

COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 39 COMMUNITIES

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
James Larry Lyon
December, 1972

647683

To Laura

COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 39 COMMUNITIES

Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

James Larry Lyon

December, 1972

COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE:

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 39 COMMUNITIES

ABSTRACT

Two previous research efforts (Clark 1971; and Grimes, Bonjean and Lineberry 1972) in the field of community politics were compared and then partially replicated employing the same statistical procedures used in the original papers. The major findings of both studies were confirmed with significant correlations found between population size and decentralization of community leadership. In general, however, it was concluded that demographic-ecological variables are not efficient predictors of the structure of community leadership and perhaps have been given too much emphasis in previous community power research. The best predictor of leadership structure was the one nondemographic-ecological variable used in this analysis--Lineberry and Fowler's index of reformism. A consistent negative association between the dimensions of reformism and leadership decentralization was found.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND A REVIEW OF BASIC CONCEPTS	1
A. Introduction	1
B. Theoretical Background	2
1. Measurement of Community Power	3
2. Measures of Community Structure	9
3. Previous Comparative Research	12
4. The Development of the Community as a Research Site	17
C. Summary	20
II. COMPARISON OF TWO PREVIOUS STUDIES AND PRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESES	21
A. Introduction	21
B. Clark's Comparative Study of 51 Communities	21
C. Grimes, Bonjean, and Lineberry's Comparative Study of 17 Communities	26
D. A Comparison of the Two Studies	29
E. The Hypotheses	33
III. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	40
A. Introduction	40
B. Leadership Structure	40
C. Community Structure Variables	41
D. The Communities Studied	43
E. The Measures of Association	44
F. Summary	48
IV. FINDINGS	49
A. Introduction	49
B. Socioeconomic Status and Leadership Decen- tralization	50
C. Family Life Cycle and Leadership Decentrali- zation	52

Chapter	Page
IV. Continued	
D. Governmental Revenues and Expenditures and Leadership Decentralization	55
E. Residential Mobility and Leadership Decentralization	56
F. Urbanism and Leadership Decentralization	56
G. Manufacturing Concentration and Leadership Decentralization	57
H. Commercial Center and Leadership Decentralization	58
I. Reformism and Leadership Decentralization	60
J. Summary of Findings	64
V. SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS	67
A. Introduction	67
B. Methodological Limitations	67
C. Advantages of the Study	70
D. Universe and Sample Comparisons	71
E. Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research	74
APPENDICES	77
A. Factors, Indicators, and Weights	78
B. Leadership Scores for Each Community	79
C. City and County Listings	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

C H A P T E R I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND A REVIEW OF BASIC CONCEPTS

A. Introduction

With the advent of comparative studies in community power, there has been a shift in substantive interest.¹ The emphasis is now upon analysis rather than description. Researchers have become concerned with the antecedents, correlates and consequences of community leadership structure. Research has developed from "Who Governs" into "When, Where, and With What Effects?" (Clark, 1968a).

The findings of these comparative analyses have, at times, been inconsistent. For example, while Clark (1971) found significant relationships between community leadership structures and community system variables in an analysis of 51 communities, analyses by Grimes, Bonjean and Lineberry (1972), Walton (1970) and Aiken (1970) failed to provide support for similar hypothesized

¹Bonjean and Grimes (1972) present a review of the changes and current status of this area of research.

relationships. The need for further research in this area of inquiry seems obvious.

One possible way of adding to this research problem would be to replicate two of these studies, those by Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972) by employing commonly held techniques, and, where possible, by using variables common to both studies. It may then be possible to explain the differences between the findings of the two studies and, in turn, perhaps bring more consistency to comparative community research. This is the aim of the paper presented here.

B. Theoretical Background

The area of research known as community leadership studies has undergone several metamorphoses during its history. One of the first major studies of community leadership structures was Hunter's (1953) analysis of Atlanta. Prior to his study it had been assumed that decisions in the local community were made by the holders of the formal leadership positions in the community. Using a "reputational" measurement technique, Hunter found that the actual decision-making power in the community was in the hands of individuals who were not the occupants

of the formal political positions in the community. In his well-known analysis, Atlanta was dominated by a small, business-oriented group of leaders.

Following Hunter's study, debate over the merits of the approach he employed began. Perhaps the most important of the resulting work was Robert Dahl's Who Governs? (1961), a study of community leadership in New Haven. Using an approach which has come to be known as the decisional method, he found that the leadership structure in New Haven was rather diffused among several different segments of the community.

With the battle lines drawn by these two approaches to community leadership, the debate among scholars as to which "approach" provided the most valid view of leadership structures began.² As discussed below, the resolution of this debate provided the stimulus for the emergence of another dominant research theme in the late sixties and early seventies--comparative research.

1. Measurement of Community Power

The first major study of a community power structure (Hunter, 1953) came about as a challenge to the

²See Kauffman and Jones (1954) and Dahl (1958) for examples of the debate.

accepted method of determining community leadership (i.e., the positional approach). Hunter's "new"³ approach (i.e., the reputational approach) has been hotly debated and stimulated the development of yet another approach (i.e., the decisional approach) to counter it. Since the method employed in this study to measure leadership structure utilizes all three basic approaches and since the dispute over how power should be measured is probably the major issue in the history of community power structure studies, a brief review of the three approaches to measuring community power will be presented here.⁴

The Positional or Structural Approach designates as leaders those members of the community holding important positions in major organizations. Obviously, a basic problem with this approach is determining the major organizations and important positions. Should this

³Actually, the approach was borrowed from earlier stratification analysis. For review of this application, see Gordon (1950).

⁴For critical evaluation of all three techniques, see Bachrach and Baratz (1962), Blankenship (1964), Bonjean (1963a and b). Bonjean and Olson (1964), Clark (1968a), D'Antonio and Erickson (1962), Dahl (1958, 1961), Freeman (1963), Ehrlich (1967), Polsby (1959), Presthus (1964), Preston (1969), Rosenbaum (1967), Walton (1966), and Wolfinger (1960).

problem be overcome, one is faced with determining the power each of the persons listed wield. Another criticism of this approach was made in Hunter's Community Power Structure. In determining leadership by position, it must be assumed only occupants of important community positions actually make decisions affecting the community. Naturally this would reject all power analyses which projected a covert elite as the decision-making body of a community.

In spite of the above limitations, there are times when the positional approach is preferable and even necessary. For example, in many historical analyses of community leadership, the only data available are those comprised of official community leadership positions. Thus, this method is frequently employed in historical studies.

The Reputational Approach was the technique employed by Hunter (1953) in his analysis of Atlanta's power structure.⁵ Basically, the procedure entails selecting a panel of community members and asking them to identify leaders in the community. This approach has varied

⁵An earlier example of this approach is the early stratification analysis of W. Lloyd Warner.

considerably in the number of leaders to be chosen, the method of selecting the panel, and the wording of questions asked panel members.⁶

A fundamental criticism of the approach is that it measures only the reputation for power and not actual power (Dahl, 1958). Clark (1968a) has listed five other, more technical, problems: (1) the method is biased because a pyramidal decision-making structure is assumed, (2) there is no appropriate cut-off point for the list of leaders, (3) the separations of "top leaders" and "second stringers" must be arbitrarily decided, (4) by asking for general leaders, leaders in specific areas are ignored and (5) a possible lack of agreement between the researcher's and respondent's concept of influential. Though the reputational approach has come under rather severe attack, it persists as a popular technique in leadership analysis. Its relative simplicity of design coupled with ease of application seem to be the prime sources of appeal. Two additional advantages listed by Clark (1968a)

⁶For different examples of the reputational approach, see Hunter (1953), Schulze and Blumbert (1957), Burgess (1960), Belknap and Steinle (1963), Pellegrin and Coates (1956), and Fanelli (1956).

were: (1) conceptual parsimony exists because power can be studied without other community variables, and (2) it is highly reproducible and can thus be easily tested for reliability.

The Decisional Approach requires an analyst to select several issues in the community and identify the persons who participated in the decision-making process. This is the approach used by Dahl (1961) in his study of New Haven.

The decisional approach is not subject to many of the limitations found in the other two methods. It is superior to the positional approach in that it can discover leaders who are not in official positions. In addition it answers several of the disadvantages of the reputational approach. The "top leaders" can be distinguished from the "second stringers." The number of persons involved in the decision-making process can be determined empirically. Likewise, the overlap in an individual's influence can also be determined empirically.

The decisional approach is not without its own set of disadvantages, however. Initially, there is the problem of deciding which issues to use. Then, there is the possibility that some issues were decided before they developed into an overt decision-making phase.

A major problem associated with the use of any single method identified above is the likelihood that the findings will be an artifact of the method. The criticisms outlined above suggest that the positional or decisional approaches would yield evidence of a more pluralistic power structure, while the reputational approach yields support for an elitist power structure. Secondary analysis by Walton (1966) of 33 studies and later (Walton, 1970) of 39 studies has supported the hypothesis that leadership structure is best predicted by the type of approach used by the researcher. Other analyses have set forth the same relationship between method and findings (e.g., Aiken 1970 and Gilbert 1968).

There appears to be widespread agreement today that some combination of the three approaches must be used in order to insure the validity of research findings concerning community power structure. One attempt to combine these approaches which has added to the literature is Clark's (1971) "ersatz decisional method" used in this analysis.⁷

⁷This method is explained more fully in Chapter II.

2. Measures of Community Structure⁸

One of the major difficulties in community analysis has been a lack of systematic attention to the concept community. The range of attempts to classify and study communities is wide. Previous efforts to classify communities have focused upon such diverse phenomena as size, historical development (Mumford, 1961), economic development (Ogburn, 1937), location (Bogue, 1949), and even according to "goodness" (Thorndike, 1939).

Perhaps the variable most often employed as a classifying criterion is size. The U.S. Bureau of Census has used an extensive size classification scheme since 1950. As a result, many researchers using census data have also adopted the census classification. There are two classes of villages--one between 1,000 and 2,500 population, another with less than 1,000. Those communities with more than 2,500 are classified as urban. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas consist of at least one city with a minimum of 50,000 in population when including the contiguous counties with which it is socially and

⁸Much of the information presented in this section was drawn from Bonjean (1971).

economically integrated. In 1960 the Standard Consolidated Area was identified. There are only two: (1) New York-Northeastern New Jersey and (2) Chicago-Northwestern Indiana.

