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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

One of the more noticeable and intellectual products of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is the rise of the social sciences and their efforts to apply methods and techniques useful for dealing with the physical world and transplant them to the social world (Martindale, 1976). Sociology, as a social science, is concerned with the development of knowledge about the behavior of human groups. One of the areas of sociology is rural sociology through which we study rural communities and rural life in both agricultural and industrialized societies. Considerable emphasis in these studies is on the development of general principles and on the application of sociological principles to solve the problems of rural communities (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969). Among the important trends in rural sociology are studies of rural groups, social participation, and community power structure (Anderson, 1959).

The diverse social participation of people in their community activities facilitates and enhances the achievement of the objectives of their developmental projects. Their involvement in conducting their own plans of action creates and increases their commitment to the community as a social system (Cary, 1970; Warren, 1978; Kaufman, 1979).
Social participation is an important concern which has potential significance for the quality of living experiences by rural people. Phillips (1967), in his study of a sample of six hundred adults, indicated that self-reports of happiness with life are highly related to social participation. People socially participate in organizational or community projects in order to achieve personal objectives, and by doing so, contribute support, work or talent that increases the organizational or community goal achievement and effectiveness.

People's participation is an index of social integration, reflecting features and procedures for conduct and beliefs among individuals. As individuals associate with each other in society, a collective consciousness emerges, which in turn constrains and guides behavior. These individuals behave as a result of this mechanical solidarity (Durkheim, 1947; Tonnies, 1940).

Forms and Level of Social Participation

It is often thought that participation is indicated through membership in which the member of any organization or community speaks or enters into a discussion. However, there are many patterns of participation. Beal, Bohlen, and Raudabaugh (1965) refer to the personal and psychological
involvement of individuals in groups as one of the more important elements of group participation. Other patterns of participation include attending meetings, involvement on committees or as being officers, being financial supporters, participating in work groups, washing dishes, producing publications or being involved in publicity. A positive relationship between the potential or actual member participation and individual or group productivity is supported by research.

This study classifies the activities of social participation into three main types: instrumental, expressive and instrumental-expressive participation (Edwards and Booth, 1973). These are defined as follows:

**Instrumental participation:** This kind of participation means that the actor is participating in activities which have instrumental objectives, that is, objectives which are to have functional consequences to some sectors of the community, the whole community or the larger society. These activities are considered means to a certain goal, and the participants derive gratification from achieving the goal and not the immediate situation, e.g., participation in social protest movements.

**Expressive participation:** This participation is an end by itself. A large portion of the social activity is self-
contained; the consequences of participation are greatly restricted to the participants. Achieving the goals does not affect the nonparticipants. In achieving expressive goals, participants receive immediate gratification, e.g., card playing.

**Instrumental-expressive participation:** The activities and goals of the participants are mixed; some activities and goals are directed outside the group of participants and others are directed within. Also, the gratification of the participants is mixed and depends on achieving the goals. Many of the objectives of the activities of voluntary associations are instrumental-expressive.

We can also classify social participation as formal or informal participation. However, this typology is often unclear because it is a difference of degree rather than of kind. These major classifications of social participation cross-cut one another. That is, instrumental participation may be formal or informal, and the same is true for expressive participation. In general, however, instrumental participation is more formally structured than expressive participation (Edwards and Booth, 1973).

Individuals' levels of participation are also different. These levels depend on people's interest, resources and characteristics. Scope of involvement is used
by Wilkinson (1974) to describe the locality-oriented role or roles of a participant. Extent of involvement is another level of participation and used to describe the individual's type of participation within a specific issue (phase participation). There are three kinds of participation within the scope of involvement:

1. Generalized participation in which actors are involved in two or more interest areas in the local field (Kaufman et al., 1975).

2. Specialized participation in which actors participate in only one interest area for multiple issues.

3. Single issue participation in which actors have role expectations which are narrowly focused on the resolution of a single issue in the community field.

Actors who participate most often have an understanding of the basic purpose and function of the group, have clearly in mind the group's expectations for its members, feel secure in member roles, and know how member roles contribute to the overall purpose and functioning of the group. Such actors also get personal satisfaction from their participation (Beal et al., 1965).

Power Structure

Both Hunter (1953) and Dahl (1961) referred to the great importance of participation as a means of sharing power. Theodorson and Theodorson (1969) define power as the
capability of an individual or group to carry out its policies or desires and to control, manipulate, or influence the actions of others with or without their cooperation. The actor who has power possesses resources to force his or her will on others. These resources come from social relationships and the actor's position in the community. In his study, Hunter (1953) mentioned that individuals with power have financial resources and occupy or control formal economic and governmental roles. Kornhauser (1966) mentioned that power is likely to be patterned according to the structure of interest in the community. Individuals with converging interests share power among themselves.

Bohlen et al. (1967) refer to power structure as a pattern of relationships which enables individuals possessing social power to act together to affect the decision-making of the social system on a given issue area. Therefore, actors who work separately to carry out a common target in the community without communication among themselves have a weak or no power structure. Actors who form patterns of relationships are able to exert more social power, and accordingly, have greater ability to affect the direction of community action. An alternative definition of power structure is given by Walton (1968). Walton defines power structure as the characteristic pattern within a
social organization (community, state, or nation) through which resources are mobilized and sanctions used in a manner that affects the organization as a whole.

Different methods have been employed in both rural and urban communities to identify community power actors and to achieve developmental programs. These methods include the positional, reputational and decision-making methods. Presthus (1964) mentioned that sociologists are more likely to find an "elitist" leadership structure, whereas political scientists are more likely to find a "pluralist" leadership structure in which power is shared among several competing groups.

Community Action

The concept of community is defined in many ways. When looking for a widely accepted definition, one should look for an operational one which includes people who live in defined proximity to one another and are in interaction with each other. Sutton and Kolaja (1960) look at community as a number of families who live in a small area and who have developed a relatively complete socio-cultural system to solve local problems. Bates (1967) defines community as a social system which deals with conflict and competition in order to give the different interest groups an opportunity
to exchange inputs and outputs and continue functioning. Freilich (1963) looks at community as a group of individuals who live in interrelated centers which are connected by their pooling of information. Hillery (1955) studied a list of 94 definitions of community and concluded that the most agreeable definition is a group of people in social interaction who live in a certain geographic location and who have one or more additional ties. Bernard (1973) reduces Hillery's three-categories definition of community into two, locality ("the community") and social ties ("community").

Kaufman (1959) has differentiated community action from other actions in the community. He mentioned five characteristics of community action:

1. degree of comprehensiveness of interests pursued and needs met;
2. degree to which action is identified with the locality;
3. relative number, status, and degree of involvement of local residents;
4. degree to which action maintains or changes the local society; and
5. extent of organization of action.

While many definitions of community action exist, the locality orientation is the central theme in most definitions (Wilkinson, 1970). The programs of community
action could be interrelated at any level: ecologically, culturally or interactionally (Landecker, 1951). Moreover, two kinds of activities take place in the community action process:

- activities for the purpose of carrying out specific goals, and
- individual activities for the purpose of relating the activities within a given program to others (program coordination).

Objectives of the Study

The future of any community is to a great extent affected by individuals who participate in community activities and decisions made by these individuals. Cary (1970) reported that programs and projects not shared in by all categories and sections of the community may not only endanger the particular action but may also get the reaction of the nonparticipants. Identifying the leadership structure is very important since the initiation and success of community action programs largely depend on the involvement of leaders and their structural positions (Tait et al., 1978; Beal et al., 1966; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

Based on the significance of citizen participation in their communities and because there are insufficient studies on structural roles of actors in local community actions,
this study identifies the community power structure in a Midwestern community and describes the different types of leadership. The study describes the locality-oriented roles of participants and their involvement in single or multiple issues within one specific interest area or across several different interest areas. In addition to describing the level or type of participation, the study examines the interest of actors in the community in terms of expressive and instrumental participation and in terms of the level of conflict in an issue. The study also identifies structural characteristics of participants with relation to their socio-economic status.

The reputational approach, which is compared in theoretical terms with the decision-making approach, is used to identify the power structure. The typology of phase participation (Wilkinson, 1979), social exchange theory and social field theory are also utilized in the guidance of this research.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

One of the major functions of a community as a social system is the opportunity for social participation and mutual support among the different units. The literature shows a shortage of studies on community participation and leadership within which community roles are played. The present study, besides identifying the community power structure, develops a conceptual strategy and operational procedure for identifying roles based on the elements and phases of community activities. The interrelationship between social participation as social behavior and social theories such as exchange theory, field theory and local-relevance orientation of community participation are reviewed.

Social Participation and Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory indicates that social participation as social behavior is not random. Rather, social participation is oriented towards gaining a reward or avoiding a punishment or otherwise nonrewarding situations. According to social exchange theory, social participation assumes that participants behave rationally in their attempt to maximize rewards and minimize costs (Wilson, 1983). The exchange network connects the actor with other participants
through a series of exchange relations. Each participant has the opportunity to transact business with at least one other actor in the network but not all participants have equal opportunities to initiate or respond to transactions (Tallman and Ihinger-Tallman, 1979). In a study of interaction among actors in a federal agency, Blau (1955) found the formation of a relationship of exchange formed between expert workers and less experienced individuals.

The application of social exchange theory can be seen in five important aspects of social participation: the emergence of social structure, inter-organizational relationships, participation relationships, internal operation of organizations, and consequences of social participation.

**The emergence of social structure**

The structure of a group or community is the product of social transactions that produce a perceived inequality in the exchange. The inequality motivates people to seek new transactions that will equalize the exchange and thus the formation of new groups or organizations.

Homans (1974) argues that participants feel fairly or unfairly treated based on their comparison of themselves with others in terms of what they receive from participation. Cartwright and Zander (1968) mentioned other
conditions which motivate participants to change. For example, when individuals feel it is more rewarding to specialize their actions based on their ability and temperament, they participate in different activities or different groups.

**Inter-organizational relations**

Parsons (1954) indicated that every social system (organization, community, or society) has two functions that must be performed, an instrumental function and an expressive function. The instrumental function is that which allows the system to cope with the physical or external environment. Additionally in the case of a highly complex division-of-labor society, the instrumental function is differentiated into two subfunctions, a goal-attaining function (i.e., production and distribution) and an adaptive function (i.e., policy-making and coordination).

Similarly, the expressive function has two subfunctions. The first is pattern-maintenance such as the socialization of the young and the provision of social and emotional support. The second is integration such as preventing deviance by reaffirming basic values. This typology of Parsons has some parallels to Blau's classification of a social institution (Blau, 1964).
According to Gordon and Babchuk (1959), social participation takes the form of instrumental or expressive or combined instrumental-expressive participation. Expressive activities control deviant behavior through socialization and integration of the adult personality while instrumental activities are more vital to technological societies. Combined activities contain elements of both instrumental and expressive activities.

**Participation relationships: modes of entry and exit**

Individuals with greater resources such as a higher educational level or a successful business tend to participate in instrumental issues. In contrast, individuals with certain ascribed qualities based on sex, age, or family background tend to participate in expressive issues in which they expect to receive direct gratification from serving as a compatible member (Edwards and Booth, 1973; Cook et al., 1985). In contrast, individuals who participate in instrumental issues tend to put less value on member compatibility.

Participants exit from both instrumental and expressive structures because of asymmetrical exchange. If participants receive greater reward than what they deserve, they may be forced to break their ties with the group and look for another group or different kinds of activities. At
the same time, if participants receive unfair reward for their participation effort, they will either alter their reward-seeking techniques or withdraw from the group. Generally, people continue their participation and involvement as long as they get satisfying rewards. Otherwise, they threaten to join another group, participate in a different issue, or totally withdraw (Edwards and Booth, 1973).

The internal operation of organizations

Wilson (1983) proposes that within each of the functionally specialized units in a social system, there exists one or more interchanges of the kinds of participation (instrumental, expressive, or combined) and all actors may participate in each of these activities at one time or another. Instrumental associations are most concerned with adaptation and goal attainment, and primary relations characteristically develop within these associations and serve to maintain solidarity. Expressive associations are integrative and pattern-maintaining structures. However, some of the activities of the expressive association need to be oriented towards the external environment for the sake of survival.

Edwards and Booth (1973) mentioned that informal participation structures, which are mostly expressive
oriented, should solve problems brought out by the external environment by offering the appropriate time and place for participation. Note also that there is a continuous flow of exchanges among the substructures of formal associations and between the external and internal environments of formal and informal participation.

**Consequences of social participation**

Social participation relationships play a vital role at the macro-level in the community, social organization or any other macro-structures of government agencies, industries and educational institutions. Participation relationships provide mechanisms which encourage the fundamental structure to operate by extending earlier socialization. For example, industries, schools and families educate individuals for performance as members of the community.

The consequences of social participation depend on the transactions of community activities and the levels on which exchange takes place. As already mentioned, social participation can be classified into the categories of instrumental, expressive and combined. The consequences of each kind of participation is quite different in nature. These consequences will be discussed in some detail later in this chapter.
Field theory is a theoretical approach based on a conception of the total configuration of an individual's perception. The approach is capable of explaining an individual's behavior in terms of the total psychological field of forces (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969).

Community field theory looks at social action as goal-directed behavior affecting the social structure in which actors carry out their objectives in the local community. Community field theory explains the structural properties which emerge from social action through concentrating on the social relational aspects of the community as a social system (Elezaby, 1985). According to community field theory, the integrated and coordinated action structure increases the capacity of the local community in solving its problems (Wilkinson, 1969 and 1970; Kaufman, 1979).

The community field approach assumes that the relationships among units and elements of the local community are very important. Based on this assumption, the researchers and specialists in the community concentrate on the process of integration among the differentiated parts by means of offering information, exchanging resources, improving communication, and facilitating the cooperation among actors with similar status positions (Anderson, 1984).
Beaulieu (1977) studies community structure by identifying the most important issues and activities which were carried out in the local community through a certain period of time. He then examines the roles played by different participants in efforts to resolve local problems besides investigating the relationships between these problems.

Methods of Identifying Community Power

Different methods have been used in both rural and urban communities to identify community power actors and implement developmental programs in the community. Bell, Hill, and Wright (1961) classified these methods into five main categories for identifying power actors by a particular leadership type. The five types are:

1. positional leadership,
2. reputational leadership,
3. social participation,
4. personal influence or opinion leadership, and
5. event analysis or decisional-making leadership.

