., roadside parks throughout the county?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>South County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Who would be the people "behind the scenes", i.e., those with the ideas and the ones that could influence or "sell" the rest of the people in the community? (Probe: Who would have the most influence within the community? Who would have contacts outside the community, e.g., the State Conservation Commission, etc.?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence OUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Which of the above people would have influence if the project in recreation involved all of South County? (Place an X beside the names mentioned.)

20. Which organizations in this community would be actively involved in a recreational project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SER</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Would you be active in an effort involving recreation?

___ Yes ___ No
(If Yes) In what way would you be active? ____________________________

22. If you had an idea for a new recreational facility, or something in the area of recreation, who would be most likely to talk to about this idea if you wanted to get some action started? (Probe: Of those mentioned under question 18, which ones would you feel free to talk to about this idea? Place an X by the ones mentioned under question 18).

Names

____________________________  ____________________________

____________________________  ____________________________

23. Recently in South County the people voted on the issue of building a new courthouse. As I recall the vote was quite close, lacking only about 1-2% of the necessary margin. To the best of your knowledge, did the vote carry in this community?

   ___ Yes   ___ No   By what margin? ______

24. Who were the people who were most active in trying to get the vote to carry? (Probe: Were they active outside of this community?)

Names

____________________________  South County

____________________________  Yes   No

____________________________  South County

____________________________  Yes   No

25. Who were the people who were most active in trying to maintain the present situation? (Probe: Were they active outside of this community?)

Names

____________________________

____________________________  South County

____________________________  Yes   No

26. Who do you think the persons were who were working "behind the scenes" to get the vote to carry? (Probe: Who was the most influential within the community?)

Names  Influence IN  Influence OUT  BOTH

____________________________
27. Which of the above people had influence throughout the entire county? (Place an X beside the names mentioned.)

28. Who do you think the persons were who were working "behind the scenes" to maintain the present situation? (Probe: Who was the most influential within the community?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence CUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. Which of the above people had influence throughout the entire county? (Place an X beside the names mentioned.)

30. Which organizations took an active part in the issue of the courthouse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>change</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SER</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. We have talked about the people who would be involved in your community and South County as a whole on projects in industry, education, recreation and government. If we lump these together and add others such as religion, welfare, promotion of business etc., and call these the general affairs of the community, who are the people who are most active in general affairs? (Probe: Would they be active if we think of South County as a whole?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>South County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Using general affairs to mean the same as above, who are the people that are "behind the scenes" in general, i.e., have influence in many matters which concern the community? (Probe: Who are the ones who are influential within the community? Who are the ones who have contact outside of the community?)
Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence IN</th>
<th>Influence OUT</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Which of the above people would have influence if we think about the general affairs of the county as a whole? (Place an X beside the names mentioned.)

34. Are you active in the general affairs of this community?
   
   ___ Yes ___ No
   
   (If Yes) In what way are you active? __________________________

35. In general, which of the organizations of the community are most active in community affairs?

   Name of organization  ED  REL  SER  REC  EC  POL
   __________________________

36. Several persons were named as being very active but not as influentials—do you think past activity, such as they are doing, is a key to becoming influential at some later time?

   ___ Yes ___ No
   
   (If Yes) Why? ____________________________________________

37. Of the following items, would you rank the five most important in helping a person become influential in your community? Rank in order; 1, 2, 3, etc.

   ___ Success in prior community activities
   ___ Level of formal education
   ___ Member of one of the "right" families
   ___ Occupation
Access to resources, e.g., money, contacts outside of community etc.
Knowledge of the particular problems in the community
Ability to think and see what is needed in the future
Ability to lay out plans for the action needed
Positions of past formal leadership (in community organizations)
Having been a member of the "right" groups in the community
Other (specify) ............................................................

38. What is your full name ..............................................

39. What is your age ____

40. How many years of formal education have you had? ____

41. What is your present occupation? ................................

42. How long have you lived in this community? ______________

43. Where did you live before? ______________________________

44. Have you had any other major occupation for more than 3 years?

45. Now I would like to obtain a list of the organizations you belong to or take part in.
A. Are you or have you been a member of a . . . (read in type of organization from sheet)
B. For each organization named by the respondent ask the following:
   1. What were the approximate dates of membership in the organization?
   2. As a member, what proportion of the meetings did you attend during the past 12 months?
   3. Are you or have you ever been an officer, board member, or council member in the organization? Include any offices at the county, state, or national level you may have held in the organization.
   4. Give the participation level. Local--Loc
      County--Co
      District Iowa--DI
      State--St
      Regional--Reg
      National--Nat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s) of organization</th>
<th>Approximate dates of membership</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you or have you been a member of a:</td>
<td>Time: From to</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Clubs: Lions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Organizations: FB etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (Denomination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Organizations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Orders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic Groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) of organization</td>
<td>Approximate dates of membership</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you or have you been a member of a:</td>
<td>Time: From to</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies: Ext., ASC etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Pos.: Sch. Bd. Co. Govt. etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational: PTA, Boosters, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political, Recreation, and Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probe Questions