Another method of classifying communities is historical development. Mumford (1961) divided cities into six stages that represented their growth and eventual decay. Other researchers, such as Redfield (1953), used historical stages to create a folk-urban continuum in community development.

Many researchers, especially ecologists, have used the location of a community to develop a classifying scheme. Bogue (1945) modified this approach to classify cities by the amount of influence they exercise over the surrounding areas.

Often cities are classified by their economic activity or function. Ogburn (1937) divided cities into seven types: (1) trading centers, (2) factory towns, (3) transportation centers, (4) mining towns, (5) pleasure resorts, (6) health resorts, and (7) college towns.

Most of these attempts at single-criterion (e.g., size, historical development, location, and economic activity) suffer from one or all of the following limitations:

1. There is a tendency to oversimplify reality.
2. The divisions are arbitrary.
3. The classifications are not mutually exclusive.
4. The rationale for classification does not produce a theoretical relation to other significant features of the community. (Bonjean, 1971:9)

On the other end of the continuum from single-criterion schemes are the studies which compile hundreds of different community variables. The County and City Data Book, The Municipal Year Book, and the U.S. Census are excellent sources for this type approach to community structure. The problem facing the researcher when confronting these sources is, of course, which variables to select and how to select them.

A recent aid to this problem has been factor analysis. The purpose of this technique

. . . is to determine from the interrelationships of a large number of variables the smallest number of factors (or underlying dimensions) whose association with the original variables will account for all of the observed interrelationships. (Price, 1942:449)

Generally, factor analysis has been applied to vast numbers of demographic-ecological variables and usually results in producing from four to fifteen underlying

dimensions. Both Grimes et al. (1972) and Clark (1971) employed factor analysis. However, the technique was used to a more exclusive and systematic extent by Grimes et al.

In conclusion, it should be noted that all of the above measures of community structure focus upon demographic-ecological variables. This is in keeping with the general pattern of community research and may indicate a need to consider other elements of community structure in order to more thoroughly analyze community politics.⁹



3. Previous Comparative Research

The first two major studies of community power (i.e., Hunter, 1953, Dahl, 1961) focused upon only one community and each found a different type of power structure. As the number of case studies of individual communities increased, analysts began to systematically compare the techniques and findings of the studies. These comparisons have yielded a breadth of additional insight into the nature of the relationship between community structure and leadership structures.

⁹An example of a nondemographic-ecological variable is the formal political structure variable employed in hypothesis VIII.

The comparative research completed thus far can be divided into five types.¹⁰ First there is the procedure of comparing a small number of case studies of individual communities which have been conducted by different researchers. Such an approach was employed by Rossi (1968). He found four types of community power structure: (1) Pyramidal, (2) Caucus Rule, (3) Polyolith, and (4) Amorphous. Also a general hypothesis was developed to guide future comparative research:

In communities with partisan electoral policies, whose officials are full-time functionaries, where party lines tend to coincide with class and status lines and where the party favored by the lower class and status groups has some good chance of getting elected to office, power structures tend to be polyolith rather than monolith. (Rossi, 1968:137)

Studies such as Rossi's have the obvious limitation of trying to compare varying research methods. To overcome this, the second type of study compares the results of three of four communities that were investigated in a similar manner by the same researcher or team of researchers. Presthus (1964) used a combination of reputational, decisional and Verstehen methods of analysis

¹⁰See Clark (1971) and Bonjean and Grimes (1972) for elaboration upon these divisions.

on two communities. He found that the importance of each leader varied with the type of issue analyzed.

Bonjean and Carter (1965) also used this second type of comparative analysis. Using a sample of four communities they found that a covert leadership structure similar to Hunter's appeared when:

- (1) a community is experiencing population influx
- (2) poverty . . . is characteristic of the community
- (3) the community has a relatively simple economic, political and demographic base (Bonjean and Carter, 1965:20)

While the data of studies such as the two mentioned above are more comparable than those used by Rossi, it is difficult to infer the findings to a larger population. The number of communities investigated is too small.

A third type of study employs secondary analysis using relatively large numbers of independent case studies. For example, Gilbert (1968) analyzed the results of previous studies that covered a total of 166 American communities. She found population, growth rates, density, age, wealth, and geographic region associated with leadership structure.

Walton (1966) analyzed data from 33 previous studies and found that the method of analysis employed to

measure leadership was the best predictor of the power structure found in each study. He noted that generally, sociologists have employed a reputational approach and found a pyramidal power structure. Political scientists have usually employed a decisional approach and found a more dispersed power structure.

Comparability is a key problem in these two examples of secondary analysis. The findings are forced to be vague and the sample size may be significantly reduced by missing information.

Finally, a fourth type of study has been developed. This type employs a more physically and financially ambitious procedure than the other studies. In return it produces data that are as comparable as the type II studies with a sample as large as those in type III. It entails study of a large number of communities with directly comparable research methods. One of the studies partially replicated in this analysis (Clark, 1971) is an example of this type. One of the problems with this approach, however, is the rather superficial leadership structure measure.

The other study contributing significantly to this paper (Grimes et al., 1972) represents a fifth type

of approach which incorporates the large samples of type IV studies and the methodological richness of type II studies. Grimes et al. compared several previous analyses done by researchers who had used identical approaches to the measurement of leadership structure. Thus he was able to gather more detailed findings than Clark (1971) and still retain a relatively large sample size. Both Clark's and Grimes' approaches will be discussed in the second chapter.

Another example of this approach which employs similar data consists of studies using findings from other researchers with different methodologies, but controlling for measurement of leadership. One study of this type is Walton's (1970) analysis of 39 studies dealing with 61 communities. Of particular interest to this paper is his finding that, "the current status of research does not allow us to draw any firm generalizations regarding the distribution of power in local communities." (Walton, 1970:453)

Aiken (1970) compared the type of leadership structure found by previous researchers in 57 cities with structural variables he drew from the Municipal Yearbook, the 1960 Census, and the 1966 City-County Data Book. He

found that, "The older cities, those located in regions that were industrialized earlier, those having the greater influx of immigrants and other minority groups, and those having nonreformed political structures, are cities that are more likely to have decentralized decision-making arrangements." (Aiken, 1970:506)

In conclusion, it can be seen that community power structure research has undergone significant methodological changes since Hunter's (1953) classic study. Large numbers of community systems are now being compared using increasingly sophisticated techniques of analysis. Nevertheless, the cumulative findings of these studies appear contradictory and even further methodological sophistication may be necessary to produce reliable findings in community research.

4. The Development of the Community as a Research Site

Since one of the possible sources for variation between the two studies compared in this paper may be the difference in their definitions of the term community, an exploration of the development of the term needs to be presented.

The community was the major research site in early American sociology. The ecological approach of the University of Chicago produced many classical analyses of communities. In general, a community was accepted as a mutually interrelated population organized around a certain geographical territory.¹¹

Reviews were made of community literature in 1948 and again in 1955. Hollingshead (1948) classified the studies as either focusing upon ecological, structural, or typological variables. Hillery (1955) identified 94 definitions of community in his review. In 69 of those definitions he found a basic agreement on points similar to those developed by the Chicago school. In general, a community consisted of "persons in social interaction within a geographic area and having one or more additional ties." (Hillery, 1955:111)

Definitions similar to the one above are often made more specific for methodological reasons. Usually a community is defined as consisting of an area within certain corporate (i.e., legal-political) boundaries since most census and other government data are reported in

¹¹See Park (1936:1-15) for a general development of this definition.

this manner. However, even the use of corporate boundaries has not produced completely comparable studies. For example, Clark (1971) used cities of over 50,000 population as his community sample while Grimes et al. (1972) used counties.¹² It should be noted, however, that decisions made in the city as a geo-political unit will influence and be influenced by the larger environment of which it is a part. Therefore, the county, since it presents data that are larger in aggregate than the city data, may more adequately represent the environment in which decisions are made.¹³

Nevertheless, comparability remains a problem, as does generalization. For example, can a study of county systems be interpreted as applicable to city systems? Can a study of cities be generalized to all community systems? At what point do divisions in the term community need to be made? It is obvious that further research is needed before these questions can be

¹²Chapter II, page 29, presents a discussion of the difference between Clark (1971) and Grimes. et al. (1972) on this point.

¹³A more detailed discussion of the appropriateness of the county as the unit of analysis in community research can be found in Bonjean, Browning and Carter (1969).

completely answered and, until the answers are found, problems concerning the definition of community will remain.

C. Summary

As can be seen by the review above, the research in the area of community leadership structure studies is still relatively unsophisticated. In addition, the conclusions drawn from previous research are at times conflicting. Since this analysis attempts a partial replication of two of the most recent attempts at theoretical and methodological clarification, it is hoped that it will provide additional refinement in this area of research.

C H A P T E R I I

COMPARISON OF TWO PREVIOUS STUDIES AND PRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESES

A. Introduction

The two analyses reviewed here are those which will be replicated in this study. Thus, particular emphasis will be given to those parts of Clark's research (i.e., the sample and method of leadership measurement) and Grimes' research (i.e., unit of community analysis, structural variables, and hypotheses) that are incorporated into this study. Comparisons will then be made between the significant areas of each study so that a method combining both studies can be constructed in the following chapter. Finally, the hypotheses to be tested in this paper will be presented.

B. Clark's Comparative Study of 51 Communities

Clark (1971) selected 51 American communities for his study. They were sampled on the basis of region and population size. The populations ranged from 50,000

to 750,000. The upper range was chosen to eliminate what Clark considered unique metropolitan characteristics. The lower size was necessary because census statistics are not as available for the smaller communities.

The community variables were chosen for their theoretical relevance and importance as indicators in a factor analysis. Eleven were selected: (1) Population Size, (2) Community Poverty, (3) Industrial Activity, (4) Economic Diversification, (5) Highly Educated Population, (6) Catholic Population, (7) Civic Voluntary Organization Activity, (8) Form of Government, (9) Patterns of Decision-Making, (10) General Budget Expenditures, and (11) Urban Renewal Expenditures.