Tait et al. (1978) referred to the positional method as the oldest approach used to identify community power. In the positional method, leaders are identified as individuals who occupy key formal authority positions in formal
organizations and are considered community power actors. In most cases, power actors selected include elected political officials, officials of voluntary associations, leaders of religious groups, heads of labor unions and military officers. The advantage of the positional method is that it is relatively simple to use in discovering power actors. However, this method has the disadvantage of not identifying power actors who may work behind the scenes and yet influence community decisions.

The social participation method involves listing participants in voluntary organizations in the community where power is acquired through participation (Tait et al., 1978). This method provides detailed information on holding formal offices, degree of meeting attendance in associations, and involvement on committees. This approach lacks the ability to identify power actors who are not participating in the actual execution of social action programs but who participated in early phases as "behind-the-scenes" actors.

The third approach of identifying community power actors is the personal influence or opinion leadership method. This method assumes that in each community there are opinion leaders who influence the daily activities of others in the community. These leaders are found among
business and professional people, and also among unskilled workers (Bohlen et al., 1967). The advantage of this approach is its ability to directly analyze the formation of opinions by the community actors. This approach is also easy to apply to discover the formation of political, economic, and religious opinions. However, like the previous approaches, the opinion leadership approach has some disadvantages such as its limitations in studying power actors. That is, it is unknown whether or not the opinion leaders have the potential to decide the course of community action.

The remaining two methods, the reputational and decisional methods, will be discussed in more detail in the next section due to their great importance to the current study.

Reputational Versus Decisional Method

In the reputational method, researchers interview community knowledgeables. During the interviews, researchers ask knowledgeables to name individuals whom they think have social power in various community issue areas. For example, the researcher might ask the knowledgeable to name individuals whom the knowledgeable regards as the most influential out of all the people in the community (Fox, 1971).
Powers (1965), in his study on identifying community power structures, lists steps of the reputational approach as follows:

1. Define the geographical area, usually a community;
2. Define issue areas of current concern and those factors which influence participation in those areas, e.g. education and age,
3. Select knowledgeable which includes bankers, newspaper editors, extension workers, and local government officials, and try to cover different community sectors through this selection;
4. Interview knowledgeable and formulate questions for each of the selected issue areas to discover the reputed power actors from the knowledgeable;
5. After finishing the interviews with the knowledgeable, summarize the names of the reputed power actors along with how many times each has been named for each issue area, usually retaining an individual who has been named at least three times;
6. Check for reliability by asking the most frequently named persons the same questions as asked the knowledgeable, and matching results with the list of reputed power actors obtained from the knowledgeable; and
7. Repeat the entire process every five to ten years to determine any changes in the power structure.

The initial number of knowledgeables chosen depends on the size of the community. For example, there might be only ten knowledgeables chosen in a community of five to ten thousand. Actors with the most votes in an issue area from the knowledgeables are often referred to as the top power actors in that issue area. Bohlen et al. (1967) mentioned that the validity of the reputational method depends on the ability of the researchers to name people who affect community decisions. On the other hand, the validity of this method can be promoted through studying power structures for a large number of community issue areas.

While the reputational method's main focus is on determining top leaders, the decisional approach focuses on specific issues. In fact, the decisional approach is often called "issue analysis" since the researcher picks several local issues and analyzes the processes by which issues are resolved (Bonjean and Grimes, 1974). Bohlen et al. (1967) indicate that the decisional method focuses on the process of an issue from its early beginning until its completion where key decision-makers are identified for each stage of the one issue. Bonjean and Grimes (1974) refer to the key of the decisional method as the actual decision making in
which the researcher tries to reconstruct the processes, e.g., "who initiates?" and "who vetoes?", by collecting information through extensive interviews, attending committees and organizational meetings, and using reports, speeches and newspaper accounts. In his classical decisional-making study, Dahl (1961) looked at a series of concrete cases in which key decisions were made in order to identify individuals who were influential in community decisions.

Fox (1969) concluded that there is a sharp and continuous argument between those who support the reputational approach and those who support the decisional approach. Although the two methods may not converge to the same leadership groups, both methods do reveal the same type of power structure in studies in which they have been used jointly. The reputationalists, a group composed basically of sociologists, argue that the most effective way to study power relations in the local community is to interview knowledgeable observers of the political scene within that community. The decisionalists, a group dominated by political scientists, argue that the only valid method to study power structure is to reconstruct actual decisions to determine the most influential actors in these decisions.
Walton (1966a, 1966b) concluded that the reputational method tends to find pyramidal hierarchical structures, i.e., systems in which all important decisions are made by one group who have similar socio-economic status and political views, while the decision-making and combined methods tend to find factional, coalitional, and amorphous types. The same conclusion was also reached by other researchers trying to replicate these findings. They observed that reputationalists tend to discover "monolithic" power structures, i.e., structures in which power is concentrated in the hands of a small, cohesive, consensual group of elites, while decisionalists tend to find "pluralistic" power structures, i.e., structures in which leaders represent a number of different groups in the community and have differences over goals, ways and processes of making decisions. Thus, the results of community power studies tend to be biased by the method selected for the research (Polsby, 1959a,b and 1962; Wolfinger, 1960; Dahl, 1961; Rogers, 1962; Aiken, 1970; Cartis and Petras, 1970; Fox, 1971; and Seiler, 1975).

Wolfinger (1962) reported that the logical conclusion of the decisionalists was that results obtained by the reputationalists should be thrown away and the method buried. However, Fox (1969) contended that the two sides
are not arguing for methodology's sake but rather for the findings reached by each method.

Freeman et al. (1971) concluded that the different approaches to studying community power structure seem to discover varying types of leaders. The study of reputation, position or organizational participation seems to obtain institutional leaders. However, the study of decision-making participation discovers the effectors of the community actions.

Spinrad (1965) reported that the reputational approach appears to be comprehensive and methodologically neat. Additionally, Spinrad mentioned that some studies reveal that formal leaders may be neither those who have power by reputation nor those who are directly involved in important decisions. In spite of the attack led by Polsby (1959b), Wolfinger (1962), and Dahl (1961) on the reputational method, other researchers such as D'Antonio et al. (1962), Spinrad (1965) and French and Aiken (1968) discovered that the reputations of power are indeed an adequate index of the perceived distribution of power in the local community.

Some Critiques of the Reputational and Decisional Methods

As far as critiques of the reputational and decisional methods are concerned, Clark (1968) mentioned criticisms for
the reputational technique. First, the reputational researcher biases his/her results by assuming the existence of a pyramidal decision-making structure when he/she designs a question such as "Who are the top leaders in the community?". Second, the reputationalist reports a list of twenty, forty, or two hundred individuals reputed to be the key influential in the community even though there is no intrinsic method for arriving at an appropriate cut-off point for the precise number used. Third, the separation of so-called "top leaders" from "second stringers" is based on an arbitrary decision by the researcher. Fourth, what it means to be influential depends on the panelists and the researcher. Fifth, even if the concept of "influential" is apparent to the researcher, many community members are likely to confuse influential with people of social fame who might not have actual influence in community decisions. Sixth, the approach only gives a "reputation" for power or potential influence which, even if the "influential" has power available, he/she may not decide to use this influence or may only use the power in a narrow range of issues. Finally, the reputational approach does not identify the scope of influence of different groups and is not able to identify a more pluralistic arrangement if it exists. Most of these shortcomings of the reputational approach were also
referred to by other researchers (Dahl, 1958; Wolfinger 1960 and 1962; Polsby, 1963; and Bonjean and Grimes, 1974).

Despite these shortcomings, the reputationalist approach has many important advantages (Wolfinger, 1960; Bonjean, 1963; Miller and Dirksen, 1964; Powers, 1965; and Clark, 1968). First, the cost and effort involved in applying the reputational approach are less than those involved in applying the decision methods. Second, there is a conceptual briefness to the reputational approach. It enables the researcher to analyze the power aspect without becoming involved in unimportant details. Third, the reputational approach is reproducible since its operations are simple and clearly defined. The ability to be reproduced enables many researchers to study several different communities with the reassurance that operations can be closely followed elsewhere. Finally, the reputational approach is an effective means of identifying top-ranking leaders.

There are also some limitations and disadvantages of the decisional method (Anton, 1963; Bachrach and Baratz, 1963; Bonjean and Olson, 1964; and Clark, 1968). First, the decisional method does not address the problem of indirect influence. Second, it does not address the problem of nondecisions, the pattern of value distribution and the
"mobilization of bias." Third, while the decisional method yields concrete, empirical data to a competent researcher, the data are often too concrete so that the researcher must generalize from a sample of the data. Fourth, the decisional method yields information on only a sample of cases of exercised influence. Fifth, the decisional method is time consuming and assumes that power actors "visibly do something" when in reality, power actors may or may not take visible action. Sixth, the method concentrates on direct observations and public reports and thus may underrepresent or overlook some activities and actors who are actually included in the decision-making process. Seventh, the method ignores actors who may be able to keep latent issues from emerging into open controversy. Eighth, decisions selected for study may not be the most important or the most representative decisions. Finally, it is difficult to apply this method for comparative purposes in more than one community since the decisional circumstances are not likely to be identical across communities.

The decisional method has also shown some advantages (Dahl, 1961; Clark, 1968). First, the decisional method is able to identify overt power and provides a realistic viewpoint of power relations as process and not as fixed structure. Second, no questionable inferences need be
formed concerning the relationships between organizational position-holders and the actual decision-makers. Third, "top leaders" can be identified and separated from second-level leaders who carry out the work once high-level decisions have been made. Finally, the overlap of an individual's influence from one decision area to another decision area and the overlap between social and economic notables and influential decision-makers can both be discovered empirically.

Types of Community Power Structure

There is little disagreement among researchers concerning the different types of community power structure. Walton (1968) categorizes power structures into four types: (1) the pyramidal or monopolistic structure which includes a single cohesive group of leadership, (2) the factional structure which includes at least two leadership groups that compete with each other for advantage, (3) the coalitional structure in which the leadership group depends on the issue, and (4) the amorphous structure for which there is no special pattern of leadership or power exercised on the local level.

Rossi (1968) also classifies power structures into four types. Two of these, pyramidal and amorphous, agree with
Walton's categories. The other two kinds of power structures according to Rossi are caucus rule, in which the lines of power end in a relatively large group of decisional leaders, and polylith structure in which separate power structures are definable for the main centers of activity in the community.

Dahl (1961) uses a somewhat different way of classifying power structures. Dahl lists five patterns of leadership as (1) covert integration by economic notables so that top leaders consist of a unified group of private citizens, (2) an executive-centered "grand coalition of coalitions," (3) a coalition of chieftains such that policies in different sectors in the community are integrated by a coalition of chieftains, (4) independent sovereignties with spheres of influence, and (5) rival sovereignties who are fighting it out for power. Types 2 and 3 are seen to differ only in their degree. The fourth and fifth patterns are viewed as analogous to a system of independent city-states in which each issue is controlled by a different set of top leaders whose goals and methods are adapted to the particular sectors of the community which are interested in that specific issue.

The classifications of Walton and Rossi have been used most often by other researchers in their own studies to
classify power structures. Also, it is worthy to note that Dahl's classification is actually a set of possibilities which Dahl listed before he ever conducted his study.

Methodological Characteristics

While investigating community structure and configurations of power, Walton (1970) included some characteristics of the methods he studied. Here, we list seven of these characteristics as identified by Walton. (1) The reputational method is more likely to discover pyramidal power structures, whereas the decisional technique identifies factional and coalitional power structures. (2) Studies of public matters tend to identify factional and coalitional structures, but studies of private matters find pyramidal descriptions. (3) The definition of power based on control or dominance helps to identify pyramidal power structures, but the definition of power as influence discovers factional and coalitional power structures. (4) Political scientists are more likely to find factional and coalitional power structures more frequently than sociologists are. (5) One tends to find pyramidal power structures in communities which have a high proportion of businessmen in the leadership group or else a small number of community leaders. (6) One finds factional and
coalitional power structures in communities which have a high proportion of public officials in the leadership group. (7) Comparative studies are more likely to identify factional and coalitional power structures more frequently than single case studies.

After reviewing the previous methodological characteristics, one might conclude that it is not only the type of method (reputational, decisional, etc.) which is responsible for identifying different patterns of community power structures, but also many other factors such as other characteristics of the community, the issues under study, the various activities practiced in the community, the number of leaders, and the different understandings of power.

With concentration on methodology as a factor responsible for the pattern of community power structure, we look at Table 2.1 extracted from Walton (1970, p. 446). The data in the table indicate that the reputational method tends to find more pyramidal power structures than the other different types in contrast to the decisional approach although the difference is not great (about 10%). Also, there is a high proportion of pluralistic structures (76%) found by the decisional method.
TABLE 2.1. Research method and community power structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Method</th>
<th>Pyramidal</th>
<th>Factional, Coalitional, and Amorphous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional, Combined</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Towards a Better Combination of the Reputational and Decisional Methods

In accordance with most of the studies reviewed, we conclude that both the reputational and decisional methods have limitations especially when either of them is used separately in studying power structure. Most researchers seem to support this point of view except for some extremist reputationalists and decisionalists who attack each other and claim that their own method is the best for identifying the power structure in a community. At the same time, many specialists have recommended as a result of their studies that one use a combination of the two methods to obtain better results in identifying community power structure.
Conway (1973) supports a combined reputational-decisional approach and mentions that using this combination can counter accusations of bias of the research efforts that arises when using only one of the approaches. Fox (1969) reports in his research that most of the researchers feel that the two approaches complement each other, and together they identify the leaders that one approach alone could not identify.

In his study of community power, Presthus (1964) uses both the decisional and reputational approaches to identify community power. Presthus began with the assumption that the decisional approach gives a more objective indication of the distribution of power, but he later modified this assumption and concluded that both methods had a great contribution and that neither was clearly superior to the other. In addition, each method provided important checks against the characteristic shortcomings of the other.

We also find that Tait et al. (1978) support the idea of using a combination of elements from the reputational and decision-making methods through asking qualified persons about actual decisions that have been made. In this way, one might do away with the limitations of using one method.

Although some sociologists have tested the validity of the reputational approach and found it imperfect but
We might use it alone in some cases because it is simple and provides an excellent beginning point for the analysis. The cases for which we suggest using the reputational method alone include when one wishes to conduct developmental programs in underdeveloped communities and when one needs to know the leaders in several community issue areas. In underdeveloped communities, the reputational leaders play vital roles and might be able to increase or decrease the degree of involvement by the target audience in the developmental programs because of their great influence on the people. Thus, one would wish to be able to identify the reputational leaders in order to gain their support for the programs.