1. If a relatively young married man came to this community and estab-
lished himself occupationally and wanted to become active in the
community and eventually be a person of influence, what should he
do?

2. What organizations would be influential as a group in this
community?

3. Do you see any difference between the persons who are influential
and the persons who carry out projects?

4. Do you believe there is any conflict between the "young" group in
town, say 25-35 years of age, and the older citizens who are influ-
ential in community affairs?

5. Are there any women who are influential in community affairs?
APPENDIX B

Power Questionnaire

Introduction

The Study
The Purpose
The Use of the Data
Why You Are Being Interviewed

In interviewing some people in your community before I have asked them who the people were who could influence decisions in the community. That is, when some need is determined (like the need for a swimming pool, school, courthouse, hospital etc.), who are the people in this community who can influence the decisions and actions of other people in the community?

Specifically I have asked people in your community to tell me who the influential or key people were with respect to business or industry, schools, recreation, courthouse, and in general. Your name was one of several mentioned by one or more persons.

I am now interviewing all of the people who were mentioned as being influential or key persons in a variety of community affairs.

1. The first (and longest) question which I would like to ask you is to indicate the amount of influence you feel each of the persons on the list has. First I would like to pose this question in terms of business expansion or industry. That is, if the objective was to expand the size and type of business establishments in this community, how much influence would each of the following people have. (Give the list and explain the scale.) Are there any other people whose names should be included? (Add and have them rank them.)

2. Now with respect to the county hospital which was built. Of those people who are on the list, how much influence did they have? (Have them rank on a new sheet.) Are there any persons not on that list that should be? (Add and rank.)

3. Considering the attempt to obtain a new courthouse in this community, how influential have the people on this list been in getting the community to vote in the way in which they did? (Have them rank the people on a new sheet.) Are there any persons not on this list that should be? (Add and rank.)
4. An area that I would like to ask about now concerns the future possibility that there would be a need for fallout shelters to protect the citizens of the community against fallout from nuclear warfare. Before I ask you to rank the people as to the amount of influence which you feel they would have, I would like to ask you several questions about Civil Defense in general. (Insert and ask the questions on Civil Defense.) Now, supposing there was a need to obtain shelter for the people in the community, which of the following persons would likely be the key people in getting the job done? (Check with X on margin, add any names that are mentioned.) How influential would they be? (Have them rate them on the scale.)

5. Lumping all of these kinds of problems together, how influential are each of the persons in general? (Have them rank the people on a new sheet.) Are there any other persons that should be added? (Add and rank.)

6. I would like you to indicate whether you believe each of these people are Increasing, The Same, or Decreasing in the amount of influence they have in the community. Would you check in the appropriate box at the side of the sheet?
Business and Industry

1. To the right of each person's name in the list below is a numbered scale from 1 to 11. Please circle the number to the right of each name which you believe best describes the amount of influence that person would have (or has) in the Center Town community if we were concerned about problems like expansion of business, securing a new business establishment etc. Your name is also included, please circle the number which you believe best describes the amount of influence which you have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NO INFLUENCE</th>
<th>VERY INFLUENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there other names which you believe should be on this list? If so, please add them and rate them.
County Hospital

3. Some time ago a county hospital was built in South County. As you think back to this project and the people who exerted influence, i.e., attempted to get other people to make certain decisions or carry out certain jobs, I would like to have you circle the number to the right of each person's name on this list which you feel best describes the amount of influence they had in the county hospital project. Please rate yourself as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
<th>VERY INFLUENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Are there other people whose names should be on this list? If so, please add them and rate them.
5. Just recently the people of South County voted to build a new courthouse after having defeated the vote earlier in the year. I would like you to circle the number to the right of each name which best describes the amount of influence you believe that person had in getting the vote to carry. Please rate yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>No InfluenCe</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Prevert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are there other people whose names should be on this list? If so, please add them and rate them.
Civil Defense Shelters