The leadership structure variable was measured by Clark's "ersatz decisional method." His researchers interviewed eleven strategically placed informants in each community: the mayor, the Chairmen of the Democratic and Republican parties, the president of the largest bank, the editor of the newspaper with the largest circulation, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, the president of the bar association, the health commissioner, the urban renewal director, and the director of the last major hospital fund drive. Each informant was asked the

following questions concerning four community issues (i.e., urban renewal, the election of the mayor, air pollution and the anti-poverty program):

1. Who initiated action on the issue?
2. Who supported this action?
3. Who opposed this action?
4. What was the nature of the bargaining process; who negotiated with whom?
5. What was the outcome? Whose views tended to prevail? (Clark, 1971:297)

The results of this questionnaire were used to measure leadership participation in the community and the amount of overlap between leaders from one issue to another. Both participation and overlap were interpreted as dimensions of leadership centralization. The two dimensions were combined into a single index by counting the number of actors named by the informants and then dividing that total by the number of issues relevant to each community. Each actor was counted only once even if he was named in more than one issue area. An example drawn from Clark may clarify this procedure.

Consider first a situation which most writers would label highly centralized or monolithic: a community

where the mayor initiated action on a decision, was supported by the downtown businessmen, and opposed by the labor unions and the newspaper. The mayor was the major "entrepreneur" in bargaining between the various groups. And the mayor-businessmen coalition prevailed. Under such circumstances, the total numbers of actors in the issue would be four: mayor, businessmen, labor unions, and newspaper. If these same four actors, again playing the same roles, were the only ones involved in the other three issues, there would still only be a total of four actors in all issue areas, which, dividing by the number of issue areas, yields a final score of one for the community. This centralized community would thus rank near the bottom of our scale of decentralization. On the other hand, if we consider a situation generally regarded as more decentralized, where, for example, five different actors were involved in each issue area, the total number of actors would be twenty, and, dividing by the number of issue areas, the community score comes to five. Applying this same procedure, we computed a decentralization score for each of the 51 communities. (Clark, 1971:298)

The overriding purpose of Clark's study was to test his general hypothesis that:

The greater the horizontal and vertical differentiation in a social system, the greater the differentiation between potential elites, the more decentralized the decision-making structure, without the establishment of integrative mechanism which leads to less coordination between sectors and a lower level of outputs. (Clark, 1971:299)

On the whole, Clark's data supported the hypothesis and in addition he found that:

Decentralized decision-making was positively associated with economic diversification, population

size . . . and negatively associated with the index of reform government. (Clark, 1971:312)

The above finding was supported through multiple regression analysis and its graphic variation, path analysis. To justify this level of statistics an interval measurement was assumed and a "sequential" distinction was drawn between the variables (i.e., economic diversification and population size became independent variables while decentralized decision-making was treated as a dependent variable). Economic diversification had a path coefficient of .477 and a zero-order correlation of .347 when associated with leadership decentralization. Population size produced a .066 path coefficient and a .384 zero-order correlation. The reform government index was negatively associated with decentralization; producing a -.548 zero-order correlation and a -.586 path coefficient. Clark also found a consistent positive association between decentralization and varying types of budget expenditures. Thus Clark produced considerable support for relationships between certain antecedent, correlate, and output variables and leadership decentralization.

C. Grimes, Bonjean and Lineberry's Comparative
Study of Seventeen Communities

The Grimes et al. (1972) study was more specifically concerned with the relationship between community structure and community leadership than the one described above. He combined previous analyses done by several researchers to produce a sample of seventeen communities. Each community's leadership pattern had been measured by Bonjean's two step reputational approach (Bonjean, 1963a). This approach is believed to produce a more systematic and precise measurement of leadership than that employed by Clark. For the structural variables, the analysis used the seven most important factors developed through a previous factor analysis of community structure (Bonjean. et al., 1969).¹ Together, these factors explained 53.6 percent of the total variation in community structures. A brief review of these factors follows.²

¹This paper will employ the same seven factors.

²For complete description of the variables, see Bonjean, et al. (1969). Complete listings of the factors and indicators are presented in Appendix A.

Factor I, Socioeconomic Status,³ explained 18.2 percent of the total variation. Of the four highest indicators, median income, dwelling condition and percent of units with telephones were found to be positively correlated while poverty was negatively correlated with factor I.

Factor II, Family Life Cycle, explained 11.3 percent of the total variation and was generally a measure of the age structure of the community. Percent 21 and over and median age were negatively correlated to factor II. Percent under 5 years of age and percent of population of school age were positively correlated.

Factor III, Governmental Revenues and Expenditures, explained 6.1 percent of the total variation. The four indicators positively correlated with factor III were: local expenditures per person in active population, local revenues per person in active population, local expenditures for education per person in the active population, and local tax revenue per pupil.

³Each variable is presented in order of its correlation with the factor. For example, median income is the most highly associated with factor I and therefore listed first, whereas poverty is the variable with the least association of the four indicators and is listed last.

Factor IV, Residential Mobility, explained 5.6 percent of the total variation. The four indicators were dwelling newness, percent of migrants from a different county, percent of occupied units moved into, 1958-1960, and per cent gain or loss through migration. All four variables were positively correlated with factor IV.

Factor V, Urbanism, explained 4.2 percent of the total variation. The four variables most highly correlated with factor V were: heterogeneity, population size, population density, and one negatively correlated, percent of housing units in one unit structures.

Factor VI, Manufacturing Concentration, explained 4.0 percent of the variation. Percent employed in manufacturing and industrial bureaucracy were both positively correlated with factor VI, while percent employed in public administration represented a negative factor loading.

As was the case with factor VI, factor VII, Commercial Center, also represents an economic specialization. The factor explained 3.9 percent of the variation. The variable with the strongest relationship, percent employed outside county of residence, produced a negative correlation. The remaining three variables, percent employed in wholesale and retail trade, percent employed

in wholesale trade, and percent employed in retail trade, produced positive correlations.

Grimes et al. tested numerous hypotheses derived from the literature at the ordinal level by employing Kendall's tau. Their study may be characterized by its almost total lack of statistically significant support for these hypotheses.

D. A Comparison of the Two Studies

1. Unit of Analysis--Clark's selection of cities is in keeping with much of the research done in the field of community politics. The early empirical works (e.g., Hunter's Community Power Structure and Dahl's Who Governs?) often dealt with the power structure of cities.

Grimes et al.'s choice of county as an alternate definition of community was motivated by the structure of Bonjean, Browning, and Carter's factor analysis of U.S. counties and their rationale for the use of county over city as a measure of community structure:

- (1) The county is the one administrative unit below the level of the state for which the greatest amount of comparable data are available.
- (2) The use of city data alone eliminates the rural population and would prohibit the measurement of the

effect of urban-rural determinants within the community system. Furthermore, even if some more precise "locality" designation would be preferable (city, town, village, etc.) comparable data are readily available only for cities larger than 25,000.

(3) The political, social, economic, cultural and functional boundaries of cities and villages are no more sharply delineated than are those of counties.

This analysis will use county based data for community structural variables.

2. Size and Structure of Sample--Clark's sample was significantly larger and more geographically diversified than Grimes et al. Thus Clark's sample should be more representative and random and, as such, allow greater generalization to the population of communities than does Grimes et al.

3. Measures of Leadership--Clark's "ersatz decisional method" was constructed to measure the number participating in the decision making process and the overlap of leaders into different issues in the community.

The measure employed by Grimes et al. (i.e., Bonjean's Two-Step Reputational Approach) isolated two other dimensions of leadership: the legitimacy of the leaders and their visibility to other members of the community.

Bonjean and Olson (1964) have isolated four dimensions of leadership structure which seem relevant:

legitimacy, visibility, scope of influence and cohesiveness. The first two of these are the measures of power structure used by Grimes. Clark produced a measure of leadership that roughly corresponds to Bonjean and Olson's third dimension, scope of influence. Thus, although both studies approach leadership structure as varying along an "elitist"- "pluralists" continuum, it can be seen that they are actually measuring different dimensions of the same phenomena. The two approaches can only be comparable if it is assumed that the dimensions measured by Clark and Grimes et al. vary concomitantly.

We will use Clark's leadership measure since no other is available for our sample.

4. Community Structure Variables--While both Clark and Grimes et al. used factor analysis in producing their community structure variables, the variables they developed were quite different. This is to be expected since differing methods of factor analysis and differing original matrices were used by both researchers. However, the "community population" is in both studies and the "economic diversification" variable of Clark's is similar to the "manufacturing concentration" factor of Grimes. The budget expenditure variables of Clark can

be compared to the expenditure variables examined by Grimes. Also, both researchers included measures of community poverty.

An additional structural variable employed by both Grimes et al. and Clark was the index of reformism developed by Lineberry and Fowler (1967). They constructed a four-point index of reformism using three measures usually associated with the age of reform in American politics. The principal changes advocated by the reformers were a shift (1) from the mayor-council to the city manager or commission form of government, (2) from partisan to nonpartisan elections and (3) from ward or district to at-large elections. They held that "governments which are products of the reform movement behave differently from those which have unreformed institutions, even if the socioeconomic composition of their population may be similar." (Lineberry and Fowler, 1967:278) To test this hypothesis, Lineberry and Fowler developed a four-point index of reformism using the three reform measures noted above. The presence or absence of these reformed institutions determines a community's leadership positions on the index in the following manner:

type I--cities with none of the reformed institutions

type II--cities with any one of the reformed institutions

type III--cities with two of the reformed institutions

type IV--cities with all three reformed institutions

Thus comparisons can be made on those variables which Clark found to be significantly related to "leadership decentralization."

5. Measures of Association--Clark assumed a higher level of measurement than Grimes et al. Clark used multiple regression analysis and path analysis while Grimes et al. employed a nonparametric measure of association, Kendall's tau. Although support can be given for each measure to the exclusion of the other, the purpose of this paper is replication. Thus the hypotheses will be tested with both multiple regression analysis and Kendall's tau.

E. The Hypotheses

The structural variables of the hypotheses selected for this study are similar to those used by Grimes et al. (1972). There is one hypothesis for each factor developed in the Bonjean et al. (1969) analysis and one

hypothesis concerning Lineberry and Fowler's (1967) index of reformism. The leadership variable is that developed by Clark (1971).

The hypotheses will be presented followed by previous studies which were theoretically or empirically relevant to them. Included will be a comparison of the findings of Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972).

1. The higher the socioeconomic status of a community, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Clark (1968a) suggests that education level is positively related with pluralistic decision-making. Crain and Rosenthal (1967) suggest a direct relationship between pluralism and socioeconomic status. Bonjean and Carter (1965) found communities with high poverty to be elitist in their power structure. Aiken (1970) however, suggests the opposite relationship. His secondary analysis of 57 communities provides moderate support for his notion that high-status communities are less likely to have pluralistic power structures. Walton (1970) employed many of the same communities as Aiken and found "adequate economic resources" positively associated with pluralism in his secondary analysis of 61 communities. In yet another secondary analysis, Gilbert (1968:145-146) found

no relationship between poverty and decentralization, nor education and decentralization.