**Typology of Issue Participation**

Social participation as a form of social behavior can be classified according to the nature of the issues participated in or the organizations belonged to. The three main categories of social participation are instrumental, expressive, and instrumental-expressive (combined).

Instrumental activities are activities which have functional consequences for some segments of the community, the community as a whole or the larger society. These activities are considered means to a certain goal which is
extrinsic to the activities. The rewards of instrumental activities are neither immediate nor personal. Usually, instrumental participation is formally structured.

On the other hand, an expressive activity is an end by itself. Normally, a large portion of the social activity of the participant is self-contained. The rewards for the participants in expressive activities are both immediate and personal thus having impact on the personality system. In contrast to instrumental activities, the rewards of expressive activities are intrinsic to the activity and achieving the goals does not affect the nonparticipants.

It must be noted, however, that the rewards derived from any kind of activity is rarely identified in such a clear-cut manner as mentioned in the descriptions of instrumental and expressive activities. Sometimes the significance of expressive activities goes beyond the immediate enjoyment of participants because from a communal point of view expressive activities are important for communal and societal cohesion. Also, participation in instrumental activities provides the participants with a sense of belonging and helps in the integration of the personality system. Thus, both instrumental and expressive activities have some impact on the personality and social system at least in the long run.
Instrumental-expressive activities are those in which the goals of participants are mixed. Some goals are directed outside the group of participants and others are directed within. The rewards of the participants are also mixed, and the reward depends on achieving the goal. Many of the objectives and activities of voluntary associations are instrumental-expressive. For example, the American Legion provides its members with both immediate rewards through dancing, eating, and drinking and nonimmediate rewards through supporting a national lobby group which aims to keep certain values and maintain the larger social order (Edwards and Booth, 1973).

Conflict and Controversy in Issue Participation

Sociologists look at conflict in different ways. Some sociologists define conflict as a "social disease" which works against equilibrium. These people look at keeping a state of collaboration as a social health and as the basic orientation of industrial sociology. Also, Lewin's former student group look at conflict as a dysfunctional social phenomenon (Coser, 1964).

However, conflict theorists criticize the order and consensus of functionalism; they see that powerful elites try to suppress class struggles either through ideology or
by the physical violence of the state (Stoneall, 1983).
Coser (1964) rephrases Simmel's proposition about conflict saying that conflict helps establish and maintain the identity and boundary lines of societies and groups. Coser sees the positive function of conflict in regulating systems of relationships of interactive patterns. In his opinion, conflict clears the air and reduces the accumulation of hostility and permits free behavior and opinions. Participation in conflicting issues or tension-releasing activities may provide satisfaction by itself. Conflict works as an outlet for the release of tension and hostility. Coser also mentioned that the German sociologist Vierkandt refers to conflicting issues as "river beds" which repress drives thus keeping other social relations from destruction.

Ritzer (1983) looks at the two faces of society described by Dohrendorf (conflict and consensus) indicating that conflict can lead to consensus and integration and can also lead to change and development. Within a local community, participation in conflicting activities can bring some isolated people to be active participants. Such participation can also act as a communication function through which the positions and boundaries between groups in the local community will be clarified and the groups can obtain a better idea of their relative strengths. The
possibility for peaceful accommodation might also be increased.

However, participating in conflicting issues still has some dysfunctions. Turner (1982) mentions that individuals who are involved in conflicting activities grow increasingly intense about the activities and become very emotionally involved. Such intensity might bring about some negative or violent collective actions, or it might bring about some basic dissension on societal norms and values which will cause some degree of instability. Dye (1986) mentions that community elites struggle for consensus to keep stability, to improve capital investment, to persuade the local government officials to participate in the elite consensus, and to create favorable business conditions. Finally, this consensus will create a sense of community responsibility and benefit the entire community. However, Miller and Farm (1960) refer to the great possibility of achieving consensus only in small communities with a single industry and communities independent from a large metropolitan area.

Some Structural Characteristics of Community Leadership

The community leadership plays an important behavioral role in helping carry out the goals of the community and keeping its structural integrity (Anderson, 1984). Several
studies have shown that the appropriate participation of community leaders creates successful actions in the community (Powers, 1965). Community power actors play a vital role in the important decision-making processes which control the direction of community change. Therefore, the study of the community leadership structure is of great concern among developmental program specialists. Cartwright and Zander (1968) refer to the basic roles of leadership as instrumental ones.

Power actors in each community relate to each other and form a power structure. The relationships among actors vary from one community to another and vary within the same community over time. Powers (1965) classified these relationships between power actors into four categories:

1. Power structure in some communities is centered in "one person." This type of structure includes those in which one family dominates for generations or one company owns the whole community. This is called a one-industry community.

2. The power structure in other communities is centered in a tightly knit group or power elite which controls policy making, e.g., a local aristocracy.

3. The power structure may be a split community structure in which various groups or sectors form separate power
structures. These groups could be Republican and Democrat, Christian and Muslim, rural and urban, or white and black. The structure within each group could be one of those mentioned in either 1 or 2.

4. The power structure could also be what is called a power pool in which there are about ten to twenty-five top community power actors. In each issues area, maybe three or four of these top community power actors form the power structure. The specialization by issue among power actors decreases as the community size decreases. The members of the power pool changes over time. Top power actors do not usually hold positions of formal authority in the community but are active in formal organizations.

Power actors usually share some clear socio-economic characteristics. The power actors tend to have higher income and education, be middle-aged (50-60), have access to resources of credit, jobs, and mass-media, and have a long-time residency in the community (Spinrad, 1960; Hausknecht, 1962; Abu-Laban, 1963; Erbe, 1964; Powers, 1965; Hodge and Treiman, 1968; Hyman and Wright, 1971; Payne et al., 1972).
Elitist versus Pluralist

The debate between the elitist versus pluralist "power structure," which occurred to a large extent in the 1950s and 1960s, has for the most part enriched the community power studies. Liebert and Imershein (1977) mentioned that the repeated confrontation between supporters of the two models indicate that the contradictions of the findings by the two approaches are very much less than the contradictions in their ideology.

The social exchange perspective of looking at power is close to the old "elitist" and "pluralist" case study designs in which one tries to identify those individuals in a community who possess certain major resources of power (reputation, position, wealth, etc.) and discover the structure.

Regardless of the differences, both the elitists and pluralists see very definite limits to the possible participation of the mass of the people within political life generally and within significant social institutions and groupings (Plant, 1974). According to Pareto (1966), all political power is held by an elite group, and people always have been and always will be governed, controlled and manipulated by the elite. As a pluralist, Dahl (1961) responded to the elitist critique of direct democracy.
Pluralists look at political power not in terms of
government by a homogeneous elite but rather in terms of the
way competing groups are able to present their case to the
political authorities.

Reviewing the two extreme points of view of elitists
and pluralists, we find that Hunter (1953) exaggerates in
characterizing covert elitism by the following:

- no top decision-makers occupy positions in the
  formal structure of government,
- no one person is recognized as the key decision-
  maker by the community at large,
- each top decision-maker exercises influence in all
  "important" issue areas, and
- there is consensus among leaders on ideology and
  thus on policy directions.

The other extreme case was presented by Dahl (1961).
Dahl claims that legitimate pluralism is in total opposition
to covert elitism and is thus characterized by the
following:

- decision-makers hold formal political offices,
- the leaders are visibly recognized as key decision-
  makers by the community at large,
- each decision-maker is influential only in issue
  areas related to the formal positions he holds, and
- constituents are heterogeneous and the leaders
  represent their different values, priorities, and
  directions.
In the middle of these two extremes, there are independent subgroupings concerned with one or more decision area, some other visible subgroupings competing on some decisions, and interest groups which contain some leaders recognized by the community (Dahl, 1961).

Leadership Structure and Population

Bonjean and Grimes (1974) reported that there is a correlation between the leadership structure and some demographic-ecological variables, e.g., population, heterogeneity, economy, industrialization, education, age, region, and poverty. Community leadership patterns in the larger society tend to follow the more general process, such as differentiation, division of labor, interdependence and great complexity which demands coordination and integration among the different units and parts of the social system (Schulze, 1958; Freeman, 1960; and Walton 1968).

In fact, there is no consensus on the correlation between the type of leadership structure in the community and the population of that community. Clark (1968) listed some basic demographic variables which were frequently observed in the literature and found to be related to the pattern of leadership structure. Here we consider a partial list of those related to our present study. Clark
hypothesized that the larger the population, the more pluralistic is the power structure and the larger is the number of potential elites that can compete for power democratically. Also, the larger the community, the greater is the number of full-time political roles and the more autonomous is the political institution of the community. As the political institutions of a community become more autonomous, the more pluralistic becomes the power structure. The power structure tends to be more pluralistic also as the degree of industrialization in a community or (and) the educational level of the community residents increases. We also see more pluralistic power structures as the economic structures within the community become more diverse and as the number of full-time nonelected officials in the community government increases.

French and Aiken (1968) concluded that the reputational technique developed by Bonjean is very effective even in different sizes of communities and the method tends to find elitist leadership structures. However, it has been reported by many researchers that there is no conclusive empirical evidence of the relationship between the community power structure and the size of population in the community (Barth, 1961; Gilbert, 1968; and Conway, 1973).
Class, Status and Power of Community Elites

Weber (1978) looked at class, status, and power in relational terms as three dimensions of stratification. Weber defined class as the differential distribution of "material property" and "life chances" resulting from "people meeting competitively in the market for the purpose of exchange." Status is looked at as a specific style of life and can be measured through education, holding a public office, and length of residency (Bonjean, 1964). Power, as defined by Weber (1978), is the likelihood that the actor with power in a social relationship will be able to carry out his will despite resistance.

Hunter and Fritz (1985) mentioned that the three distinct dimensions (class, status, and power) are possibly different among themselves within a certain chosen elite. Bonjean (1964) discovered that community leaders with high rank of class and status are more likely to be reputed leaders with high visibility. However, community leaders with low rank of class and status are more likely to be invisible or "concealed" leaders who are known to the elite but not known to the community at large.

Hunter and Fritz (1985) in their study refer to the elite structures in a community as a direct function of the social class composition of community residents. They
concluded from their research that the structure of the elite relationships has its variation across specific types of ties and across communities.

Summary of the Literature

The basic objectives of this study are to identify the community power structure in a Midwestern city, to describe the roles of the leaders in single or multiple issues, and to define the scope and extent of leaders' participation. The study also describes the types and nature of issues in which individuals participate.

Several studies have indicated that leaders, especially top or elite leaders, with active roles in community programs have the capability and power to control and influence other participants. Elites are more likely to participate in several projects and interest fields. The elites are also able to stay with a particular issue and play active roles in all stages or phases of an issue because of their higher levels of resources, e.g., income, better resources of communication, and other socio-economic characteristics.

Elites have the capacity to direct social change in the local society. They play crucial roles in decision-making processes because of their reputational power and because of
their prestigious positions, higher income, higher education, and longer residency in the community. Higher incomes and higher levels of education are markedly associated with both more extensive and intensive involvement in community activities (Payne et al., 1971). Elites have higher class and status and are generally not newcomers to the community; instead they have long residency in the community which enables them to have higher rates of membership and participation, and their backgrounds are known to the rest of the community. Therefore, they are able to have a direct influence on the social structure in the community.

Dye (1986) mentions that elites strive for consensus to keep order and encourage local officials to cooperate with them to help the total community. Elites have a tendency to participate in issues with lower rates of conflict and controversy to avoid dissension.

Based on the nature and purpose of the instrumental and expressive types of issues, the elite leaders are more likely to participate in instrumental issues which give gratification to different groups or to the whole community. Elites also have the potential to volunteer for new activities. They do not hesitate to participate in the early phases of the programs in the community to encourage
others to participate, and they are able to take some risk by participating in early phases like the early adopters of innovations (Rogers, 1983).

Studies have shown the nature of relationships among elites. Elites are more likely to have cohesive relationships. They are more likely to have close friendly and professional relationships. The relationships of class, status, and power tend to exist among the members of the elite in the form of a network. Leadership activity is expressed through the relationships among the leaders and the participants in the community as a social system. Elites exercise power in the community to achieve the planned objectives and to maintain group structure in the community through their active roles.

Theoretical Propositions

From the theoretical and empirical literature, we can derive several propositions concerning the anticipated relationships between variables.

T1. Elite leaders will have a greater scope of community participation than nonelite leaders.

T2. Elite leaders will have a greater extent of community participation than the nonelite leaders.
T3. Elite leaders will have greater participation in issues of less conflict and controversy than nonelite leaders.

T4. Elite leaders will have greater participation in instrumental issues than in combined and expressive issues.

T5. Elite leaders will have greater participation in early phases of issues than nonelite leaders.

T6. Elite leaders will have higher class than nonelite leaders.

T7. Elite leaders will have a higher level of education than nonelite leaders.

T8. Elite leaders will have a longer length of residency than nonelite leaders.

T9. Elite leaders will have a higher score of IER (Income, Education and Residency) than nonelite leaders.

T10. Elite leaders will have a cohesive relationship among themselves.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Iowa State University conducted a case study in the Fall of 1981 concerning citizen participation in community action. The study took place in a Central Iowa community which is hereafter referred to as Mill City.

General Information about Mill City

According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1980), the population of Mill City was 26,938. Of these people, 12,914 were male (48%), and 14,024 were female (52%). Only 429 were under one year old (1.59%) with the largest age category being between 35 and 44 years old (10.61%). The total number of housing units in Mill City was 10,771 with 4 seasonal migratory and 523 vacant units.

Mill City, a Midwestern city, serves as an agricultural trade center but is also considered a relatively large and diversified industrial center which has a large manufacturing labor force. At the time of collecting the data, many citizens indicated that relations between labor and management in Mill City were characterized by a relatively high degree of tension.

As its county seat, Mill City houses several governmental and nongovernmental agencies, offices and
associations which serve the county such as a city hall, district court, Animal Rescue League, Senior Citizens and Handicapped centers, a crime and drug abuse center and recreation centers. Mill City also provides health services through a community hospital, county care facility, mental health center, community nursing service, and county public health office. Additionally, Mill City has a city bus service, public library, a number of schools serving children from preschool to high school, and a community college.