7. Supposing this community built a community fallout shelter in the near future, which of the people on this list would be involved in that kind of activity? Place an X at the left of each name. Following this, I would like you to circle the number to the right of each name (even though you didn't check it) that best describes the amount of influence you believe each would have in a fallout shelter program. Please rate yourself too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No Check</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Are there any other names which should go on this list? If so, please add and rate them.
9. This is the last time you will rate these names. This time I would like you to circle the number to the right of each person's name which best describes the amount of influence you believe this person has if we consider the general affairs of the community, i.e., all of the problems or projects which a community like Center Town has. Please rate yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
<th>VERY INFLUENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Are there any other names which should be added to this list? If so, please add them and rate them.

11. I would also like to know whether these people are Increasing, The Same, or Decreasing in the amount of influence that they have. Would you check in the appropriate column to the right?
12. Below are the same names which you have been rating. I would like you to indicate how well you know each of them. Please check in one of the four columns left of the double bar. I would also like to know whether you visit in their homes (or they in yours), whether they are a relative or whether you know them only because of business dealings. Please check in the right hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DO NOT KNOW</th>
<th>HEARD OF</th>
<th>KNOW SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>KNOW WELL</th>
<th>VISIT HOME</th>
<th>IS A RELATIVE</th>
<th>ONLY IN BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Knight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Frevert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gayle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Edgewild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are there other people than those on this list whom you visit with frequently during the course of your work day? Who are they?

14. Are there other people than those on this list whom you visit with frequently on a social basis? Who are they?
15. We have been talking about people who have influence. What do you think makes a person influential in this community?

16. Listed below are some things which other people like yourself have said give a person influence. I would like you to check the ones which you believe give a person influence.

- Past achievements
- Formal education
- Family background
- Kind of occupation
- Control of money and credit
- Long time resident of community
- Past participation in community groups
- Contacts with lots of people
- Good source of ideas
- Human relations skills
- Control over jobs of others in community
- Influential in community groups
- Has a position of authority
- Access to important people out of community
- Has the time
- Middle age or older

17. Now taking the top five people you rated on the general affairs, which of the above contribute to the amount of influence which they have? Are there others? Rank the top three for each person.
18. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What kind of work do you do? ________________________________

2. Does your wife work? ___ Yes ___ No (If yes) What does she do? ____________________________________________

3. Do you and your family own your own home? ___ Yes ___ No

4. Altogether, how many people including children live in your household? ______

5. How many children under 18 years of age do you have in your family? ______

6. How many years have you lived in this community? ______

7. How many years have you lived in this state? ______

8. Where did you live before? ____________ How long? ______

9. Have you always done the type of work you do now? ___ Yes ___ No

If no, what did you do? __________________________________________

10. What newspapers do you take? ________________________________

11. What magazines or journals do you take? ________________________

12. What is your age? ______

13. How many years of formal education have you had?

7 or less, 8  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  19

14. Have you ever been in active military service? ___ Yes ___ No

15. Which of the categories on Card*** best describes your political position?

___ 1. Conservative Republican
___ 2. Liberal Republican
___ 3. Independent but close to conservative Republican
___ 4. Independent but close to liberal Republican
___ 5. Independent
___ 6. Independent but close to conservative Democrat
___ 7. Independent but close to liberal Democrat
___ 8. Conservative Democrat
___ 9. Liberal Democrat

16. Which of the categories on Card _____ best estimate your average gross family income for the past three calendar years (1959, 1960, 1961)?

a  b  c  d  e  f  g  h  i  j  k  l  m  n  o  p  q  r
Probe Questions

1. Have you ever been influenced by any other people in this community to make a decision to support some particular issue?

2. Have you ever influenced anyone in this community to make a particular decision? How did you influence them?

3. Do you exert influence in all kinds of issues (e.g., educational, recreational, business etc.) in the community?

4. (If no to 3) What determines the issues in which you try to exert influence?

5. Do you think persons who are influential ever get involved in carrying out projects, or do they stay "behind the scenes"? What about yourself?

6. Are you involved in all levels of community issues? For example, the courthouse bond issue and the Red Cross Drive.

7. If a relatively young married man came to this community and established himself occupationally and wanted to become active in the community and eventually be a person of influence, what should he do?

8. What did the top power actors actually do in the _____ issue?

9. What did you do in the _____ issue?

10. Did any other people in this community do more, and if so, what did they do?