Clark (1971) found no relationship between a decentralized leadership structure and either poverty or education. Grimes et al. (1972) failed to find significant support for a relationship between socioeconomic status and his measure of leadership structure.

2. The lower (i.e., older) the family life cycle, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Bonjean and Carter (1965) indicated that cities with large dependent populations were more likely to be elitist. Gilbert (1968) found cities with older populations more likely to be decentralized.

Clark did not include a comparable variable in his study, while Grimes et al. found no significant relationship between family life cycle and leadership structure.

3. The greater the governmental revenues and expenditures, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Presthus (1964) noted that governments with high resources were more decentralized.

Clark found a positive zero order correlation between budget expenditures and decentralization. Grimes

et al., however, failed to find support for the hypothesized positive relation between governmental revenues and expenditures and pluralism.

4. The greater the residential mobility of the community, the less decentralized the leadership structure.

Gilbert (1968) found communities with high growth rates to be elitist. Bonjean and Clark (1965) associated community growth and population mobility with centralized governments. Walton (1970) found a positive relationship between growth and pyramidal power structures.

Clark did not include the variable and Grimes, et al. found no significant relationship between residential mobility and decentralization.

5. The more urban the community, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Two elements of urbanism, size and heterogeneity, have been connected with centralization of leadership. Clark (1967a), Gilbert (1968), Bonjean and Carter (1965), Presthus (1964), Preston (1969), and Rogers (1962) reported size as directly associated with decentralization. However, Aiken (1970) found a positive relationship between size, heterogeneity, and pyramidal power structure.

Clark reported a .384 zero order correlation between size and decentralization. Grimes et al. found all four components of urbanism associated with decentralization, but only heterogeneity produced a significant ($\alpha=.05$) relationship.

6. The higher the manufacturing concentration in the community, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Aiken (1970) reported that industrial cities are more decentralized while Walton (1970) found no relationship.

Clark produced a weak negative association between industrialization and pluralism. Grimes. et al. found support in the opposite direction (i.e., a positive relation between manufacturing concentration and decentralization) although the findings were not significant at the .05 level.

7. The higher the commercial center ranking of the community, the more decentralized the leadership structure.

Little previous support for the above hypothesis can be found. However, it can be reasoned that communities that are commercial centers would also have many of the characteristics associated with factors V and VI. These two factors are represented in hypotheses 5 and 6

and it may be assumed that the direction of hypothesis 7 will be the same as 5 and 6.

The variable was not included by Clark and while Grimes et al. found directional support for the hypothesis, the results were not significant at the .05 level.

8. The more reformed the local political structure, the less decentralized the leadership structure.

Lineberry and Fowler (1967) suggest that there is an inverse relationship between the indicators of reformism and pluralism. Aiken (1970) supports this relationship with his finding that those communities with the most concentrated power structures were also more likely to have a city manager form of government and at-large elections. However, studies by Gilbert (1968) and Walton (1970) have revealed an opposite relationship (i.e., a positive relationship between certain indicators of reformism and pluralism).

Clark found a $-.548$ correlation between reformism and decentralization. Grimes et al.'s findings gave directional, but not statistically significant, support to the reformism-centralization hypothesis.

As can be seen from the above discussion, Clark did not use several of the variables for which hypotheses

were presented. Nevertheless, this study should provide an adequate test of his general hypothesis relating community system variables (i.e., demographic-ecological and political structure variables) to leadership configurations.⁴ In addition, the hypotheses closely resemble those tested by Grimes et al.

⁴Refer to Chapter II, pp. 24-25, for the presentation and discussion of Clark's hypotheses.

C H A P T E R I I I

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

A. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to compare and replicate the two studies discussed in Chapter II. The variables and statistical procedures described below are structured in a manner to allow maximum comparison and replication. Thus much of the description of the leadership and structural variables can be found in Chapter II since they are basically the same as those employed by Clark (1971) or Grimes et al. (1972).

B. Leadership Structure

The leadership structure of each community considered in this paper was measured by Clark (1971). Explanation of this approach to leadership measurement was given in Chapter II. The community scores ranged from a highly centralized 3.25 (Waco, Texas) to a more pluralistic 9.38 (Utica, New York).¹

¹Appendix B shows the leadership scores for each community.

Each community's raw score was used in linear regression analysis to produce a zero-order correlation matrix, partial correlations and path coefficients in order to be compatible with Clark's study. In addition, the communities were ranked according to their leadership scores so that they could be analyzed at the level employed by Grimes et al.

C. Community Structure Variables

The community structure variables employed in this paper are the same used by Grimes et al. and are discussed in Chapter II. Eighteen factors were developed² explaining 78.6 percent of the total variation in a matrix constructed of variables from the City and County Data Book. The first seven of these factors, explaining 53.6 percent of the total variation, were used for this analysis. The four variables with the highest loading on each factor were selected as indicators of that factor.³

²Bonjean et al. (1969) present the original discussion of this factor analysis.

³The seven factors and the indicators comprising these factors are listed in Appendix A.

In order to analyze the data in a manner comparable to Clark, each of the 28 variables selected through factor analysis was correlated with the leadership scores through computation of a Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient. Each set of four indicators (one set for each factor) was combined in a multiple regression equation to "test" the association between the "factors" and the leadership measure. In addition to this, partial correlation coefficients were used comparing each variable to the leadership structure measure while controlling for the others. Since Clark utilized path analysis in addition to zero-order correlations, path coefficients were also computed for this paper. However, no causal sequence between the variables is suggested in this paper.

The study was made comparable with Grimes et al's analysis by ranking each community on each factor. This was done by first constructing a "weighted" rank for each community on each variable. Then these ranks were summed and averaged to produce a rank for each community on each factor. Again using Socioeconomic Status as an example, the variables and their loadings (representing the contribution of that variable to the factor) are: median income of families (.89), dwelling condition (.87), percent

of units with telephones (.84), and poverty (-.84). Thus the rank for a community on Socioeconomic Status equals the sum of the squared weighted rank scores $(w)^2x_{1I}$ on the four variables of that factor or:

$$I_a = (w)^2a_{1I} + (w)^2b_{1I} + (w)^2c_{1I} + (w)^2d_{1I}$$

I_a is the "weighted" rank of a community on a variable. a , b , c , and d are a particular community's ranks on the four indicators of that factor. w is the factor loading of that particular indicator.

Seven factor scores for each community were computed and ranked among the other communities.

In addition to ranking by factors, the communities were also ranked on each of the 28 variables. They were then correlated with the ranked leadership scores to further increase the amount of comparison between Clark's and Grimes et al.'s studies.

D. The Communities Studied

The communities selected for this study are those counties in which Clark's 51 cities are located. However, in several cases more than one of the cities selected by Clark was from the same county (e.g., Gary and Hammond,

Indiana are both in Lake county). Thus a methodological problem was presented in dealing with the counties from which more than one city was selected. Such a county could either be counted only once, or counted once for each city it contained. However, it was felt the "safest" procedure was to eliminate those multicounty counties. Therefore, the original sample of 51 communities was reduced to one of 39 communities.⁴

E. The Measures of Association

As with other parts of this research, the measures of association were designed to both aid in the comparison of Grimes et al. and Clark's papers and to make this study as similar to their research as possible.

To evaluate the relationship between the ranked variables, the measure of rank order correlation employed is the same as that used by Grimes et al., Kendall's tau. It was applied to the first eight hypotheses.

In this case, Kendall's tau⁵ is a function of the minimum number of changes between the rankings of communities

⁴A list of each city and its county is given in Appendix C. A further discussion of the effect of this sample reduction is presented in Chapter V.

⁵See Kendall (1962) and Siegel (1956) for detailed discussion of this measure of association.

on structure and leadership variables required to transform one ranking into the other. Should the agreement between the original rankings be perfect, $\underline{r} = 1$. When one ranking is exactly opposite to the other, $\underline{r} = -1$. For other levels of agreement between these limiting values (i.e., 1 and -1) there will be values that correspond to the amount of agreement between the ranks. When $\underline{r} = 0$, it may be regarded as indicative of independence.

A test of significance was made for each of the eight hypotheses tested.⁶ Since the cases exceeded 10 in number, the sampling distribution was assumed to be normal. Thus a z score could be computed to measure the significance of each correlation.

The power of Kendall's tau when rejecting the null hypothesis of independence between the two rankings is 91 percent when compared to the Pearson product moment correlation. That is, it is approximately as sensitive a measure of association with a sample of 100 cases as is the Pearson r when $n = 91$. (Siegel, 1956: 223)

The hypothesis concerning reformism was tested in a different manner by Grimes et al. Since the formal

⁶It should be noted that this test of significance is simply descriptive since the sample involved is neither random nor completely representative.

political structure is measured by a different index than the other structural variables, a difference of means test⁷ was employed rather than Kendall's tau. In each type, mean scores on the two leadership variables (i.e., reformism and decentralization) were computed and then compared to test the hypothesis. In addition, a mean leadership score was computed for each of the three elements of reformism and then compared to further analyze the index of reformism. This will be the same method applied in this paper.

To evaluate the interval level data in a manner similar to Clark, a Pearson's r was computed for each structural variable⁸ and the leadership decentralization measure through a zero-order matrix of product moment correlations. Pearson's r is a measure of linear relationships with a range of 1.0 for perfect positive correlations to -1.0 for perfect negative correlations. If r = 0 it can be assumed there is no linear relationship between the two variables.⁹

⁷Blalock (1972: 219-240) presents detailed explanation of the difference of means test.

⁸The reformism index was treated separately. See Chapter IV, page 60.

⁹For a more detailed discussion of Pearson's r, see Blalock (1972: 376-385).

In addition, a partial correlation was computed in order to determine the relationship between leadership decentralization and each of the structural variables while controlling for the effects of the other three variables which were also indicators of the same factor. Again the correlation coefficient will vary between 1 and -1 with appropriate reduction of the measure for each decrease in association.¹⁰

Path coefficients were computed for comparison with those produced by Clark. These coefficients were obtained by computing a standardized regression coefficient from the same data used in production of the partial correlations.¹¹ As with the correlation coefficients discussed above, path coefficients may also vary from 1 to -1.¹²

For analyzing the relationships between the "factors" and leadership structures, a multiple correlation coefficient was used.¹³

¹⁰See Blalock (1972: 429-400).