Concerning the labor force in Mill City, there were 12,592 individuals 16 years old or over in the labor force. Of the males, 7023 were employed while 321 were unemployed (4.37% unemployment). For the females 5569 were employed while 233 were unemployed (4.02% unemployment). Areas employing high percentages were manufacturing (30.25%) and professional and related services, i.e., health, educational, and others, (24.34%) while those industries employing relative small numbers were agricultural and related industries, i.e., forestry, fisheries, and mining, (1.94%) and business and repair services (2.37%).
Sampling Strategy

The study was conducted basically to identify and measure the interaction structures through which the citizens participated in local issues and activities. The strategy of data collection was a snowball sampling designed to locate the core actors who conducted fundamental roles in community activities. Data collection was started by identifying 10 community knowledgeable including the mayor, former mayor, newspaper editor, and cooperative extension specialist. In a personal interview, each knowledgeable actor was asked about community issues, projects or any other activities which had received the greatest amount of local attention over the past three years. Any issue listed by at least two knowledgeable was selected for further study. The final number of issues chosen was 17 (see Table 3.1).

After mentioning an issue, each knowledgeable was asked to name local residents who were most involved in making the decisions on that particular issue. Individuals who were identified by two or more knowledgeable were called "issue authorities" and were automatically included in the sample. Fifty-four individuals received the minimum number of nominations (2), but three of these declined to participate and another four had since moved out of Mill City.
TABLE 3.1. Issues for Mill City study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.</td>
<td>Extension of airport runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.</td>
<td>Quality of sewage treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.</td>
<td>Crosstown Boulevard development/Improvement of surface transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 4.</td>
<td>Development of recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 5.</td>
<td>Fire safety code inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 6.</td>
<td>Swimming pool at Rolling Hills School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 7.</td>
<td>Student walkout at high school/Committee for Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 8.</td>
<td>Defeat of bond issue for auditorium at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 9.</td>
<td>Pride Days Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 10.</td>
<td>Efforts to improve labor-management relations/Labor-management Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 11.</td>
<td>Skatetown rezoning request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 12.</td>
<td>Jobs for Mill City Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 13.</td>
<td>Community Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 14.</td>
<td>Congregate Meals Program/Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 15.</td>
<td>Raising money for police dog/Crime Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 16.</td>
<td>Lack of industrial space/Speculative building projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 17.</td>
<td>Charging Arts Association rent on space in Johnson Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a structured questionnaire, the remaining forty-seven issue authorities were interviewed to identify their roles in each of the issues, up to 5 of the 17 issues, and those individuals who were involved in these issues. They were asked to describe their roles in each of the issues. The subjects in Mill City were given a list similar to that of Card C in Appendix B which gives several possible actions for community projects in each of the five phases of a specific issue. These five phases are initiation, organization of sponsorship, goal-setting, recruitment, and implementation (Wilkinson, 1970).

Historical information on issue participation was collected. Information in the following areas was also collected during each interview: 1-formal organizational affiliates; 2-sociodemographic characteristic; 3-personal contact with other citizens in the community concerning social, economic, and community affairs; and 4-perceived leadership patterns in the community.

A snowballing procedure similar to the one used by Freeman et al. (1963) was used to locate additional actors besides the issue authorities. The issue authorities were asked to name other subjects who played vital roles in each of the 17 issues. The subjects who were nominated two or more times as active participants in any issue were called
"first level influentials" and were added to the sample and subsequently interviewed. Similarly, the first level influentials were asked about the number of issues in which they were greatly involved (up to five out of the 17 issues) and to describe their role in each. Another step of the snowball technique was done to list individuals who were identified by one authority and one or more first level influential. Such individuals were also considered first level influentials and thus added to the sample. The snowball technique was repeated until no additional first level influentials were nominated. At the final iteration, the total number in the sample was 169 actors who were nominated as having actively participated in at least one of the 17 issues.

Of the 169 actors, ten actors were eliminated since they had moved from the community; another 14 were excluded (one was on an extended vacation, four were in high school, and nine subjects were not interviewed due to bookkeeping errors at the time of interviewing). Thus, the sample was reduced to 145. Eight of these rejected participation in the study, leaving a total of 137 actors who were interviewed. Following Freeman's (1968) techniques, other criteria of self-acknowledged participation were applied to check if the individual was a valid participant in the issue
for which he/she had been considered an authority or first level influential. As a result of applying the additional criterion of self-acknowledgement, 17 actors were omitted from further analysis. The final rate of participation was 78.9% (120 out of 152 after eliminating the 17 actors who did not meet the self-acknowledgement criterion).

Previous researchers who used the same set of data excluded three out of the seventeen issues due to the criteria used for selecting actors. Thus, in issues 3, 6, and 12, there were not enough actors who met their criteria (Elezaby, 1985). We have chosen to include these issues in the current study since some initial summaries of the data showed that issue 3 was ranked as the top issue with 82 actors out of the 120 actors considering it as one of the three most important issues in the community in the past three years. Additionally, issue 6 was ranked as the second most important issue. Moreover, excluding the three issues would give an underestimate of the total number of issues participated in for those people who included one or more of these three issues among the top five issues in which they participated.

We note that we use two different totals of participation. The first total, based on question 4 of the questionnaire (Appendix B), reflects the actual total
participation in an issue. The second total, based on question 5a of the questionnaire, reflects the total participation in an issue by individuals who considered the issue to be among the five in which they had participated the most. In the beginning of Chapter 4 (Tables 4.2 and 4.3), when we look at the distribution of participation in issue types and the importance of issues, the total participation used is the first total mentioned above. These totals more accurately reflect the actual participation in the three issue types. The second total is employed because responses to all questions from 6 to 20 were obtained only for those issues in which the respondent had considered himself/herself to have participated the most. This limit of up to 5 issues was imposed for ease in the interview and to decrease response error from fatigue.

It is important to make a note about the method of snowball sampling. If we assume that this method was highly successful in Mill City, then we have obtained nearly a census of all active participants in the seventeen issues in Mill City. However, if active participants were omitted, then we have only a sample of the active participants in these issues. Since the selection of individuals through a snowball sample is not random, one can not assume that this nonprobability sample is representative of the total
population of active participants in Mill City nor can one estimate the sampling error. Whether the Mill City data is a sample or a census, it is not suitable for statistical analysis (Bailey, 1978). In this current descriptive study, only means and percentages will be used to analyze the data and describe the results. We note that the closer the snowball sample is to a census, the closer these means and percentages are to the actual population means and percentages for the population of active participants in the seventeen issues in Mill City.

Description of the Issues

Issue 1: Extension of the airport runway

Because use of the airport had been very restricted, the acquisition of land was desired to extend the runway at the Mill City airport. The runway extension which made it possible for small jets to use the facilities was completed before data collection.

Issue 2: Quality of sewage treatment

Some industries in Mill City had failed to meet the ammonia level standards set by the state for the quality of sewage effluent. Improving sewage treatment facilities was projected to cost the city several million dollars and could have forced some local industry to close. At the time of
the interviews, the problem had been resolved temporarily through negotiations, but several participants had expressed doubts that the issue had been put to rest.

**Issue 3: Crosstown boulevard development**

Mill City had restricted traffic flow in the inner city area because of numerous railroad crossings. The plan to improve surface transportation was to reroute traffic and to construct four viaducts. At the time of data collection, work had begun on two of the four viaducts.

**Issue 4: Development of recreational facilities**

This issue involved building new and remodeling old baseball and softball diamonds including the installation of night lights at existing diamonds. Night lighting had been completed and construction was underway for another facility at the time of the interviews.

**Issue 5: Fire safety code inspections**

When a strict local fire safety code was enforced, landlords and businesses were opposed because the local code was much more strict than the state's fire code. Several existing buildings met the state's standards but failed to meet the local standards. At the time data were collected, the state's code was being enforced while the local code was under investigation.
Issue 6: Swimming pool at Pleasant Hills school

This issue involved the construction of a swimming pool at a school which served handicapped children. Fund raising activities were being undertaken at data collection time.

Issue 7: Student walkout at the high school

Many students had walked out of the public high school because they felt that basketball players were receiving special privileges and that too much emphasis was being placed on athletics. A committee of Mill City residents was formed to resolve the matter, and at the time of the interviews, the issue had been solved and the committee had stopped meeting.

Issue 8: Bond issue for a school auditorium

An addition to the school was desired in order to increase space for arts activities and to provide some classroom space. The bond issue had been defeated twice prior to completion of the survey.

Issue 9: Pride Days Committee

Pride Days is a celebration in Mill City designed to increase pride among Mill City residents and includes a wide range of activities. The committee planned the activities for the day long summer event that had been held just before data collection. Respondents indicated that similar activities were being planned for the next year.
Issue 10: Efforts to improve labor-management relations

Because there was a great amount of tension between labor and management in Mill City, this program was designed to bring representatives from both sides together so that they could discuss their problems and work for the betterment of the community. A committee including representatives from both parties had been formed shortly before the interviews were made.

Issue 11: Skatetown rezoning request

The operator of a local roller skating rink desired to expand, but the land he wished to purchase was not zoned for this purpose. A majority of business leaders supported the zoning change but the board in charge was initially opposed. The board reversed its decision after much public pressure.

Issue 12: Jobs for Mill City Committee

The committee which was formed to make plans that would attract new industry to the city included representatives from both labor and management and was created with the support of the Chamber of Commerce. Plans for increasing job opportunities were being developed at the time of interviews.
Issue 13: Community Relations Committee

This committee was created to improve relations among various groups within the community, to increase understanding of local issues among citizens, and to provide a public meeting place for discussing community concerns. The committee conducted a needs assessment survey prior to the conduction of interviews.

Issue 14: Congregate meals program

This issue involved the development of two meals programs for the elderly— one involved the delivery of meals to the homes of elderly citizens and the other involved founding a place where elderly could come for meals together. Both programs were operating at the time interviews were completed.

Issue 15: Raising money for police dog

A police dog was desired for use in emergencies and official police business. However, the police department did not have the funds for such a purchase, and a committee was formed to raise money for this purpose. At the time of data collection, fund raising efforts were being made.
Issue 16: Lack of industrial space

Many Mill City residents believed that there were not enough buildings adequate for industrial development and felt that new industry could be brought into the city if attractive space were provided. One such speculative building project was being undertaken when the interviews were conducted.

Issue 17: Charging the Arts Association rent

This issue arose when the Arts Association was asked to pay rent for space it occupied in a building constructed from the donations of a local family who had traditionally supported the arts. The building held the Chamber of Commerce and the Arts Association as well as other offices. The city was responsible for the upkeep of the building and felt that the Arts Association should pay rent on the space it occupied. At the time data was collected, the association was paying rent.

Measurement of the Variables

Sex

Actor's gender is treated as a dummy variable defined as follows: Males = 1, Females = 0.
Age

The age variable was measured by asking the respondent, "What is your present age?" The sample was selected within the age limits 24-75. We use the following coding: 1 = 24-39 years old, 2 = 40-54 years old, 3 = 55-69 years old, and 4 = 70-75 years old.

Education

This variable was measured by asking, "How much formal education have you completed?" We choose to use the following coding: 1 = less than high school, high school, or some college, 2 = four year college, and 3 = some graduate work or a graduate degree.

Income

This variable was treated similar to the educational variable by asking the actor to select one of eight categories which matched his/her family's total income, after taxes, in 1980. We obtain a reduced number of categories from the original ones that are defined as: 1 = Less than $10,000, 2 = $10,000-$19,999, 3 = $20,000-$24,999, 4 = $25,000-$34,999, 5 = $35,000-$49,000, and 6 = More than $50,000.
Marital Status

This variable was measured simply by asking the subject, "What is your present marital status? a) married, b) never married, c) separated, d) divorced, or e) widowed?" However, in this study we treat this variable as a dummy variable defined as: Married = 1 and Unmarried = 2, where the unmarried category includes categories b, c, d, and e from the original question.

Years of Residence

This variable was measured by asking how many years the actor lived in the community. The maximum years was set at 75 years since all actors were 75 years old or younger. For our purposes, we have categorized the years of residence as: 1 = Less than 5 years, 2 = 5 years or more but less than 10 years, 3 = 10 years or more but less than 55 years, and 4 = 55 years or more.

Conflict in the Issue

This variable, defined for each of the 17 issues, is a measure of the degree of conflict and controversy in each issue. The original scale was a 1-9 scale, with 1 representing a very high degree of conflict and controversy and 9 representing a very high degree of agreement and consensus. We choose to define conflict in the issue as a
dummy variable with 1 = conflict in the issue (levels 1-4) and 2 = no conflict in the issue (levels 5-9).

Reputational Power

This variable was measured by the question, "In your opinion, who was the one individual who had the greatest influence on the decisions made concerning (name issue)?" The actual index used is the total number of times the respondent was named as most influential.

Scope of Participation

The respondent was asked to indicate in which of the 17 issues he/she had participated (Question 4, Appendix B). Then, the respondent was asked to select the issues up to 5 in which he/she had participated the most (Question 5a, Appendix B). The scope of participation is the number of most important issues up to 5.

Extent of Participation

The role which was played by the actor in each issue (i.e., the role can be identified through the actor's participation in one or more of the five phases of each issue or project).
Operational Definitions

**Reputational Power** is defined to be the number of votes or the times an actor was nominated as the most influential individual in an issue by the rest of the issue participants in the study.

**Class** is defined to be the level of income of each participant in the study. Level of income is divided into six categories with each successive categories receiving one additional point to obtain a class score.

**Status** is defined to be the combination of the educational level and the length of residency of each participant. Education is divided into three categories with each successive category receiving a score of one additional point. Length of residency is divided into four categories with each successive category receiving a score of one additional point. The status score is the sum of the education and length of residency scores.

**IER Score** is a combined (3-13) point scale consisting of income (6 points), education (3 points), and length of residency (4 points) to measure the overall class and status of the different ranks of leaders to classify the ranks as elite or nonelite leaders. We will call the rank elite if it receives an average score between 9 and 13, pluralist if it receives an average score between 5 and 8.99, and
ambiguous if it receives an average score between 3 and 4.99.

**Power Relationship** is operationally defined to be the relationship among top leaders in terms of nominations by one another as an individual with whom he/she had the most contact in general. A score of one will be given to each nomination.

**Class Relationship** is defined to be the relationship among the top leaders in terms of nominations by one another as an individual whom he/she considers to be among the ten people with whom the respondent has had the most business or professional dealings. A score of one will be given to each nomination.