¹¹See Clark (1972: 300-301) for description of the graphic analysis employed in his paper.

¹²Blalock (1972: 450-453) describes the technique employed in the development of the path coefficients used in this paper.

¹³Blalock (1972: 458-459) presents a complete explanation of this technique.

F. Summary

In short, the statistics used in this analysis are designed to parallel as closely as possible those used by both Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972). As will be seen in Chapters IV and V, this fact complicates interpretation of the results of the analysis considerably. We feel, however, that if comparative research is to continue, such problems must be endured.

C H A P T E R I V

FINDINGS

A. Introduction

The presentation of the results is organized by the eight variables from which the hypotheses developed in Chapter II are structured. The data are presented at both ordinal and interval levels of measurement in order to maximize the comparisons between Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972).

The first seven variables in the study (as identified by the factor analysis) are analyzed in two, related ways. First, the variables are used as wholes. This is to take advantage of the benefits provided by factor analysis in summarizing data. Second, each of the component indicators is also related to the leadership decentralization measure. This provides an additional test for the relationships and enables a more exact comparison to be made with the findings of previous studies which did not use the factor analytic approach for structuring the independent variables. The relationship between the eighth structural variable, reformism, and leadership decentralization, due

to the nature of the data, is handled in a slightly different manner.

B. Socio-economic Status and Leadership Decentralization

The first hypothesis postulates a direct relationship between the socioeconomic status of a community and the decentralization of its leadership structure. As shown in Table 1, the relationship is in the direction hypothesized. However, both the ordinal ($\tau = .1238$) and the interval ($R = .2751$) association between Factor I and leadership decentralization are weak and nonsignificant. The indicators of socioeconomic status follow the same general trend: weak, nonsignificant support for the hypothesis.

Grimes et al.'s data produced support in the opposite direction of the hypothesized relationship, although his findings were also nonsignificant at the .05 level.

A variable common to the two previous studies, "poverty (Table 1, Factor I, Variable 4), produced a relationship with leadership decentralization similar to that found by both Clark and Grimes et al. (i.e., negative, but not significant).

TABLE 1
COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION IN 39 COMMUNITIES:
FACTORS I (SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS) AND II (FAMILY LIFE CYCLE)

Factors and Indicators	Tau	Signif- icance	Zero-order Coefficients	Partial Correlations	Signif- icance	Path Coefficients
I. <u>Socioeconomic Status</u>	.1238	ns				
1. median income	.1621	ns	.264	.095	ns	.2965
2. dwelling condition	.0677	ns	.172	-.016	ns	-.0220
3. units with tele- phones	.1221	ns	.182	-.074	ns	-.1365
4. poverty	-.1739	ns	-.252	-.035	ns	-.1031
R = .2751 (not significant)			Variance Explained = 7.56%			
II. <u>Family Life Cycle</u>	-.1664	ns				
1. percent 21 and over	.1587	ns	.219	-.064	ns	-.3340
2. median age	.1409	ns	.191	-.044	ns	-.1441
3. percent under 5 years	-.0174	ns	-.101	-.004	ns	-.0118
4. percent of popula- tion of school age	-.2381	.018	-.318	-.235	ns	-.7414
R = .3697 (not significant)			Variance Explained = 13.66%			

An additional result that will repeat itself throughout this analysis is the finding that no large differences were found between the rank-order data and the zero-order coefficients.

C. Family Life Cycle and Leadership Decentralization

The second hypothesis suggests that the older (lower in rank or less in interval measure) the family life cycle, the more decentralized its power structure. The data (Table 1, Factor II) produced weak ($\tau = -.1664$, $R = .3697$) support for the hypothesized relationship between the factor and leadership decentralization.

One indicator of family life cycle was statistically significant however. The "percent of population of school age" (Table 1, Factor II, Variable 4) produced a negative ordinal correlation significant at the .05 level and a strong ($-.7414$) path coefficient.

The general finding of nonsignificant directional support is in general agreement with that of Grimes et al.

D. Governmental Revenues and Expenditures and Leadership Decentralization

The third hypothesis suggests a direct relationship between governmental revenues and expenditures and

decentralization of leadership. This hypothesis is supported directionally, but not at the .05 level of significance. The relationship between this factor and leadership decentralization appears to be extremely weak ($\tau = .1310$, $R = .3625$).

However, two of the indicators of this factor, "local expenditures per person in active population" and "local tax revenue per pupil" (Table 2, Factor III, Variables 1 and 4) produced statistically significant ordinal correlations. In addition to being significant at the ordinal level, "local tax revenue per pupil" developed a strong positive (.8415) path coefficient, as did "local expenditures per person in active population," (-.7344), although the relationship here is in the opposite direction to that predicted by the hypothesis.

The findings are in the opposite direction of those produced by Grimes et al. They are, however, in general agreement with Clark's finding that the general budget expenditures of a community are positively correlated with its leadership decentralization. One variable, "local expenditures per person in active population" (Table 2, Factor III, Variable 3), demonstrated a zero-order correlation with leadership decentralization (.218) very similar

TABLE 2

COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION IN 39 COMMUNITIES:
 FACTORS III (GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES)
 AND IV (RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY)

Factors and Indicators	Tau	Signif- icance	Zero-order Coefficients	Partial Correlations	Signif- icance	Path Coefficients
III. <u>Governmental Revenues and Expenditures</u>	.1310	ns				
1. local expenditures per person in active population	.2367	.018	.218	.203	ns	.8415
2. local revenues per person in the active population	.1851	ns	.191	-.184	ns	-.7344
3. local expenditures for education per person in active population	.0818	ns	-.021	-.168	ns	-.2179
4. local tax revenue per pupil	.2138	.029	.289	.179	ns	.2888
R = .3625 (not significant)			Variance Explained = 13.14%			
IV. <u>Residential Mobility</u>	-.0456	ns				
1. dwelling newness	-.0029	ns	-.008	.261	ns	.3788
2. percent migrants from a different county	-.2013	.038	-.312	-.382	.023	-.6840
3. percent units moved into, 1958-60	-.0908	ns	-.228	-.025	ns	-.0333
4. percent gain or loss through migration	-.0086	ns	-.038	.137	ns	.1820
R = .4595 (not significant)			Variance Explained = 21.11%			

to the zero-order correlation produced by Clark's general budget expenditures (.237).

E. Residential Mobility and Leadership Decentralization

An inverse relationship between residential mobility and leadership decentralization is postulated in the fourth hypothesis. Extremely weak directional support is given this hypothesis by the data presented in Table 2. Although the multiple correlation coefficient (.4595) indicates a stronger relationship than the ordinal statistic (-.0456), the association between Factor III and leadership decentralization is still not statistically significant.

The indicators of Factor III also produced weak nonsignificant associations with the exception of "percent migrants from a different county" (Table 2, Factor IV, Variable 2) which produced significant ordinal and partial correlations and a moderately strong path coefficient (-.6840).

The nonsignificant directional support does not differ greatly from Grimes et al.'s data which produced virtually no association between residential mobility and leadership decentralization.

F. Urbanism and Leadership Decentralization

The fifth hypothesis suggests a direct relationship between urbanism and decentralization of leadership. This relationship was found to be as predicted and significant at the .05 level. This factor also produced the strongest multiple correlation coefficient of the entire analysis ($R = .4783$). However this multiple correlation coefficient, like all of the others in this analysis, failed to be statistically significant at the .05 level. Two indicators of this dimension produced significant ordinal correlations, "population size" and "population density" (Table 3, Factor V, Variables 2 and 3).

This factor correlation (.276) is similar to the correlation produced by Grimes et al., comparing urbanism and legitimacy (.301). However, because of a wide variance existing between the legitimacy and visibility scores on this factor in Grimes et al.'s data, further comparisons could not be made satisfactorily.

Population size created a .384 zero-order correlation with leadership decentralization in Clark's analysis. This compares favorably with the .419 correlation produced in this study (Table 3, Factor V, Variable 2), and the

TABLE 3
COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION IN 39 COMMUNITIES:
FACTORS V (URBANISM) AND VI (MANUFACTURING CONCENTRATION)

Factors and Indicators	Tau	Signif- icance	Zero-order Coefficients	Partial Correlations	Signif- icance	Path Coefficients
V. <u>Urbanism</u>	.2762	.007				
1. heterogeneity	.0129	ns	-.035	-.217	ns	-.2170
2. population size	.3687	.001	.419	.390	.0204	.4250
3. population density	.2645	.009	.240	.086	ns	.1162
4. percent of housing units in one unit structures	-.1652	ns	-.278	-.041	ns	-.0545
R = .4783 (not significant)		Variance Explained = 22.87%				
VI. <u>Manufacturing Concentration</u>	.0697	ns				
1. percent employed in manufacturing	.0660	ns	.117	.149	ns	.1858
2. industrial bureaucracy	.0504	ns	-.004	-.106	ns	-.1294
3. percent employed in public administration	-.0594	ns	-.106	-.138	ns	-.1386
4. percent employed in agriculture	-.0991	ns	-.084	-.070	ns	-.0708
R = .2071 (not significant)		Variance Explained = 4.28%				

partial correlation between size and leadership decentralization, controlling for the other variables, is statistically significant also.

G. Manufacturing Concentration and Leadership Decentralization

The hypothesis dealing with the relationship between this dimension and leadership decentralization predicts a direct association. Virtually no association ($\tau = .0697$, $R = .2071$) was found in this data (Table 3, Factor VI) however.

This is not very dissimilar from Grimes et al. who found a weak, nonsignificant relationship between manufacturing concentration and leadership structure, or from Clark, who found no association when he compared leadership decentralization with industrial activity.