**Status Relationship** is defined to be the relationship among the top leaders in terms of nominations by one another as an individual who is among his/her top ten personal friends. A score of one will be given to each nomination.

**Elite Leaders** are the top leaders who receive at least five votes as most influential and compose fifteen percent or less of the total number of leaders. Each of the top leaders has a relationship of class, status or power with the rest of the top leaders either directly or indirectly through a chain of other top leaders. Two examples of relatively weak relationships that could exist between ten
elite leaders is given in Figure 3.1 where each unidirectional arrow represents any class, status or power relationship, and the two-directional arrows can represent different relationships in each direction. The numbering of the ten leaders given in Figure 3.1 is arbitrary.

FIGURE 3.1. Elite leaders relationship structures
Nonelite Leaders are all leaders in the study who receive less than five votes as most influential. They compose 85% or more of the total number of leaders; nonelite leaders include both the middle and low ranked leaders.

Scope of Participation is the number of different issues in which the respondent participated and considered as among his/her top five issues. We consider the scope to be high if the number of issues participated in is 4 or 5, medium if the number is 2 or 3, and low if the number is 1.

Extent of Participation is the role or roles played by each individual in single issues where each issue has five phases. An individual is said to have a high extent of participation in an issue if he/she participated in 4 or 5 phases, a medium extent if he/she participated in 2 or 3 phases, and a low extent if he/she participated in only one phase.

Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical propositions listed in Chapter 2 and the operational definitions given in this chapter, we form the following hypotheses.

H1. Elite leaders have a higher scope of participation than nonelite leaders.
H2. Elite leaders have a higher extent of participation than nonelite leaders.

H3. Elite leaders have greater participation in issues of low conflict than nonelite leaders.

H4. Elite leaders have greater participation in instrumental issues than expressive and combined issues.

H5. Elite leaders have higher participation in the first and second phases than the nonelite leaders.

H6. Elite leaders have higher income than nonelite leaders.

H7. Elite leaders have a higher level of education than nonelite leaders.

H8. Elite leaders have a longer residency in Mill City than the nonelite leaders.

H9. Elite leaders have a higher average IER Score than nonelite leaders.

H10. Each elite leader has a relationship of class, status, or power with every other elite leader either directly or indirectly through a chain of elite leaders.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, we investigate the data collected in the Mill City sample to determine whether or not our previously proposed hypotheses are supported by the data. Discussion concerning various trends is given. Frequencies of various descriptive characteristics (sex, age, education, income, marital status, and length of residency) are given in Appendix A.

Criteria for Classifying Issues

To classify the seventeen issues into types, we mention the criteria used. The issue is considered to be instrumental if its activities are directed outside the group of participants and have functional consequences for a part or all of the community. The activities of an instrumental issue are just means to an end; participants receive their rewards from achieving the goal and not their immediate involvement. Examples of instrumental issues might be a social protest issue, building an airport, or forming a research station.

We consider the issue to be expressive if most of its activities are self-contained. Consequences of the activities of an expressive issue matter only to the participants who get their rewards immediately during the activities.
Examples of expressive issues are holding a sports tournament or entertainment program.

The issue is classified as instrumental-expressive (combined) if the activities and the goals have mixed characteristics. Some activities are oriented outside the group of participants and some inside. Some rewards are immediate, and others come later. Voluntary associations are more likely to be concerned with these issues. For example, the local P.T.A. might be concerned with providing an alcohol-free senior prom.

The previous criteria are purely theoretical. Practically, some issues are hard to classify in terms of function, purpose or rewards derived therefrom. The gratification from any activity is rarely clearly identifiable from the criteria above. Some rewards of expressive activities go beyond the immediate joy of the participants, and some instrumental activities include immediate rewards. Both instrumental and expressive activities have consequences for both the personality system and the social system. Due to this difficulty of classification, there is a chance of error in deciding the type of an issue due to the personal bias and the cognitive understanding of the researcher.
Typology of the Issues

Based on the previous criteria and the nature of the seventeen issues under study as described in Chapter 3, we classify the seventeen issues into the three types, instrumental, expressive, and combined, as given in Table 4.1.

Summing the total participation scores by issue type and dividing by the total number of issues in each type, we see that the participants in the Mill City study participate more in combined issues (Table 4.2). That is, the combined issues are ranked at the top in terms of the average total participation in these issues. Instrumental issues are ranked at the bottom in terms of the average total participation. This difference in participation levels is perhaps because individuals are attracted to participate in activities which are more entertaining and which give gratification and benefits immediately or after a short time.

The Importance of Issues

Individuals view the importance of an issue or activity differently because of their variation of interest, expected benefits, understanding to the issue, and perhaps because of the nature of the issue. The importance of the issues in the current study is looked at from the perspective of the
### TABLE 4.1. Structural categories of interest fields for Mill City issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest field</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Issue 1. Extension of airport runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 11. Skatetown rezoning request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 12. Jobs for Mill City Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 16. Lack of industrial space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Issue 4. Development of recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 6. Swimming pool at Rolling Hills school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 7. Student walkout at high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 9. Pride Days Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 14. Congregate meals program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 17. Charging Arts Association rent on space in Johnson Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Issue 2. Quality of sewage treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 3. Crosstown Boulevard development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 5. Fire safety code inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 8. Defeat of bond issue for auditorium at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 10. Efforts to improve labor-management relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 13. Community Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 15. Raising money for police dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2. Distribution of participation in issue types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest field</th>
<th>Average number of active participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>28.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The averages are based on the total participation of the respondents in the seventeen issues.*

Participants themselves where the community is considered the unit of analysis. We have ranked the seventeen issues by the number of nominations each received from the participants as one of the three most important issues in Mill City in the past three years (see Table 4.3).

From Table 4.3, we see that Issue 3 (Crosstown Boulevard development, a combined issue) is the most important one with 82 nominations; Issues 9 (Pride Days Committee, an expressive issue) and 10 (Efforts to improve labor-management relations, a combined issue) are ranked as the least important issues with zero nominations. Note that we have also included a total participation score where the score reflects the participation of all individuals including those who did not list the issue as one of their five of most active involvement. We see that individuals evaluate some issues as having been the most important ones.
TABLE 4.3. Rank of issue by importance in community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Nominations as one of 3 most important</th>
<th>Total Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total participation is based on the involvement of a respondent in the seventeen issues.

but they do not participate as highly in these issues and vice versa. For example, the expressive Issue 9 (Pride Days Committee) has the largest participation but it is ranked by the same participants as least important.
The Degree of Conflict in Issues

Using the operational definition for conflict from Chapter 3, we note that, from the community perspective, issues 1, 5, 7, and 17 are the most controversial issues (see Table 4.4). The percentage of active participants indicating controversy in these four issues ranged from 100% for Issue 7 (Student walkout at high school) to 81.3% for Issue 1 (Extension of airport runway). We classify these four issues to have a high level of conflict and denote the category by a 1. The issues having a medium level of controversy (issues 2, 8, 10, and 11) have between 64.7% and 43.8% of the active participants indicating conflict in the issue. The remainder of the seventeen issues are considered to have low conflict levels. The percentage of participants reporting conflict in these issues ranges from 33.3% for Issue 15 (Raising money for police dog) to 0% for Issue 6 (Swimming pool at Rolling Hills School).

Ranking the Reputational Leaders

Concerning how to identify the reputational leaders, the consensus in the literature is to ask actors who is the most influential person in making the decisions in your community in general or in relation to a specific issue (Abu-Laban, 1963; Powers, 1965; Fox, 1971; and Bonjean, 1974).
In this research, we apply a similar measurement for each of the seventeen issues. The 120 participants are ranked according to the number of votes each received collectively (Appendix C, Table C.1). After reviewing some characteristics of the participants with relation to the total votes they received, we classify the leaders into three levels—top, middle, and low. There are 18 top leaders, 43 middle rank leaders, and 59 low rank leaders.

While the criterion for identifying the top leaders is the number of nominations received, there are two other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Category</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent indicating conflict</th>
<th>Total participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
measures which can be used as a check. The first measure is simply the percentage of participants in each level. We will consider the leadership to be elite if the percentage of top leaders is less than or equal to 15, pluralistic if the percentage of top leaders is between 15 and 50, and an ambiguous or unclear pattern if the percentage of top leaders is greater than or equal to 50. According to the

**TABLE 4.5. Percentage of leaders in each rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage in each rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top rank</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle rank</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low rank</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mill City data, the top leaders make up 15% of all the participants, and thus they compose the elite in the leadership (see Table 4.5).

The second measure used to check our ranks is a combined score of income (1-6 points), education (1-3 points), and residency (1-4 points), which we denote as the IER Score (Table 4.6). This method of scoring is illustrated for the top eighteen leaders whose average IER score is 9.5.
TABLE 4.6. IER score for top 18 leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>IER Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class and Status of Elite and Nonelite Leaders (H6-H9)

We hypothesized in Chapter 3 that the elite leaders will have higher class and status than the nonelite leaders. The average income, education, years of residence, and IER scores for the three levels are given in Table 4.7. The income of the participants in Mill City vary from less than $10,000 (scored 1) to $50,000 or more (scored 6) (see Appendix A, Table A.4.). Elite leaders have a higher
average income than middle rank and low rank leaders. Nine out of the eighteen elite leaders (50%) make $35,000 or more and none of the elite leaders makes less than $10,000. We also note that the elite leaders have a higher average level of education than the nonelite leaders. The majority of elites (15 out of 18 or 83%) have at least a four year college education with 12 of the elites having done graduate work or obtained a graduate degree. Thus hypotheses H6 and H7 are supported.

Elite leaders in the current study do not, however, have a higher average length of residency in the community than the middle and low rank leaders. Thus there is no evidence to support hypothesis H8. It is noticeable that three of the eighteen elites are, in fact, newcomers who have lived in Mill City for less than five years. A possible reason for having these three newcomers among the elites is the strong ties that they had with local leaders or relatives before they moved to Mill City.

If we now consider the IER Scores, we see that the top leaders have a slight edge in terms of overall class and status than the middle rank and low rank leaders. This difference in IER Scores supports the contention that the top eighteen leaders are elites and shows that hypothesis H9 is supported.
TABLE 4.7. Class and status of Mill City leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of leader</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>IER score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top rank</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle rank</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low rank</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class, Status, and Power Structures for Elites (H10)

In this section, we investigate the degree of cohesiveness among the elite leaders. These relationships are measured in terms of whom these elite leaders identified among themselves as being included in their top ten friends (status), top ten professional contacts (class), and top ten most frequent contacts in general (power). The complete matrices for these identifications are given in Appendix C, Tables C.2, C.3, and C.4. The tables are to be read as "leader in row i said he does or does not have the indicated relationship with the leader in column j," where a 1 indicates such a relationship and 0 indicates no such relationship. From these tables, we see that there is no evidence of a status structure among the elite leaders, but there are relatively strong class and power structures with the power structure being the strongest. We note that two
of the leaders, ID's 9 and 149, were nominated by 12/17 and 11/17 of the others as among their most frequent contacts, respectively.

As there is no evidence of any status structure, we concentrate now on determining if there are any strong relationships in the class and power structures for the elite leaders. If we delete all rows and columns for leaders who are not nominated by any of the others, continuing this process until each remaining leader has been nominated by another at least once, we obtain the reduced relationship matrices presented in Tables 4.8 and 4.9.

**TABLE 4.8. Reduced class structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>148</th>
<th>149</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 |

From Table 4.8, we see that there are three clusters of leaders in the reduced class structure. Let cluster A1 be
TABLE 4.9. Reduced power structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>149</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 19 |

(8 and 9), cluster B1 be (34, 91, and 142), and cluster CI be (148, 149, and 19) where the numbers in parentheses are the ID's of the leaders. The leaders in cluster A1 nominated each other while in cluster B1 two of the leaders (91 and 142) nominated each of the other two but the third leader (34) nominated just one of the others. The third cluster, CI, has relatively weak ties. None of the leaders in cluster CI mutually nominated each other, but two of the leaders (148 and 149) nominated the third leader (19). We also note that the only class interrelationships between the three clusters of leaders is a very weak tie between clusters A1 and CI in which one of the leaders in cluster A1 nominated the one leader in cluster CI who was not nominated by either of the other two leaders in cluster CI. Finally,
we note that implicit in thus structure is a fourth cluster composed of the remaining nine top leaders who have very weak ties with each other and the three clusters A1, B1, and C1.

From Table 4.9, we note that there also appear to be three clusters of leaders in the reduced power structure. Let cluster A2 be (8, 9, and 149), cluster B2 be (19 and 34), and cluster C2 be (28 and 142). Each leader in cluster A2 nominated at least one of the other two with two out of the three nominating both of the others. For clusters B2 and C2, we see that the two leaders in each mutually nominated each other. Also, no leader in cluster A2 nominated any of the leaders in clusters B2 and C2, and no leader in cluster B2 nominated one of the leaders in cluster C2. However, leaders in clusters B2 and C2 nominated either one or two of the three leaders in cluster A2, and the two leaders in cluster C2 nominated one of the leaders in cluster B2. Thus, Table 4.9 has been arranged so that the unidirectional relationship is clear. Thus, it appears that clusters B2 and C2 consider themselves connected to cluster A2, but the opposite is not true. We note that there is one remaining leader (46) in the reduced power structure who does not really belong to any of the three clusters A2, B2, and C2, but this leader does have a
tie to cluster B2. It is interesting to note here that the leader identified as 46 is the only female among the top eighteen leaders.

By comparing the reduced class and power structures, we see that six out of the ten leaders represented in these two structures appear in both structures, but only two of the leaders (8 and 9) remain with each other in a cluster in both structures (clusters A1 and A2). The remaining four leaders who appear in both (19, 34, 142, and 149) have mixed ties across the two structures.