H. Commercial Center and Leadership Decentralization

The seventh hypothesis predicts this community structural variable will be positively associated with leadership decentralization. As was the case with the preceding factor, little or no association ($\tau = -.0071$, $R = .3702$) was found (Table 4, Factor VII). Only one indicator,

TABLE 4
COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION IN 39 COMMUNITIES:
FACTOR VII (COMMERCIAL CENTER)

Factors and Indicators	Tau	Signif- icance	Zero-order Coefficients	Partial Correlations	Signif- icance	Path Coefficients
VII. <u>Commercial Center</u>	-.0071	ns				
1. percent employed working outside county of residence	.0058	ns	.037	.152	ns	.1713
2. percent employed in retail trade	.0217	ns	.008	.068	ns	.1012
3. percent employed in wholesale and re- tail trade	-.1310	ns	-.297	-.365	.0312	-.4121
4. percent employed in wholesale trade	.0750	ns	.043	.131	ns	.1776
R = .3702 (not significant)			Variance Explained = 13.70%			

"percent employed in wholesale and retail trade," suggested any trace of association with leadership decentralization. While this indicator's correlation coefficients were not strong, it did produce a significant partial correlation.

These findings again produced only a small variance from Grimes et al., who found a weak, nonsignificant relationship between commercial center and leadership legitimacy and visibility.

I. Reformism and Leadership Decentralization

The final hypothesis predicts an inverse relationship between reformism and leadership decentralization. An examination of Table 5 presents directional and significant support for this hypothesis. There is a constant decrease in leadership decentralization as one progresses from Type I (least reformed) to Type IV (most reformed). This is similar to findings by Grimes et al.--only the relationship presented here is stronger and more consistent.¹

When Types II and III are broken down into subtypes [i.e., Type II is divided into groups: (a) those

¹In Grimes et al. (1972), Type III communities had the most legitimate and visible leadership structures.

TABLE 5
FORMAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION

Community Type	Interval Level Comparisons		
	Interval Mean	Standard Deviation	Sample Size
I (least reformed)	7.6	(1.4)	(7)
II	7.4	(1.3)	(10)
III	7.0	(1.0)	(11)
IV (most reformed)	6.0	(1.5)	(11)

Difference of means significant at .05 level between:
 I-IV $t = 2.22$ $p(t > 1.746)$, II-IV $t = 1.187$ $p(t \geq 1.729)$,
 III-IV $t = 1.760$ $p(t \geq 1.725)$

I II III IV

Community types connected by a line beneath them have significantly different leadership means.

Community Type	Ordinal Level Comparisons		
	Mean Rank	Standard Deviation	Sample Size
I (least reformed)	26.68	(8.94)	(7)
II	20.45	(9.74)	(10)
III	16.25	(12.54)	(11)
IV (most reformed)	14.50	(11.9)	(11)

Difference of means significant at .05 level between:
 I-IV $t = 2.19$ $p(t \geq 1.746)$, II-IV $t = 1.187$ $p(t \geq 1.729)$,
 I-III $t = 1.803$ $p(t \geq 1.746)$

I II III IV

Community types connected by a line beneath them have significantly different leadership means.

communities with a city manager, (b) communities with non-partisan elections and (c) communities with at-large elections. Type III is divided into groups: (a) communities with a city manager and nonpartisan elections, (b) communities with a city manager and at-large elections and (c) communities with nonpartisan and at-large elections.] the earlier distinction between the four types becomes less clear. For example, the mean leadership for those communities (Table 6, Type IIc) possessing only at-large elections among the three reformism traits is greater than the mean leadership score of communities possessing none of the dimensions of reformism (i.e., Type I communities). Thus while the addition of a dimension of reformism should produce a less decentralized leadership, in this case the addition of at-large elections is associated with a more decentralized leadership structure.

Since the preceding inconsistency may be due to the small sample size ($n = 4$ for Type IIc), the original sample of 39 communities was further subdivided into populations consisting of communities containing a particular dimension of reformism and those that did not. Examination of the second group of data in Table 6 shows that each of the three dimensions produce a less decentralized power

TABLE 6
 FORMAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP DECENTRALIZATION:
 THE DIMENSIONS OF REFORMISM

	Interval Mean	Standard Deviation	Sample Size
Comparison of Community Subtypes			
TYPE II			
a. Manager	0	0	0
b. Nonpartisan	6.6	.98	6
c. At-large	8.4	.76	4
TYPE III			
a. Manager, nonpartisan	0	0	0
b. Manager, at-large	5.75	0	1
c. Nonpartisan, at-large	6.96	.86	10
Comparison of Reform Dimensions			
REFORM DIMENSION			
Mayor	7.37	1.18	27
Manager	5.98	1.42	12
Partisan	7.80	1.36	12
Nonpartisan	6.38	1.25	27
Ward	7.14	1.28	13
At-large	6.80	1.49	26

Difference of means significant at .05 level between:
 Mayor-Manager $t = 3.09$ $p(t > 1.697)$
 Partisan-Nonpartisan $t = 3.09$ $p(t \geq 1.697)$

structure. Although the differences of mean leadership scores between these communities are not statistically significant in all cases, they do produce directional support for the hypothesis.

When reformism is analyzed as an interval scale, the Pearson's r produced (-.423) is not as strong as the correlation developed by Clark (-.548), but certainly in the same range of magnitude.

J. Summary of Findings

The data produced in this research would seem to lend support to both Clark and Grimes et al. Grimes et al.'s general conclusion that "our exploration . . . yielded no statistically significant findings. In addition, most of those relationships found were either quite small . . . or inconsistent." (Grimes et al., 1972: 23) can be validated by the findings of this research. Only two hypotheses (i.e., urbanism and reformism) are supported with significant results, and one of these (reformism) was only partially significant. In addition, most of the relationships reported in this chapter are small and/or inconsistent. Thus the data produced in this research agrees with the findings of Grimes et al. (1972), Walton (1970)

and Aiken (1970) and their doubts concerning the existence of relationships between community structure and leadership structures.

However, on those variables that are comparable with Clark's data, general agreement can also be found. On those variables in which Clark developed notable relationships (i.e., population, budget expenditures, and reformism), substantial relationships were also found in this data. And, those variables which Clark found to be insignificant (i.e., industrial activity, and poverty) were also found to have little or no association with leadership decentralization in this data.

In addition to comparing Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972), two other significant findings resulted from this research.

One concerns the moderately strong direct relationship found between population size and leadership decentralization. Considering the rather contradictory findings preceding this analysis,² it is hoped that this study will aid in accepting the tentative conclusion that

²See Chapter III, page 36, for a discussion of previous findings.

Finally, since the relationship between the formal leadership structure of a community and its leadership decentralization has been established in all three studies (Walton, 1970; Clark, 1971; and Grimes et al., 1972), its importance should not be underestimated.

C H A P T E R V

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS

A. Introduction

The data presented in the previous chapter provide little support for those hypotheses suggested by many previous research efforts in the area of community structure and leadership structure. So, in addition to viewing the relationship of this analysis with the findings of Clark (1971) and Grimes et al. (1972), consideration will also be given to the possible relevance of this study to the entire field of community leadership research.

B. Methodological Limitations

Because of limited amounts of time, money, and manpower, certain restrictions were placed upon this analysis that could question the validity of the findings. Some of these are noted below.

Definition of Community. As was discussed earlier,¹ there is a mixing of demographic-ecological

¹The original discussion of this problem is in Chapter II, pp. 29-30.

variables measured at the county level and leadership variables (reformism and decentralization) measured at the city level. While both county and city are appropriate units of community analysis, it is questionable whether they can be considered interchangeable. However, since the only data available were divided between these units of analysis, the combination had to be made. Nevertheless, this may not be a true limitation since it can be reasoned the environmental effect of the total county may be more substantial in determining the leadership structure of the community than the effect of just the city variables.

Measures of Leadership Structure. In an attempt to replicate two studies and use the available data, certain elements of Clark's analysis were discarded in favor of Grimes et al.'s and vice versa. For example, the measure of leadership decentralization used in this analysis is the one employed by Clark. It appears to measure a different dimension of leadership than the method employed by Grimes et al. Naturally this limits the comparison of the present findings of Grimes² et al.

²Examination of this restriction can be found in Chapter II, pp. 30-31.

some here also. It is hoped that the leadership measure employed in this analysis and that used by Grimes et al. vary concomitantly along an elitist-pluralistic continuum. If this is the case, comparisons can be made between the findings of this analysis and that of Grimes et al. This is one of the major problems that plagues the field of community power research.

Variable Overlap. Further, because the structural variables were those employed by Grimes et al., rather than Clark, many of the variables tested by Clark are not present in this analysis. Thus only a portion of Clark's findings can be reevaluated.³

Sample Comparisons. Finally, although this sample (n = 39) represents a significant improvement over the size of Grimes et al.'s, sample (n = 17), methodological difficulties⁴ forced Clark's original sample (n = 51) to be reduced by one-fourth.

³Mention of which of the findings are open to reexamination can be found in Chapter II, p. 39.

⁴See Chapter III, p. 44, for a discussion of these methodological problems.

C. Advantages of the Study

In spite of the limitations just described, this investigation has certain advantages over the two studies which it replicated.

Community Structure Variables. First, the structural variables tested in this paper are more extensive and systematic than those employed by Clark. In addition, this analysis dealt more specifically with leadership structure than Clark whose main focus was upon community output.

The Number of Data Units. The sample size is significantly increased from the 17 communities analyzed by Grimes et al. Thus the findings of this research should prove more reliable than those produced by these researchers.

Research Design. Although discussed earlier as limitations, the numerous ways in which the research design was modified can represent a positive aspect of this analysis. The research became more comparable with the two previous studies. The sample employed resembles both that used by Clark (number and location) and Grimes

et al. (units of analysis). The structural variables were drawn from Grimes et al., while the method of measuring leadership decentralization is that used by Clark. Thus each hypothesis partially resembles those of Grimes et al. and Clark. Further, the data is analyzed at two statistical levels in order to be similar to both Clark and Grimes et al. In this way the comparability of the present research with that of Grimes et al., and Clark has been maximized while many advantages of each study are still retained.

Thus while the research design may be far from ideal, its advantages should not be overlooked in assessing the findings.