We can consider a figure of the type defined in Chapter 3 for the complete class, status, and power structures for the top eighteen leaders. Figure 4.1 represents this structure except that we have chosen to use a relative minimum number of arrows to indicate the relationships among the leaders and have deleted ones that could be replaced by a chain of arrows through other leaders for clarity of the figure. We note that the arrows in Figure 4.1 may represent any combination of the nominations defining the class, status, and power relationships. Additionally, two directional arrows may represent one type of relationship in one direction and a second type of relationship in the other direction.
FIGURE 4.1. Combined class, status, and power structure

For Mill City, we see that the eleven leaders identified as 8, 9, 149, 91, 28, 142, 34, 19, 46, 22, and 148, which we denote as the main group of leaders, are jointly connected either directly or indirectly through a chain of leaders. Six of the seven remaining leaders identified as 4, 12, 59, 16, 5, and 14 all consider themselves to be connected to the main group, but there are no relationships among these six leaders. Finally, there is one of the top leaders identified as 138 who never nominated any of the other seventeen top leaders, and he was nominated only once by one of the leaders in the secondary group.
Thus, our hypothesis for the class, status, and power structure in Mill City is partially supported in that the main group, which composes about 60% of the main group, is connected in the proposed way while the secondary group is unidirectionally connected to the main group even though it is not connected within itself.

Participation of Mill City actors in the three interest fields (H4)

As we have already mentioned, the highest overall average of actors participate in combined issues. However, we have not discussed how this overall trend holds for the top leaders. In Table 4.10, we divide the scope of participation of the top eighteen leaders into three separate scores for each of the three issue interest fields. It is noticeable that there are three among the top eighteen leaders who participated in only one issue (one interest field). In two cases, the interest field of the issue is combined while the actor's interest field is expressive in the third case. However, all three of those who participated in only one issue were involved in every single phase and were either considered as the most influential person in that issue or were tied with another leader as most influential for that issue. Thus, participation in one
TABLE 4.10. Participation in the interest fields for the top 18 leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader ID</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Scope of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  14  21  34  69

issue with this large extent of participation made them reputational leaders in the eyes of the other community actors.

We see from Table 4.10 that the top leaders participate in combined issues the most (in terms of scope of participation) followed by expressive and instrumental issues. This trend does not show any support for hypothesis H4. One might explain this high participation in combined
issues in terms of the concern that top leaders might have to satisfy the majority of the people in the community or to achieve quick and noticeable success thereby retaining their reputational influence. We note that this is the same trend that held when we considered the 120 participants as a whole. We also see that seven of the eighteen participated in issues in all three interest fields, eight of the top leaders participated in two out of three interest fields, and three as we have already mentioned who participated in only one interest field. Finally, we note that there was only one leader out of the top eighteen who did not participate in any combined issue.

Scope of Participation (H1)

In Chapter 2, we hypothesized that the elites have a greater scope of participation than either the middle ranked leaders or the low ranked leaders. Consider Table 4.11 in which we indicate the number (and percentage) in each rank who had the various scopes of participation. We see that 10 out of the top eighteen leaders (elites) participated in five issues (55.56%) with an average scope of 3.83 while for the middle ranked leaders 10 out of 43 (23.26%) participated in five issues with an average scope of 3.09 and for the low ranked leaders 13 out of 59 (22.03%) participated in five
issues with an average scope of 2.81. Thus, our hypothesis for the Mill City community in terms of scope of participation is supported.

**TABLE 4.11. Scope of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Leader</th>
<th>Number of issues participated in</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>27.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>22.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extent of Participation (H2)**

While the elite leaders have a greater scope of participation, we have yet to determine whether the elites have a greater extent of participation (phase participation). Table 4.12 shows that the overall average of the top leaders concerning the number of phases in which they participated is 3.57 whereas the middle ranked leaders' average is 3.48. There is also a difference between top leaders' phase participation and the low ranked leaders.
whose average is 3.21. Reviewing these three averages, we see that there is support for H2 that elite leaders have a higher extent of participation than nonelite leaders.

### TABLE 4.12. Average phase participation by leader type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Average phase participation by rank of leader</th>
<th>Total Participation</th>
<th>Issue Type</th>
<th>Level of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average: 3.57 3.48 3.21

<sup>a</sup>I=Instrumental, C=Combined, and E=Expressive.

<sup>b</sup>Only one top leader participated in this issue.

From the separate averages in Table 4.12, we calculate the total average participation of leaders within the
various issue types (Table 4.13). Results show that top
leaders and middle ranked leaders have nearly the same
averages for combined issues while top ranked leaders have a
slightly greater phase participation in expressive issues
and middle ranked leaders have a slightly greater phase
participation in instrumental issues. Top leaders have
slightly greater participation in all three issue types than
the low ranked leaders do. Thus, there is no support for
the hypothesis which states that top leaders (elite)
participate more in instrumental issues versus the
expressive and combined ones.

TABLE 4.13. Average phase participation by type of issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of issue</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entry in Early Phases (H5)

We note here that there are other trends in terms of
phase participation (Table 4.14). The elites have a
tendency to participate in early phases of the issues and to
exit in one of the two latter phases of an issue. While
middle and low ranked leaders also tend to enter in the early phases, there were several issues in which several low ranked participants and a few middle ranked participants entered in one of the latter two phases. This late phase entry occurred only one time in all of the seventeen issues for the top ranked leaders. Top leaders participate more in early phases of the issues because of their higher ability as early adopters to risk (Rogers, 1983).

TABLE 4.14. Entry phases of the participants\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Entries represent total counts over all issues.

Average Participation of Leaders in Conflicting Issues (H3)

After classifying the issues into the three degrees or levels of conflict (high, middle, and low), we find that the high rank leaders have higher participation in the high level of conflict than do the middle rank and low rank leaders (Table 4.15). Note that the elite leaders participate less in the middle level of conflict than either
the middle or low rank leaders. At the same time, elite leaders participate more in issues with a low level of conflict than nonelite leaders. These results show partial support for hypothesis H3.

TABLE 4.15. Average scope of participation by degree of conflict and rank of leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Conflict</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are also in agreement with the literature in that elite leaders sometimes avoid participation in issues of high conflict and controversy in order to reduce any emotional tension and to keep consensus and stability in the community (Dye, 1986). Another reason for the elites' behavior may be due to the tense relationship between labor and management in Mill City that was noted during the interviews.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Social participation has been widely emphasized as one of the most important elements in community development activities. The individuals who actively participate in community issues play an important role in decision making which affects the life of the total community. Discovering the patterns of leadership structure is normally necessary because of the vital role played by the leaders in terms of the initiation and the success of community action programs (Tait et al., 1978; Beal et al., 1966; and Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

The primary objectives of this study are identifying the community power structure in a Midwestern community and describing the different kinds of leadership and their roles in a single or multiple issues to determine the scope and extent of leaders' participation. This study also aims at investigating the types and nature of issues in which individuals have the interest to participate. The types of issues include instrumental, expressive, and combined issues. By the nature of issues, we mean the degree of conflict in these issues with relation to the participation of different leaders. Finally, the study shows some demographic characteristics of the participants.
Theoretical framework to the study is limited to the use of the reputational approach, which is compared in theoretical terms with other approaches especially the decision-making technique. Social exchange theory, community field theory as well as theoretical models for classifying issues and phase participation are used and utilized from to guide this research.

Social participation as a social behavior can take different forms and levels, such as membership locally, statewide or nationally. Social participation might also take the form of personal and psychological involvement in the affairs of a group, organization, and community. Sometimes social participation takes the form of attending meetings, holding offices, giving financial support or playing roles in publicity. In the current research, social participation is considered to be any role or roles played by any of the participants in any of seventeen issues which were considered among the most important issues and projects carried out in the three years previous to 1981 in a Midwestern community (Mill City).

The participation in each issue or project was within five phases: initiation, organization of sponsorship, goal-setting, recruitment, and implementation. For the purpose of narrowing down the concept of social participation, the
seventeen issues were classified into three main areas of interest or types of participation: instrumental, expressive, and instrumental-expressive or combined participation. In this study, it is meant by scope of participation the description of the locality-oriented role or roles of a participant in more than one issue or area of interest. On the other hand, we mean by extent of participation the description of the individuals' types of participation within a specific issue such as phase participation (Wilkinson, 1974; Kaufman et al., 1975; and Cook, 1984).

Power structures as patterns of relationships vary from one issue to another and from one social system to another. One may even find more than one power structure in the same community. Actors who work separately towards a common target but with no communication or relation between themselves have no power structure. The individuals who form patterns of relationships are able to exert more social power and thus their ability to affect the direction of community actions becomes greater (Bohlen et al., 1967).

Community action is loosely defined, but the central theme in nearly all definitions of community action is that of locality orientation. The projects which take place in the community are interrelated at one or more of the ecological, cultural or interactional levels.
There is a relationship between social participation and some social theories such as field theory and exchange theory. Community field theory refers to the local-relevance orientation of community participation where actions reflect a wide range of coordinated local interests (Kaufman, 1959). With relation to social participation, social exchange theory assumes that participants behave rationally and try to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs (Wilson, 1983). The exchange network makes the connection between the different participants through a series of exchange relations. The application of social exchange theory can be in five important aspects of social participation: the emergence of social structure, participation relationships, inter-organizational relationships, internal operation of an organization, and consequences of social participation.

Identifying power structure is very important in any community. Researchers have been using different methods in both rural and urban communities to identify the community actors and community power structure. Among the more commonly used methods are the reputational and decision-making methods. In the reputational approach, the researchers interview the community knowledgeables asking them to name individuals whom they think have influential
power in different community issues. The reputational method focuses mainly on determining top leaders whereas the decisional technique concentrates on the issues. For this reason, the decisional method is also called the issue analysis approach and researchers select several issues in the community and try to analyze the processes by which these issues are resolved (Bonjean and Grimes, 1974). There are some advantages and disadvantages of using each method. The supporters of each approach argue that their approach is better. A third opinion refers to using a combination of both the reputational and decisional methods as the better approach.

Researchers have some disagreement on classifying the types of community power structure. One of the ways of classifications that has met with a small amount of disagreement is that of Walton (1968). He listed four types of power structure: the pyramidal which includes a single cohesive group, the factional which includes at least two leadership groups in competition with each other, the coalitional in which the relationship between groups depends on the issue, and the amorphous for which there is no special pattern of leadership or power on the local level. There is a general trend in the literature that the reputational method is more likely to find pyramidal power
structures while the decisional method is more likely to identify factional and coalitional power structures. The debate between elitist and pluralist power structure is not over yet and continues to enrich community power studies.

The methodology used in the current study is based on a survey study using the reputational approach. A snowball technique was used to determine the sample of the study. Gathering data started in 1981 in a Midwestern community which has a population of about 25,000. The study was conducted basically to identify and measure the interaction structures through which the citizens participated in local issues and activities. In a personal interview, the community knowledgeables listed seventeen issues which had received the greatest amount of local attention in the previous three years. The final sample of active participants in these seventeen issues is 120 persons. Each person was asked to limit his/her active participation to a maximum of five issues in which the individual considered himself/herself to have participated the most.

Findings

Reviewing some demographic characteristics of the 120 individuals who participated in the study, we find that the majority were married males (95% males and 93.4% married).
The age of the participants ranged from 24 to 75 with upper-middle aged participants (55-69 years old) making up 24.2% of the total participants. Most of the top leaders came from the middle and upper-middle age groups. The education of the participants varies from high school or less to graduate education. The income of the participants also varies from less than $10,000 to more than $50,000. With relation to the length of residency in the community, only nine individuals are newcomers, that is, those individuals who have lived in the community for less than five years. The majority of the participants (80 out of 120) have from 10 to 55 years as their length of residency.

The seventeen issues were classified into three main categories: instrumental, expressive, and combined. Participants are close to being equally distributed among the three kinds of participation which reflects their interest field. However, instrumental participation is ranked at the bottom according to total participation of the individuals with combined issues ranked at the top.

The seventeen issues were also looked at in terms of their importance from a community perspective. Issue 3 (Crosstown boulevard development, a combined issue) is ranked as the most important with 82 nominations while Issue 9 (Pride Days Committee, an expressive issue) and Issue 10
(Efforts to improve labor-management relations, a combined issue) are ranked as the least important issues with no nominations.

Concerning the degree of conflict in the issues from the perspective of the respondents, we rank issues 1, 5, 7, and 17 as the most controversial issues and thus they comprise the highest level of conflict. The middle level of conflict includes issues 2, 8, 10, and 11 in which between 43.8% and 64.7% indicated that there was conflict in the issue. The low level of conflict includes the remainder of the issues with Issue 6 (Swimming pool at Rolling Hills School) representing the lowest level of conflict with no participant indicating that there was conflict in that issue.

After looking at the number of votes each individual received as the most influential in some issue or issues, reputational leaders are classified as top rank, middle rank, and low rank leaders. Top leaders number 18 while middle rank and low rank leaders number 43 and 59 respectively. The top leaders are considered to be elite not only because they represent a minority among all the leaders but because they tend to have a higher IER (Income, Education, and Residency) Score. The average top leader has a score of 9.50 while middle rank leaders have an average
score of 9.02 and the low rank leaders have an average score of 8.80.

Examining the class, status, and power relationships among the top eighteen leaders showed that there was no evidence of a status relationship among these elite leaders at all but there were class and power structures composed of three clusters of leaders each. These structures also have an implicit fourth cluster composed of the leaders who are not in one of the three clusters. Six of the leaders identified as 8, 9, 19, 34, 142 and 149 appear in the three clusters in both structures, but only 8 and 9 are in a cluster together in both structures. There were various cross-structure relationships between these leaders so these six leaders have ties to each other through the two structures.

We then considered the three structures, class, status, and power, jointly in order to discover the overall connections between the top eighteen leaders. We found that there was a main group of leaders that was connected to every other leader in that group either directly or indirectly through a chain of leaders. There was also a secondary group that considered themselves to be tied to the main group but the opposite was not true. Also, ties among the secondary group itself were nonexistent. One top leader
did not identify himself with either the main group or the secondary group.

With respect to the scope and extent of participation of the top leaders, we find that they have the highest percentage of participation in five issues (55.56%) compared with the middle rank leaders (23.26%) and the low rank leaders (22.03%). Also elite leaders in the Mill City study have a relatively greater extent of participation than nonelite leaders. The average number of phases participated in by elites is 3.57 while the average is 3.48 for middle rank leaders and 3.28 for low rank leaders. Examining the type of participation for the three ranks of leaders, it was found that top leaders have slightly greater participation in all three issue types (instrumental, expressive and combined) than do the low ranked leaders but they were nearly equal in this concern with the middle rank leaders. However, when compared with their own participation, elite leaders participated less in instrumental issues than in expressive or combined issues.

Concerning the participation of leaders in the issues with different degrees of conflict and controversy, results show that the high rank leaders participate more in issues which have either a high degree of conflict or a low degree of conflict than do middle rank and low rank leaders.
However, middle rank leaders participate more in issues which have a medium degree of conflict than either the top rank or low rank leaders.

Implications of the Study

The current study has some implications in both theory and application which can be utilized in future related studies.

Theoretical Implications

Social participation as an essential social behavior in community action was demonstrated in terms of the nature, types and value of this behavior in the community as a social system. Social exchange theory and community field theory were utilized to explain the individual's behavior in terms of the total psychological field of forces.

Social exchange theory demonstrated that an actor's participation was not random behavior, but rather it was a rational behavior directed towards a goal to obtain a reward and enjoy gratification, to avoid unsatisfactory situations or to balance the system of rewards and costs (Wilson, 1983). Social exchange theory has applicability in aspects such as the emergence of social structure, participation relationships, inter-organizational relationships, internal operation of organizations and consequences of social participation.
### TABLE 5.1. Summary of the hypotheses findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Weakly Supported</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Elite leaders have a higher scope of participation than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Elite leaders have a higher extent of participation than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Elite leaders have greater participation in issues of low conflict than nonelites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Elite leaders have greater participation in instrumental issues than in combined and expressive issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5. Elite leaders have higher participation in the first and second phases than the nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6. Elite leaders have higher income than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7. Elite leaders have a higher level of education than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8. Elite leaders have a longer residency in Mill City than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9. Elite leaders have a higher average IER Score than nonelite leaders.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10. Each elite leader has a relationship of class, status or power with every other elite leader either directly or indirectly through a chain of elite leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exchange theory was useful in explaining motivation behind the individual's participation, but it did not offer explanation concerning the timing of the participation and the type of issue participation with relation to the socioeconomic characteristics of the participant. The theory was also useful in making the typology of participation (instrumental, expressive, and combined), but there are no definite and clear-cut differences between the functions of each type and the consequences of each type.

Social field theory explained some aspects of the individual's participation especially with relation to how participants affect community structure and to the formation of clusters among some members of the top leaders in the community and the ways they communicate with each other. Community field theory shed light on how to begin studying the community structure through identifying the most important issues carried out in the community in a certain period of time and then examining the roles played by different participants in these issues (Beaulieu, 1977). The previous steps agree to a great extent as to what the reputational approach offers in studying the community power structure and in identifying community leaders (Powers, 1965).
The reputational approach has been successfully used in a great number of community studies in determining top leaders. The reputational method was useful in the current study in identifying the top leaders and in discovering the type of power structure. However, this approach does not answer the critics who say that the results could be biased by just expecting a small, cohesive, consensual group of elites and using arbitrary ways of ranking leaders. However, the method is comprehensive, methodologically simple, and applicable in spite of having some shortcomings.

**Applied Implications**

The results of the current study have some implications to be utilized in the areas of community leadership, policy making and community development. The results of this study indicate that policy makers need to consider the value of the community leaders and the importance of these leaders' potential roles in the different types of projects and in the different phases of each project. Discovering the top leaders who have a high scope and extent of participation and recognizing their socioeconomic characteristics would help community developers or change agents to reach them in order to use their power and influence in motivating other individuals to participate and have a community-wide involvement in the different activities. The results of
this study also help other community specialists to use top leaders for their ability to communicate and their strong vertical and horizontal ties to achieve inside and outside cooperation, coordination and integration thereby increasing the degree of success of developmental issues.

The findings of this study showed in what type of issue (instrumental, expressive or combined) and in what nature of issue (issues of high, medium or low levels of conflict) community leaders have the interest to participate. This knowledge is useful in keeping the order and in maintaining the group structure in the community.

To increase the efficiency of community projects, other information is needed concerning the importance of the issues from a community perspective. The current study showed that a great number of participants take part in some issues but consider other issues to be more important. Thus, practitioners can give priority to similar issues in future programs and use the community as a unit of analysis in their planning and evaluating future projects.

The findings of the current study also refer to some unexpected characteristics of the elite leaders. For example, three of the eighteen elite leaders were newcomers who had lived in the community for less than five years. However, they were active participants and had noticeable
reputational power. Therefore, developmental planners should not exclude newcomers when they plan for community projects and programs. As an other example, we note that the current study showed that the eighteen elites have some cohesiveness in power and class structures, but they lack a status structure which means that communication among the elites as friends are weak. Thus, the change agent or developmental practitioner should play a role in this concern to facilitate communications by arranging for frequent friendly meetings to strengthen the structure among the different members and groups in the community and to increase the involvement of all community segments in local programs to improve the effectiveness of the community programs.

Limitations of the Study

The community actions were examined over a previous three-year time period which is not long enough to include additional institutional interest fields and actors who are multiple-interest area actors. However, a very long time period would increase the potential for errors and inaccuracies in the responses as it would require respondents to recall details that had occurred a long time before the interviews. This problem could be reduced if the
survey was repeated, say, every three years and the data from these surveys combined, but this approach could be very costly and respondents might not be willing to participate in multiple surveys.

We also note that the selection of ten knowledgeables in the Mill City study could be somewhat biased and care is needed in future studies to select knowledgeables from a wide range of groups and interests. We recommend that the number of knowledgeables be increased for communities the size of Mill City. Current literature recommends the selection of ten knowledgeables for a community of five to ten thousand people. As the population of Mill City was about 25,000, we recommend that at least twice the number of knowledgeables be selected in communities of this size.

Excluding or keeping the issues 3, 6, and 12 because of their not being enough actors who met the required nominations or the self-acknowledgement criterion creates a problem either way. If they are excluded, there is a bias introduced in the description of active participation due to the limit of five issues on which data was collected during the interview. If they are retained, there is also a bias because top leaders participated in these issues (as well as the other fourteen issues) but did not always consider these as among their top five issues. Thus the results are
unclear as for Issue 12 in which one of the top leaders was considered as the most influential in that issue by 6 out of the 12 participants but he did not consider this issue as one of the five most important in which he had participated. There were also possible errors in classifying the seventeen issues into instrumental, expressive, and instrumental-expressive (combined). Such errors can be dealt with in future studies by using a team of judges who have related knowledge to help classify the issues.

The nature of the related literature was limited to relatively old references for the most part because of a peak in community studies that declined in the late 1970s. However, more work needs to be done on the combination of the reputational and decisional methods for operational purposes. It would also be more beneficial to use a comparative study by including another community similar to Mill City and using different methods or approaches to compare the results. We might also use the same methodology in the same community, Mill City, after five to ten years in order to discover any changes in the power structure. One could use a snowball technique, but it is recommended to modify the technique used in this study to achieve a probabilistic sample by choosing the sample randomly in each stage of the snowball technique (Bailey, 1978). Modifying
the snowball technique in this way would make statistical tests applicable, and the findings of the research could then be generalized to other similar communities.
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Frequencies of Demographic Characteristics

Sex of Participants

The majority of individuals in the study were male (Table A.1). One reason may relate to the first step in which ten knowledgeable were chosen as a start for the snowball sample. This difference could also be related to the nature and type of the activities besides the interest of the individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the Participants

The age of participants ranged from 24 to 75. In this study, four categories were formed to study the relationship between the actors' ages and the patterns of relationship (Table A.2).
TABLE A.2. Frequency of age for actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Status of Participants

The frequency for the level of education indicates the diversity of participants in terms of education (Table A.3). Note that there were the same number of participants who had no college degree as those who had done at least some graduate work.

TABLE A.3. Frequency of education for actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school to some college</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year college degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work or degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income of the Participants

Only 3.3% of the participants have an annual income of less than $10,000 and 23.3% earn an annual income of $50,000 or more (Table A.4).
### TABLE A.4. Frequency of income for actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-less than $20,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-less than $30,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-less than $35,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-less than $50,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marital Status of Participants

The majority of the actors involved in the study are married (Table A.5). This might indicate that married people participate more in their community out of their commitment and family-related concern.

### TABLE A.5. Frequency of marital status of actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Residency

Only 7.5% of the participants were newcomers to Mill City while 10.0% had lived in the community for 55 years or more (Table A.6).

**TABLE A.6. Frequency of length of residency of actors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years-less than 10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years-less than 55 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years or more</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE
Hi, I'm ______. I'm working on an Agricultural Experiment Station project for Iowa State University. This project is intended to increase our understanding of citizen participation in Iowa communities.

We are talking to several persons like yourself about recent Mill City issues, events, and projects. We are also interested in people's involvement in organizations, and their opinions about leadership in Mill City. Our goal is to determine what types of people actively participate in community affairs.

All of the information you provide will be strictly confidential. None of the information will be published or released in any form which would identify you as the source, nor will any name or individuals be mentioned in any of our findings.

Are there any questions you would like to ask before I begin?
A Study of Citizen Participation

Q-1. We would like to begin by asking what you think have been the three most important things which have been done over the past three years to make this community a better place in which to live?

a) ____________________________________________
b) ____________________________________________
c) ____________________________________________

Q-2. Looking to the future, what do you think are the three most important things which need to be done to make this community a better place in which to live?

a) ____________________________________________
b) ____________________________________________
c) ____________________________________________

Q-3. Now we would like to discuss some issues commonly faced by American communities. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD A). Please look over the six issues listed on this card. They represent different things most cities would like to accomplish. Unfortunately, no one community has the resources to do all these things at once. Look over the list and order the issues according to their importance for Mill City. That is, which issue do you think is most in need of immediate attention in Mill City? Which would you rank second? Third? And so forth? Please rank all six.

[RECORD THE NUMBER IN EACH BLANK PROVIDED.]

A. ___ Seeing to it that this city becomes a very attractive place to live—with good residential areas and pleasant, convenient community facilities.

B. ___ Seeing to it that Mill City has a good climate for business which would encourage economic growth.

C. ___ Seeing to it that Mill City provides its poor and disadvantaged with a decent life—with adequate food, housing, and opportunity.

D. ___ Seeing to it that this community is free from harmful conflict between special interest groups.
E. Seeing to it that Mill City has an honest, efficient, and economical government.

F. Seeing to it that Mill City is a place where residents play an active role in local government.

II. ISSUE PARTICIPATION

In an earlier phase of this study, we asked individuals living in Mill City to list issues, projects, and events which have received widespread attention in this community over the past three years or so. Here is a list of some of the issues frequently mentioned. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD B).

Q-4. Please read over the list and tell me which issues you have been actively involved in at any time over the past three years. That is, indicate each issue in which other people would recognize you as an active participant or spokesperson.

[CIRCLE NUMBER OF EACH ISSUE NAMED.]

1. Extension of Airport Runway
2. Quality of Sewage Treatment
3. Crosstown Boulevard Development/Improvement of Surface Transportation
4. Development of Recreational Facilities
5. Fire Safety Code Inspections
6. Swimming Pool at Pleasant Hills School
7. Student Walkout at High School/Committee for Resolution
8. Defeat of Bond Issue for Auditorium at School
9. Pride Days Committee
10. Efforts to Improve Labor-Management Relations/Labor-Management Relations Committee
11. Skatetown Rezoning Request
12. Jobs for Marshalltown Committee
13. Community Relations Committee
14. Congregate Meals Program/Meals on Wheels
15. Raising Money for Police Dog/ Crime Committee
16. Lack of Industrial Space/Speculative Building Projects
17. Charging Arts Association Rent on Space in Fisher Building
Q-5. Are there any other issues which you have not already mentioned that are listed on card B in which you were actively involved as a participant or spokesperson?
_____ yes (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER)
_____ no

[IF RESPONDENT INDICATES INVOLVEMENT IN MORE THAN 5 ISSUES ASK 5a.] [OTHERWISE GO TO Q-6.]

Q-5a. Of the issues you mentioned, which five would you say you were most actively involved in?

(UNDERLINE THE 5 INDICATED ISSUES)

[ASK Q-6 TO Q-20 FOR EACH ISSUE IN WHICH RESPONDENT INDICATES INVOLVEMENT. IF INVOLVEMENT IN MORE THAN 5 ISSUES IS INDICATED, ASK ONLY FOR THE 5 ISSUES IN WHICH RESPONDENT WAS MOST ACTIVELY INVOLVED. RECORD ANSWERS FOR Q-6 TO Q-20 ON WORKSHEETS.]

Q-6. First we'd like to talk about (name issue). Would you say your participation was voluntary or not voluntary, by voluntary we mean were you drawn in because of occupational, organizational, or other commitments which required you to become involved?

Yes, Voluntary (RECORD ON WORKSHEET)
No, Not Voluntary (RECORD ON WORKSHEET) (Q-6b)

Q-6a. In your own words, what were the reasons you became actively involved in (name issue)? (Q-7)

Q-6b. Specifically, what were the commitments which required your involvement in this issue or project?

Q-7. Now, would you briefly describe how this became a community issue or project? For instance, did some event take place that made this a community issue? Or did some group or individual initiate this project or issue?
Q-8. Now, we would like to have you describe all the actions you have taken with respect to (name issue). To give you an idea of what I mean, here is a list of actions which are normally carried out during community projects of this type. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD C). I would like to emphasize that this is by no means a complete list, so please feel free to mention any other activities you took concerning (name issue). Precisely what role or roles did you play which were relevant to this matter?

Q-8a. Are there any other actions you took which are not on Card C? (IF YES, RECORD ANSWERS ON WORKSHEET)

Q-9. As you recall, who else in Mill City was actively involved in (name issue) besides yourself? In answering this question, please try to think of individuals who actively supported or opposed (name issue)?

Q-10. Are there any other individuals that you have not already mentioned who were actively involved in this issue?

[RECORD NAMES OF ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUALS ON WORKSHEET Q-9 AND Q-10.]

Q-11. Of the individuals you mentioned as active participants, which ones did you personally have the most contact with concerning (name issue)?

Q-12. With which, if any, of these individuals have you had close business or professional contact? I'm thinking here of individuals you frequently communicate with concerning business or professional matters.

Q-13. Which, if any, of the individuals mentioned do you consider to be close personal friends? That is, persons with whom you meet socially on a fairly regular basis.

Q-14. In your opinion, who was the one individual who had the greatest influence on the decisions made concerning (name issue)?

Q-15. Next, please name the organizations, agencies, or groups which actively supported or opposed (name issue). Again I'm thinking here of any groups which took an active role concerning this issues.
Q-16. Are there any other organizations, agencies, or groups that you have not already mentioned which were actively involved in this issue or project?

[RECORD NAMES OF ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON WORKSHEET Q-15 AND Q-16.]