D. Universe and Sample Comparisons

Since the original universe for the sample used in this analysis is all U.S. cities ranging from 50,000 to 750,000, it would be useful to know how representative the sample is of all U.S. counties after the transformation from city to county data was made. Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations of the 32 indicators of community structure for all U.S. counties and compares

TABLE 7

SAMPLE AND UNIVERSE COMPARISONS ON 32 COMMUNITY STRUCTURE INDICATORS

Factors and Indicators	1		2		Sig- nifi- cance
	Universe N=3,101*		Sample N=39		
	μ		$\bar{x}$	S	
<u>I. Socioeconomic Status</u>					
median income	4,166.24	1,336.90	6,139.60	934.09	.001
dwelling condition	56.58	17.08	79.91	7.35	.001
percent telephone	65.66	19.26	83.64	7.43	.001
poverty	35.46	16.18	16.12	6.96	.001
<u>II. Family Life Cycle</u>					
percent 21 and over	58.58	4.47	61.11	3.99	.001
median age	29.14	4.72	30.30	3.81	.001
percent under 5 years	11.13	1.77	11.33	14.98	ns
percent of school age	30.28	3.25	27.55	2.90	.001
<u>III. Governmental Revenues and Expenditures</u>					
local expenditure per person in active population	2.74	1.28	2.94	.89	ns
local revenues per person in active population	2.68	1.26	2.71	.89	ns
local expenditure for education per person in active population	140.01	58.55	127.07	40.84	ns
local tax revenue per pupil	24,876.17	18,738.46	36,474.00	17,551.00	.001
<u>IV. Residential Mobility</u>					
dwelling newness	22.54	11.10	30.04	15.77	.001
percent migrants from a different county	17.68	8.76	17.94	9.66	ns
percent units moved into, 1958-60	29.13	8.08	31.99	7.26	.05
percent gain or loss through migration	-8.87	24.73	32.17	14.54	.001
<u>V. Urbanism</u>					
heterogeneity	1,595.12	5,881.10	3,332.40	2,504.90	.001
population size	57,304.00	203,919	510,570.00	386,380.00	.001
population density	211.16	1,836.48	1,856.20	3,528.60	.001
percent house per unit	91.95	9.08	72.49	18.89	.001
<u>VI. Manufacturing Contraction</u>					
percent employed mfg.	18.95	12.93	27.31	11.99	.001
industrial bureaucracy	7.02	7.52	10.30	5.54	.01
percent employed agricul.	20.42	15.09	2.15	3.23	.001
percent employed pub. adm.	4.29	3.11	5.51	4.8	.02
<u>VII. Commercial Center</u>					
percent employed outside county of residence	13.25	11.56	13.48	16.87	ns
percent, retail trade	9.42	3.64	13.33	2.87	.001
percent, wholesale and retail	16.90	3.75	19.44	2.77	.001
percent, wholesale trade	1.97	1.76	5.18	2.70	.001
<u>VIII. Unemployment</u>					
percent unemployed	5.16	2.55	5.08	1.70	ns
percent employed, agricul.	20.40	15.09	2.15	3.23	.001
population in farming	16.90	3.75	1.25	1.34	.001
percent actually employed	73.93	11.67	71.42	4.67	ns

*3,101 of the total U.S. counties were employed in the factor analysis (Bonjean, et.al, 1969) producing the structural variables for this table.

them to the communities in this analysis. The last column of Table 7 shows that on 24 of the 32 indicators (75 percent) the difference between the population mean and sample mean is large enough to be significant at .05 level. The counties used in the Grimes et al. sample had only 12 indicators to vary significantly from the population means, thus indicating a truer representation of the universe than that presented here.

The basis for such large deviations from the population means is the strongly urban bias of those counties selected for this sample. Thus we find that the sample counties have higher rankings on socioeconomic status (Factor I), are significantly younger (Factor II), more mobile (Factor IV), more urban (Factor V), more industrial (Factor VI), and more commercial (Factor VII) than are the universe of counties.

In short, the evidence above indicates that the community systems in the analysis do not adequately represent the universe of communities on many of the measures of community structure chosen. Interpretation of the data should bear this qualification in mind.

E. Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

In light of the data presented in this analysis certain tentative conclusions can be drawn and a few new directions for future research may be considered.

First, the relationship between population size and leadership decentralization needs to be considered as a relevant variable in determining the leadership structure of a community. Most previous analyses have noted this relationship also. This, then, is perhaps the only demographic-ecological variable which shows a consistent relationship to decision-making structures.

Second, further investigation is needed concerning the relationship between leadership structure and formal political structural variables. Since the index of reformism may be even more powerful than population size in predicting decentralization of leadership, the above findings tend to indicate that further analysis and perhaps revision of the index might produce an even more effective community variable. Those component dimensions comprising the index of reformism must be evaluated more carefully. Can each dimension be considered equally important? Are these three variables the only elements of formal leadership structure related to leadership

decentralization? The strong association found between reformism and leadership decentralization would seem to make these worthwhile questions in analyzing community leadership.

Third, the findings of this research suggest that the relationship between leadership structure and ecological or demographic structural variables is extremely weak at best and probably not worth the large amount of research previously devoted to it. Thus, it might be well for future community analysts to either forget about most demographic-ecological variables or examine them in new (e.g., nonlinear) ways.

Fourth, though only two findings of this analysis (population and reformism) were considered significant enough for discussion in this section, it should be remembered that the original purpose of this paper was to undertake a type of research often called for in the social sciences, but seldom attempted: replication. The numerous verifications made of little or no association between leadership decentralization and certain structural variables should not be ignored. In fact, it may be these findings that hold the most significant place in evaluating present theory concerning community leadership and in determining the direction of future research.

The final suggestion for future research comes not from the findings of this analysis but rather from the difficulties encountered in trying to compare the studies of Clark and Grimes et al. A more standard definition and measurement of leadership structure is needed for adequate comparative community research. The divisions over the proper unit of analysis (i.e., county or city) can be considered at least partially complementary, but until community leadership is adequately defined and a satisfactory measure is accepted, comparative analyses of community politics will be severely hampered. As long as researchers employ methods that measure different dimensions of leadership, the comparability of their results will be minimal. The work of Bonjean and Olson (1964) represents an important step toward a systematic, theoretical, categorization of community leadership structure. The NORC permanent community sample and data bank (Rossi and Crain, 1968) that was employed by Clark for his research will certainly prove to be another major benefit for community research but until the leadership measurement problem is standardized, the level of comparison needed for significant advances in community research will not be reached.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

FACTORS, INDICATORS, AND WEIGHTS

I.	Socioeconomic Status	
1.	median income of families	.89
2.	dwelling condition	.87
3.	percent of units with telephones	.84
4.	poverty	-.84
II.	Family Life Cycle	
1.	percent 21 and over	-.96
2.	median age	-.94
3.	percent under five years	.87
4.	percent of population of school age	.85
III.	Governmental Revenues and Expenditures	
1.	local expenditures per person in active population	.91
2.	local revenues per person in the active population	.89
3.	local expenditures for education per person in active population	.79
4.	local tax revenue per pupil	.71
IV.	Residential Mobility	
1.	dwelling newness	.79
2.	percent migrants from different county	.76
3.	percent occupied units moved into, 1958-60	.72
4.	percent gain or loss through migration	.63
V.	Urbanism	
1.	heterogeneity	.93
2.	population size	.90
3.	population density	.62
4.	percent of housing units in one unit structures	-.44
VI.	Manufacturing Concentration	
1.	percent employed in manufacturing	.78
2.	industrial bureaucracy	.70
3.	percent employed in public administration	-.41
4.	percent employed in agriculture	-.40
VII.	Commercial Center	
1.	percent employed working outside county of residence	-.70
2.	percent employed in retail trade	.66
3.	percent employed in wholesale and retail trade	.61
4.	percent employed in wholesale trade	.49

SOURCE: Charles M. Bonjean, Harley L. Browning and Lewis F. Carter, "Toward Comparative Community Research: A Factor Analysis of United States Counties," The Sociological Quarterly 10 (Spring, 1969), pp. 157-176.

A P P E N D I X B

LEADERSHIP SCORES FOR EACH COMMUNITY

0.	Akron, Ohio	7.50
1.	Albany, New York	6.63
2.	Amarillo, Texas	3.33
3.	Atlanta, Georgia	6.50
4.	Berkeley, California	5.92
5.	Birmingham, Alabama	5.88
6.	Bloomington, Minnesota	4.45
7.	Boston, Massachusetts	7.25
8.	Buffalo, New York	8.67
9.	Cambridge, Massachusetts	8.67
10.	Charlotte, North Carolina	6.25
11.	Clifton, New Jersey	5.90
12.	Duluth, Minnesota	5.25
13.	Euclid, Ohio	6.93
14.	Fort Worth, Texas	6.75
15.	Fullerton, California	6.45
16.	Gary, Indiana	6.75
17.	Hamilton, Ohio	6.00
18.	Hammond, Indiana	7.75
19.	Indianapolis, Indiana	9.00
20.	Irvington, New Jersey	7.67
21.	Jacksonville, Florida	6.25
22.	Long Beach, California	4.75
23.	Malden, Massachusetts	8.50
24.	Manchester, New Hampshire	4.97
25.	Memphis, Tennessee	6.38
26.	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	7.75
27.	Minneapolis, Minnesota	8.00
28.	Newark, New Jersey	9.13
29.	Palo Alto, California	6.50
30.	Pasadena, California	5.50
31.	Phoenix, Arizona	7.75
32.	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	7.75
33.	Saint Louis, Missouri	8.00
34.	Saint Paul, Minnesota	8.50
35.	Saint Petersburg, Florida	6.75
36.	Salt Lake City, Utah	7.13
37.	San Francisco, California	7.75
38.	Santa Ana, California	6.50
39.	San Jose, California	5.63
40.	Santa Monica, California	6.33
41.	Schenectady, New York	5.75
42.	Seattle, Washington	7.50
43.	South Bend, Indiana	7.00
44.	Tampa, Florida	8.25
45.	Tyler, Texas	7.67
46.	Utica, New York	9.38
47.	Waco, Texas	3.25
48.	Warren, Michigan	5.50
49.	Waterbury, Connecticut	8.75
50.	Waukegan, Illinois	7.67

SOURCE: Terry N. Clark, "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures, and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," in Community Politics, ed. by Charles M. Bonjean, Terry N. Clark, and Robert L. Lineberry (N.Y.: The Free Press, 1971) p. 297.

A P P E N D I X C

CITY AND COUNTY LISTINGS

<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State</u>
Akron	Summit	Ohio
Albany	Albany	New York
Amarillo	Potter	Texas
Atlanta	DeKalb	Georgia
Berkeley	Marin	California
Birmingham	Jefferson	Alabama
*Bloomington	Hennepin	Minnesota
Boston	Suffolk	Massachusetts
Buffalo	Erie	New York
*Cambridge	Suffolk	Massachusetts
Charlotte	Gaston	North Carolina
Clifton	Passaic	New Jersey
Duluth	St. Louis	Minnesota
Euclid	Cuyahoga	Ohio
Ft. Worth	Tarrant	Texas
*Fullerton	Orange	California
*Gary	Lake	Indiana
Hamilton	Butler	Missouri
*Hammond	Lake	Indiana
Indianapolis	Marion	Indiana
Irvington	Essex	New York
Jacksonville	Duval	Florida
*Long Beach	Los Angeles	California
*Malden	Middlesex	Massachusetts
Manchester	Hillsborough	New Hampshire
Memphis	Shelby	Tennessee
Milwaukee	Milwaukee	Wisconsin
*Minneapolis	Hennepin	Minnesota
Newark	Essex	New Jersey
*Palo Alto	Santa Clara	California
*Pasadena	Los Angeles	California
Phoenix	Maricopa	Arizona
Pittsburgh	Allegheny	Pennsylvania
St. Louis	St. Louis	Missouri
St. Paul	Ramsey	Minnesota
St. Petersburg	Pinellas	Florida
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake	Nevada
San Francisco	San Francisco	California
*Santa Ana	Orange	California
*San Jose	Santa Clara	California
*Santa Monica	Los Angeles	California
Schenectady	Schenectady	New York
Seattle	King	Washington
South Bend	St. Joseph	Indiana
Tampa	Hillsborough	Florida
Tyler	Smith	Texas
Utica	Oneida	New York
Waco	McLennan	Texas
Warren	Macomb	Michigan
Waterbury	New Haven	Connecticut
Waukegan	Lake	Illinois

*Indicates those communities which were eliminated from the sample in order to control for multicity counties.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiken, Michael
1970 "The Distribution of Community Power: Structural Bases and Social Consequences. The Structure of Community Power. ed. by Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott. New York: Random House.
- Bachrach, P. and M. Baratz
1962 "Two Faces of Power." American Political Science Review, 51 (December): 947-952.
- Belknap, Ivan and John G. Steinle
1963 The Community and It's Hospitals. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Blalock, Hubert M.
1972 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Blankenship, Vaughn
1964 "Community Power and Decision-Making: A Comparative Evaluation of Measurement Techniques." Social Forces, 43 (December): 207-216.
- Bogue, Donald J.
1949 The Structure of the Metropolitan Community: A Study of Dominance and Subdominance. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Bonjean, Charles M.
1963 "Community Leadership: A Case Study and Conceptual Refinement." American Journal of Sociology, 68 (May): 672-681.
- 1963 Community Leadership: A Conceptual Refinement and Comparative Analysis. unpublished PhD. dissertation, University of North Carolina.
- 1964 "Class, Status and Power Reputation." Sociology and Social Research, 49 (October): 69-75.

- 1970 "Dimensions of Power Structure: Some Problems in Conceptualization and Measurement." in Frederick M. Wirt (ed), Future Research Directions in Community Power Studies. Berkeley: Institute for Governmental Studies.
- 1971 "The Community as Research Site and Object of Inquiry." Community Politics. ed. by Charles M. Bonjean, Terry N. Clark and Robert L. Lineberry. New York: The Free Press.
- Bonjean, Charles M., Harley L. Browning and Lewis F. Carter. 1969 "Toward Comparative Research: A Factor Analysis of United States Counties." The Sociological Quarterly, 10 (Spring): 157-176.
- Bonjean, Charles M. and Lewis F. Carter 1965 "Legitimacy and Visibility: Leadership Structure Related to Four Community Systems." Pacific Sociological Review, 8 (Spring): 16-20.
- Bonjean, Charles M. and Michael D. Grimes 1972 "Community Power: Issues and Findings." Unpublished manuscript.
- Bonjean, Charles M. and Robert L. Lineberry 1970 "The Urbanization-Party Competition Hypothesis: A Comparison of All United States Counties." Journal of Politics, 32 (May): 305-321.
- Bonjean, Charles M. and David M. Olson 1964 "Community Leadership: Directions of Research." Administrative Science Quarterly, 9 (December): 278-300.
- Burgess, M. Elaine 1960 Negro Leadership in a Southern City. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Clark, Terry N. 1967 "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where and When?" Sociological Quarterly, 8 (Summer): 291-316.

- 1967 "The Concept of Power: Some Overemphasized and Underrecognized Dimensions--An Examination with Special Reference to the Local Community." *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 48 (December): 271-286.
- 1968 a *Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analyses*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- 1968 b "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities." *American Sociological Review*, 33 (August): 576-593.
- 1971 "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities. *Community Politics*. ed. by Charles M. Bonjean, Terry N. Clark and Robert L. Lineberry. New York: The Free Press.
- Crain, Robert L. and Donald Rosenthal
1967 "Community Status as a Dimension of Local Decision-Making." *American Sociological Review*, 32 (December): 970-984.
- D'Antonio, William V. and Eugene C. Erickson
1962 "The Reputational Technique for the Study of Community Power." *American Sociological Review*, 27 (June): 362-375.
- Dahl, Robert A.
1958 "A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model." *American Political Science Review*, 52 (June): 463-469.
- 1961 *Who Governs? Power and Democracy in America*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ehrich, Howard
1967 "The Social Psychology of Reputations for Community Leadership." *Sociological Quarterly*, 8 (Autumn): 514-530.

- Fanelli, A. Alexander
1956 "A Typology of Community Leadership Based on Influence and Interaction within the Leader Subsystem." *Social Forces*, 34 (May): 332-338.
- Freeman, Linton C., Thomas J. Fararo, Warner Bloomberg, Jr. and Morris H. Sunshine.
1963 "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches." *American Sociological Review*, 28 (October): 791-798.
- Gilbert, Claire, W.
1967 "Some Trends in Community Politics: A Secondary Analysis of Power Structure Data from 166 Communities." *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 48 (December): 373-381. ✓
- 1968 "Community Power and Decision-Making: A Quantative Examination of Previous Research." in Terry Clark (ed), *Community Structure and Decision-Making*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Gordon, Milton M.
1950 *Social Class in American Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill. ✓
- Grimes, Michael D., Charles M. Bonjean and Robert L. Lineberry.
1972 "Structural Correlates of Leadership Arrangements in Seventeen Communities." Unpublished revision of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, March 1971.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. and Edgar F. Borgatta
1965 *American Cities: Their Social Characteristics*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hillery, George A., Jr.
1955 "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." *Rural Sociology*, 20 (June): 111-123.
- Hollingshead, August B.
1948 "Community Research: Development and Present Conditions." *American Sociological Review*, 13 (April): 135-156. ✓

- International City Manager's Association
annual The Municipal Yearbook. Chicago: Inter-
 national City Managers' Association.
- Kaufman, Herbert and Victor Jones
1954 "The Mystery of Power." Public Administra- ✓
 tion Review, 14 (Summer): 205-212.
- Kendall, Maurice G.
1948 Rank Correlation Methods. London: C. Griffin.

1962 Rank Correlation Methods. London: C. Griffin.
- Lineberry, Robert L. and Edmund Fowler
1967 "Reformism and Public Politics in American
 Cities." American Political Science Review,
 61 (September): 701-716.
- Mumford, Lewis
1961 The City in History: Its Origins, Its Trans-
 formations and Its Prospects. New York:
 Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Ogburn, William F.
1937 Social Characteristics of Cities. Chicago:
 International City Managers' Association.
- Pellegrin, Ronald J.
1967 "Selected Bibliography on Community Power
 Structure." Southwestern Social Science
 Quarterly, 48 (December): 451-465.
- Pellegrin, Ronald J. and Charles H. Coates
1956 "Absentee-Owned Corporations and Community
 Power Structure." American Journal of Socio- ✓
 logy, 61 (March): 413-419.
- Polsby, Nelson W.
1959 "Three Problems in the Analysis of Community
 Power." American Sociology Review, 24
 (December): 797-803.
- 1960 "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist ✓
 Alternative." Journal of Politics, 22
 (August): 474-484.

- Presthaus, Robert
 1964 Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power.
 New York: Oxford University Press.
- Preston, James D.
 1969 "The Search for Community Leaders: A Re-
 examination of the Reputational Technique."
 Sociological Inquiry, 39 (Winter): 37-47.
- Price, Daniel O.
 1942 "Factor Analysis in the Study of Metropolitan
 Centers." Social Forces, 20 (May): 449-459.
- Redfield, Robert
 1953 The Primitive World and Its Transformations.
 Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Rogers, David
 1962 "Community Political Systems: A Framework
 and Hypothesis for Comparative Studies," in
 Bert Swanson (ed) Current Trends in Compara-
 tive Community Studies. Kansas City, Mo.:
 Community Studies, Inc., 31-48.
- Rosenbaum, Allan
 1967 "Community Power and Political Theory: A
 Case of Misperception." Berkeley Journal of
 Sociology, 12 (Summer): 91-116.
- Rossi, Peter H.
 1960 "Power and Community Structure. Midwest
 Journal of Political Science, 4 (November):
 390-401.
- 1968 "Power and Community Structure." in Terry
 N. Clark (ed) Community Structure and Decision-
 Making. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Rossi, Peter H. and Robert Cain.
 1968 "The NORC Permanent Community Sample." Public
 Opinion Quarterly, 32 (Summer): 261-272.
- Schulze, Robert O. and Leonard U. Blumberg
 1957 "The Determination of Local Power Elites."
 American Journal of Sociology, 63 (November):
 290-296.

- Siegel, Sidney
 1956 Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thorndike, Edward L.
 1939 Your City. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World
- Walton, John
 1966 "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status ✓
 of Research on Community Power Structure."
 American Journal of Sociology, 71 (January):
 403-436.
- 1967 "The Vertical Axis of Community Power: A
 Note on the Sociology of Knowledge." American
 Sociological Review, 31 (October): 353-368.
- 1968 "Differential Patterns of Community Power
 Structure: An Explanation Based on Inter-
 dependence." in Terry N. Clark (ed) Community
 Structure and Decision-Making. San Francisco:
 Chandler.
- 1970 "A Systematic Survey of Community Power Re-
 search." The Structure of Community Power.
 ed. by Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott. New
 York: Random House.
- Wolfinger, Raymond
 1960 "Reputation and Reality in the Study of
 Community Power." American Sociological Re-
 view, 25 (October): 636-644.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
 1962 County and City Data Book. Washington, D.C.:
 U. S. Government Printing Office.

Martha Ann Zivley typing service

2707 HEMPHILL PARK • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78705 • AC 512 472-3210