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD D). Please use Card D to answer the following 3 questions. Notice that the statements on each end of the scales represent opposites.

Q-17. Using the scale for question 17, please give me the number that you think best represents the degree to which information was openly exchanged among residents and groups concerning (name issue). You should answer number 1 if you think this issue was characterized by a very open exchange of information among community residents and groups. You should answer 9 if a very restricted exchange of information characterized this issue. Or, you may choose any number between 1 and 9 which you feel characterizes the exchange of information among community residents and groups concerning this issue.

Q-18. Now, using the scale for question 18, rate the degree of conflict and controversy surrounding (name issue)? Notice that 1 represents a very high degree of conflict and controversy, while 9 represents a very high degree of agreement and consensus. Which number along the scale would you choose?

Q-19. Using the scale for question 19, please give me the number which you think best represents the degree to which average citizens had the opportunity for becoming involved in (name issue). On this scale, the number 1 represents much opportunity for citizen involvement, while 9 represents very little opportunity for citizen involvement.

Q-20. Thinking back on your involvement in (name issue), what, if anything, would you do differently if you had it to do over again?

[REPEAT Q-6 TO Q-20 FOR EACH ISSUE RESPONDENT HAS PARTICIPATED IN.]
III. ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

Q-21. Listed here are some types of organizations and associations in which people frequently participate. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD E). Please examine the list and give me the name of each organization and association in which you have held membership at any time over the last 3 years. In addition to local organizations, we're interested in any memberships you may have in regional, state, or national organizations, even if there is not a local chapter.

[List each organization in column Q-21.]

We obviously have not included all types of organizations and groups on the list. Please name any other organizations, groups, or associations which you have belonged to over the past three years, even if you think the group is unimportant.

[Write additional organizations in column Q-21.]

Q-21a. At any time over the past three years, have you been an officer of (name organization) or a member of its Board of Trustees or Board of Directors?

[If no go to Q-22.]

Q-21b. (If yes:) Was the position you held at the local, county, state, or national level?

Q-22. Have you served on any committee of (name organization) over the past three years?
Q-21. ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>Q-21a. OFFICER OR BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>Q-21b. LEVEL OF OFFICE</th>
<th>Q-22. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SOCIAL AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Q-23. [INTERVIEWER DO NOT ASK, CHECK SEX:]
(1) _____ Male  (2) _____ Female

Q-24. What is your present age? _____ Years

Q-25. How much formal education have you completed?
   a) _____ Less than high school graduate
   b) _____ High school graduate (includes GED)
   c) _____ Some college
   d) _____ Vocational or technical training
   e) _____ Four year college graduate
          (BA, BS or equivalent)
   f) _____ Some graduate work
   g) _____ Received post graduate degree
          (MS, PhD, MD, DDS, MBA, MSW, etc.)
Q-26. Using the categories listed on Card F (HAND RESPONDENT CARD F), please select the letter of the category which contains your family's total income, after taxes, in 1980.

   a) ____ Less than 5,000 e) ____ 20,000-24,999
   b) ____ 5,000-9,999 f) ____ 25,000-34,999
   c) ____ 10,000-14,999 g) ____ 35,000-49,999
   d) ____ 15,000-19,999 h) ____ 50,000 or more

Q-27. Are you presently:

   a) ____ Employed fulltime e) ____ Disabled (Q-28)
   b) ____ Employed parttime f) ____ Fulltime homemaker
   c) ____ Unemployed (Q-28) g) ____ Student (Q-28)
   d) ____ Retired (Q-28) h) ____

Q-27a. What is your primary occupation? Please be specific about job title and kind of work.

__________________________________________________________

Q-27b. Who is your primary employer? That is, what firm or business do you work for?

__________________________________________________________

Q-28. What is your present marital status?

   a) ____ Married d) ____ Divorced
   b) ____ Never married (Q-30) e) ____ Widowed
   c) ____ Separated

Q-29. How many children do you have who are: (WRITE IN 0 IF NONE.)

   a) ____ Under 5 years of age
   b) ____ 5 through 12 years of age
   c) ____ 13 through 18 years of age
   d) ____ Older than 18

Q-30. Generally, speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or do you have some other political preference?

   a) ____ Republican
   b) ____ Democrat
   c) ____ Independent (Q-30b)
   d) ____ Other (specify) ________________________________ (Q-31)

Q-30a. Would you call yourself a strong (Republican/Democrat)?

   (1) ____ Yes (Q-31)
   (2) ____ No (Q-31)
Q-30b. IF INDEPENDENT: Do you think of yourself as closer
to the Republican or the Democratic party?
1. ____ Republican
2. ____ Democrat

Q-31. How many years have you live in the Mill City area?
_____ Years

Q-32. Was your father a resident of this community?
a) ____ Yes (Q-33)
b) ____ No (Q-33)

Q-32a. IF YES ASK: During what years was your father a
resident of the Mill City area?
from ____________ to ____________

Q-33. Being as specific as you can, what kind of work was
your father involved in most of his life, that is,
what was his occupation?
________________________________________

Q-34. How active would you say your father was in the
organizations and affairs of the communities in which
he lived?
_____ 1. Very active
_____ 2. Quite active
_____ 3. Somewhat active
_____ 4. Not very active at all

Q-35. Of all the friends you now have, what proportion would
you say live in the Mill City area? Would you say:
_____ 1. More than 75%
_____ 2. Between 50% and 75%
_____ 3. Between 25% and 50%, or
_____ 4. Fewer than 25%

Q-36. Of all your adult relatives and in-laws, excluding the
very distantly related ones and those in your
household, what proportion would you say live in the
Mill City area? Would you say:
_____ 1. More than 75%
_____ 2. Between 50% and 75%
_____ 3. Between 25% and 50%, or
_____ 4. Fewer than 25%
Q-37. What proportion of the economic leaders in the Mill City area do you personally know? Would you say you know:
   1. More than 75%
   2. Between 50% and 75%
   3. Between 25% and 50%, or
   4. Fewer than 25%

Q-38. What proportion of the political leaders in the Mill City area do you personally know? Would you say you know:
   1. More than 75%
   2. Between 50% and 75%
   3. Between 25% and 50%, or
   4. Fewer than 25%

Q-39. Suppose that for some reason you had to move away from this community. How would you feel? Would you feel:
   1. Very sorry
   2. Quite sorry
   3. Quite pleased
   4. Very pleased, or would you say
   5. It wouldn't make any difference one way or the other

Q-40. Would you say you have
   1. Little or no interest
   2. Some interest, or
   3. Much interest in knowing what goes on in the Mill City area

Q-41. Now I would like to read you some statements about Mill City. Using the categories on this card (HAND RESPONDENT CARD G), please tell me whether you (SA) strongly agree, (A) agree, are (U) undecided, (D) disagree, or (SD) strongly disagree with each statement after I read it.

   | (CIRCLE ANSWER) |
   | SA | A | U | D | SD |

a) Relations between labor and management in Mill City are as good as can be expected.  
   1 2 3 4 5

b) Mill City should more actively seek new industry.  
   1 2 3 4 5
c) Women in Mill City have as much opportunity as men for getting involved in local decision making.

1 2 3 4 5

d) Labor unions locally have had a positive impact on our community.

1 .2 3 4 5

e) Community leaders are willing to take economic chances to attract new industry to Mill City.

1 2 3 4 5

f) Persons who have lived in the Mill City area for less than three years have as much opportunity as long time residents for getting involved in local decision making.

1 2 3 4 5

g) I really don't feel "at home" in Mill City.

1 2 3 4 5

h) Mill City appears incapable of solving its own problems.

1 2 3 4 5

i) Young adults do not have as much opportunity as others for getting involved in local decision making.

1 2 3 4 5

j) I feel a deep sense of commitment to Mill City.

1 2 3 4 5

k) There is little conflict between people or groups in Mill City.

1 2 3 4 5

l) Businessmen in Mill City are good at working for the total community.

1 2 3 4 5

m) Local unions have restricted the efficient use of labor in Mill City.

1 2 3 4 5
n) Mill City leaders discourage citizen involvement in local issues. 1 2 3 4 5
o) Members of minority groups do not have as much opportunity as others for getting involved in local decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
p) Local labor unions have become too powerful for the good of Mill City. 1 2 3 4 5
q) The economic outlook for Mill City appears bright. 1 2 3 4 5
r) Working conditions in Mill City are very good. 1 2 3 4 5
s) There is too much power concentrated in the hands of a few large companies for the good of Mill City. 1 2 3 4 5
t) Mill City controls its affairs without county, regional, state, or national groups telling it what to do. 1 2 3 4 5

Q-42. Now we would like to have you name the persons in this community who you would say are your closest personal friends.
a) __________________________
b) __________________________
c) __________________________
d) __________________________
e) __________________________

Q-43. Please name the individuals in this community with whom you've had the closest business or professional contact.
a) __________________________
b) __________________________
c) __________________________
d) __________________________
e) __________________________
Q-44. Now, name the persons in this community with whom you've had the most contact concerning general Mill City affairs.
   a) __________________________________________
   b) __________________________________________
   c) __________________________________________
   d) __________________________________________
   e) __________________________________________

VI. LEADERSHIP
Q-45. For communities to effectively deal with the types of issues and projects we've been discussing requires good leadership. One aspect of effective leadership is the way in which decisions are made. Which of the following three statements best describes the way important decisions have been made in Mill City over the last 3 years or so? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD H)

[WAIT FOR A RESPONSE. CHECK THE LETTER OF THE RESPONSE]

_____ A. The majority of important public decisions in Mill City are made by a small group of residents who seem to be in constant contact with one another and whose influence is dominant over almost all public decisions, regardless of the subject matter. In short, Mill City is pretty much run by a small group of residents who frequently communicate with one another.

_____ B. The majority of important public decisions in Mill City are made by a small group of residents who are in constant communication with their own constituency of Mill City's residents, rather than in constant contact with each other. The influence of these individuals is dominant over nearly all public decisions. In short, Mill City is pretty much run by a few individuals who represent special interest groups. Or:
C. The majority of important public decisions in Mill City are made through a process of give and take among a large number of local groups and individuals. On one issue, one combination of interested groups and individuals will work together, while on another issue an almost entirely different combination of residents will be found working together for a common purpose. In short, the community is pretty much run by changing groups of residents.

ASK Q-46 ONLY IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS A OR B TO Q-45. IF C IS SELECTED GO TO Q-49.

Q-46. From your response to the last question, it appears that in general, you feel public decisions in Mill City are made by a small number of residents. Please name all the individuals whose influence you feel has dominated public decisions in Mill City over the past 3 years.

CHECK IF NAMED AS MOST INFLUENTIAL IN Q-48

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________
4. ____________________________
5. ____________________________
6. ____________________________
7. ____________________________
8. ____________________________
9. ____________________________
10. ____________________________

Q-47. Are there any other individuals that you have not already named whose influence has been dominant in Mill City over the past three years? (WRITE IN NAMES IN SPACES ABOVE).

Q-48. Of the individuals you named, which three would you say have been the most influential in shaping Mill City affairs? (CHECK THE 3 MOST INFLUENTIAL NAMED IN Q-48 IN SPACES ABOVE).
Q-49. Now, please name all the organizations, groups, or agencies which you feel have been very influential in shaping public decisions in the Mill City area over the past three years.

CHECK IF NAMED AS MOST INFLUENTIAL IN Q-50a

1. _____________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________
4. _____________________________________________
5. _____________________________________________

Q-50. Are there any other organizations, groups, or agencies which you have not already named that have been very influential in shaping public decisions in the Mill City area over the past three years?

[IF MORE THAN 3 GROUPS HAVE BEEN NAMED ASK]

Q-50a. Of the organizations you named, which 3 would you say have had the most influence in shaping Mill City affairs?

(CHECK THE THREE MOST INFLUENTIAL IN SPACES LISTED FOR Q-49.)

Q-51. I'd like to thank you for your participation in this project. Would you like to receive a summary of the findings and conclusions of the Community Leadership Research Project?

(1) _____ Yes (2) _____ No

Q-52. Finally, we would like to give you this opportunity to offer any additional comments or suggestions as to how we might improve future studies of this type? Or any other comments you might have.

__________________________________________________________________________

Q-53. End time _____ ___:____ ___ a.m. 1. p.m. 2.
Q-54. INTERVIEWER:
Was the respondent
1) _____ Very cooperative
2) _____ Quite cooperative
3) _____ Somewhat cooperative
4) _____ Very uncooperative

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS
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CARD C

Phase and Action

1. **Initiation**
   Conceived of the need and discussed it privately with others, who then took action
   
   Raised the issue with newspaper stories and editorials
   
   Went before formal authorities to complain about a troublesome situation
   
   First pointed out the need within a formal organization
   
   Gathered information on the nature and extent of a local problem
   
   Wrote letters to local residents pointing out a need
   
   Took an individual action which forced the matter into public view

2. **Organization of sponsorship**
   Got a few people together privately and formed a new group
   
   Called a public meeting or organized a new group
   
   Made suggestions at a meeting in which a new group was organized
   
   Urged an established group to take responsibility
   
   Appointed a committee within an established group
   
   Planned the structure of a new group to sponsor the action
   
   Developed group structure after it was organized

3. **Goal-setting**
   Participated in board meeting while long-range goals or policies were being planned
   
   Collected data specifically for use in goal-setting
Planned technical aspects of a facility or complex
operation
Planned strategy for accomplishment of a specific goal
Voted in government body meeting to resolve the issue
Personally suggested specific goals

4. **Recruitment**
   Spoke at civic clubs and public meetings
   Made appeals and gave information through the mass media
   Made other mass appeals, for example, letters or billboards
   Appealed to individuals for money, support, or involvement
   Asked local government for money or authorization
   Sought money or authorization outside the community
   Hired technical personnel for implementation

5. **Implementation**
   Provided money or materials
   Gave technical or professional service
   Directed construction or organization of a facility or event
   Served as paid director of the continuous program of an agency after it was organized
   Carried out the objectives of a program after it was organized
APPENDIX C: PATTERNS OF LEADERSHIP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Votes as most influential</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Votes as most influential</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C.1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Votes as most influential</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>4 5 8 9 12 14 16 19 22 28 34 46 59 91 138 142 148 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE C.2. Status relationships among top 16 leaders
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### TABLE C.3. Class relationships among top 18 leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>148</th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 2 0 1 2 4
TABLE C.4. Power relationships among top 18 leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>148</th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 11